

at 344,000 tons. Thus, the \$0.0122 rate should provide \$3,777,120 in assessment income and be adequate to meet this year's expenses. The increased assessment rate is primarily due to increased budget expenditures.

The following table compares major budget expenditures recommended by the Board for the 2006–07 and 2007–08 fiscal years:

Budget expense categories	2006–07	2007–08
Administrative Staff/Field Salaries & Benefits	\$415,000	\$438,600
Travel/Board Expenses	75,000	86,000
Office Costs/Annual Audit	142,500	139,500
Program Expenses Including Research Controlled Purchases	5,000	5,000
Crop Acreage Survey		85,000
Crop Estimate	100,000	100,000
Production Research	725,000	730,000
Domestic Market Development	1,750,000	2,002,000
Reserve for Contingency ..	10,360	191,020

The Board reviewed and unanimously recommended 2007–08 expenditures of \$3,777,120. Prior to arriving at this budget, the Board considered alternative expenditure levels, but ultimately decided that the recommended levels were reasonable to properly administer the order. The assessment rate recommended by the Board was derived by dividing anticipated expenses by expected shipments of California walnuts certified as merchantable. Merchantable shipments for the year are estimated at 309,600,000 kernelweight pounds which should provide \$3,777,120 in assessment income and allow the Board to cover its expenses. Unexpended funds may be used temporarily to defray expenses of the subsequent marketing year, but must be made available to the handlers from whom collected within 5 months after the end of the year, according to § 984.69.

According to NASS, the season average grower prices for years 2005 and 2006 were \$1,570 and \$1,600 per ton respectively. These prices provide a reasonable price range within which the 2007–08 season average price is likely to fall. Dividing these average grower prices by 2,000 pounds per ton provides an inshell price per pound range of between \$0.785 and \$0.80. Dividing

these inshell prices per pound by the 0.45 conversion factor (inshell to kernelweight) established in the order yields a 2007–08 price range estimate of \$1.74 and \$1.78 per kernelweight pound of assessable walnuts.

To calculate the percentage of grower revenue represented by the assessment rate, the assessment rate of \$0.0122 (per kernelweight pound) is divided into the low and high estimates of the price range. The estimated assessment revenue for the 2007–08 marketing year as a percentage of total grower revenue would likely range between 0.701 and 0.685 percent.

This action would increase the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While assessments impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are minimal and uniform on all handlers. Some of the additional costs may be passed on to producers. However, these costs would be offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order. In addition, the Board's meeting was widely publicized throughout the California walnut industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Board deliberations on all issues. Like all Board meetings, the May 31, 2007, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue. Finally, interested persons are invited to submit comments on this proposed rule, including the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

This proposed rule would impose no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California walnut handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: <http://www.ams.usda.gov/fv/moab.html>. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Jay Guerber at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

A 15-day comment period is provided to allow interested persons to respond to this proposed rule. Fifteen days is deemed appropriate because: (1) The 2007–08 marketing year will begin on August 1, 2007, and the marketing order requires that the rate of assessment for each year apply to all assessable walnuts handled during the year; (2) the Board needs to have sufficient funds to pay its expenses which are incurred on a continuous basis and; (3) handlers are aware of this action which was unanimously recommended by the Board at a public meeting and is similar to other assessment rate actions issued in past years.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 984

Walnuts, Marketing agreements, Nuts, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 984 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 984—WALNUTS GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 984 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

2. Section 984.347 is revised to read as follows:

§ 984.347 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2007, an assessment rate of \$0.0122 per kernelweight pound is established for California merchantable walnuts.

Dated: August 13, 2007.

Kenneth C. Clayton,

Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. E7–16199 Filed 8–16–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Guam 07–005]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zone; Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change a permanent security zone in waters adjacent to the island of Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). Review of this

established zone indicates that its scope is overly-broad and that it imposes an unnecessary and unsustainable enforcement burden on the Coast Guard. This proposed change is intended to narrow the zone's scope so it more accurately reflects current enforcement needs.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 17, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Guam, PSC 455 Box 176, FPO, AP 968540-1056. Sector Guam maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are available for inspection and copying at Coast Guard Sector Guam between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Commander John Winter, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Guam at (671) 355-4861.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (COTP Guam 07-005), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Sector Guam at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we would hold one at a time and place announced by separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The security zones at Tinian codified in 33 CFR 165.1403 were first established on November 14, 1986 (51

FR 42220, November 24, 1986), as requested by the U.S. Navy in order to prevent injury or damage to persons and equipment incident to the mooring of the first Maritime Preposition Ships in the port. In addition to describing a larger security zone that is enforced when a Maritime Position Ship is moored at the site, the regulation, as currently written, establishes a permanent 50-yard security zone around Moorings A and B when no vessel is moored there. The zone is approximately 100 nautical miles from the nearest Coast Guard surveillance assets, a distance that hinders our ability to patrol it regularly.

A recent review of the 50-yard zone indicates that patrolling it is unnecessary except when the Navy needs to ensure availability of the mooring space, which is signaled by the anchoring of mooring balls. The purpose of this proposal is to change the smaller zone from one that is activated all the time to one that is activated only when necessary. The proposed change would both reduce a burden to more accurately reflect current enforcement needs and eliminate our need to travel 100 miles to patrol the zone when enforcement is unnecessary.

