Taking of Private Property

This 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 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 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 safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this rule and has determined that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)g, of Commandant Instruction M16475.lC, that this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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. Section 165.758 is added to read as follows:

§ 165.758 Security Zone; San Juan, Puerto Rico.

(a) *Location.* Moving and fixed security zones are established 50 yards around all cruise ships entering, departing, moored or anchored in the Port of San Juan, Puerto Rico. The security zone for a cruise ship entering port is activated when the vessel is one mile north of the #3 buoy, at approximate position 18°28′17″ N, 66°07′37.5″ W. The security zone for a vessel is deactivated when the vessel passes this buoy on its departure from the port.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Under general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entering, anchoring, mooring or transiting in these zones is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port of San Juan.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at the Greater Antilles Section Operations Center at (787) 289–2041 or via VHF radio on Channel 16 to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

(3) The Marine Safety Office San Juan will attempt to notify the maritime community of periods during which these security zones will be in effect by providing advance notice of scheduled arrivals and departures of cruise ships via a broadcast notice to mariners.

(c) *Definition.* As used in this section, *cruise ship* means a passenger vessel greater than 100 feet in length that is authorized to carry more than 150 passengers for hire, except for a ferry.

(d) *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: November 26, 2002.

W.J. Uberti,

Captain, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port.

[FR Doc. 02–31599 Filed 12–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Charleston–02–146]

RIN 2115–AA97

Security Zones; Charleston Harbor, Cooper River, SC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Temporary final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is maintaining the temporary fixed security zones for the waters under the Highway 17 bridges over Charleston Harbor and the Don Holt I–526 Bridge over the Cooper River. These security zones are needed for national security reasons to protect the public and ports from potential subversive acts. Vessels are prohibited from anchoring, mooring, or loitering within these zones, unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Charleston, South Carolina or his designated representative.

DATES: This regulation is effective on December 17, 2002 until 11:59 p.m. July 15, 2003. Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 14, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston, 196 Tradd Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29401. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston 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, are part of [COTP Charleston 02–146], will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at Marine Safety Office Charleston, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Kevin D. Floyd, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Charleston, at (843) 747–7411.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). Publishing a NPRM and delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to national security since immediate action is necessary to protect the public, ports and waterways of the United States.

For the same reasons, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

Based on the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Arlington, VA, there is an increased risk that subversive terrorist activity could be launched by vessels or persons in close proximity to the Port of Charleston, S.C., against bridges within the security zones continued by this rule. If a bridge were damaged or destroyed, the Port of Charleston would be isolated from access to the sea, crippling the local economy and negatively impacting national security. These temporary security zones are necessary to protect the safety of life and property on the navigable waters, prevent potential terrorist threats aimed at the bridges crossing the main shipping channels in the Port of Charleston, S.C. and to ensure the continued unrestricted access to the sea from the Port.

A similar temporary rule was published in the **Federal Register** on October 18, 2001 (67 FR 9194, 9195, February 28, 2002) creating temporary security zones around these bridges. That rule expired on January 15, 2002. Those security zones were extended by another temporary rule published on February 22, 2002 (67 FR 9201) which expired on June 15, 2002. Those security zones were again extended by a temporary rule published in the **Federal Register** on July 3, 2002 (67 FR 44555) and will expire on December 16, 2002.

Regulatory Evaluation

This 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 rule to be so minimal so that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. The limited geographic area impacted by the security zones will not restrict the movement or routine operation of commercial or recreational vessels through the Port of Charleston. Also, an individual may request a waiver of these regulations from the Coast Guard Captain of the Port.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Coast Guard must consider whether this rule would have a significant economic effect 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the limited geographic area encompassed by the security zones will not restrict the movement or routine operation of commercial or recreational vessels through the Port of Charleston. Also, an individual may request a waiver of these regulations from the Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Charleston.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 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 will affect your small business and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Small businesses may also 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 rule calls for no new collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implication 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 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 rule will not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will 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 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 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 create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

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 relationships 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 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 considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that, under Figure 2–1, paragraph 34(g) of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A ''Categorical Exclusion Determination'' is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reports and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard is amending 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 § 165.T07–146 is added to read as follows:

§ 165.T07–146 Security Zones; Charleston Harbor, Cooper River, South Carolina.

