jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed 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 Chief Petty Officer Daniel Dugery at the address listed under **ADDRESSES**.

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

The Coast Guard analyzed this proposed rule under E.O. 13132 and has determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism under that Order.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) governs the issuance of Federal regulations that require unfunded mandates. An unfunded mandate is a regulation that requires a State, local, or tribal government or the private sector to incur direct costs without the Federal Government's having first provided the funds to pay those costs. This proposed rule would not impose an unfunded mandate.

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

The Coast Guard 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 does not pose an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, (34)(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.lC, this proposed 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 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 temporary § 165.T02–025 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01–107 Safety Zone; Aggregate Industries Fireworks—Boston, Massachusetts.

(a) *Location*. The following area is a safety zone: All waters of the Boston Harbor within a 400-yard radius of the fireworks launch platform located in approximate position 42°21′73″ N., 071°02′73″ W. All coordinates are NAD 1983.

(b) *Effective date*. This section is effective from 8 p.m. until 11 p.m. on October 24, 2002.

(c) *Regulations*. (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone will be prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Boston.

(2) All vessel operators shall comply with the instructions of the COTP or the designated on-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, local, state, and federal law enforcement vessels.

Dated: August 29, 2002.

B.M. Salerno,

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

[FR Doc. 02–23916 Filed 9–19–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 264–0370; FRL–7380–7]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified, Ventura County, and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control Districts

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified (SJVUAPCD), Ventura County (VCAPCD), and Santa Barbara County (SBCAPCD) Air Pollution Control Districts' portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from architectural coatings. In accordance with the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), we are proposing action on local rules that regulate these emission sources. We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by October 21, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support documents (TSDs) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 E. Gettysburg, Fresno, CA 93726.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Dr., 2nd Fl., Ventura, CA 93003.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 26 Castilian Dr. Suite B–23, Goleta, CA 93117.

A copy of the rule may also be available via the Internet at *http://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdbltxt.htm*. Please be advised that this is not an EPA website and may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne Fong, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4117.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, ''we,'' ''us'' and ''our'' refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

I. The State's Submittal
A. What rules did the State submit?
B. Are there other versions of these rules?
C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
II. EPA's Evaluation and Action.
A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
C. What are the rules' deficiencies?
D. EPA recommendations to further improve the rules.
E. Proposed action and public comment.
III. Background information.
A. Why were these rules submitted?
IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rules Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this proposal with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted to us by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD	4601	Architectural Coatings	10/31/01	03/15/02
VCAPCD	74.2	Architectural Coatings	11/13/01	03/15/02
SBCAPCD	323	Architectural Coatings	11/15/01	03/15/02

On May 7, 2002, these rule submittals were found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are There Other Versions of These Rules?

There are no previous versions of SJVUAPCD Rule 4601 in the SIP, although the rule was previously approved into the SIP as SJVUAPCD Rule 460.1 on June 30, 1993. We approved versions of VCAPCD Rule 74.2 and SBCAPCD Rule 323 into the SIP on March 24, 2000. The SJVUAPCD, VCAPCD, and SBCAPCD adopted revisions to the SIP-approved versions of these rules on October 31, 2001, November 13, 2001, and November 15, 2001, respectively. CARB submitted all three rule revisions to us on March 15, 2002.

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule Revisions?

The rule revisions primarily modify the rules for consistency with the Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings (SCM). The SCM is a model rule developed by CARB which seeks to provide statewide consistency for the regulation of architectural coatings. The CARB adopted the SCM on June 22, 2000. The TSDs have more information about these rules.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A)), must not relax requirements adopted before the 1990 CAA amendments in nonattainment areas (section 193), and must not interfere with attainment, reasonable further progress or other applicable requirements of the CAA (section 110(1)). The SJVUAPCD, VCAPCD, and SBCAPCD regulate ozone nonattainment areas (see 40 CFR 81), however, because these rules regulate nonmajor area sources, they are not subject to CAA RACT requirements.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to help evaluate specific enforceability and other CAA requirements consistently include the following:

1. Portions of the proposed post-1987 ozone and carbon monoxide policy that concern RACT, 52 FR 45044, November 24, 1987.
2. ''Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, andDeviations,'' EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook).
3. ''Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other RuleDeficiencies,'' EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook).
4. National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings, September 11, 1998 (40 CFR Part 59 Subpart D).
5. ''Suggested Control Measure for Architectural Coatings,'' CARB, June 22, 2000.
6. ''Improving Air Quality with Economic Incentive Programs,'' EPA–452/R–01–001, EPA, January 2001 (the EIP).

B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

These rules improve the SIP by establishing more stringent emission limits and by clarifying labelling and reporting provisions. They are largely consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability and SIP relaxations. Provisions of the rules which do not meet the evaluation criteria are summarized below and discussed further in the TSDs.

C. What Are the Rules' Deficiencies?

These rules were all based on the same model—the SCM—and, as a result, contain many of the same rule deficiencies. The following provisions common to SJVUAPCD Rule 4601, VCAPCD Rule 74.2, and SBCAPCD Rule 323 conflict with section 110 of the Act and prevent full approval of the SIP revisions.

1. The rules allow the VOC content displayed on a coating to be calculated using product formulation data. A definition of the term formulation data must be added to ensure the regulation is clear and enforceable and to ensure that unreliable data is not used to determine compliance.
2. The rules allow for the sell-through of coatings included in approved averaging programs. Because emissions from coatings sold under the sell-through provision cannot be distinguished from emissions from coatings sold under an averaging program, the enforceability of the rules may be compromised by manufacturers claiming that a certain portion of emissions from coatings sold under the sell-through provision should be excluded from averaged emissions.
3. The rules grant the Executive Officer of CARB authority to approve or disapprove initial averaging programs, program renewals, program modifications, and program terminations. This raises jurisdictional issues which could create enforceability

problems since CARB has not been granted authority by the state Legislature under the California Health and Safety Code to regulate architectural coatings.

4. The provisions of the averaging compliance option which require manufacturers to describe the records being used to calculate emissions are not specific enough to verify compliance with the rules and represent executive officer discretion. More specificity as to the types of suitable records is needed to verify compliance with the averaging compliance option.

5. The rules' language regarding how violations of the averaging compliance option shall be determined is ambiguous. The language should be clarified to specify that ''an exceedance for each coating that is over the limit shall constitute a separate violation for each day of the compliance period.''

6. The rules contain typographical errors that make the rules confusing and less enforceable.

D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSDs describe additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA's current action but are recommended for the next time the local agencies modify the rules.

E. Proposed Action and Public Comment

As authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, EPA is proposing a limited approval of the submitted rules to improve the SIP. If finalized, this action would incorporate the submitted rules into the SIP, including those provisions identified as deficient. This approval is limited because EPA is simultaneously proposing a limited disapproval of the rules under section 110(k)(3). If this disapproval is finalized, sanctions will be imposed under section 179 of the Act unless EPA approves subsequent SIP revisions that correct the rules' deficiencies within 18 months. These sanctions would be imposed according to 40 CFR 52.31. A final disapproval would also trigger the federal implementation plan (FIP) requirement under section 110(c). Note that the submitted rules have been adopted by the districts and EPA's final limited disapproval would not prevent the local agencies from enforcing them.

We will accept comments from the public on the proposed limited approval and limited disapproval for the next 30 days.

III. Background Information

A. Why Were These Rules Submitted?

VOCs help produce ground-level ozone and smog, which harm human health and the environment. EPA has established a National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations necessary to achieve the NAAQS. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agencies' VOC rules.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP–Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101–549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review.

B. Executive Order 13211

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

C. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be ''economically significant'' as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks and is not an economically significant action.

D. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure ''meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.'' ''Policies that have federalism implications'' is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.'' Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This proposed rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national

government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132, because it merely acts on a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this proposed rule.

E. Executive Order 13175

Executive Order 13175, entitled ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 6, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure ''meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.'' ''Policies that have tribal implications'' is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have ''substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes.''

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on tribal governments, 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, as specified in Executive Order 13175. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule. In the spirit of Executive Order 13175, and consistent with EPA policy to promote communications between EPA and tribal governments, EPA specifically solicits additional comment on this proposed rule from tribal officials.

F. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and Title I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply act on requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

EPA's proposed disapproval of the state request under section 110 and Title I, part D of the Clean Air Act does not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Any pre-existing federal requirements remain in place after this disapproval. Federal disapproval of the state submittal does not affect state enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does not impose any new Federal requirements. Therefore, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. EPA,* 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

G. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (''Unfunded Mandates Act''), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of $100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the proposed action does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This proposed Federal action acts on pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use ''voluntary consensus standards'' (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to today's proposed action because it does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compound.

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

Dated: September 3, 2002.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 02–23987 Filed 9–19–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[UT–001–0045b, UT–001–0046b; FRL–7378–1]

Determination of Attainment for the Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Metropolitan Provo; State of Utah, and Approval of Revisions to the Oxygenated Gasoline Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would make a determination of attainment for the carbon monoxide (CO) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for the metropolitan Provo CO nonattainment area (hereafter Provo area) which was classified as ''moderate''. The Provo area was required by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to attain the CO NAAQS by December 31, 1995. This determination would be based on complete, quality assured ambient air quality monitoring data for the years 1994 and 1995. In addition, on September 27, 2001, the Governor