

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule does not require an environmental impact statement because section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule: (a) Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million; (b) will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and (c) does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises. This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate on state, local, or tribal governments or the private sector

of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal, which is the subject of this rule, is based upon counterpart federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 931

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: December 5, 2001.

Brent T. Wahlquist,

Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 02-481 Filed 1-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD05-01-070]

RIN 2115-AE46

Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Western Branch, Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, VA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish permanent special local regulations for marine events held on the waters of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the events. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic in portions of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River during the events.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before March 11, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (Aoax), Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004, hand-deliver them to Room 119 at the same address between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, or fax them to (757) 398-6203. The Operations Oversight Branch, Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety Section, Fifth Coast Guard District, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and materials 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 the above address between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: S. L. Phillips, Project Manager, Auxiliary and Recreational Boating Safety Section, at (757) 398-6204.

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 (CGD05-01-070), 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 the address listed 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 City of Portsmouth, Ports Events, Inc., and other event organizers sponsor marine events throughout the year on the waters of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River. These marine events are held adjacent to the Portsmouth City Park. A fleet of spectator vessels traditionally gathers near the event site to view the marine events. To provide for the safety of event participants, spectators and transiting vessels, the Coast Guard proposes to temporarily restrict the movement of all vessels operating in the event area during the marine events.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a permanent regulated area on specified waters of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River. The proposed special local regulations will restrict general navigation in the regulated area during the events. Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol

Commander, no person or vessel will be allowed to enter or remain in the regulated area. The proposed regulated area is needed to control vessel traffic during the marine events to enhance the safety of participants, spectators and transiting vessels.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed 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).

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.

Although this regulation prevents traffic from transiting a portion of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River during the events, the effect of this regulation will not be significant due to the limited duration that the regulated area will be in effect and the extensive advance notifications that will be made to the maritime community via the Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, and area newspapers, so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly. Additionally, the regulated area has been narrowly tailored to impose the least impact on general navigation yet provide the level of safety necessary.

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. Although this regulation prevents traffic from transiting a portion of the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River during the events, the effect of this regulation will not be significant because of the limited duration that the regulated area will be in effect and the extensive advance notifications that will

be made to the maritime community via the Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, and area newspapers, so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly. If you think that your business, organization or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed 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 proposed 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 proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. 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 the address listed under **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

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State law or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed 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 proposed rule will not result in such 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 does not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial and 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.

To help the Coast Guard establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian and Alaskan Native tribes, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 36361, July 11, 2001) requesting comments on how to best carry out the Order. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a "tribal implication" under the Order.

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.

Environment

We prepared an "Environmental Assessment" in accordance with

Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, and determined that this proposed rule will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The "Environmental Assessment" and "Finding of No Significant Impact" is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

PART 100—MARINE EVENTS

1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. § 100.525 is added to read as follows:

§ 100.525 Western Branch, Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia.

(a) *Definitions*—(1) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander*. The Coast Guard Patrol Commander is a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Group Hampton Roads.

(2) *Official Patrol*. The Official Patrol is any vessel assigned or approved by Commander, Coast Guard Group Hampton Roads with a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board and displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(3) *Regulated Area*. The regulated area includes all waters of the Western Branch, Elizabeth River bounded by a line connecting the following points:

Latitude	Longitude
36°50'18" North	076°23' 10" West, to
36°50'18" North	076°21'42" West, to
36°50'12" North	076°21'prime;42" West, to
36°50'12" North	076°23'10" West, to
36°50'18" North	076°23'10" West

All coordinates reference Datum NAD 1983.

(b) *Special Local Regulations*. (1) Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

(2) The operator of any vessel in this area shall:

(i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any Official Patrol, including any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board a vessel displaying a Coast Guard ensign; and

(ii) Proceed as directed by any Official Patrol, including any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board a vessel displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(c) *Effective Dates*. This section is effective annually from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. local time on the fourth Friday and fourth Saturday in March, the fourth Friday and fourth Saturday in April, the second Friday and second Saturday in May, and the second Saturday and second Sunday in October.

Dated: December 11, 2001.

Thad W. Allen,

Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02-545 Filed 1-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 725

[OPPTS-50645; FRL-6809-2]

RIN 2070-AD43

Burkholderia Cepacia Complex; Proposed Significant New Use Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a significant new use rule (SNUR) under section 5(a)(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) for *Burkholderia cepacia* complex (Bcc), a group of naturally-occurring microorganisms. Bcc microorganisms, when encountered in sufficient numbers through an appropriate route of exposure by a member of a sensitive population, such as a cystic fibrosis (CF) patient, have the potential to cause a severe infection, resulting in significantly increased rates of mortality. This proposed rule would require persons who intend to manufacture, import, or process Bcc for

a significant new use to notify EPA at least 90 days before commencing the manufacturing (including import) or processing of Bcc for a use designated by this SNUR as a significant new use. The required notice would provide EPA with the opportunity to evaluate the intended new use and associated activities and, if necessary, to prohibit or limit that activity before it occurs.

DATES: Comments, identified by docket control number OPPTS-50645, must be received on or before March 11, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPPTS-50645 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information contact: Barbara Cunningham, Director, Office of Program Management and Evaluation, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (7401), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 554-1404; e-mail address: TSCA-Hotline@epa.gov.

For technical information contact: James Alwood, Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (7405M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564-8974; e-mail address: alwood.jim@epa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you manufacture (including import), process, or use products that contain living microorganisms subject to jurisdiction under TSCA, especially if you know that your products contain or may contain Bcc. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

Categories	NAICS codes	Examples of Potentially Affected Entities
Chemical manufacturers	325	Persons manufacturing, importing, or processing products for commercial purposes containing Bcc for biofertilizers; biosensors; biotechnology reagents; commodity or specialty chemical production; energy applications; and other TSCA uses
Waste management and remediation	562	Waste treatment or pollutant degradation