In addition, we propose changing the section heading of this regulation to reflect CNMI's proper name and the fact that the section describes two security zones. We also propose to make it easier to distinguish the two zones by describing them in separate paragraphs in 33 CFR 165.1403. Finally, we seek to clarify that while these regulations would be in effect at all times, the security zones would only be activated—and thus subject to enforcement—when necessary.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

In order to narrow the scope of the 50-yard security zone established in 33 CFR 165.1403, we propose to add the condition that mooring balls be anchored and on station as a condition for that smaller zone to be activated and thus subject to enforcement. The mooring balls would only be anchored and on station when it is necessary to enforce the zone.

Also, we propose to separate the two zone descriptions currently in paragraph (a) of § 165.1403. The existing description of the large zone would appear in paragraph (a)(1) with the only change being that the words “is in effect” would be replaced by “will be enforced.” The description of the smaller zone, reflecting the mooring-balls activation condition discussed above, would appear in paragraph (a)(2).

Finally, we propose to revise the section's title by pluralizing the word “Zone,” inserting “of the” after “Commonwealth,” and singularizing “Marianas.” The revised section heading would read: “*Security Zones; Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.*”

Regulatory Evaluation

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.

The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. This expectation is based on the nature of the proposed change (diminishing an established security zone's enforcement period), which is likely to further minimize the economic impact of an established rule.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule will 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 will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Due to the nature of the proposed change (diminishing an established security zone's enforcement period), we anticipate that it will further reduce any economic impact of the established rule.

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 proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Lieutenant Commander John Winter, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Guam, (671) 355-4861. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This proposed 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 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 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, 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 proposed rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may 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 proposed 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 made a preliminary determination that this action is not likely to have a significant effect on the human environment. Draft documentation supporting this preliminary determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. 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), Reports and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons set out 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; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107-295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. In § 165.1403, revise the section heading and paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 165.1403 Security Zones; Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(a) *Location.* The following areas are security zones:

(1) The waters of the Pacific Ocean off Tinian between 14°59'04.9" N, 145°34'58.6" E to 14°59'20.1" N, 145°35'41.5" E to 14°59'09.8" N, 145°36'02.1" E to 14°57'49.3" N, 145°36'28.7" E to 14°57'29.1" N, 145°35'31.1" E and back to 14°59'04.9" N, 145°34'58.6" E. This zone will be enforced when one, or more, of the Maritime Preposition Ships is in the zone or moored at Mooring A located at 14°58'57.0" N and 145°35'40.8" E or Mooring B located at 14°58'15.9" N, 145°35'54.8" E.

(2) Additionally, a 50-yard security zone in all directions around Moorings A and B will be enforced when no vessels are moored thereto but mooring balls are anchored and on station.

Note to paragraph (a): All positions of latitude and longitude are from International Spheroid, Astro Pier 1944 (Saipan) Datum (NOAA Chart 81071).

* * * * *

Dated: August 6, 2007.

William Marhoffer,

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

[FR Doc. E7-16203 Filed 8-16-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R08-OAR-2007-0465; FRL-8453-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Revised Denver and Longmont Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plans, and Approval of Related Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to take direct final action approving a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Colorado. On September 25, 2006, the Governor's designee submitted revised maintenance plans for the Denver metropolitan and Longmont carbon monoxide (CO) maintenance areas for the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). These revised maintenance plans address maintenance of the CO standard for a second ten-year period beyond redesignation, extend the horizon years, and contain revised transportation conformity budgets. In addition, Regulation No. 11, "Vehicle Emission Inspection Program," and Regulation No. 13, "Oxygenated Fuels Program," are removed from Denver's and Longmont's revised CO maintenance plans. EPA is proposing approval of the revised Denver and Longmont CO maintenance plans, and the revised transportation conformity budgets. In addition, EPA is proposing to approve the removal of Regulation No. 11 and Regulation No. 13 from Denver's and Longmont's revised CO maintenance plans. This action is being taken under section 110 of the Clean Air Act.

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 Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA

receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. 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 EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of the rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA 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 September 17, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R08-OAR-2007-0465, by one of the following methods:

- *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *E-mail: videtich.callie@epa.gov and fiedler.kerri@epa.gov.*

- *Fax: (303) 312-6064* (please alert the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** if you are faxing comments).

- *Mail: Callie A. Videtich, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129.*

- *Hand Delivery: Callie A. Videtich, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129.* Such deliveries are only accepted Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays. Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

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: Kerri Fiedler, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, Colorado 80202-1129, phone (303) 312-6493, and e-mail at: *fiedler.kerri@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**.

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

Dated: July 30, 2007.

Kerrigan G. Clough,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. E7-16164 Filed 8-16-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[EPA-R06-OAR-2006-1028; FRL-8455-2]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Louisiana; Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve the State Plan submitted by Louisiana on October 25, 2006. The plan addresses the requirements of EPA's Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR), promulgated on May 18, 2005 and subsequently revised on June 9, 2006. EPA is proposing that the submitted State Plan fully implements the CAMR requirements for Louisiana.

CAMR requires States to regulate emissions of mercury (Hg) from large coal-fired electric generating units (EGUs). CAMR establishes State budgets for annual EGU Hg emissions and requires States to submit State Plans that ensure that annual EGU Hg emissions will not exceed the applicable State budget. States have the flexibility to choose which control measures to adopt to achieve the budgets, including participating in the EPA-administered CAMR cap-and-trade program. In the State Plan that EPA is approving, Louisiana would meet CAMR requirements by participating in the EPA administered cap-and-trade program addressing Hg emissions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 17, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Mr. Matthew Loesel, Air Permits Section (6PD-R), 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 in the final rules section of the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Matthew Loesel, Air Permitting Section (6PD-R) U.S. EPA, Region 6, Multimedia Planning and Permitting