

*Oregon:* Motor Vehicles Division, 1905 Lana Avenue, NE., Salem, OR 97314, (503) 378-6903.

*Pennsylvania:* Department of Transportation, Bureau of Motor Vehicles, Transportation and Safety Bldg., Harrisburg, PA 17122, (717) 787-3130.

*Rhode Island:* Department of Motor Vehicles, State Office Building, Providence, RI 02903, (401) 277-6900.

*South Carolina:* Motor Vehicle Division, P.O. Drawer 1498, Columbia, SC 29216, (803) 758-5821.

*South Dakota:* Division of Motor Vehicles, 118 W. Capitol, Pierre, SD 57501, (605) 773-3501.

*Tennessee:* Department of Revenue, Motor Vehicle Division, 500 Deaderick Street, Nashville, TN 37242, (615) 741-1786.

*Texas:* Department of Highways and Public Transportation, Motor Vehicle Division, 40th and Jackson Avenue, Austin, TX 78779, (512) 475-7686.

*Utah:* Motor Vehicle Division State Fairgrounds, 1095 Motor Avenue, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, (801) 533-5311.

*Vermont:* Department of Motor Vehicles, State Street, Montpelier, VT 05603, (802) 828-2014.

*Virginia:* Department of Motor Vehicles, 2300 W. Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23220, (804) 257-1855.

*Washington:* Department of Licensing, Highways-Licenses Building, Olympia, WA 98504, (206) 753-6975.

*West Virginia:* Department of Motor Vehicles, 1800 Washington Street, East, Charleston, WV 25317, (304) 348-2719.

*Wisconsin:* Department of Transportation Reciprocity and Permits, P.O. Box 7908, Madison, WI 53707, (608) 266-2585.

*Wyoming:* Department of Revenue, Policy Division, 122 W. 25th Street, Cheyenne, WY 82002, (307) 777-5273.

*Guam:* Deputy Director, Revenue and Taxation, Government of Guam, Agana, Guam 96910, (no phone number available).

*Puerto Rico:* Department of Transportation and Public Works, Bureau of Motor Vehicles, P.O. Box 41243, Minillas Station, Santurce, Puerto Rico 00940, (809) 722-2823.

[FR Doc. 05-7165 Filed 4-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-05-032]

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills, and Their Tributaries, NY

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commander, First Coast Guard District, has issued a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations for the Metropolitan Avenue Bridge, mile 3.4, across English Kills at New York City, New York. Under this temporary deviation the bridge may remain in the closed position from April 27, 2005 through April 29, 2005. This temporary deviation is necessary to facilitate bridge maintenance.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective from April 27, 2005 through April 29, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Judy Leung-Yee, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, at (212) 668-7195.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Metropolitan Avenue Bridge has a vertical clearance in the closed position of 10 feet at mean high water and 15 feet at mean low water. The existing drawbridge operation regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.801(e).

The owner of the bridge, New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT), requested a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations to facilitate rehabilitation repairs at the bridge. The bridge must remain in the closed position to perform these repairs.

Under this temporary deviation the NYCDOT Metropolitan Avenue Bridge may remain in the closed position from April 27, 2005 through April 29, 2005.

This deviation from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR 117.35, and will be performed with all due speed in order to return the bridge to normal operation as soon as possible.

Dated: April 5, 2005.

Gary Kassof,

Bridge Program Manager, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 05-7327 Filed 4-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[CGD07-05-009]

RIN 1625-AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Seventh Coast Guard District

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is removing drawbridge operation regulations for seven bascule bridges within the Seventh Coast Guard District. The seven bascule bridges were removed and the regulations governing their operation are no longer needed.

**DATES:** This rule is effective April 12, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents referred to in this rule are available for inspection or copying at the office of the Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 909 SE 1st Avenue, Room 432, Miami, Florida 33131, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (305) 415-6743. The Seventh District Bridge Branch maintains the public docket for this rulemaking.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Evelyn Smart, Bridge Branch, at (305) 415-6753.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Good Cause

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this regulation. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM. Public comment is not necessary since the purpose of the affected regulations is to regulate the opening and closing of bridges that have been removed. For the same reasons under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds good cause exists for making this rule effective in less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

##### Background and Purpose

The State of Florida (Department of Transportation) has removed five bascule bridges, removing the need for their associated regulations. The following bridges have been removed:

