

F.28 Mark 0070/0100 series airplanes), as applicable, is acceptable for compliance with paragraph (a) of this AD.

Spares

(b) As of the effective date of this AD, no person shall install torque link damper having P/N 23700-1 or -3, on any airplane.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116.

Note 3: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM-116.

Special Flight Permits

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Incorporation by Reference

(e) The actions shall be done in accordance with Fokker Service Bulletin SBF28/32-157, dated October 1, 1999; or Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100-32-114, dated October 1, 1999; as applicable. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Fokker Services B.V., P.O. Box 231, 2150 AE Nieuw-Vennep, the Netherlands. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 4: The subject of this AD is addressed in Dutch airworthiness directive 1999-138, dated October 29, 1999.

Effective Date

(f) This amendment becomes effective on December 4, 2001.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on October 22, 2001.

Ali Bahrami,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01-27069 Filed 10-29-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

28 CFR PART 16

[AAG/A Order No. 246-2001]

Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice currently exempts the following system of records from subsection (d) of the Privacy Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2): Controlled Substances Act Nonpublic Records (JUSTICE/JMD-002). This final rule makes changes to reflect the current statutory authority, as well as the primary reason for exempting the system.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective October 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Cahill at 202-307-1823.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 20, 2001 (66 FR 37939), a proposed rule was published in the *Federal Register* with an invitation to comment. No comments were received.

This order relates to individuals rather than small business entities. Nevertheless, pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, this order will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in Part 16

Administrative Practices and Procedures, Courts, Freedom of Information Act, Privacy Act, and Government in Sunshine Act.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Attorney General by 5 U.S.C. 552a and delegated to me by Attorney General Order No. 793-78, 28 CFR part 16 is amended as follows:

PART 16—AMENDED

1. The authority for part 16 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 552, 552a, 552b(g), 553; 18 U.S.C. 4203(a)(1); 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 534; 31 U.S.C. 3717, 9701.

2. It is proposed to amend 28 CFR 16.76 by revising paragraph (b)(1) as follows:

§ 16.76 Exemption of Justice Management Division.

* * * * *

(b) Exemption from subsection (d) is justified for the following reasons:

(1) Access to and use of the nonpublic records maintained in this system are restricted by law. Section 3607(b) of

Title 18 U.S.C. (enacted as part of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, Pub. L. 98-473, Chapter II) provides that the sole purpose of these records shall be for use by the courts in determining whether a person found guilty of violating section 404 of the Controlled Substances Act qualifies:

(i) for the disposition available under 18 U.S.C. 3607(a) to persons with no prior conviction under a Federal or State law relating to controlled substances, or

(ii) for an order, under 18 U.S.C. 3607(c), expunging all official records (except the nonpublic records to be retained by the Department of Justice) of the arrest and any subsequent criminal proceedings relating to the offense.

* * * * *

Dated: October 17, 2001.

Janis A. Sposato,

Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-27202 Filed 10-29-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FB-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Francisco Bay 01-009]

RIN 2115-AA97

Security Zones; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA and Oakland, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Temporary final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing two temporary security zones in areas of the San Francisco Bay adjacent to San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport. These actions are necessary to ensure public safety and prevent sabotage or terrorist acts at these airports. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into or remaining in these security zones without permission of the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 5 p.m. (PDT) on September 21, 2001 to 4:59 p.m. (PDT) on March 21, 2002. Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before December 31, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, San Francisco Bay, Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA 94501. Any comments and material received from the public, as

well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of docket COTP San Francisco Bay 01-009, and will be available for inspection or copying at the same address between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Andrew B. Cheney, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, at (510) 437-3073.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

As authorized by 5 U.S.C. 553, we did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. In keeping with the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM, and that under 5 U.S.C. 553 (d)(3), good cause exists for making this regulation effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

On September 11, 2001, two commercial aircraft were hijacked from Logan Airport in Boston, Massachusetts and flown into the World Trade Center in New York, New York inflicting catastrophic human casualties and property damage. On the same day, a similar attack was conducted on the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia. Also, on the same date, a fourth commercial passenger airplane was hijacked, this one from Newark, New Jersey, and later crashed in Pennsylvania. National security officials warn that future terrorist attacks against civilian targets may be anticipated. A heightened level of security has been established concerning all vessels transiting in the San Francisco Bay, and particularly in waters adjacent to San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport. These security zones are needed to protect the United States and more specifically the people, ports, waterways, and properties of the San Francisco Bay area.

