

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 rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Ann B. Deaton, Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, (757) 398–6222.

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 affect 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.

To help the Coast Guard establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian and Alaskan Native tribes, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 36361, July 11, 2001) requesting comments on how to best carry out the Order. 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 (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination”

is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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 authority of Pub.L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.727 is revised to read as follows:

§ 117.727 Manasquan River.

The draw of the Route 70 Bridge, mile 3.4, at Riviera Beach, shall open on signal on the hour; except that from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays and from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. daily, the draw need not be opened.

Dated: August 26, 2002.

Arthur E. Brooks,

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

[FR Doc. 02–23115 Filed 9–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[UT–001–0021b, UT–001–0041b; FRL–7264–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program; Utah County

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan revision submitted by the Governor of Utah on December 7, 2001. This SIP submittal consists of a revision to Utah’s rule R307–110–34 and section X, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program, Part D, Utah County. This SIP submittal satisfies one of the conditions of EPA’s June 9, 1997 interim approval of Utah County’s improved vehicle I/M program SIP. The other condition of EPA’s interim approval was submittal of a demonstration that Utah County’s decentralized I/M program can obtain the same emission reduction credits as a centralized I/M program. The State

submitted such a demonstration on May 20, 1999. These submittals meet the requirements of Section 348 of the National Highway System Designation Act, which allows States to claim additional credit for their decentralized I/M programs. In this case, Utah has demonstrated that Utah County's improved vehicle I/M program is entitled to 100% emissions reduction credit. Thus, EPA is hereby proposing to approve Utah's program evaluation, and revisions to Utah's rule R307-110-34 and section X, which would allow Utah County to claim 100% emissions reduction credit for its improved vehicle I/M program.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision and demonstration as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing on or before October 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Mailcode 8P-AR, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado, 80202. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado, 80202-2466. Copies of the State documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection at the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality, 150 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kerri Fiedler, EPA Region VIII, (303) 312-6493.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: August 13, 2002.

Patricia D. Hull,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. 02-23085 Filed 9-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[DE061-DE066 -1034; FRL-7375-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Six Control Measures to Meet EPA-Identified Shortfalls in Delaware's One-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration

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 Delaware. This proposed revision consists of six control measures to meet EPA-identified shortfalls in Delaware's one-hour ozone attainment demonstration. The intended effect of this action is to propose approval of the six control measures.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before October 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to David L. Arnold, 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 Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control, 89 Kings Highway, P.O. Box 1401, Dover, Delaware 19903.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rose Quinto, (215) 814-2182, or by e-mail at quinto.rose@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: On March 1, 2002, the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) submitted to EPA revisions to the Delaware's State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions consist of six control measures

to meet EPA-identified shortfalls in Delaware's one-hour ozone attainment demonstration for the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton severe nonattainment area (64 FR 70444, December 16, 1999 and 66 FR 54598, October 29, 2001). These six control measures also fulfill Delaware's commitment to adopt measures to address the shortfalls. In addition, Delaware submitted a technical support document (TSD), entitled, Measures to Meet the EPA-Identified Shortfalls in Delaware's Phase II Attainment Demonstration for the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton Ozone Nonattainment Area (November 11, 2001), which indicates the reductions achieved by these adopted measures.

I. Background

In December 1999, EPA identified emission reduction shortfalls in several one-hour ozone nonattainment areas in the Ozone Transport Region and required those areas to address the shortfalls. The Ozone Transport Commission (OTC) developed control measures into model rules for a number of source categories and estimated emission reduction benefits from implementing those model rules that will close the shortfalls.

II. Summary of the SIP Revisions

The following are the six control measures, which are based on the model rules developed by OTC, that Delaware adopted and submitted to EPA on March 1, 2002, as SIP revisions to meet the shortfalls:

(1) Regulation 24, Control of Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions, Section 11—Mobile Equipment Repair and Refinishing—applies to any person who applies coatings to mobile equipment, such as cars, trucks, and/or tractors for beautification or protection in the State of Delaware. The regulation establishes: (a) Requirements for using improved transfer efficiency coating and application equipment, such as high volume low pressure spray guns; (b) requirements for enclosed spray gun cleaning techniques; and (c) minimum training standards in the proper use of equipment and materials. VOC limits for mobile equipment repair and refinishing coatings are in effect nationally under the Federal requirements at 40 CFR part 59, subpart B, National VOC Emission Standards for Automobile Refinish Coatings, which was adopted by EPA in 1998.

(2) Regulation 24, Control of VOC Emissions, Section 33—Solvent Cleaning and Drying—applies to any person who owns or operates solvent cleaning machines that contain more