- Brooks Memorial (SE 17th Street) bascule span bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1065.9 at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida. (33 CFR 117.261(ii))

b. MacArthur Causeway bascule span bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1088.8 at Miami, Miami-Dade County, Florida. (33 CFR 117.261(o))

c. Fuller Warren (I10–I–95) bascule span bridge across the St. Johns River, mile 25.4 at Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida. (33 CFR 117.325(b))

d. Vilano Beach (State Road A1A) bascule span bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 778 at Vilano Beach, Duval County, Florida. (33 CFR 117.261(c))

e. Ringling Causeway (State Road 780) bascule span bridge across the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, mile 73.6 at Sarasota, Sarasota County, Florida. (33 CFR 117.287(c))

The regulations governing the operation of the above mentioned bascule bridges are to be removed.

The County of Miami-Dade (Department of Public Works) constructed a new bascule bridge of modern safe design to replace the then existing West Venetian Causeway bascule bridge across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1088.6 at Miami, Miami-Dade County, Florida. The previous bascule span bridge was removed and the regulation governing the operation of that bridge remains in 33 CFR 117.261(nn). The USCG is removing 33 CFR 117.261(nn) from the Code of Federal Regulations as the new bascule bridge opens upon signal as provided for in 33 CFR 117.5.

The State of South Carolina (Department of Transportation) has constructed a new fixed bridge of modern safe design to replace the then existing Maybank Highway bascule span bridge across the Stono River, mile 11.0 at Johns Island, Charleston County, South Carolina. The previous bascule span bridge that serviced the area was removed even though the regulation governing the operation of that bridge still remains at 33 CFR 117.937. The USCG is removing 33 CFR 117.937 from the Code of Federal Regulations since the fixed bridge does not require a bridge operating regulation.

#### Regulatory Evaluation

This 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. It is not “significant” under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

This rule removes regulations that are obsolete because the bridges they govern no longer exist.

#### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule will have no impact on any small entities because the regulations being removed apply to bridges that no longer exist.

#### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

#### Collection of Information

This rule calls 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 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 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 rule will 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 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 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 rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 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 rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

### Environment

We have analyzed this rule under 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 concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction an “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are not required for this rule.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

### Regulations

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); Section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

#### § 117.261 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 117.261, remove and reserve paragraphs (c), (ii), (nn) and (oo).

#### § 117.287 [Amended]

■ 3. In § 117.287, remove and reserve paragraph (c).

#### § 117.325 [Amended]

■ 4. In § 117.325, remove paragraph (b) and redesignate paragraph (c) as paragraph (b).

#### § 117.937 [Removed]

■ 5. Remove § 117.937.

Dated: March 31, 2005.

**D.B. Peterman,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 05–7325 Filed 4–11–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[R04–OAR–2004–GA–0002–200504(a); FRL–7898–5]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: Approval of Revisions to the Georgia State Implementation Plan

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is approving the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Georgia, through the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GAEPD), on December 18, 2003. These revisions pertain to rules for Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance (I/M). These revisions were the subject of a public hearing held on November 5, 2003, adopted by the Board of Natural Resources on December 3, 2003, and became State effective on December 25, 2003.

**DATES:** This direct final rule is effective June 13, 2005 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comment by May 12, 2005. If adverse comment is received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the *Federal Register* and inform the public that the rule will not take effect.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Regional Material in EDocket (RME) ID No. R04–OAR–2004–GA–0002, by one of the following methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. Agency Web site: <http://docket.epa.gov/rmepub/> RME, EPA’s

electronic public docket and comment system, is EPA’s preferred method for receiving comments. Once in the system, select “quick search,” then key in the appropriate RME Docket identification number. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

3. E-mail: [martin.scott@epa.gov](mailto:martin.scott@epa.gov).

4. Fax: (404) 562–9019.

5. Mail: “R04–OAR–2004–GA–0002”, 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.

6. Hand Delivery or Courier. Deliver your comments to: Scott M. Martin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division 12th floor, 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.

Instructions: Direct your comments to RME ID No. R04–OAR–2004–GA–0002. EPA’s policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://docket.epa.gov/rmepub/>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through RME, [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), or e-mail. The EPA RME website and the federal [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) website are “anonymous access” systems, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail comment directly to EPA without going through RME or [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD–ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of