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 the 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.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this regulation and concluded that, under Figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, it will have no significant environmental impact and it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination and Environmental Analysis Checklist will be available for inspection and copying in the docket to be maintained at the address listed in **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

Proposed Regulation

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

1. The authority citation for 33 CFR 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. In § 165.1102, revise paragraph (a) and add a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 165.1102 Security Zone: San Diego Bay, CA.

(a) Location. The following area is a security zone: the water area within Naval Station, San Diego enclosed by the following points: Beginning at 32°41′16.5″ N, 117°08′01″ W (Point A); thence running southwesterly to 32°41′06″ N, 117°08′09.3″ W (Point B); thence running southeasterly along the U.S. Pierhead Line to 32°39′36.9″ N, 117°07′23.5″ W (Point C); thence running easterly to 32°39′38.5″ N, 117°07′06.5″ W (Point D); thence running generally northwesterly along the shoreline of the Naval Station to the place of beginning.

(b) * * *

(c) The U. S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U. S. Navy.

Dated: April 3, 2001.

E.R. Riutta,

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

[FR Doc. 01–9991 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD11–98–003]

RIN 2115–AA97

Security Zone; San Diego Bay

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to expand the geographical boundaries of the permanent security zone at Naval Air Station North Island, Coronado, California. There were previously only two aircraft carriers home-ported at Naval Air Station North Island; however, a third aircraft carrier has been designated to homeport at Naval Air Station North Island. The modification and expansion of this security zone is needed to ensure the physical protection of this third aircraft carrier at Naval Air Station North Island.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 23, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to LT Kathleen Garza, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, 2716 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, CA 92101–1064, (619) 683–6477. The Marine Safety Office 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 and copying at the Marine Safety Office between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Patricia Springer, Vessel Traffic Management Section, 11th Coast Guard District, telephone (510) 437–2951; e-mail pspringer@d11.uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

Interested persons are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting written views, data, or any other materials to the address listed under **ADDRESSES** in this preamble. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify the docket number for this rulemaking, the specific section of the proposal to which their comments apply, and give reasons for each comment. The Coast Guard requests that all comments and attachments be submitted in an unbound format suitable for copying and electronic filing. If not practical, a second copy of any bound materials is requested. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period and may change this proposal in view of the comments.

No public hearing is planned, but one may be held if written requests for a hearing are received and it is determined that the opportunity to make oral presentations will aid in the rulemaking process. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the address listed above in **ADDRESSES.** The request should include reasons why a hearing would be beneficial. If it determines that the opportunity for oral presentations will aid this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will hold a public hearing at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The Coast Guard published a NPRM on May 15, 1998 (63 FR 27019). That NPRM proposed to modify the Security Zone adjacent to Naval Air Station North Island, Coronado, California, 33 CFR 165.1105. No comments were received. Publication of the final rule, however, was delayed due to the need for operational reassessment. Due to the length of time since publication of the NPRM, we are publishing a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking and providing an additional opportunity for comment on this rulemaking. The Coast Guard proposes to modify the security zone, enlarging it to accommodate the home-porting of a

new aircraft carrier at Naval Air Station North Island. There were previously only two aircraft carriers home-ported at Naval Air Station North Island; however, a third aircraft carrier has been designated to homeport at Naval Air Station North Island.

The security zone will be expanded at its Northwest tip to the West by 0.144 square miles. It will be expanded in its mid-section to the North by 0.182 square miles.

The modification and expansion of this security zone is needed to accommodate the home-porting of this third aircraft carrier. The modification and expansion of this security zone will prevent recreational and commercial craft from interfering with military operations involving all naval vessels home-ported at Naval Air Station, North Island, and it will protect transiting recreational and commercial vessels, and their respective crews, from the navigational hazards posed by such military operations. In addition, the Navy has been reviewing all aspects of its anti-terrorism and force protection posture in response to the attack on the USS COLE. The modification and expansion of this security zone will safeguard vessels and waterside facilities from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature. Entry into, transit through, or anchoring within this security zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, the Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, the Commander, Naval Base San Diego, or the Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station North Island.

Vessels or persons violating this section would be subject to the penalties set forth in 50 U.S.C. 192 and 18 U.S.C. 3571: seizure and forfeiture of the vessel, a monetary penalty of not more than $250,000, and imprisonment for not more than 10 years.

The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U.S. Navy.

Regulatory Evaluation

This regulation 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). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This proposal will have minimal additional impact on vessel traffic because it is only a slight modification and expansion of the existing security zone codified at 33 CFR 165.1105.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Coast Guard considered whether this proposal would have significant 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 because vessel traffic would be allowed to pass through the zone with the permission of the Captain of the Port.

Collection of Information

This proposed regulation contains no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

The Coast Guard has analyzed this proposed regulation under Executive Order 13132 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 12630m Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets the 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.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this regulation and concluded that, under Figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, it will have no significant environmental impact and it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination and Environmental Analysis Checklist will be available for inspection and copying in the docket to be maintained at the address listed in **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

Proposed Regulation

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

1. The authority citation for 33 CFR 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. In § 165.1105, revise paragraph (a) and add a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 165.1105 Security Zone: San Diego Bay, CA.

