

however, that the withdrawal of this proposed rule does not preclude it from reinstating rulemaking concerning the issues addressed in the proposal at a future date. Should a future rulemaking ensue, the Department will provide a new opportunity for public comment on such a proposal.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of August 2009.

Jane Oates,

Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-19801 Filed 8-18-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2009-0670]

RIN 1625-AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Franklin Canal, Franklin, LA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change the regulation governing the operation of the Chatsworth Road swing span bridge across the Franklin Canal, mile 4.8, at Franklin, St. Mary Parish, Louisiana. The St. Mary Parish Government has requested that the operating regulation of the Chatsworth Road swing span bridge be changed in order for the bridge not to have to be continuously manned by a draw tender. This change would allow the bridge to remain unmanned during most of the day by requiring a one-hour notice for an opening of the draw between 5 a.m. and 9 p.m. daily. Currently the bridge opens on signal during this time period.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 19, 2009. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before September 3, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2009-0670 using 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 methods. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instruction on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail Phil Johnson, Bridge Administration Branch, Eighth Coast Guard District; telephone 504-671-2128, e-mail [Philip.R.Johnson@uscg.mil](mailto:Philip.R.Johnson@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-2009-0670), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide the reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (<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 as having been 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 phone 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 Rules" and insert "USCG-2009-0670" 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 them 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-2009-0670" and click "Search." Click on 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 all 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 the Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008 issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

##### Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one on or before September 3, 2009 using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why one 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

The St. Mary Parish Government has requested that the operating regulation of the Chatsworth Road swing span bridge, located on the Franklin Canal at mile 4.8 in Franklin, St. Mary Parish,

Louisiana, be changed in order for the bridge not to have to be continuously manned by a draw tender from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. when the bridge is now required to open on signal. Because of the relocation of a public boat landing downstream of the bridge, vessel traffic has become infrequent, and it is no longer necessary to have a bridge tender continuously man the bridge.

Concurrent with the publication of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, a Test Deviation [USCG–2009–0670] has been issued to allow the St. Mary Parish Government to test the proposed schedule and to obtain data and public comments. The test period will be in effect during the entire Notice of Proposed Rulemaking comment period. The Coast Guard will review the logs of the drawbridge and evaluate public comments from this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and the above referenced Temporary Deviation to determine if a change to the permanent special drawbridge operating regulation is warranted.

The Test Deviation allows the bridge to operate as follows: The Chatsworth Road Bridge, mile 4.8 at Franklin, shall open on signal from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. if at least one hour notice is given. From October 1 through January 31 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall be opened on signal if at least three hours notice is given. From February 1 through September 30 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least 12 hours notice is given.

#### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The bridge owner has requested a change in the operating regulation which would require a one-hour notice for an opening of the draw from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily. Presently, the bridge operates as follows: The draw of the Chatsworth Road Bridge, mile 4.8 at Franklin, shall open on signal from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. From October 1 through January 31 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least three hours notice is given. From February 1 through September 30 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least 12 hours notice is given. This rule would allow the bridge to operate as follows: The draw of the Chatsworth Road Bridge, mile 4.8 at Franklin, shall open on signal from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. if at least one hour notice is given. From October 1 through January 31 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall be opened on signal if at least three hours notice is given. From February 1 through September 30 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least 12 hours notice is given. The proposed rule change to 33 CFR

117.445 would reduce the burden on the bridge owner while maintaining the ability to operate the bridge.

#### 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 public would need to notify the bridge owner of a required opening only one hour in advance rather than on signal.

#### 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 needing to transit the bridge with less than a one hour advance notice. The requests for bridge openings by commercial vessels are infrequent and those vessels that do require an opening of the draw are normally able to schedule operations in conjunction with advance requests for openings. Vessels patronizing commercial facilities upstream of the bridge will be easily able to contact the bridge tender an hour prior to anticipating arrival at the bridge. The bridge provides a vertical clearance of 7 feet above high water. Thus, many small commercial or pleasure craft can safely transit under the bridge at any time.

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 Phil Johnson, Bridge Administration Branch, at 504–671–2128. 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 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 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 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.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. § 117.445 is revised to read as follows:

#### § 117.445 Franklin Canal.

The draw of the Chatsworth Bridge, mile 4.8 at Franklin, shall open on signal from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. if at least one hour notice is given. From October 1 through January 31 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall be opened on signal if at least three hours notice is given. From February 1 through September 30 from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least 12 hours notice is given.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

**Mary E. Landry,**

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

[FR Doc. E9-19825 Filed 8-18-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0470; FRL-8946-3]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve state implementation plan revisions submitted by the State of California on June 5, 2009 relating to the State's basic and enhanced vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) program. EPA is also proposing to find, with two exceptions, that California's program meets the requirements of the Clean Air Act and EPA regulations for basic and enhanced I/M programs. EPA is making the proposed approval contingent upon California's submittal of revisions to the enhanced program performance standard evaluations to address a different attainment year for the Western Mojave Desert 8-hour ozone nonattainment area and to address California's base-year program performance. If the necessary information is not provided, then EPA is proposing a partial approval and partial disapproval of California's June 5, 2009 I/M submittal. Under these circumstances, EPA is proposing approval of all of the submittal, except for the enhanced I/M performance standard evaluations for which EPA is proposing disapproval. The effect of this action would be to make the revisions federally enforceable as part of the California state implementation plan.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 18, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0470, by one of the following methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.
2. E-mail: [buss.jeffrey@epa.gov](mailto:buss.jeffrey@epa.gov).
3. Mail or deliver: Jeffrey Buss (Air-2), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

**Instructions:** All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI)