

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 will 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 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

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.

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. The Administrator of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated this as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment because it simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

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; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 117.181 to read as follows:

§ 117.181 Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal.

The draws of the Alameda County highway drawbridges at Park Street, mile 5.2; Fruitvale Avenue, mile 5.6; and High Street, mile 6.0; and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers railroad drawbridge, mile 5.6 at Fruitvale Avenue, shall open on signal between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. and upon 4 hours advance notice between the hours 4:30 p.m. and 9 a.m. During Interstate rush hours, 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, the draws need not be opened for the passage of vessels. However, the draws shall open during the above rush hour periods for vessels which must, for reasons of safety, move on a tide or slack water, if at least four hours notice is given to the bridge owner. For the four hour advance notice requirement; waterway users may contact the Fruitvale Ave drawbridge operator via telephone at (510) 533–7858 or VHF–FM marine radio, or by contacting the bridge operator during daytime bridge operating hours.

Dated: May 12, 2010.

J.R. Castillo,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2010–12737 Filed 5–26–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2009–0316]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zones; Sabine Bank Channel, Sabine Pass Channel and Sabine-Neches Waterway, TX

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish moving security zones for certain vessels for which the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur deems enhanced security measures are necessary. In addition, the Coast Guard proposes a 100-foot security zone around LNG carriers while they are moored at the Golden Pass LNG facility in Sabine, TX and/or the Sabine Pass LNG facility located in Cheniere, LA.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before June 28, 2010.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2009–0316 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

(3) *Mail:* Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

(4) *Hand delivery:* Same as mail address above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail Mr. Scott Whalen, Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur, Coast Guard; telephone 409–719–5086, e-mail scott.k.whelen@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2009–0316),

indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (via <http://www.regulations.gov>) or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via <http://www.regulations.gov>, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an e-mail address, or a telephone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the “submit a comment” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Document Type” drop down menu select “Proposed Rule” and insert “USCG–2009–0316” in the “Keyword” box. Click “Search” then click on the balloon shape in the “Actions” column. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½; by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the “read comments” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Keyword” box insert “USCG–2009–0316” and click “Search.” Click the “Open Docket Folder” in the “Actions” column. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation to use the Docket Management Facility.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008 issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

Public Meeting

At this time, we do not plan to hold a public meeting, but you may submit a request for one using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why you believe a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

Heightened awareness of potential terrorist acts requires enhanced security of our ports, harbors, and vessels. To enhance security, the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur proposes to establish security zones around certain vessels. These security zones are needed to safeguard the vessels, the public, and the surrounding area from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, or other events of a similar nature.

Due to the potential for terrorist attacks, this proposed rule would allow the Captain of the Port to create fixed security zones around moored LNG carriers and moving security zones around certain vessels as deemed necessary. By limiting access to these areas, the Coast Guard is reducing potential methods of attack on these vessels, and potential use of the vessels to launch attacks on waterfront facilities and adjacent population centers located within the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur zone. Vessels having a need to enter these security zones must obtain permission from the Captain of the Port or his designated representative prior to entry.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish moving security zones for certain vessels, for which the Captain of the Port deems enhanced security measures are necessary. Mariners will be notified of the activation of a moving security zone by Broadcast Notice to Mariners. Active moving security zones may also be identified by the presence of escort vessels displaying flashing blue law enforcement lights.

The moving security zones would be activated for certain vessels within the

Captain of the Port zone commencing at U.S. territorial waters through Sabine Bank Channel, Sabine Pass Channel and the Sabine-Neches Waterway, extending from the surface to the bottom. These moving security zones would extend channel edge to channel edge on the Sabine Bank and Sabine Pass Channel and shoreline to shoreline on the Sabine-Neches Waterway, 2 miles ahead and 1 mile astern of the designated vessels while in transit. Meeting, crossing or overtaking situations are not permitted within the security zone unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port.

In addition, the Coast Guard proposes a 100-foot security zone around LNG carriers while they are moored at the Golden Pass LNG facility in Sabine, TX and/or the Sabine Pass LNG facility located in Cheniere, LA.

These proposed security zones would be part of a comprehensive port security regime designed to safeguard human life, vessels, and waterfront facilities against sabotage or terrorist attacks.

All vessels not exempted under paragraph (b) of the proposed section 165.819 would be prohibited from entering or remaining in these security zones unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur or his designated representative. For authorization to enter the proposed security zones, vessels could contact the Captain of the Port's on-scene representative or Vessel Traffic Service Port Arthur on VHF Channel 01A or 65A, by telephone at (409) 719-5070, or by facsimile at (409) 719-5090.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. The basis of this finding is that the proposed fixed security zones around moored LNG carriers would be of limited size and duration and the affected area would not hinder or delay regular vessel traffic. The moving

security zone would be limited and would not create undue delay to vessel traffic because vessel traffic may request permission to enter the zone from the Captain of the Port.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit through the fixed or moving security zones. The proposed fixed security zones would be of limited size and duration and the affected area would not hinder or delay regular vessel traffic; The proposed rule for moving security zone would not create undue delay to vessel traffic because vessel traffic may request permission to enter the zone. If you think that your business, organization, or governmental 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 (Pub. L. 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 Mr. Scott Whalen, Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur, Coast Guard; telephone (409) 719-5086, e-mail scott.k.whalen@uscg.mil. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

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 (adjusted for inflation) 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 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

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.

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. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. This proposed rule involves establishing security zones. Therefore, this rule would be

categorically excluded under Figure 2-1, paragraph (34)(g) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which addresses regulations establishing, disestablishing, or changing Regulated Navigation Areas and security or safety zones. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

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. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, 160.5; Pub. L. 107-295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Add new § 165.819 to read as follows:

§ 165.819 Security Zone; Sabine Bank Channel, Sabine Pass Channel and Sabine-Neches Waterway, TX.

