§ 310.500 [Removed]

2. Section 310.500 *Digoxin products for oral use; conditions for marketing* is removed.

Dated: June 17, 2002.

Margaret M. Dotzel,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 02–16108 Filed 6–25–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–S

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 510

New Animal Drugs; Change of Sponsor's Name

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect a change of sponsor's name from MoorMan's, Inc., to ADM Alliance Nutrition, Inc.

DATES: This rule is effective June 26, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lonnie W. Luther, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–101), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–827–0209, e-mail: lluther@cvm.fda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: MoorMan's, Inc., 1000 North 30th St., Quincy, IL 62305–3115, has informed FDA of a change of sponsor's name to ADM Alliance Nutrition, Inc. Accordingly, the agency is amending the regulations in 21 CFR 510.600(c) to reflect the change of sponsor's name.

This rule does not meet the definition of ''rule'' in 5 U.S.C. 804(3)(A) because it is a rule of ''particular applicability.'' Therefore, it is not subject to the congressional review requirements in 5 U.S.C. 801–808.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 510

Administrative practice and procedure, Animal drugs, Labeling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, 21 CFR part 510 is amended as follows:

PART 510—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 510 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321, 331, 351, 352, 353, 360b, 371, 379e.

2. Section 510.600 is amended in the table in paragraph (c)(1) by removing the entry for ''MoorMan's, Inc.'' and by alphabetically adding an entry for ''ADM Alliance Nutrition, Inc.''; and in the table in paragraph (c)(2) by revising the entry for ''021930'' to read as follows.

§ 510.600 Names, addresses, and drug labeler codes of sponsors of approved applications.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) * * *

Firm name and address	Drug labeler code
* * * * *	* *
ADM Alliance Nutrition, Inc., 1000 North 30th St., Quincy, IL 62305–3115	021930
* * * * *	* *

(2) * * *

Drug labeler code	Firm name and address
* * * * *	* *
021930	ADM Alliance Nutrition, Inc., 1000 North 30th St., Quincy, IL 62305–3115
* * * * *	* *

Dated: May 24, 2002.

Andrew J. Beaulieu,

Acting Director, Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation, Center for Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc. 02–16051 Filed 6–25–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–S

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01–02–060]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Passaic River, NJ

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary final rule governing the operation of the Route 7 (Rutgers Street) Bridge, at mile 8.9, across the Passaic River at Belleville, New Jersey. This rule allows the bridge to remain in the closed position from June 15, 2002 through September 3, 2002. This action is necessary to facilitate structural work at the bridge.

DATES: This temporary final rule is effective from June 15, 2002 through September 3, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket (CGD01–02–060) and are available for inspection or copying at the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch Office, 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts, 02110, 6:30 a.m. to 3

p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joe Arca, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (212) 668–7165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

The Coast Guard has determined that good cause exists under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) for not publishing a NPRM with comment and for making this rule effective in less than thirty days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The Coast Guard believes notice and comment are unnecessary because the only vessel operator upstream from the bridge can pass under the bridge without a bridge opening. In view of the historic absence of bridge opening requests and the demonstrated need to complete structural work at the bridge, any delay encountered in this regulation's effective date would be unnecessary and contrary to the public interest.

Background

The Route 7 (Rutgers Street) Bridge, at mile 8.9, across the Passaic River, has a vertical clearance of 8 feet at mean high water, and 13 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The existing drawbridge operating regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.739(k) require the bridge to open on signal if at least four-hours notice is given.

The Route 7 Bridge has been replaced with a new Route 7 Bridge located at the same alignment on the waterway and with the same vertical clearance as the old structure. The final phase of bridge construction involves installation of the roadway deck. During this installation the bridge will not be able to open for vessel traffic. Presently there is only one vessel operator upstream from this bridge and that vessel can pass under the bridge without a bridge opening.

The bridge owner, New Jersey Department of Transportation, requested a temporary regulation to facilitate final structural work at the bridge. The Coast Guard believes this rule is reasonable because no vessel traffic will be precluded from transiting this bridge as a result of this bridge closure.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule 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). This conclusion is based on the fact that no known vessel traffic will be prevented from transiting the bridge as a result of this bridge closure.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612) we considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''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 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. This conclusion is based on the fact that no known vessels will be prevented from transiting this bridge as a result of this bridge closure.

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. Small businesses may 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 under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

We have analyzed this rule 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 unfunded mandate costs. This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate.

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 concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this rule and concluded that under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because promulgation of changes to drawbridge regulations have been found to not have a significant effect on the environment. A written ''Categorical Exclusion Determination'' is not required for the temporary final rule.

Indian Tribal Governments

This final rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have 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.

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.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. From June 15, 2002 through September 3, 2002, § 117.739 is temporarily amended by suspending paragraph (k) and adding a new paragraph (q) to read as follows:

§ 117.739 Passaic River

* * * * *

(q) The draw of the Route 7 (Rutgers Street) Bridge, mile 8.9, need not open for the passage of vessel traffic from June 15, 2002 through September 3, 2002.

Dated: May 31 2002.

J.L. Grenier,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard Acting Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–16130 Filed 6–25–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA261–0344a; FRL–7227–6]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from motor vehicle and mobile equipment, can and coil, and wood products coating operations, as well as, VOC emissions from graphic arts and polyester resin operations. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on August 26, 2002, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by July 26, 2002. If we receive such comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

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 documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460;

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; and,

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerald S. Wamsley, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 947–4111.

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

Table of Contents

I. The State's Submittal
A. What rules did the State submit?
B. Are there other versions of these rules?
C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
C. EPA recommendations to further improve the rules
D. Public comment and final action
III. Background information
A. Why were these rules submitted?
IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the SJVUAPCD and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD	4602	Motor Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Coating Operations	12/20/01	02/20/02
SJVUAPCD	4604	Can and Coil Coating Operations	12/20/01	02/20/02
SJVUAPCD	4606	Wood Products Coating Operations	12/20/01	02/20/02
SJVUAPCD	4607	Graphic Arts	12/20/01	02/20/02
SJVUAPCD	4684	Polyester Resin Operations	12/20/01	02/20/02

On March 15, 2002, these rule submittals were found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are there other versions of these rules?

We approved earlier versions of the above listed rules into the SIP on the following dates: Rule 4602, November 13, 1998; Rule 4604, November 18, 1994; Rule 4606, March 22, 2000; Rule 4607, November 13, 1998; and, Rule 4684, June 13, 1995. Between these SIP incorporations and today, CARB made no intervening submittals of these rules.

C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?

The majority of changes to these rules result from adding organic solvent use, disposal, and storage requirements. The changes related to these additions are