(a) Location. The following area is a security zone: on the waters along the northern shoreline of Naval Air Station North Island, the area enclosed by the following points: Beginning at 32°42′53.0″ N, 117°11′45.0″ W (Point A); thence running northerly to 32°42′55.5″N, 117°11′45.0″ W (Point B); thence running easterly to 32°42′55.″ N, 117°11′30.5″ W (Point C); thence running southeasterly to 32°42′40.0″ N, 117°11′06.5″ W (Point D); thence running southerly to 32°42′37.5″ N, 117° 11′07.0″ W (Point E); thence running southerly to 32°42′28.5″ N, 117°11′11.0″ W (Point F); thence running southeasterly to 32°42′22.0″ N,

117°10′48.0″ W (Point G); thence running southerly to 32°42′13.0″ N, 117°10′51.0″ W (Point H); thence running generally northwesterly along the shoreline of Naval Air Station North Island to the place of beginning.

(b) * * *

(c) The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of this security zone by the U.S. Navy.

Dated: April 3, 2001.

E.R. Riutta,

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

[FR Doc. 01–9992 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[TX–126–4–7475; FRL–6969–5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); Texas: Low Emission Diesel Fuel

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to fully approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision for the State of Texas establishing a Low Emission Diesel (LED) fuel for nine counties in the Dallas-Fort Worth Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA). Beginning May 1, 2002, aromatic hydrocarbon content, cetane number and sulfur content will be regulated for diesel fuel sold in these counties for use in both motor vehicles and nonroad engines. We propose that the Texas LED fuel program requirements are necessary to achieve the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone in the Dallas/Fort Worth ozone nonattainment area (DFW), and are therefore exempt from preemption under section 211(c)(4) of the Clean Air Act (the Act).

DATES: Comments should be received on or before May 23, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Mr. Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, 12100 Park 35 Circle, Austin, Texas 78711–3087. Persons interested in examining these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandra Rennie, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7214.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document ''we,'' ''us,'' and ''our'' refers to EPA.

Texas submitted an attainment demonstration SIP for the DFW 4-county nonattainment area on April 25, 2000. The SIP contained measures for reducing Nitrogen Oxides (NO_X), the pollutant identified as controlling the formation of ozone in this area. The LED fuel program was submitted as part of the attainment demonstration. This LED rule was codified in Chapter 114 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (Sections 114.6, 114.312–114.317 and 114.319). See 30 TAC Chapter 114 (Apr. 19, 2000). Since the SIP submittal, the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC) has revised these LED regulations to expand the covered area, revise recordkeeping and reporting requirements and add a second more stringent phase of sulfur standards to be implemented May 1, 2006. See 30 TAC 114.312–317, 114.319 (Dec. 6, 2000). For purposes of today's action, we are proposing approval of the current LED regulations only insofar as they apply to the nine counties in the DFW CMSA,[1] and only with respect to the standards to be implemented on May 1, 2002.

What Does the State's LED Regulation Include?

The State's LED SIP submittal for DFW requires that diesel fuel produced for delivery and ultimate sale within nine counties of the DFW CMSA have a maximum sulfur content of 500 ppm, have no more than 10% aromatic hydrocarbons by volume, and have a cetane number of 48 or greater. Alternative diesel fuel formulations that achieve equivalent emission reductions may also be used. The regulations apply to diesel fuel sold in the nonattainment counties of Dallas, Tarrant, Collin, and Denton, and the attainment counties of Parker, Johnson, Ellis, Kaufman, and Rockwall for use in either on-highway vehicles or nonroad engines. The State regulations require compliance by May 1, 2002.

What Are the Requirements of the Clean Air Act?

Section 211(c)(4)(A) of the Act generally prohibits the State from prescribing or attempting to enforce controls respecting motor vehicle fuel characteristics or components that EPA has controlled under section 211(c)(1), unless the State control is identical to the Federal control. Under section 211(c)(4)(C), EPA may approve a non-identical state fuel control as a SIP provision, if the state demonstrates that the measure is necessary to achieve the NAAQS. We may approve a state fuel requirement as necessary if no other measures would bring about timely attainment, or if other measures exist and are technically possible to implement but are unreasonable or impracticable.

In this rulemaking, EPA does not need to determine whether the State requirements for LED fuel used in motor vehicles are preempted under section 211(c)(4)(A) before acting to approve the SIP submittal because EPA is finding the fuel requirements necessary under section 211(c)(4)(C) to achieve the ozone standard in the DFW nonattainment area.

What Did the State Submit?

The State submitted the LED rules as part of the DFW SIP by letter from the Governor dated April 25, 2000. The SIP submittal contains 30 TAC Chapter 114 rules as adopted on April 19, 2000,[2] a request for a waiver from Federal preemption pursuant to Section 211(c)(4)(C) of the Act, and Texas laws providing the authority for the State to adopt and implement revisions to the SIP.

Texas submitted data and analyses to support a finding under section 211(c)(4)(C) that the LED fuel requirement for the nine counties is necessary for the DFW nonattainment area to achieve the ozone NAAQS. The State has (1) identified the quantity of reductions of NO_X needed to achieve attainment of the ozone NAAQS; (2) identified all other control measures and the quantity of reductions each would achieve; (3) identified those control alternatives that were deemed

[1] There are 12 counties in the DFW CMSA. The nine counties subject to the LED requirements are Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Johnson, Kaufman, Parker, Rockwall and Tarrant.

[2] As explained above, TNRCC subsequently revised these LED regulations on December 6, 2000. Because the State's SIP submittal for the DFW nonattainment area only requested approval of the LED program for the nine counties and only for the standards effective May 1, 2002, today's action proposes approval of the current State LED regulations only insofar as they apply to the nine counties and only with respect to the standards to be implemented May 1, 2002.