

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

### Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have 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 proposed rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

### Taking of Private Property

This proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

### Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph 34(g) of Commandant Instruction M16475.LC, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

### 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 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 and 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. A new temporary section 165.T09–926 is added to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–926 Safety Zone, Waters off Sister Bay Marina, Sister Bay, Wisconsin

(a) *Location.* The following area is a Safety Zone:

(1) The safety zone will encompass all waters bounded by the arc of a circle with a 420-foot radius with its center in approximate position 45° 10.60' N, 087° 06.60' W, located off Sister Bay marina.

(b) *Effective Dates and Times.* This safety zone is effective on September 1st, 2001 from 8:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (CST).

(c) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in Section 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is subject to the following requirements:

(1) This safety zone is closed to all marine traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port or his duly appointed representative.

(2) The “duly appointed representative” of the Captain of the Port is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port, Milwaukee, Wisconsin to act on his behalf. The representative of the Captain of the Port will be aboard either a Coast Guard or Coast Guard Auxiliary vessel.

(3) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the Safety Zone shall contact the Captain of the Port or his representative to obtain permission to do so. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the Safety Zone shall comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port or his representative.

(4) The Captain of the Port may be contacted by telephone via the Command Duty Officer at (414) 747–7155 during working hours. Vessels assisting in the enforcement of the Safety Zone may be contacted on VHF–FM channels 16 or 21A. Vessel operators may determine the restrictions in effect for the safety zone by coming alongside a vessel patrolling the perimeter of the Safety Zone.

(5) Coast Guard Group Milwaukee will issue a Marine Safety Information Broadcast Notice to Mariners to notify the maritime community of the Safety Zone and restriction imposed.

Dated: June 15, 2001.

**M.R. DeVries,**

*Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Milwaukee.*

[FR Doc. 01–15999 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–01–037]

**RIN 2115–AA97**

### Safety Zone; Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, Michigan

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a safety zone for a fireworks display on Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, Michigan. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life and property on navigable waters during this event. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic in a portion of Kalamazoo Lake.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 11, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to: Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Chicago, 215 W. 83rd Street, Suite D, Burr Ridge, Illinois 60521. Marine Safety Office Chicago maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. 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 this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at MSO Chicago between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** MST2 Mike Hogan, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Chicago, 215 W. 83rd Street, Suite D, Chicago, Illinois 60521, (630) 986-2175.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [CGD09-01-037], 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 8½ 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 proposed rule in view of them.

**Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to MSO Chicago at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one 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**

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone that will be activated for a fireworks display. The proposed safety zone will include the waters of Kalamazoo Lake bounded by the arc of a circle with a 1000-foot radius with its center in approximate position 42° 38'52.5" N, 086° 12'18.15" W (NAD 1983).

Based on recent accidents that have occurred in other Captain of the Port zones and the explosive hazard associated with this event, the Captain of the Port has determined that

fireworks launches in close proximity to watercraft pose a significant risk to public safety and property. The likely combination of large numbers of inexperienced recreational boaters, congested waterways, darkness punctuated by bright flashes of light, and debris falling into the water could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities. Establishing a safety zone to control vessel movement within a 1000-foot radius of the fireworks launch platform will help ensure the safety of persons and property at these events and help minimize the associated risk.

Establishing temporary safety zones by notice and comment rulemaking gives the public the opportunity to comment on the proposed zones, provides better notice than promulgating temporary rules annually, and decreases the amount of annual paperwork required for these events. The Coast Guard has not previously received notice of any impact caused by these events.

**Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The proposed size of this safety zone was determined using National Fire Protection Association and local area fire department standards, combined with the Coast Guard's knowledge of waterway conditions in these areas.

The proposed safety zone would be in effect from 8 p.m. (local) to 11:30 p.m. (local), July 28, 2001. Vessels may only enter, remain in, or transit through this safety zone during this time frame if authorized by the Captain of the Port Chicago, or designated on scene Coast Guard patrol personnel, as provided for in 33 CFR 165.23.

**Regulatory Evaluation**

This proposed 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).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

This determination is based on the minimal time that vessels will be restricted from the zones, and all of the zones are in areas where the Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse

impact to mariners from the zones' activation.

**Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have 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.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of commercial vessels intending to transit a portion of an activated safety zone.

This safety zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: The proposed zone is only in effect for a few hours on the day of the event. Vessel traffic can safely pass outside the proposed safety zone during the events. In cases where traffic congestion is greater than expected, traffic may be allowed to pass through the safety zone under Coast Guard escort with the permission of the Captain of the Port Chicago. Before the effective period, we will issue maritime advisories widely available to users of the Port of Chicago by the Ninth Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners, Marine information broadcasts, and facsimile broadcasts may also be made. Additionally, the Coast Guard has not received any negative reports from small entities affected during these displays in previous years.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

**Assistance for Small Entities**

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects and participate in the rulemaking process. If the rule would affect your small business,

organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Marine Safety Office Chicago (see **ADDRESSES.**)

### Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

### Federalism

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have 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) 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 proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### Taking of Private Property

This proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

### Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph 34 (g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.IC, this rule is categorically excluded from further

environmental documentation. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES.**

### 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 record keeping 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 1.46.

2. Add section 165.T09–925 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–925 Safety Zone: Kalamazoo Lake, Saugatuck, MI

(a) The following area is designated a safety zone:

(i) *Location.* The waters of Kalamazoo Lake bounded by the arc of a circle with a 1000-foot radius with its center in the middle of the fireworks launch barge, in approximate position 42° 38'52.5" N, 086° 12'18.15" W (NAD 1983).

(ii) *Effective dates.* This regulation is effective from 8 p.m. (local) to 11:30 p.m. (local) on July 28, 2001.

### (b) Regulations.

(1) The general regulations contained in 33 CFR 165.23 apply.

(2) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the designated on scene patrol personnel. Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the U.S. Coast Guard. Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel via siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator shall proceed as directed.

Dated: May 24, 2001.

**R.E. Sebald,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Chicago.*

[FR Doc. 01–16019 Filed 6–25–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA242–0240; FRL–7002–9]

### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing a disapproval of revisions to the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District's (ICAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern visible emissions (VE) from many different sources of air pollution. We are proposing action on Rule 401—Opacity of Emissions, a local rule regulating different emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by July 26, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

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