

Tiamulin in grams per ton	Combination in grams per ton	Indications for use	Limitations	Sponsor
(iii) 35 .....	Chlortetracycline, approximately 400 (varying with body weight and feed consumption to provide 10 milligrams of chlortetracycline per pound of body weight daily).	For treatment of swine bacterial enteritis caused by <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Salmonella choleraesuis</i> and bacterial pneumonia caused by <i>Pasteurella multocida</i> susceptible to chlortetracycline, and control of swine dysentery associated with <i>Brachyspira</i> (formerly <i>Serpulina</i> or <i>Treponema</i> ) <i>hyodysenteriae</i> susceptible to tiamulin.	Feed continuously as sole ration for 14 days. Use as only source of chlortetracycline. Withdraw 2 days before slaughter. As chlortetracycline calcium complex, Type A medicated articles containing the equivalent of 50 to 100 grams per pound of chlortetracycline hydrochloride provided by 046573 and 053389 in §510.600(c) of this chapter.	000010
(iv) 200 .....	.....	For treatment of swine dysentery associated with <i>Brachyspira</i> (formerly <i>Serpulina</i> or <i>Treponema</i> ) <i>hyodysenteriae</i> susceptible to tiamulin.	Feed continuously as the sole feed for 14 consecutive days. Withdraw feed 7 days before slaughter.	000010

(2) [Reserved]

Dated: January 31, 2002.

**Claire M. Lathers,**

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

[FR Doc. 02-3831 Filed 2-15-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-S

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### 28 CFR Part 65

[OJP(BJA)-1334]

RIN 1121-AA60

#### Bureau of Justice Assistance; Emergency Federal Law Enforcement Assistance

**AGENCY:** Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Justice.

**ACTION:** Final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This rule corrects the address for submission of applications to the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, for the Emergency Federal Law Enforcement Assistance (EFLEA) Program. This correction reflects a change of address for the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Program, U.S. Department of Justice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This change will be effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Linda Fallowfield or Victoria O'Brien at 202-307-6235.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Bureau of Justice Assistance is issuing this final rule to correct the address to which a state or local unit of government may submit applications for the Emergency Federal Law

Enforcement Assistance Program. The purpose of this program is to provide assistance to an uncommon situation which is or threatens to escalate to serious or epidemic proportions and state or local resources are not sufficient to protect the lives and property of citizens, or to enforce the criminal law.

Currently, the state must submit the application directly to the Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice with one copy to the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The Office of Justice Programs has moved to a different location in Washington, DC necessitating this correction to the regulation.

#### Regulatory Certifications

##### Executive Order 12866

This regulation has been written and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866, Sec. 1(b), Principles of Regulation. The Office of Justice Programs has determined that this rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866, Sec. 3(f), Regulatory Planning and Review, and accordingly this rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

##### Executive Order 12612

This regulation will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Office of Justice Programs, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this regulation and by approving it certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: The EFLEA program is administered by the Office of Justice Programs. The economic impact is limited to the Office of Justice Program's appropriated funds.

#### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

#### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by Sec. 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in cost or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

## Paperwork Reduction Act

No new collection of information requirements as defined under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3504(h)) are being added by this proposed regulation.

## Environmental Impact

OJP has evaluated this rule in accordance with its procedures for ensuring full consideration of the potential environmental impacts of OJP's actions, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*) and related directives. OJP has concluded that the issuance of this rule does not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and, therefore, does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

## Energy Impact Statement

OJP has evaluated this rule and has determined that it creates no new impact on the energy supply or distribution.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, Title 28, Chapter I, Part 65 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

## PART 65—EMERGENCY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

1. The authority citation for Part 32 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** The Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, Title II, Chap. VI, Div. I, Subdiv. B, Emergency Federal Law Enforcement Assistance, Pub. L. 98–473, 98 Stat. 1837, Oct. 12, 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10501 *et seq.*); 8 U.S.C. 1101 note; Sec. 610, Pub. L. 102–140, 105 Stat. 832.

2. Section 65.40 is revised to read as follows: 65.40 General.

\* \* \* \* \*

This subpart describes the process and criteria for the Attorney General's review and approval or disapproval of state applications. The original application, on Standard Form 424, signed by the chief executive officer of the state should be submitted directly to the Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20503. One copy of the application should be sent to the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20531.

Dated: February 8, 2002.

**Harri j Kramer,**

*Deputy Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 02–3833 Filed 2–15–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Diego 01–021]

RIN 2115–AA97

### Security Zones; Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, and Glen Canyon Dam

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing three security zones on the Colorado River: one surrounding the Hoover Dam, the second one surrounding the Davis Dam, and the third zone surrounding the Glen Canyon Dam. These actions are necessary to ensure public safety and prevent sabotage or terrorist acts against the public and commercial structures and individuals near or upon these structures. These security zones will prohibit all persons and vessels from entering, transiting through or anchoring within the security zones unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP), or his designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 12 midnight (PST) on November 5, 2001 to 12 midnight (PDT) on June 21, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Any comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket COTP San Diego 01–021, and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Diego, 2716 N. Harbor Drive, San Diego California 92101, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant Rick Sorrell, Chief of Port Operations, Marine Safety Office San Diego, at (619) 683–6495.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. In keeping with the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM. In keeping with the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard also finds that good cause exists for making this regulation effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

On September 11, 2001, two commercial aircraft were hijacked from

Logan Airport in Boston, Massachusetts and flown into the World Trade Center in New York, New York inflicting catastrophic human casualties and property damage. A similar attack was conducted on the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia on the same day. National security officials warn that future terrorist attacks against high visibility civilian targets may be anticipated. A heightened level of security has been established concerning all vessels and persons transiting in the vicinity of the Colorado River Dams. These security zones are needed to protect the United States and more specifically the people, waterways, and properties of the Colorado River Dams.

The delay inherent in the NPRM process, and any delay in the effective date of this rule, is contrary to the public interest insofar as it may render individuals and facilities within and adjacent to the Colorado River Dams vulnerable to subversive activity, sabotage or terrorist attack. The measures contemplated by the rule are intended to prevent future terrorist attacks against these dams themselves, or individuals and facilities within or adjacent to these dams. Immediate action is required to accomplish these objectives. Any delay in the effective date of this rule is impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

### Background and Purpose

On September 11, 2001, terrorists launched attacks on civilian and military targets within the United States killing large numbers of people and damaging properties of national significance. Personnel, vehicles or vessels operating near these installations upon the Colorado River and activities upon adjacent lands present possible situations through which individuals may gain unauthorized access to these installations, or launch terrorist attacks upon the waterfront structures and adjacent population centers.

As part of the Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–399), Congress amended The Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA) to allow the Coast Guard to take actions, including the establishment of security and safety zones, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism against individuals, vessels, or public or commercial structures. 33 U.S.C. 1226. The terrorist acts against the United States on September 11, 2001, have increased the need for safety and security measures on U.S. ports and waterways.

In response to these terrorist acts, and in order to prevent similar occurrences,