The delay inherent in the NPRM process, and any delay in the effective date of this rule, is contrary to the public interest insofar as it may render individuals and facilities within and adjacent to the San Francisco and Oakland airports vulnerable to subversive activity, sabotage or terrorist attack. The measures contemplated by this rule are intended to prevent future terrorist attacks against individuals and facilities within or adjacent to these west coast airports. Immediate action is required to accomplish these objectives. Any delay in the effective date of this

rule is impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

Request for Comments

Although the Coast Guard has good cause in implementing this regulation, we want to afford the maritime community the opportunity to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material regarding the size and boundaries of these security zones in order to minimize unnecessary burdens. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking, COTP San Francisco Bay 01-009, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8 1/2 by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this temporary final rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not plan to hold a public meeting. However, you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section, or to the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

On September 11, 2001, terrorists launched attacks on civilian and military targets within the United States killing large numbers of people and damaging properties of national significance. Vessels operating near the airports adjacent to the San Francisco Bay present possible platforms from which individuals may gain unauthorized access to the airports. As part of the Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-399), Congress amended the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA) to allow the Coast Guard to take actions, including the establishment of security and safety zones, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism against individuals, vessels, or public or commercial structures. 33 U.S.C. 1226. The terrorist acts against the United States on September 11, 2001 have increased the need for safety and security measures on

U.S. ports and waterways. In response to these terrorist acts, and in order to prevent similar occurrences, the Coast Guard is establishing two temporary security zones in the navigable waters of the United States surrounding San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport.

San Francisco International Airport

This security zone will extend 2000 yards seaward from the shoreline of the San Francisco International Airport. This distance from the shoreline is estimated to be an adequate zone size to provide increased security for San Francisco International Airport.

Oakland International Airport

This security zone will extend 1800 yards seaward from the shoreline of the Oakland International Airport. This distance from the shoreline is estimated to be an adequate zone size to provide increased security for Oakland International Airport.

The size of each security zone is tailored to each airport and their specific navigational limitations, and therefore, are not the same exact size. The two security zones are uniform, however, in their purpose—to provide increased security for the airports, while minimizing the impact to vessel traffic on the San Francisco Bay.

These temporary security zones are necessary to provide for the safety and security of the United States of America and the people, ports, waterways and properties within the San Francisco Bay area. These security zones will be enforced by Coast Guard patrol craft or any patrol craft enlisted by the COTP. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into or remaining in these security zones without permission of the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative. Each person and vessel in a security zone shall obey any direction or order of the COTP. The COTP may remove any person, vessel, article, or thing from a security zone. No person may board, or take or place any article or thing on board, any vessel in a security zone without the permission of the COTP.

Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1232, any violation of the security zone described herein, is punishable by civil penalties (not to exceed \$27,500 per violation, where each day of a continuing violation is a separate violation), criminal penalties (imprisonment for not more than 6 years and a fine of not more than \$250,000), in rem liability against the offending vessel, and license sanctions. Any person who violates this regulation, using a dangerous weapon, or who engages in conduct that causes

bodily injury or fear of imminent bodily injury to any officer authorized to enforce this regulation, also faces imprisonment up to 12 years (class C felony).

Regulatory Evaluation

This temporary final rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, 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).

Due to the recent terrorist actions against the United States the implementation of these security zones are necessary for the protection of the United States and its people. Because these security zones are established in an area of the San Francisco Bay that is seldom used, the Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that full regulatory evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Coast Guard considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "Small entities" include small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations less than 50,000.

These security zones will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because these security zones will not occupy an area of the San Francisco Bay that is frequently transited. Therefore, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this temporary final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), the Coast Guard offers to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. If your small business or organization is affected by this rule and you have questions

concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Lieutenant Andrew B. Cheney, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Office San Francisco Bay at (510) 437–3073.

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

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 and have determined that this rule 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 create 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, 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 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.

Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that under figure 2–1, paragraph (34), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation, because we are establishing security zones. A "Categorical Exclusion Determination" is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under ADDRESSES.

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—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 1.46.

