

each comment. The Coast Guard requests that all comments and attachments be submitted in an 8½" × 11" unbound format suitable for copying and electronic filing. If this is not practical, a second copy of any bound material is requested. Persons desiring acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

The Coast Guard has also scheduled a public hearing on November 4, 1997, at 9 a.m., to receive oral presentations. The public meeting will be held in the Function Room on the first floor of Building 1, at the Coast Guard Integrated Support Company, 427 Commercial St., Boston, MA.

Background

The Chelsea Street Bridge is a bascule-type bridge owned by the City of Boston and originally constructed in 1939. It spans the Chelsea River providing a means for vehicles to travel between Chelsea, MA and East Boston, MA. Several petroleum-product transfer facilities are located on the Chelsea River, upstream and downstream of the Chelsea Street Bridge. Transit of tankships through the bridge is necessary to access the facilities upstream of the bridge. The narrow bridge-span opening creates a very difficult passage through the bridge for larger vessels. Adding to the difficulty are the close proximity of neighboring shore structures and, at times, vessels moored at facilities adjacent to the bridge.

In 1986, the bridge and its fendering system were in a dilapidated condition, which further complicated vessel transits. Additionally, the Northeast Petroleum Terminal (locally referred to as the Jenny Dock) and the Mobil Oil Terminal were located downstream of the bridge on the north and south bank of the river respectively. If one or more vessels were moored at either of those facilities, the already short and narrow approach to the bridge was further restricted, thus reducing the maneuverability space of vessels during the approach and transit through the bridge. Meetings between the Coast Guard, marine operators, and pilots indicated that restrictions on length and width of particular vessel traffic were necessary to achieve an acceptable level of safety for navigating this difficult area. Additionally, with the double hull requirements set forth in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA-90), several tanker designs keeping the present cargo capacities while meeting the requirements of OPA-90 will create a tanker with a beam up to 92 feet.

Agenda of Meeting

Due to the above mentioned concerns, the Coast Guard seeks comments on the following specific items.

Existing Safety Zone Regulations

On June 27, 1986, (51 FR 23415) the Coast Guard promulgated the safety zone regulations published in 33 CFR 165.120. These regulations extend over the waters of the Chelsea River for 100 yards upstream and downstream of the bridge, restrict water traffic transiting the Chelsea Street Bridge and implement vessel operational constraints. The Coast Guard justified these restrictions and constraints by citing more than 75 bridge collisions and other incidents involving vessels transiting the Chelsea Street Bridge during the period from 1978 through 1985.

Vessel Size Restrictions

Currently, only vessels meeting certain draft and physical dimensions (overall length and overall width) are allowed to enter the safety zone. No vessel greater than 661 feet in length, or greater than 90.5 feet in beam, may transit the safety zone. No vessel greater than 630.5 feet in length, or 85.5 feet or greater in beam, may transit the safety zone between sunset and sunrise. No tankship greater than 550.5 feet in length may transit the safety zone with a draft less than 18 feet forward and 24 feet aft. Current regulations authorize the restrictions to be relaxed with specific approval from the Captain of the Port.

Extending the Width of Tankers Permitted Through the Bridge

While focusing on the physical dimensions of tank vessels transiting the Chelsea River, the current regulation does not address added or redundant systems aboard these vessels which may be used to enhance port and vessel safety and minimize potential pollution incidents. A slightly wider or longer double-hulled tankship with enhanced operational system transiting the Chelsea River may, in fact, have a margin of safety greater than the currently used smaller, less equipped tankships due to the former's improved maneuvering, handling, and safety characteristics.

Maneuvering

These enhanced systems may include: redundant power systems, redundant propulsion, controllable pitch propellers, improved steering capabilities, bow thrusters and other safety systems.

Procedural

All sessions are open to the public. At the Chairperson's discretion, members of the public may make oral presentations during the meeting. Persons wishing to make oral presentations at the meeting should notify Lt. Michael H. Day no later than October 27, 1997. Written material for distribution at the meeting should reach the COTP Boston no later than October 27, 1997. If a person submitting material would like copies distributed in advance of the meeting, that person should submit 25 copies to the COTP Boston no later than October 27, 1997.

Information on Services for the Handicapped

For information on facilities or services for the handicapped or to request special assistance at the meeting, contact COTP Boston as soon as possible.

Dated: September 30, 1997.

J.L. Grenier,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Boston, Massachusetts.

[FR Doc. 97-28287 Filed 10-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

33 CFR Part 334

Naval Restricted Area, Naval Station Annapolis, Maryland

AGENCY: Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Corps is proposing to establish a new restricted area in the waters of the small boat basin off the Severn River, in Annapolis, Maryland to prohibit public entry into the area. The restricted area is needed for the security of U.S. navy facilities and watercraft and navigational safety for U.S. Naval Academy training vessels in that area. The water area in the small boat basin has always been closed to the public, however, as a result of the closure of the adjacent Naval Surface Warfare Center and the planned future public ownership of that facility, the water may become accessible by the public.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 24, 1997.

