

a portion of Chelsea River between June 27, 2001 and July 13, 2001, during the designated closures. This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: the minimal time that vessels will be restricted from the area and the advance notifications which will be made to the local maritime community by safety marine information broadcasts and local notice to mariners.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), the Coast Guard offered to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. The Coast Guard coordinated a meeting to achieve this on June 21, 2001.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520).

Federalism

The Coast Guard analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132 and has determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal Government's having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

Taking of Private Property

This rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have

taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

The Coast Guard analyzed this rule under E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not pose an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. A rule with tribal implications has a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that, under figure 2-1, (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.IC, this proposed rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping

requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05-1(g), 6.04-1, 6.04-6, 160.5; 49 CFR 1.

2. Add temporary § 165.T01-107 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01-107 Safety Zone: McArdle Bridge Dredge Operations—Boston, Massachusetts

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All waters of Boston Inner Harbor one hundred (100) yards upstream and downstream of the McArdle Bridge, Boston, MA.

(b) *Effective date.* This section will be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on June 27 through June 29, 2001, and from sunrise on July 10 until sunrise on July 13, 2001.

(c) *Regulations.*

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone will be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Boston.

(2) All vessel operators shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, local, state, and federal law enforcement vessels.

Dated: June 27, 2001.

B.M. Salerno,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Boston, Massachusetts.

[FR Doc. 01-17382 Filed 7-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD07-01-048]

RIN 2115-AA97

Safety Zone; Ashley River, Charleston, SC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is removing the safety zone in front of Brittlebank

Park on the Ashley River, South Carolina. The zone was created for fireworks displays launched from a barge in the Ashley River. The zone is no longer needed because the fireworks are now launched from land.

DATES: This section becomes effective on August 10, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket [CGD07-01-048] and are available for inspection or copying at Marine Safety Office Charleston, 196 Tradd Street, Charleston, SC 29401-1899, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lt. Paul Dittman, Port Operations Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, Charleston, SC (843) 724-7684.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that publishing an NPRM is unnecessary because this rule removes a safety zone that is no longer needed because fireworks are no longer launched or exploded over the River.

Background and Purpose

The rule creating the safety zone was published in the **Federal Register** (56 FR 30508) on July 3, 1991. The rule established a safety zone around a barge that launched fireworks every year on the Fourth of July. The safety zone was needed to prevent damage or injury from falling fireworks debris and to prevent the accidental discharge of the fireworks prior to their launching. The regulation was in effect July 4 each year. Starting in 2000 the fireworks launch area was moved inland. The safety zone is no longer needed and the Coast Guard is removing the regulation.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. The office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979).

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because this rule removes an obsolete safety zone.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-121), we offer to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. Small entities may contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for assistance in understanding and participating in this rulemaking. We also have a point of contact for commenting on actions by employees of the Coast Guard. Small business may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247).

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the

aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to health or safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2-1, paragraph 34(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.IC, this proposed rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a significant energy action under that order because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a

significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—[AMENDED]

1. The authority for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); 6.04–1, 6.04–6. 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

§ 165.713 [Removed]

2. Remove § 165.713.

Dated: July 2, 2001.

G.W. Merrick,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Charleston, South Carolina.

[FR Doc. 01–17405 Filed 7–10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 071–0283; FRL–6997–6]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, and South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD) portion and Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2000 and concerns PM–10 emissions from livestock feed lots and from agricultural burning. Under authority of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), this action simultaneously approves local rules that regulate these emission sources and directs California to correct rule deficiencies.

EPA is also finalizing full approval of revisions to the ICAPCD portion of the California SIP concerning definitions, PM–10 emissions from orchard heaters, incinerators, open burning, and range improvement burning; to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portion concerning PM–10 emissions from restaurant operations; and to the MBUAPCD portion concerning exceptions to other rules.

EPA is deferring to a separate action revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California SIP concerning PM–10 emissions from industrial processes and from residential wood combustion.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule is effective on August 10, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA’s Region IX office during normal business hours. You can inspect copies of the submitted rule revisions at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 “I” Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, 150 South Ninth Street, El Centro, CA 92243.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 East Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 744–1135.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to EPA.

I. Proposed Action

On December 15, 2000 (65 FR 78434), EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of the rules in Table 1 that were submitted by CARB for incorporation into the California SIP.

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
ICAPCD	420	Livestock Feed Yards	9/14/99	5/26/00
ICAPCD	701	Agricultural Burning	9/14/99	5/26/00
MBUAPCD	403	Particulate Matter	3/22/00	5/26/00
SJVUAPCD	4201	Particulate Matter Concentration	12/17/92	11/18/93
SJVUAPCD	4901	Residential Wood Burning	7/15/93	12/10/93

We proposed a limited approval because we determined that these rules improve the SIP and are largely consistent with the relevant CAA requirements. We simultaneously proposed a limited disapproval because some rule provisions conflict with section 110 and part D of the CAA and have limited enforceability.

On December 15, 2000 (65 FR 78434), we also proposed a full approval of the adoption or rescision of the rules in Table 2 that were submitted by CARB for incorporation into or removal from the California SIP.

TABLE 2.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted or rescinded	Submitted
ICAPCD	101	Definitions	9/14/99	5/26/00
ICAPCD	408	Frost Protection	9/14/99	5/26/00