

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 will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

#### Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in section 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 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 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 rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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. Paragraph 32(e) excludes the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges from the environmental documentation requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Since this proposed regulation would alter the normal operating conditions of the drawbridges, it falls within this exclusion. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination” is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

#### Regulations

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; 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.

2. From 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on May 15, 2005, in § 117.393, *suspend paragraph (c) and add a new paragraph (f)* to read as follows:

#### § 117.393 Illinois Waterway.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) The draws of the McDonough Street Bridge, mile 287.3; Jackson Street bridge, mile 288.4; and Ruby Street bridge, mile 288.7; all of Joliet, shall open on signal. However, the draws of Jefferson Street bridge, mile 287.9, and Cass Street bridge, mile 288.1 need not open.

Dated: April 4, 2005.

**R.F. Duncan,**

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

[FR Doc. 05–7326 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(b); FRL–7898–4]

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

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

**ACTION:** Proposed 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. In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the 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 significant, material, and 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 rule. The 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.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before May 12, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted by mail to: Scott M. Martin, 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. Comments may also be submitted electronically, or through hand delivery/courier. Please follow the detailed instructions described in the direct final rule, **ADDRESSES** section which is published in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott M. Martin, 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) 562-9036. Mr. Martin can also be reached via electronic mail at [martin.scott@epa.gov](mailto:martin.scott@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information see the direct final rule which is published in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 28, 2005.

**A. Stanley Meiburg,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 05-7307 Filed 4-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[R06-OAR-2005-TX-0019; FRL-7898-6]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Agreed Orders in the Beaumont/Port Arthur Ozone Nonattainment Area

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to take direct final action on revisions to the Texas State Implementation Plan (SIP). This rulemaking covers eight Agreed Orders with six companies in the Beaumont/Port Arthur (B/PA) ozone nonattainment area. We are approving the eight Agreed Orders between the State of Texas and the six companies in Southeast Texas as a strengthening of the Texas SIP. These Agreed Orders will contribute to the improvement in air quality in the B/PA nonattainment area and will continue to contribute to the maintenance of the ozone standard in the southeastern portion of the State of Texas. The EPA is proposing to approve this SIP in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (the Act), sections 110 and 116.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP Revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comment. The EPA has explained its reasons for this approval in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no relevant adverse comments, the EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If the EPA receives relevant adverse comment, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. The EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based upon this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. Please note that if we receive significant adverse comments on an amendment, paragraph or section of this rule and if that provision is independent of the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before May 12, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Mr. Thomas Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the Addresses section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Guy Donaldson, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-7242; fax number 214-665-

7263; e-mail address [donaldson.guy@epa.gov](mailto:donaldson.guy@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, 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 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 rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives significant 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. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives significant adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision is independent of the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 11, 2005.

**Lawrence E. Starfield,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 05-7303 Filed 4-11-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[R04-OAR-2004-GA-0003-200427; FRL-7897-9]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: Vehicle Miles Traveled State Implementation Plan for the Atlanta 1-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area

**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 Georgia, through the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) on June 30, 2004, regarding the Severe Area Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) SIP for the Atlanta 1-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area for the purpose of offsetting any growth in emissions from