ADDRESSES: HQUSACE, CECW-OR, Washington, DC 20314-1000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ralph Eppard, Headquarters Regulatory Branch, at (202) 761-1783, or Mr. Steve

Elinsky, Corps Baltimore District, at (410) 962-4503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to its authorities in section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1917 (40 Stat. 266; 33 U.S.C. 1) and Chapter XIX of the Army Appropriations Act of 1919 (40 Stat. 892; 33 U.S.C. 3), the Corps proposes to amend the regulations in 33 CFR part 334 by adding a new § 334.155 which establishes a naval restricted area at the Naval Station Annapolis small boat basin, off the Severn River at Annapolis, Maryland. The Commanding Officer of the Naval Station Annapolis, has requested that the Corps establish the restricted area for reasons of security and navigational safety. The small boat basin plays an integral role in the training of midshipmen of the U.S. Naval Academy. The basin is used continuously by the Naval Academy as a training area for maneuvering and seamanship exercises. Over the past 40 years, the small boat basin has been surrounded by restricted U.S. Navy property of the Naval Station Annapolis and the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), and accordingly, access to the basin was limited to Naval personnel. In 1995, the Congress approved the Department of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission's recommendation to close the NSWC at that location. The NSWC property is slated to become the property of Anne Arundel County and presumably that area and the shoreline of the basin could become accessible to the public. Public access to the basin from the NSWC property by non-U.S. Navy/Department of Defense personnel would pose an unacceptable security risk to the Naval Station. Navigational safety would also be a problem if non-Naval vessels are allowed to operate in the basin and because 260 feet of the NSWC seawall is located at the entrance to the basin, which is only 170 feet wide, any mooring by vessels along the seawall would further restrict the entrance and present a hazard to boats entering and leaving the basin. In addition to the publication of this proposed rule, the Baltimore District Engineer is soliciting public comment on these proposed changes to the restricted area rules by distribution of a public notice to all known interested parties.

Procedural Requirements

A. Review Under Executive Order 12866

This proposed rule is issued with respect to a military function of the Defense Department and the provisions of Executive Order 12866 do not apply.

B. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

These proposed rules have been reviewed under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354), which requires the preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis for any regulation that will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (i.e., small businesses and small Governments). The Corps expects that the economic impact of the establishment of this restricted area would have practically no impact on the public, no anticipated navigational hazard or interference with existing waterway traffic and accordingly, certifies that this proposal if adopted, will have no significant economic impact on small entities.

C. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act

An environmental assessment has been prepared for this action. We have concluded, based on the minor nature of the proposed additional restricted area regulations, that this action will not have a significant impact to the human environment, and preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required. The environmental assessment may be reviewed at the District Office listed at the end of **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, above.

D. Unfunded Mandates Act

This proposed rule does not impose an enforceable duty among the private sector and, therefore, is not a Federal private sector mandate and is not subject to the requirements of section 202 or 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act. We have also found under section 203 of the Act, that small Governments will not be significantly and uniquely affected by this rulemaking.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 334

Navigation (water), Transportation, Danger Zones.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, we propose to amend 33 CFR part 334, as follows:

PART 334—DANGER ZONE AND RESTRICTED AREA REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 334 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 40 Stat. 266; (33 U.S.C. 1) and 40 Stat. 892; (33 U.S.C. 3)

2. Add new § 334.155 to read as follows:

§ 334.155 Severn River, Naval Station Annapolis, Small Boat Basin, Annapolis, MD; naval restricted area.

(a) *The area.* The waters within the Naval Station Annapolis small boat basin and adjacent waters of the Severn River enclosed by a line beginning at the southeast corner of the U.S. Navy Marine Engineering Laboratory; thence to latitude 38°58'56.5", longitude 76°28'11.5"; thence to latitude 38°58'50.5", longitude 76°27'52"; thence to the southeast corner of the Naval Station's seawall.

(b) *The regulations.* No person, vessel or other craft shall enter or remain in the restricted area at any time except as authorized by the enforcing agency.

(c) *Enforcement.* The regulations in this section shall be enforced by the Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy, in Annapolis, Maryland, and such agencies as he/she may designate.

Dated: October 20, 1997.

Approved.

Robert W. Burkhardt,

Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Executive Director of Civil Works.

[FR Doc. 97-28196 Filed 10-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CT-7202b; FRL-5902-3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Conditional Approval of Implementation Plans; Connecticut

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing action on State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Connecticut. The EPA is proposing approval of Connecticut's 1990 base year ozone emission inventories, and establishment of a Photochemical Assessment Monitoring Stations (PAMS) network, as revisions to the Connecticut SIP for ozone. The EPA proposes a conditional approval of SIP revisions submitted by the State of Connecticut to meet the 15 Percent Rate of Progress (ROP) Plan requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA). A conditional approval is also proposed for the Connecticut contingency plan.

The inventory was submitted by Connecticut to satisfy a CAA requirement that those States containing ozone nonattainment areas (NAAs)