2. Add new § 165.T11–095 to read as follows:

§ 165.T11–095 Security Zones; Waters surrounding San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport, San Francisco Bay, California.

(a) *Locations.* (1) *San Francisco International Airport Security Zone.* This security zone extends 2000 yards seaward from the shoreline of the San Francisco International Airport and encompasses all waters in San Francisco Bay within an area drawn from the following coordinates beginning at a point latitude 37°39'06" N and longitude 122°22'37" W; thence to 37°38'28" N and 122°21'04" W; thence to 37°36'59" N and 122°19'52" W; thence to 37°35'33" N and 122°20'44" W; and along the shoreline back to the beginning point.

(2) *Oakland International Airport Security Zone.* This security zone extends 1800 yards seaward from the shoreline of the Oakland International Airport and encompasses all waters in San Francisco Bay within an area drawn from the following coordinates beginning at a point latitude 37°44'21" N and longitude 122°15'34" W; thence to 37°43'51" N and 122°16'09" W; thence to 37°43'12" N and 122°16'17" W; thence to 37°41'00" N and 122°13'29" W; thence to 37°41'13" N and 122°12'09" W; thence to 37°41'37" N and 122°11'38" W; and along the shoreline back to the beginning point.

(b) *Effective dates.* This section is in effect from 5 p.m. (PDT) on September 21, 2001 to 4:59 p.m. (PDT) on March 21, 2002. If the need for these security zones ends before the scheduled termination time, the Captain of the Port will cease enforcement of these security zones and will also announce that fact via Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

(c) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the security zone

established by this temporary section, unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative. All other general regulations of § 165.33 of this part apply in the security zone established by this temporary section.

Dated: September 21, 2001.

L.L. Hereth,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, California.

[FR Doc. 01–27255 Filed 10–29–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MD 072–3086; FRL–7088–9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; One-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration for the Baltimore Ozone Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving the State Implementation Plan (SIP) consisting of the attainment demonstration for the one-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for the Baltimore severe nonattainment area (the Baltimore area). This control strategy plan was submitted by the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). The measures that have been adopted by the State which comprise the control strategy of the one-hour ozone attainment demonstration have and will result in significant emission reductions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) in the Baltimore area. The intended effect of this action is to approve these SIP revisions as meeting the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This final rule is effective on November 29, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 and Maryland Department of the Environment, 2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, 21224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cristina Fernandez, (215) 814–2178 at EPA Region III office above or by e-mail at fernandez.cristina@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section is organized to address the following questions:

- A. What Action Is EPA Taking In This Final Rulemaking?
- B. What Previous Action Has Been Proposed on These SIP Revisions?
- C. What Were the Conditions for Approval Provided in the Notice of Proposed Rulemakings for the Attainment Demonstration?
- D. What Amendments to the Attainment Demonstration SIP Did Maryland Submit for the Baltimore Area Since December 16, 1999?
- E. What Did the Supplemental Notices of Proposed Rulemaking Cover?
- F. When Did EPA Make a Determination Regarding the Adequacy of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Baltimore Area?
- G. What SIP Elements Did EPA Take Final Action on Concurrently or Before the Full Approval of the Attainment Demonstration Could Be Granted?
- H. What Measures Are in the Control Strategy for the Attainment Demonstration?
- I. What Are the Approved Transportation Conformity Budgets, and What Effect Does This Action Have on Transportation Planning?
- J. What Happens to the Approved 2005 Budgets When States Change Their Budgets Using the MOBILE6 Model?
- K. What is the Status of Maryland's New Source Review Program?
- L. What Comments Were Received on the Proposed Approvals and How Has EPA Responded to Those?

I. Background

A. What Action Is EPA Taking in This Final Rulemaking?

EPA is approving the one-hour attainment demonstration submitted by Maryland for the Baltimore area as fully meeting the requirements of CAA section 182(c)(2) and (d). The following table identifies submittal dates and amendment dates for the attainment demonstration:

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF ATTAINMENT DEMONSTRATION SIP SUBMITTAL DATES

	Date	Summary of content
Initial Submittal	April 29, 1998	Attainment Demonstration.
Amendment	August 18, 1998	Attainment Demonstration Revision to Include Supplemental Regional Scale Modeling.
Amendment	December 21, 1999	Attainment Demonstration Revision to Include Revised Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets.