use of references to the California coast and coastal areas on wine labels.

The proposed California Coast viticultural area covered 22,000 square miles and spanned 650 miles along the Pacific coast, from the Mexican border north into Mendocino County in northern California, 175 miles south of the Oregon border. The petitioned area's inland width varied from approximately 5 to 68 miles. The petition's proposed boundary lines joined the established South Coast, Central Coast, San Francisco Bay, and North Coast viticultural areas and filled in the gaps between those established areas. The petitioned area included a total of 68 smaller, established viticultural areas.

Notice No. 903 and Resulting Comments

On September 26, 2000, ATF published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Notice No. 903, in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 57763) soliciting public comments regarding the proposed California Coast viticultural area. In response to that notice, ATF received 477 comments from vineyard and winery owners, industry associations, city and county officials, and individuals. Of those commenting, 97% opposed the petition. These commenters stated that the petitioned area did not meet the regulatory requirements, and, if established, would threaten the California wine industry, jeopardize the viticultural area system, mislead consumers, and make the Estate-bottled claim less meaningful.

ATF Analysis of Petition and Comments

Prior to denying the California Coast viticultural area's establishment, ATF thoroughly reviewed all the information provided in the March 2000 petition and in the comments and documentation filed in response to Notice No. 903. The documentation and evidence provided by commenters and ATF's own research has established that the petitioned California Coast viticultural area fails to meet the regulatory requirements of 27 CFR, part 9, American Viticultural Areas.

Summary of the Reasons for Denial

The primary reasons for the denial of the California Coast viticultural area petition were:

- As commonly understood, the name ''California Coast'' applies to a longer coastal region than was included in the proposed area; and
- The significant climatic diversity found within the petitioned area due to its great north-south span.

Name Evidence

ATF has concluded that the California Coast viticultural area's petitioned boundary lines do not reflect the public's understanding of the ''California Coast'' name or meet the linguistic, geographic, or definition standards for viticultural areas or wine labeling purposes. ATF believes the term ''California Coast'' refers to the entire Pacific coastal area between Mexico and Oregon, and that no other use of the name, as related to a geographical area, can be considered accurate and true for viticultural area purposes.

Geographical Evidence

The geographical evidence presented in response to the Notice No. 903 shows that the proposed California Coast viticultural area is not a unified geographical area with viticultural features that distinguish it from surrounding areas. The area's proposed boundaries span almost 650 miles from north to south, and include shoreline, coastal plains, 5,000-foot high mountain ranges, and interior basins and valleys.

While the Pacific Ocean plays a dominate role in the California's coastal climate, the petitioned area's latitudinal span and differing ocean currents lead to significant climatic variations within it. Temperatures decrease, while rainfall and summer fog increase from south to north within the petitioned area. Two major ocean currents, the cold California Current flowing south from Alaska to Santa Barbara and the warmer Southern California Counter-Current flowing north from Mexico to Santa Barbara, are also responsible for the significantly different onshore coastal climates found within the petitioned area.

These factors are reflected in the petitioned area's differing climatic classifications. Experts classify the petitioned area's southern portion as a steppe or desert climate, while the central and northern portions are classified as a Mediterranean climate. ATF notes that even if the entire California coastline from Mexico to the Oregon border were included within a proposed viticultural area, such an area would likely have even greater climate diversity. Such a proposed area would, therefore, also not meet the regulatory criteria for an American viticultural area.

Supplemental Report Available

An 80-page report, ''ATF Response to the California Coast Viticultural Area Petition,'' containing a detailed analysis of the petition evidence, commenter information and documentation, under the requirements of 27 CFR 9.3(b)(1) through (3) for name evidence, boundary evidence, and geographical evidence, is available on the ATF Internet website at: *http://www.atf.treas.gov/alcohol/rules/index.htm.* Paper copies of the report are also available as described in the **ADDRESSES** section above.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is Nancy Sutton, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Michael D. Hoover provided editorial assistance.

Signed: July 29, 2002.

Bradley A. Buckles,

Director.

[FR Doc. 02–19829 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07–02–077]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Coronado Beach Bridge (SR 44), Intracoastal Waterway, New Smyrna Beach, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the operating regulations of the Coronado Beach drawbridge (SR 44), Intracoastal Waterway mile 845, New Smyrna Beach, Florida. This proposed rule would require the drawbridge to open on signal, except that from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. each day of the week, the draw need only open on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour. This action is intended to improve the movement of vehicular traffic while not unreasonably interfering with the needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 7, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE. 1st Avenue, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131. 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 [CGD07–02–077] and are available for inspection or copying at

Commander (obr), Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE. 1st Avenue, Miami, FL 33131 between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Barry Dragon, Bridge Branch, 909 SE 1st Ave, Miami, FL 33131, telephone number 305–415–6743.

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 [CGD07–02–077], 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 Bridge Branch, Seventh Coast Guard District, 909 SE 1st Ave, Room 432, Miami, FL 33131, 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 Coronado Beach bascule bridge is a two-lane, narrow, undivided arterial roadway. This roadway is severely congested due to insufficient vehicular capacity. The existing operating schedule is published in 33 CFR 117.5 and requires the bridge to open on demand. This proposed rule would continue to require the drawbridge to open on signal, except that from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. each day of the week, the draw need only open on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

In order to meet the reasonable needs of vehicular traffic while not significantly impacting navigation, the Coast Guard proposes to allow the Coronado Beach bridge (SR 44) to open on signal, except that from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. each day of the week, the bridge need open only on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour. This proposed rule would facilitate the movement of vehicle traffic across the bridge while not unreasonably interfering with or decreasing vessel safety while awaiting passage through the draw.

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, l979) because this proposed rule only modifies the existing bridge operation schedule during heavy vehicle traffic hours and still provides for regular openings.

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.

This proposed rule may affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels and vehicles intending to transit under and over the Coronado Beach bridge (SR 44) during the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. 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 proposed rule only slightly modifies the existing bridge operation schedule and still provides for regular bridge openings.

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 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 person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

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. Although this proposed 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 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 proposed 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.

Environment

We considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, this proposed rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed 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 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); Section 117.255 also issued under authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.261(ss) is added to read as follows:

§ 117.261 Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from St. Marys River to Key Largo.

* * * * *

(ss) *Coronado Beach bridge (SR 44), mile 845, New Smyrna Beach, Florida.* The Coronado Beach bridge (SR 44), mile 845, shall open on signal, except that from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. each day of the week, the draw need only open on the hour, twenty minutes past the hour and forty minutes past the hour.

Dated: July 24, 2002.

James S. Carmichael,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–19998 Filed 8–6–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 155

[USCG–1998–3417]

RIN 2115–AF60

Salvage and Marine Firefighting Requirements; Vessel Response Plans for Oil

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking; notice of public meeting; notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is announcing a public meeting to discuss its previously published notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) titled ''Salvage and Marine Firefighting Requirements; Vessel Response Plans for Oil'' (67 FR 40254). The Coast Guard is also announcing the extension of the comment period for the NPRM, and updating the point-of-contact for this rulemaking project.

DATES: Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 18, 2002. The public meeting will be held in Louisville, KY, on September 26, 2002. The meeting may conclude before the allotted time if all matters of discussion have been addressed.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held at the following location:

Louisville, KY—The Galt House Hotel (West Tower), Court Room (2nd Floor), 140 North Fourth Avenue, Louisville, KY, 40202.

Please submit your comments and related material(s) by any one of the following methods (choose only one method of delivery in order to avoid multiple listings in the public docket):

- By mail to the Docket Management Facility [USCG–1998–3417], U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590–0001;
- By delivery to room PL–401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays;
- By fax to the Docket Management Facility at 202–493–2251; or
- Electronically through the website for the Docket Management System at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions concerning this proposed rulemaking, please contact Lieutenant Commander Paul Albertson, Office of Response, Response Operations Division, Coast Guard Headquarters, at 202–267–0423, or via e-mail at *PAlbertson@comdt.uscg.mil.* If you have questions on viewing or submitting material(s) to the docket, please call Ms. Dorothy Beard, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, at 202–366–5149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material(s). If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [USCG–1998–3417], 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(s) in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to receive confirmation that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material(s) received during the comment period.

Regulatory History

A notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) was published in the **Federal Register** on May 10, 2002 (67 FR 31868), entitled ''Salvage and Marine Firefighting Requirements; Vessel Response Plans for Oil.'' Subsequent to that publication, the Coast Guard