(a) Location.

(1) The following areas are designated as fixed security zones: All waters within a 100-foot radius of LNG carriers moored at:

(i) Golden Pass LNG facility located in Sabine, TX, in position 29°45'52" N 093°55'25" W; and/or

(ii) Sabine Pass LNG facility located in Cheniere, LA, in position 29°44'31" N 093°52'18" W.

(2) The following areas are designated as moving security zones: All waters of the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur Zone commencing at U.S. territorial waters and extending from the surface to the bottom, channel edge to channel edge on the Sabine Bank and Sabine Pass Channels and shoreline to shoreline on the Sabine-Neches Waterway, 2 miles ahead and 1 mile astern of certain designated vessels while in transit within in the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur zone. Mariners would be notified of designated vessels by Broadcast Notice to Mariners and the presence of escort vessels displaying flashing blue law enforcement lights.

(b) Regulations.

(1) Entry into or remaining in a fixed security zone described in paragraph (a)(1) of this section is prohibited for all vessels except:

(i) Commercial vessels operating at waterfront facilities within these zones;

(ii) Commercial vessels transiting directly to or from waterfront facilities within these zones;

(iii) Vessels providing direct operational or logistical support to commercial vessels within these zones;

(iv) Vessels operated by the appropriate port authority or by facilities located within these zones; and

(v) Vessels operated by federal, state, county, or municipal law enforcement agencies.

(2) Entry into or remaining in a moving security zone described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section is prohibited for all vessels except:

(i) Moored vessels or vessels anchored in a designated anchorage area. A moored or an anchored vessel in a security zone described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section must remain moored or anchored unless it obtains permission from the Captain of the Port to do otherwise;

(ii) Commercial vessels operating at waterfront facilities located within the zone;

(iii) Vessels providing direct operational support to commercial vessels within a moving security zone;

(iv) Vessels operated by federal, state, county, or municipal law enforcement agencies.

(3) Meeting, crossing or overtaking situations are not permitted within the security zone described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port.

(4) Other persons or vessels requiring entry into security zones described in this section must request permission from the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur or designated representative.

(5) To request permission to enter a security zone described in this section, contact Vessel Traffic Service Port Arthur on VHF Channel 01A or 65A; by telephone at (409) 719-5070; by fax at (409) 719-5090; or contact the Captain of the Port's designated on-scene patrol vessel on VHF channel 13 or 16.

(6) All persons and vessels within a security zone described in this section must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur, designated on-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel or other designated representatives. Designated on-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the U.S. Coast Guard. Designated representatives include federal, state, local and municipal law enforcement agencies.

Dated: April 22, 2010.

J.J. Plunkett,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Port Arthur.

[FR Doc. 2010-12738 Filed 5-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0612-200914(b); FRL-9155-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Florida; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and Southeast Florida Areas

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Florida State Implementation Plan (SIP) concerning the maintenance plans addressing the 1997 8-hour ozone standards for the Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and Southeast Florida 1997 8-hour ozone attainment areas in Florida, hereafter referred to as the "Jacksonville Area," "Tampa Bay Area," and "Southeast Florida Area," respectively. The Jacksonville Area is comprised of Duval County; the Tampa Bay Area comprises Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties; and the Southeast Florida Area comprises Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach Counties. These maintenance plans were submitted to EPA on July 2, 2009, by the State of Florida, through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and ensure the continued attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) through the year 2014 in the Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and Southeast Florida Areas. EPA is proposing to approve the SIP revisions pursuant to section 110 of the Clean Air Act. These maintenance plans appear to meet all the statutory and regulatory requirements, and are consistent with EPA's guidance. On March 12, 2008, EPA issued revised ozone standards. On September 16, 2009, EPA announced it would reconsider the 2008 NAAQS for ozone and proposed a new schedule for designations for a reconsidered standard. EPA published a proposed rulemaking on January 19, 2010, for reconsideration of the 2008 NAAQS, and expects to finalize the reconsidered NAAQS by August 2010. The current proposed action, however, is being

taken to address requirements under the 1997 8-hour ozone standards. Requirements for the Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and Southeast Florida Areas under the 2010 reconsidered ozone standards will be addressed in the future.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before June 28, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0612, by one of the following methods:

1. *http://www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *E-mail*: benjamin.lynorae@epa.gov.
3. *Fax*: (404) 562-9019.
4. *Mail*: "EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0612," Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960.

5. *Hand Delivery or Courier*: Lynorae Benjamin, Chief, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Twunjala Bradley, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The telephone number is (404) 562-9352. Ms. Bradley can also be reached via electronic mail at bradley.twunjala@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 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 submittal 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 this rule, no

further activity is contemplated. 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 document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Incorporation by reference, Ozone, Nitrogen dioxides, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 11, 2010.

Beverly H. Banister,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2010-12659 Filed 5-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

42 CFR Part 84

[Docket Number NIOSH-0137]

RIN 0920-AA33

Total Inward Leakage Requirements for Respirators

AGENCY: The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), will hold a second public meeting concerning the proposed rule for Total Inward Leakage Requirements for Respirators that was published in the **Federal Register** on Friday, October 30, 2009 (74 FR 56141). The purpose of the meeting is to allow participants to make presentations to NIOSH, share results of any new research that may be available or in process in the area of filtering facepiece or other half-mask respirator inward leakage measurement, and offer any additional comments on the anticipated economic impact of the proposed rule.

Public Meeting Time and Date: 8:30 a.m.-4 p.m. EDT, or after the last public commenter has spoken, whichever is earlier, July 29, 2010.