Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

**Federalism**

The Coast Guard has analyzed this rule under the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 13132 and have determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism 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 costs without the Federal government's having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This rule will not impose an Unfunded Mandate.

**Taking of Private Property**

This rule will not affect 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 section 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity and reduce burden.

**Protection of Children**

The Coast Guard has 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 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. A rule with tribal implications has a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribe, 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.

**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, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation.

**Energy Effects**

The Coast Guard has 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.

**List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165**

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

**Regulation**

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

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, 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. Redesignate § 165.103 as § 165.108.

3. Add new § 165.103 to read as follows:

**§ 165.103 Safety Zone; vessel launches, Bath Iron Works, Kennebec River, Bath, Maine.**

(a) *Location.* The following is a safety zone: all waters of the Kennebec River within a 150-yard radius of the Bath Iron Works dry dock while it is being moved to and from its moored position at the Bath Iron Works Facility in Bath, Maine to a deployed position in the Kennebec River, and while launching or recovering vessels.

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Portland, Maine.

Dated: November 26, 2001.

**M.P. O'Malley,**

*Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port.*

[FR Doc. 01–31658 Filed 12–21–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 63**

**[DC001–1000; FRL–7121–8]**

## Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; District of Columbia; Department of Health

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve the District of Columbia (the District) Department of Health's (DoH's) request for delegation of authority to implement and enforce its hazardous air pollutant general provisions and hazardous air pollutant emission standards for perchloroethylene dry cleaning facilities, hard and decorative chromium electroplating and chromium anodizing tanks, halogenated solvent cleaning, and publicly owned treatment works, as well as the test methods, which have been adopted by reference from the Federal requirements set forth in the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR). This proposed approval will automatically delegate future amendments to these regulations once the District incorporates these amendments into its regulations. In addition, EPA is proposing to approve of DoH's mechanism for receiving delegation of future hazardous air pollutant regulations. This mechanism entails DoH's incorporation by reference of the unchanged Federal standard into its hazardous air pollutant regulation, DoH's notification to EPA of such incorporation and DoH's submission of a delegation request letter to EPA following EPA notification of a new Federal requirement. This action pertains only to affected sources, as defined by the Clean Air Act's hazardous air pollutant program. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the District of Columbia's request for delegation of authority as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates 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 action, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives 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. EPA will not institute a second comment period.

Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

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

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on this action should be sent concurrently to: Makeba A. Morris, Chief, Permits and Technical Assessment Branch, Mail Code 3AP11, Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103–2029, and Donald E. Wambsgans II, Program Manager of the Air Quality Division, District of Columbia Department of Health, 825 North Capital Street, NE, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20002. 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 District of Columbia Department of Health, 825 North Capital Street, NE, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dianne J. McNally, 215–814–3297, at the EPA Region III address above, or by e-mail at *mcnally.dianne@epa.gov.* Please note that any formal comments must be submitted, in writing, as provided in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For further information on this action, pertaining to approval of the District DoH's delegation of authority for the hazardous air pollutant general provisions and hazardous air pollutant emission standards for perchloroethylene dry cleaning facilities, hard and decorative chromium electroplating and chromium anodizing tanks, halogenated solvent cleaning, and publicly owned treatment works, as well as the relevant test methods, please see the direct final rule, with the same title, that is located in the ''Rules and Regulations'' section of this **Federal Register** publication.

Dated: December 11, 2001.

**Judith M. Katz,**

*Director, Air Protection Division, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 01–31486 Filed 12–21–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

**[LA–55–1–7485b; FRL–7121–5]**

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Louisiana; Redesignation of Lafourche Parish Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment for Ozone

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to approve a redesignation request from the State of Louisiana that redesignates Lafourche Parish from nonattainment to attainment for the 1-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

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

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to Mr. Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), at the EPA Region 6 Office listed below. Copies of documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. Anyone wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least two working days in advance.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division, 7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Diggs at (214) 665–7214.

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

For additional information, see the direct final rule located in the ''Rules and Regulations'' section of this **Federal Register**.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: December 10, 2001.

**Lawrence E. Starfield,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 01–31484 Filed 12–21–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

**[FRL–7121–2]**

### Tennessee: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Tennessee has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA proposes to grant final authorization to Tennessee. In the ''Rules and Regulations'' section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is authorizing the changes by an immediate final rule. EPA did not make a proposal prior to the immediate final rule because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. We have explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the immediate final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, and we will not take further action on this proposal. If we get comments that oppose this action, we will withdraw the immediate final rule and it will not take effect. We will then respond to public comments in a later final rule based on this proposal. You may not have another opportunity for comment. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time.

**DATES:** Send your written comments so that they are received by January 25, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Narindar Kumar, Chief, RCRA Programs Branch, Waste Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, The Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA, 30303–3104; (404) 562–8440. You can