

designated by competent authority, the senior line officer of the U.S. Navy on active duty, eligible for command at sea, who is present and in command of any part of the Department of Navy in the area.

U.S. naval vessel means any vessel owned, operated, chartered, or leased by the U.S. Navy; any pre-commissioned vessel under construction for the U.S. Navy, once launched into the water; and any vessel under the operational control of the U.S. Navy or a Combatant Command.

Vessel means every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water, except U.S. Coast Guard or U.S. naval vessels.

§ 165.2020 Enforcement Authority.

(a) *Coast Guard*. Any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer may enforce the rules and regulations contained in this subpart.

(b) *Senior naval officer present in command*. In the navigable waters of the United States, when immediate action is required and representatives of the Coast Guard are not present or not present in sufficient force to exercise effective control in the vicinity of large U.S. naval vessels, the senior naval officer present in command is responsible for the enforcement of the rules and regulations contained in this subpart to ensure the safety and security of all large naval vessels present. In meeting this responsibility, the senior naval officer present in command may directly assist any Coast Guard enforcement personnel who are present.

§ 165.2025 Atlantic Area.

(a) This section applies to any vessel or person in the navigable waters of the United States within the boundaries of the U.S. Coast Guard Atlantic Area, which includes the First, Fifth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth U.S. Coast Guard Districts.

Note to § 165.2025 paragraph (a): The boundaries of the U.S. Coast Guard Atlantic Area and the First, Fifth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth U.S. Coast Guard Districts are set out in 33 CFR part 3.

(b) A naval vessel protection zone exists around U.S. naval vessels greater than 100 feet in length overall at all times in the navigable waters of the United States, whether the large U.S. naval vessel is underway, anchored, moored, or within a floating drydock, except when the large naval vessel is moored or anchored within a restricted area or within a naval defensive sea area.

(c) The Navigation Rules shall apply at all times within a naval vessel protection zone.

(d) When within a naval vessel protection zone, all vessels shall operate at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe course, unless required to maintain speed by the Navigation Rules, and shall proceed as directed by the Coast Guard, the senior naval officer present in command, or the official patrol. When within a naval vessel protection zone, no vessel or person is allowed within 100 yards of a large U.S. naval vessel unless authorized by the Coast Guard, the senior naval officer present in command, or official patrol.

(e) To request authorization to operate within 100 yards of a large U.S. naval vessel, contact the Coast Guard, the senior naval officer present in command, or the official patrol on VHF-FM channel 16.

(f) When conditions permit, the Coast Guard, senior naval officer present in command, or the official patrol should:

(1) Give advance notice on VHF-FM channel 16 of all large U.S. naval vessel movements; and

(2) Permit vessels constrained by their navigational draft or restricted in their ability to maneuver to pass within 100 yards of a large U.S. naval vessel in order to ensure a safe passage in accordance with the Navigation Rules; and

(3) Permit commercial vessels anchored in a designated anchorage area to remain at anchor when within 100 yards of passing large U.S. naval vessels; and

(4) Permit vessels that must transit via a navigable channel or waterway to pass within 100 yards of a moored or anchored large U.S. naval vessel with minimal delay consistent with security.

Note to § 165.2025 paragraph (f): The listed actions are discretionary and do not create any additional right to appeal or otherwise dispute a decision of the Coast Guard, the senior naval officer present in command, or the official patrol.

Dated: February 8, 2002.

T.C. Paar,

Captain, Coast Guard, Commander, Atlantic Area, Acting.

[FR Doc. 02-4205 Filed 2-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR PART 52

[OH118-1b; FRL-7133-9]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan Ohio; Nonattainment Major Stationary Source Rules

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this action, EPA is proposing to approve an addition to the Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP), comprising rules for nonattainment New Source Review (NSR) procedures. This addition makes the State's existing program for nonattainment NSR procedures into the SIP. It was submitted as a SIP revision request on April 22, 1996 (with subsequent amendments), by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) to EPA for approval. It consists of general NSR provisions and NSR provisions relating to nonattainment areas. The subsequent amendments resolved problems that prevented full approval and added rules for the public notice requirements of all NSR permits. The EPA proposes to approve the amended SIP revision request as the basis for an NSR nonattainment permitting program consistent with federal rules.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comment. The EPA has explained reasons for this approval in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no relevant adverse comment, EPA will take no further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comment, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. In that event, EPA will address all relevant public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. In either event, EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received by March 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Ms. Pamela Blakley, Chief, Permits and Grants Section (IL/IN/OH), Attention: Mr. Kaushal Gupta, at the EPA Region 5 office listed below.

Copies of documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following location: Permits and Grants Section (IL/IN/OH), Air Programs Branch, (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

Anyone wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least two working days in advance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kaushal Gupta, Environmental Engineer, Permits and Grants Section (IL/IN/OH), Air Programs Branch, (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, telephone (312) 886-6803. For further information regarding OEPA's rules for public notice procedure, please contact Jorge Acevedo, Environmental Engineer, Permits and Grants Section (IL/IN/OH), Air Programs Branch, (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, telephone (312) 886-2263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the Direct Final Rule which is published in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: December 6, 2001.

Norman Niedergang,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.
[FR Doc. 02-3761 Filed 2-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MN70-7295b; FRL-7136-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision for Dakota County, Minnesota, for the control of emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) in the Pine Bend Area of Rosemount. The site-specific SIP revision for Koch Petroleum Group, LP (Koch) was submitted by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency on May 2, 2001, and is approvable because it satisfies the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Specifically, EPA is proposing

to approve into the SO₂ SIP Amendment No. 5 to the Administrative Order for Koch. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving the SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because we view this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipate no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If we receive adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. We will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before March 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christos Panos, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-8328.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the Direct Final notice which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the request and the EPA's analysis are available for inspection at the above address. (Please telephone Christos Panos at (312) 353-8328 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

Dated: January 16, 2002.

Gary Gulezian,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.
[FR Doc. 02-3757 Filed 2-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 253-0321b; FRL-7139-5]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a conditional approval of revisions to the El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District (EDCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions from internal combustion engines. We are proposing action on a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by March 25, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, 2850 Fairlane Court, Building C, Placerville, CA 95667.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charnjit Bhullar, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 972-3960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating this rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. Proposed action and public comment.
- III. Background Information
 - Why was this rule submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rule Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the dates that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).