Order 12612 and has determined that this proposal does not raise sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

#### **Environment**

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposal and concluded that under section 2.B.2.e. of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B, it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination and Environmental Analysis Checklist is included in the docket.

# List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

## **Proposed Regulations**

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

### PART 165—[AMENDED]

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. A temporary § 165.T01–072, is added to read as follows:

### § 165.T01–072 Safety Zone; New York Super Boat Race, Hudson River, New York and New Jersey.

(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: All waters of the Lower Hudson River between Pier 76 in Manhattan and a point on the New Jersey shore in Weehawken, New Jersey at 40°45′52″ N latitude, 074°01′01″ W longitude and north of a line connecting the following points:

Latitude	Longitude
40°42′16.0″ N	074°01'09.0" W, then south to
40°41′55.0″ N	074°01′16.0" W, then west to
40°41′47.0″ N	074°01'36.0" W, then north-
	west to
40°41′55.0″ N	074°01′59.0" W, then to shore
	at
40°42′20.5″ N	074°02′06.0″ W

- (b) *Effective period*. This safety zone would be in effect on Sunday, September 7, 1997, from 12 p.m. until 4 p.m.
- (c) *Regulations*. (1) The general regulations contained in 33 CFR 165.23 apply.
- (2) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or the designated on scene patrol personnel. U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel

include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard. Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel via siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

Dated: July 20, 1997.

### Richard C. Vlaun,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, New York.

[FR Doc. 97–20334 Filed 7–31–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–14–M

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[ME47-01-7002b; A-1-FRL-5867-7]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; (Hancock and Waldo Counties Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision—Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets)

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Maine. This revision establishes explicit year 2006 motor vehicle emissions budgets [Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)] for the Hancock and Waldo counties ozone maintenance area to be used in determining transportation conformity. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision 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 that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. 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 on this proposal. Any parties interested in commenting on this proposal should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 2, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Susan Studlien, Deputy Director, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, JFK Federal Bldg., Boston, MA 02203. Copies of the State submittal and EPA's technical support document are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA and the Bureau of Air Quality Control, Department of Environmental Protection, 71 Hospital Street, Augusta, ME 04333.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald O. Cooke, (617) 565–3508.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this Federal Register.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q. Dated: July 20, 1997.

### John P. DeVillars,

Regional Administrator, Region I [FR Doc. 97–20367 Filed 7–31–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[NC-82-9728(b); FRL-5863-7]

Approval and Promulgation of Revisions to North Carolina SIP Involving Open Burning and Other Miscellaneous Rules

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On August 16, 1996, North Carolina submitted, through the Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, revisions to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan (SIP) involving the adoption of open burning rules and also the amending of many other miscellaneous regulations. In the final rules section of this Federal Register, the EPA is approving the revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment 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 that direct final rule no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on