

transmission pricing issue, Commission staff will hold a technical conference on queuing of interconnection requests.

This technical conference will be held on January 21, 2003, from approximately 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC. The conference is open to the public, and registration is not required. Members of the Commission may attend and participate in the discussions.

The conference will discuss specific issues related to interconnection queuing practices and procedures, such as: whether queue position should be treated as a property right; whether the Commission should introduce due diligence requirements to prevent cancelled or delayed plants from delaying other units in the queue; how to manage the queue to best serve regional infrastructure planning, grid management, and infrastructure development needs while improving certainty for infrastructure developers; whether the Commission should standardize queue management practices across regions and RTOs or establish a set of national core principles; the most effective method for analyzing impacts of uncertain combinations of loads and generators on the grid; a critical look at current ISO/RTO interconnection queue management practices; whether small (<20MW) generator impacts on the grid warrant different analysis and queuing treatment for small generators; and interconnection queue experiences.

Further details about the conference, including information regarding how to request participation in the conference as a panelist, will be provided in supplemental notices. The staff contact person for this conference is Norma McOmber (202-502-8022 or e-mail Norma.McOmber@FERC.GOV).

Transcripts of the conference will be immediately available from Ace Reporting Company (202-347-3700 or 1-800-336-6646), for a fee. They will be available for the public on the Commission's FERRIS system two weeks after the conference. Additionally, Capitol Connection offers the opportunity for remote listening and viewing of the conference. It is available for a fee, live over the Internet, via C-Band Satellite. Persons interested in receiving the broadcast, or who need information on making arrangements, should contact David Reininger or Julia Morelli at the Capitol Connection (703-993-3100) as soon as possible or visit the Capitol Connection website at

<http://www.capitolconnection.gmu.edu> and click on "FERC."

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-31580 Filed 12-13-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Pittsburgh-02-019]

RIN 2115-AA97

Security Zone; Ohio River Mile 119.0 to 119.8, Natrium, West Virginia

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a security zone encompassing all waters extending 200 feet from the water's edge of the left descending bank of the Ohio River, beginning from mile marker 119.0 and ending at mile marker 119.8. This security zone is necessary to protect Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries (PPG), persons, and vessels from subversive or terrorist acts. Entry of persons or vessels into this security zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Pittsburgh or designated representative.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 14, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh, Suite 1150 Kossman Bldg., 100 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1371. Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh 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 or copying at Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh, Suite 1150 Kossman Bldg., 100 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Petty Officer (PO) Michael Marsula, Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at (412) 644-5808 x2114.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and

address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [COTP Pittsburgh 02-019], indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The Captain of the Port Pittsburgh established a temporary security zone for the area adjacent to PPG that expired on June 15, 2002. [COTP Pittsburgh-02-001, 67 FR 9589] No comments or objections were received concerning this rule. National security and intelligence officials have warned that future terrorist attacks against civilian targets are anticipated. In response to those continued threats, heightened awareness and security of our ports and harbors is necessary. The Captain of the Port has established a temporary security zone for this area [COTP Pittsburgh-02-019, 67 FR 58332]. That temporary final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 2002 and remains in effect until February 15, 2003.

The Captain of the Port has determined that there is a need for this security zone to remain in effect indefinitely because of the continued threat of terrorism and the nature of material handled at PPG. The proposed rule will establish a permanent security zone identical to the previous and existing zones.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

A security zone is proposed for all water extending 200 feet from the water's edge of the left descending bank of the Ohio River from mile marker 119.0 to 119.8. All persons and vessels would be prohibited from entering or remaining in this zone without the permission of the Captain of the Port

Pittsburgh or his designated representative.

The zone is designed to increase protection around the PPG facility in Natrium, West Virginia. It increases the opportunity for detection of a waterborne attack on the facility and consequently enhances public health and safety through providing greater defense and security at this location and its surrounding areas. The location of this security zone will limit access to only the waters immediately adjacent to the facility and will permit vessels to safely navigate around the zone. The establishment of this security zone will have minimal impact on maritime traffic in the vicinity of the facility.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed 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 proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This rule will not obstruct the regular flow of vessel traffic and will allow vessel traffic to pass safely around the security zone. Vessels may be permitted to enter the security zone on a case-by-case basis.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic 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. The Coast Guard is unaware of any small entities that would be impacted by this proposed rule. The navigable channel remains open to all vessel traffic. We received no comments or objections regarding the previous security zone covering the same area.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Petty Officer Michael Marsula, Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at (412) 644–5808 x2114.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications 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 proposed 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. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed 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 proposed 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 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 would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would 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. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a "tribal implication" under the Order.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed 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 have considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation because this rule is not expected to result in any significant adverse environmental impact as described in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). 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), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

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 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. Add § 165.822 to read as follows:

§ 165.822 Security Zone; Ohio River Mile 119.0 to 119.8, Natrium, West Virginia.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: the waters of the Ohio River, extending 200 feet from the water's edge of the left descending bank beginning from mile marker 119.0 and ending at mile marker 119.8.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Pittsburgh or his designated representative.

(2) Persons or vessels desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port Pittsburgh at telephone number 412–644–5808 or on VHF 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 Pittsburgh or designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

Dated: November 18, 2002.

S.L. Hudson,

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

[FR Doc. 02–31539 Filed 12–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[VA125–5058b; FRL–7421–9]

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: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia (Virginia). This action proposes to approve Virginia's repeal of its emission standards for perchloroethylene dry cleaning systems. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal 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: Comments must be received in writing by January 15, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed 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, at the EPA Region III address above, 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: For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action, Virginia's repeal of emission standards for perc dry cleaning systems, that is located in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** publication. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comments on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

Dated: December 4, 2002.

Thomas C. Voltaggio,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 02–31469 Filed 12–13–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL–7412–7]

New Jersey: Proposed Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6901 *et seq.* ("RCRA"), and the regulations thereunder, the State of New Jersey (the "State") applied for final authorization of changes to its hazardous waste program. These revisions were adopted by the State in January 1999. The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 ("EPA") has reviewed the State's application and has determined that the State's revisions to its hazardous waste program satisfy all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization. Accordingly, EPA proposes to grant final authorization to the State for these revisions, which are described in the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register**. In that section, EPA is authorizing the revisions by an immediate final rule. EPA did not publish a proposal prior to the immediate final rule because EPA believes that this action is not controversial and does not expect comments that oppose it. EPA has