

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165****[CGD11-01-011]****RIN 2115-AA97****Security Zone; Naval Amphibious Base, San Diego Bay, CA.****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to create a permanent security zone around the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, at the request of the U.S. Navy. This security zone will be established inside an already existing restricted area defined by the U.S. Navy maintained buoys. The establishment of this security zone is needed to ensure the physical protection of naval vessels and their activities at Naval Base, Coronado.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before August 13, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to LT Kathleen Garza, U.S. 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**. 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 this is 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 proposes to create a permanent security zone around the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, at the request of the U.S. Navy. The security zone will consist of the waters of San Diego Bay around the perimeter of the Naval Amphibious Base, extending approximately 100 yards out.

Currently, there is a restricted area around the Naval Amphibious Base, 33 CFR 334.860. The Navy believes that this restricted area, by itself, is insufficient to adequately safeguard its vessels and the military operations involving the base. 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 creation of this security zone will safeguard vessels moored at the Naval Amphibious Base and waterside facilities from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature. The creation of this security zone will also prevent recreational and commercial craft from interfering with military operations involving naval vessels and it will protect transiting recreational and commercial vessels, and their respective crews, from the navigational hazards posed by such military operations. Unlike the current restricted area, under this proposed rule entry into, transit through, or anchoring within this security zone would be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, the Commander, Naval Base San Diego, or the Commanding Officer, Naval Station, San Diego.

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 has 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**.

### 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 relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

### 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:

### PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

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. A new § 165.1120 is added to read as follows:

#### § 165.1120 Security Zone: San Diego, CA.

(a) Location. The following area is a security zone: the waters of San Diego Bay, enclosed by lines connecting the following points: Beginning at 32°40'30.0" N, 117°10'03.0" W (Point A); thence running northeasterly to 32°40'54.0" N, 117°09'35.5" W (Point B); thence running northeasterly to 32°40'55.0" N, 117°09'27.0" W (Point C); thence running southeasterly to 32°40'43.0" N, 117°09'09.0" W (Point D); thence running southerly to 32°40'39.0" N, 117°09'08.0" (Point E); thence running southwesterly to 32°40'30.0" N, 117°09'12.9" W (Point F); thence running a short distance to 32°40'29.0" N, 117°09'14.0" W (Point G); thence running southwesterly to 32°40'26.0" N, 117°09'17.0" W (Point H); thence running northwesterly to the shoreline to 32°40'31.0" N, 117°09'22.5" W (Point I).

(b) In accordance with the general regulations in §165.33 of this part, entry into the area of this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port or the Commanding Officer, Naval Base, San Diego.

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

Dated: May 22, 2001.

**E.R. Riutta,**

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

[FR Doc. 01–14820 Filed 6–12–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–U**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 81

[CA–034–FIN; FRL–69964]

#### Clean Air Act Redesignation and Reclassification, Searles Valley Nonattainment Area; Designation of Coso Junction, Indian Wells Valley, and Trona Nonattainment Areas; Reclassification of Coso Junction and Indian Wells Valley Nonattainment Areas; California; Particulate Matter of 10 Microns or Less (PM–10)

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to change the boundaries of the Searles Valley, California moderate PM–10 nonattainment areas (NA) by dividing that area into three separate NAs: Coso Junction, Indian Wells Valley, and Trona. Because air quality violations or inadequate monitoring data, EPA is also proposing to find that the proposed Coso Junction and Indian Wells Valley NAs have not attained the 24-hour and annual PM–10 national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) by the Clean Air Act (CAA) mandated attainment date for moderate nonattainment areas. EPA is further proposing to find that the proposed Trona NA has attained the 24-hour and annual NASQS.

If EPA takes final action on this proposal, the Searles Valley NA would be split into three new NAs, and the Coso Junction and Indian Wells Valley NAs would be reclassified by operation of law as serious PM–10 NAs under section 188(b)(2)(A) of the CAA. The classification of the proposed Trona PM–10 NA would remain moderate.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by August 13, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to John Ungvarsky, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, Air Division, Planning Office (AIR–2), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Ungvarsky, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, Air Division, Planning Office (AIR–2), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105, (415) 744–1286, ungvarsky.john@epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

The NAAQS are safety thresholds for certain ambient air pollutants set by