

C. CEF's Distinctive Feature(s) Allegedly Make the Fiber Suitable for Uses for Which Other Olefin Fibers Would Not Be Suited, or Would Be Significantly Less Well Suited

Dow asserted that CEF is suitable for uses for which olefin fibers are not suited, or not as well suited. Dow's petition stated:

Today's olefin—largely seen in carpet, thermal underwear, and socks—does not offer the consumer stretch or the easy-care characteristics gained through high temperature tolerance. To textile mill producers, CEF enables process economies and the production of new products with atypical stretch and performance properties. To the consumer, CEF offers a wider choice in garments containing stretch fabric plus the benefit of easy-care laundering at higher temperatures without degradation of the stretch fiber.⁹

With respect to its commercialization plans, Dow stated that beginning in 1999, it identified and began working with developmental partners who are leaders in the fiber manufacturing and apparel industry around the world. Since the second quarter of 2001, CEF has been successfully made on commercial-scale spinning equipment, with resulting quantities subsequently produced and used in a wide range of fabrics, including both knits and wovens. These fabrics have been used to make a variety of goods, most notably for the apparel market. The market testing process of garments with leading retailers is presently underway, with completion expected within the near future. Dow expects commercialization of CEF to begin at the end of the second quarter of 2002. In effect, therefore, Dow has argued that granting the petition would facilitate the use of CEF fiber in consumer applications, and using a new generic term (like lastol) would help consumers identify products made from CEF. Thus, Dow has maintained that a new generic fiber subclass name would be important to the public at large, not just knowledgeable professionals.

IV. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to an initial regulatory analysis (5 U.S.C. 603–604) are not applicable to this proposal, because the Commission believes that the amendment, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Commission has tentatively reached this conclusion with respect to the proposed amendment, because the amendment would impose no additional obligations, penalties or

costs. The amendment simply would allow covered companies to use a new generic name for a new fiber that may not appropriately fit within current generic names and definitions. The amendment would impose no additional labeling requirements.

To ensure that no substantial economic impact is being overlooked, however, the Commission requests public comment on the effect of the proposed amendment on costs, profits, and competitiveness of, and employment in, small entities. After receiving public comment, the Commission will decide whether preparation of a final regulatory flexibility analysis is warranted. Accordingly, based on available information, the Commission certifies, pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), that the proposed amendment, if promulgated, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

V. Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed amendment does not constitute a “collection of information” under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PL 104–13, 109 Stat. 163) and its implementing regulations. (5 CFR 1320 *et seq.*) The collection of information imposed by the procedures for establishing generic names (16 CFR 303.8) has been submitted to OMB and has been assigned control number 3084–0101.

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 303

Labeling, Textile, Trade Practices.

Authority: Sec. 7(c) of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (15 U.S.C. 70e(c)).

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–13151 Filed 5–23–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–02–006]

RIN 2115–AA97

Security Zone; Lake Erie, Perry, Ohio

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a permanent security zone on the navigable waters of Lake Erie in the Captain of the Port Zone Cleveland for

the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. This security zone is necessary to protect the Perry Nuclear Power Plant from possible sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or possible acts of terrorism. This security zone is intended to restrict vessel traffic from a portion of Lake Erie.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before June 24, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket CGD09–02–006 and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Cleveland, 1055 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44126 between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Junior Grade Allen Turner, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Cleveland, at telephone number (216) 937–0111.

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 (CGD09–02–006), 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 submit comments and related materials, 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. You may mail comments and related material to U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Cleveland, 1155 East 9th Street, Cleveland, OH 44115. Marine Safety Office Cleveland 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 Marine Safety Office Cleveland between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Background and Purpose

On September 11, 2001, the United States was the target of coordinated attacks by international terrorists

⁹ See Dow's petition dated March 19, 2002, at page 16.

resulting in catastrophic loss of life, the destruction of the World Trade Center, and significant damage to the Pentagon. National security and intelligence officials warn that future terrorists attacks are likely. This regulation proposes to establish a permanent security zone for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant. The security zone consists of all navigable waters of Lake Erie bound by a line drawn between the following coordinates: beginning at 41°48.187' N, 081°08.818' W; due north to 41°48.7' N, 081°08.818' W; due east to 41°48.7' N, 081°08.455' W; due south to the south shore of Lake Erie at 41°48.231' N, 081°08.455' W; thence westerly following the shoreline back to the beginning. These coordinates are based upon North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83). Entry into, transit through or anchoring within this security zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Cleveland or his designated on-scene representative.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

Following the catastrophic nature and extent of damage realized from the attacks of September 11, this proposed rulemaking is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States against potential future attacks.

On October 12, 2001 we published a temporary final rule establishing a security zone on the waters around Perry Nuclear Power Plant (66 FR 52043). The current rulemaking proposes to establish a permanent security zone in place of that temporary security zone. The size of the zone currently being proposed, however, is smaller than that of the original temporary security zone.

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).

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.

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 offered 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 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 Cleveland (see **ADDRESSES**.)

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 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 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 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.

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 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.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this regulation and concluded that, under figure 2-1, paragraph (34)(g) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. 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 set out 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.

§ 165.T09-111 [Removed]

2. Remove § 165.T09-111.

3. Add § 165.912 to read as follows:

§ 165.912 Security Zone; Lake Erie, Perry, OH.

(a) *Location:* The following area is a security zone: all navigable waters of Lake Erie bounded by a line drawn between the following coordinates beginning at 41°48.187' N, 081°08.818' W; then due north to 41°48.7' N, 081°08.818' W; then due east to 41°48.7' N, 081°08.455' W; then due south to the south shore of Lake Erie at 41°48.231' N, 081°08.455' W; thence westerly following the shoreline back to the beginning (NAD 83).

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Cleveland, or the designated on-scene representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

Dated: May 20, 2002.

R.J. Perry,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, MSO Cleveland.

[FR Doc. 02-13137 Filed 5-23-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 020508113-2113-01; I.D. 090501D]

RIN 0648-AP12

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid and Butterfish Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 2

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule, request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes measures contained in Framework Adjustment 2 (Framework 2) to the Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP). This action would extend the limited entry program for the *Illex* squid fishery for an additional year; modify the *Loligo* squid overfishing definition and control rule; allow for the roll-over of the annual specifications for these fisheries (with the exception of total allowable landings of foreign fishing (TALFF)) in the event annual specifications are not published prior to the start of the fishing year; and allow *Loligo* squid specifications to be set for up to 3 years, subject to annual review. NMFS has disapproved the proposed framework measure to allow *Illex* squid vessels an exemption from the *Loligo* squid trip limit during an August or September closure of the directed *Loligo* squid fishery. This action is necessary to address issues and problems that have developed relative to the management of these fisheries and is intended to further the objectives of the FMP and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

DATES: Public comments must be received no later than 5 p.m., eastern standard time, on June 10, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Copies of Framework 2, including the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Regulatory Impact Review (RIR)/Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), are

available on request from Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 South New Street, Dover, DE 19904-6790. The EA/RIR/IRFA is accessible via the Internet at <http://www.nero.gov/ro/doc/nr.htm>.

Comments on Framework 2 should be sent to: Patricia A. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, Northeast Regional Office, NMFS, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930-2298. Please mark the envelope, "Comments-SMB Framework Adjustment 2." Comments also may be sent via facsimile (fax) to 978-281-9135. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or Internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul H. Jones, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978-281-9273, fax 978-281-9135, e-mail Paul.H.Jones@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1997, Amendment 5 to the FMP established a limited entry program for the *Illex* squid fishery in response to a concern that fishing capacity could otherwise expand to over exploit the stock. At the time the program was established, there were concerns that the capacity of the limited entry vessels might prove, over time, to be insufficient to fully exploit the annual quota. In response to this concern, a 5-year sunset provision was placed on the *Illex* squid limited entry program, and it is currently scheduled to end July 1, 2002. However, in recent years the limited entry fleet has demonstrated that it has sufficient capacity to harvest the long-term potential yield from this fishery. The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) must prepare an amendment to the FMP to evaluate whether or not the limited entry program should be extended permanently. In the meantime, this action would extend the *Illex* squid moratorium through July 1, 2003, to prevent overcapitalization while the amendment is being prepared and considered by the Council. This extension complies with the criteria in section 303(b)(6) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The extension will allow the Council additional time to consider long-term management for the *Illex* squid fishery, including the limited entry program. Vessels that took small quantities of *Illex* squid in the past may continue to do so under the incidental catch provision of the FMP.

This action would also authorize the roll-over of the annual specifications for the Atlantic mackerel, squid, and butterfish fisheries. In recent years, publication of the annual specifications