(a) *Regulated area.* (1) A temporary fixed security zone is established for the waters around the Highway 17 bridges, to encompass all waters of the Cooper River within a line connecting the following points: 32 deg.48.23′ N, 079 deg.55.3′ W; 32 deg.48.1′ N, 079 deg.54.35′ W; 32 deg.48.34′ N, 079 deg.55.25′ W; 32 deg.48.2′ N, 079 deg.54.35′ W.

(2) Another temporary fixed security zone is established for the waters around the Interstate 526 Bridge spans (Don Holt Bridge) in Charleston Harbor and on the Cooper River and will encompass all waters within a line connecting the following points: 32 deg.53.49′ N, 079 deg.58.05′ W; 32 deg.53.42′ N, 079 deg.57.48′ W; 32 deg.53.53′ N, 079 deg.58.05′ W; 32 deg.53.47′ N, 079 deg.57.47′ W.

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations 165.33 of this part, vessels are allowed to transit through these zones but are prohibited from mooring, anchoring, or loitering within these zones unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1321 and 49 CFR 1.46, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Effective dates.* This section is effective on December 17, 2002 until 11:59 p.m. on July 15, 2003.

Dated: December 2, 2002.

G.W. Merrick,

Commander, Coast Guard, Captain of the Port.

[FR Doc. 02–31600 Filed 12–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[VA125–5058a; FRL–7422–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Repeal of Emission Standards for Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaning Systems

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Virginia State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision consists of the repeal of emission standards for perchloroethylene (perc) dry cleaning systems. EPA is approving this revision in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

DATES: This rule is effective on February 14, 2003 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse written comment by January 15, 2003. If EPA receives such comments, it will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to Walter Wilkie, Acting Chief, Air Quality Planning and Information Services Branch, Mailcode 3AP21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103, and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pauline De Vose, (215) 814–2186, or by e-mail at *devose.pauline@epa.gov*. Please note that while questions may be posed via telephone and e-mail, formal comments must be submitted in writing, as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On November 9, 2001, the Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia) submitted a formal revision to its SIP. The SIP revision consists of the repeal of emission standards for perc dry cleaning systems contained in Article 38 (9 VAC 5–40–5350 *et seq.*) of 9 VAC 5 Chapter 40.

Perc was added to the list of compounds excluded from the definition of volatile organic compound (VOC) on the basis that it has negligible photochemical reactivity (40 CFR 51.100 (s)). Perc is a solvent commonly used in dry cleaning, maskant operations and degreasing operations.

Summary of SIP Revision

The SIP revision contained in Article 38 (9 VAC 5–40–5350 *et seq.*) of 9 VAC 5 Chapter 40 requires the owners and operators of perc dry cleaning systems to limit air emissions. The SIP revision is repealing the emission standards of perc, since perc has a negligible photochemical reactivity and has an insignificant impact on ozone formation (61 FR 4588, February 7, 1996).

In 1995, Virginia adopted legislation that provides, subject to certain conditions, for an environmental assessment (audit) ''privilege'' for voluntary compliance evaluations performed by a regulated entity. The legislation further addresses the relative burden of proof for parties either asserting the privilege or seeking disclosure of documents for which the privilege is claimed. Virginia's legislation also provides, subject to certain conditions, for a penalty waiver for violations of environmental laws when a regulated entity discovers such violations pursuant to a voluntary compliance evaluation and voluntarily discloses such violations to the Commonwealth and takes prompt and appropriate measures to remedy the violations. Virginia's Voluntary Environmental Assessment Privilege Law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, provides a privilege that protects from disclosure documents and information about the content of those documents that are the product of a voluntary environmental assessment. The Privilege Law does not extend to documents or information (1) that are generated or developed before the commencement of a voluntary environmental assessment; (2) that are prepared independently of the assessment process; (3) that demonstrate a clear, imminent and substantial danger to the public health or environment; or (4) that are required by law.

On January 12, 1997, the Commonwealth of Virginia Office of the Attorney General provided a legal opinion that states that the Privilege law, Va. Code Sec. 10.1–1198, precludes granting a privilege to documents and information ''required by law,'' including documents and information ''required by Federal law to maintain