

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we 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 or anchor in a portion of Narragansett Bay from 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. on June 30, 2000.

This safety zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This rule would be in effect for only three hours and vessel traffic could pass safely around the safety zone. Before the effective period, we would issue maritime advisories widely available to users of Narragansett Bay.

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 CWO John W. Winter, telephone (401)435–2335.

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

We have analyzed this proposed rule under E.O. 13132 and have 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 E.O. 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 E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

Environment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of implementing this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph 34(g), of Commandant Instruction M16475.IC, 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), Reports and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, and 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(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6 and 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. Add temporary § 165.T01–197 to read as follows:

§ 165.T01–197 Safety Zone: Fireworks Display, Naval Station Newport, Newport, Rhode Island.

(a) *Location.* All waters within a five hundred (500) yard radius of the fireworks launching platform located approximately 300 yards off shore from Coasters Island, Naval Station Newport, Newport, Rhode Island.

(b) *Effective Period.* This section is effective from 8 p.m. until 11 p.m. on June 30, 2000, unless extended or terminated sooner by the Captain of the Port Providence.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) The general regulations governing safety zones 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. These personnel comprise commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard. Upon being hailed by a U.S. Coast Guard vessel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

Dated: March 6, 2000.

Peter A. Popko,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Marine Safety Office Providence.

[FR Doc. 00–7060 Filed 3–22–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 224–0213b; FRL–6549–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Unified Air Pollution Control District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Air Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concern the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from wood product and wood panelling coating operations.

The intended effect of this action is to regulate emissions of VOCs according to the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP submittal 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 this approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received, 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. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received by April 21, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report of each rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are also available for inspection at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812;

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 24580 Silver Cloud Court, Monterey, CA 93940;

San Joaquin Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1999 Tuolumne Street, Suite 200, Fresno, CA 93721;

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District 26 Castilian Drive, Suite B-23, Goleta, CA 93117; and,

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 218 East Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerald S. Wamsley, Rulemaking Office, (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1226.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document concerns the following local district rules: Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) Rule 429—Applications of Nonarchitectural Coatings; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) Rule 4606—Wood

Products Coating Operations; Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) Rule 351—Surface Coating of Wood Products; South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1104—Wood Flat Stock Coating Operations. These rules were submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to EPA on these respective dates: March 23, 1988; February 16, 1999; May 13, 1999; and, October 29, 1999.

For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action that is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: February 15, 2000.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 00-6973 Filed 3-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OR73-7288-b; FRL-6544-5]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approves various revisions to Oregon's State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision to the SIP was submitted to EPA, dated October 8, 1998.

The revised regulations include Transportation Conformity (OAR 340-020-710 through 340-020-1080) and General Conformity OAR-020-1500 through 340-020-1590). In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal 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 this action, no further activity is contemplated. If the 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. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received in writing by April 21, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Christine Lemme (OAQ-107), Office of Air Quality, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the state submittal are available at the following addresses for inspection during normal business hours. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Office of Air Quality, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101 and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204-1390.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Wayne Elson, Office of Air Quality, (OAQ-107), EPA, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553-1463.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the Direct Final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: February 22, 2000.

Chuck Findley,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 00-6970 Filed 3-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 214-0191; FRL-6563-2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Kern County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and a simultaneous limited disapproval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Kern County Air Pollution Control District (KCAPCD). The revisions concern Rule 427, stationary piston engines, for the control of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions.

The intended effect of proposing limited approval and a simultaneous limited disapproval of the rule is to regulate emissions of NO_x in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). EPA's final action on the proposed rule will incorporate the rule into the federally approved SIP. EPA has evaluated the rule and is proposing a limited approval and a simultaneous limited disapproval under