

significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

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 determined that there are no factors in this case that 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 (34)(g), of the Instruction from further environmental documentation. Paragraph (34)(g) is applicable to this event because this rule establishes a safety zone.

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.

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.

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. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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(g), 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. Add new temporary § 165.T09–017 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–017 Safety Zone; Rochester Harbor Fireworks, Rochester, NY

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: all waters of Rochester Harbor and the Genesee River encompassed by an area 400-yards around the West Jetty pier in approximate position: 43°15'40" N, 077°36'05" W. These coordinates are based upon NAD 83.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Buffalo.

(2) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his designated on-scene representative.

(c) *Effective time and date.* This section is effective from 9 p.m. through 10 p.m. (local) on June 25, 2005.

Dated: May 18, 2005.

K.C. Burke,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port Buffalo.

[FR Doc. 05–10940 Filed 6–1–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CGD09–05–016]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Presque Isle Bay, Dobbins Landing, Erie, PA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone encompassing the navigable waters of Presque Isle Bay. This safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of spectators and vessels from the hazards associated with fireworks displays. This safety zone restricts vessel traffic from a portion of Lake Erie and Presque Isle Bay, Erie, Pennsylvania.

DATES: This rule is effective from 10 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. on June 21, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of the docket (CGD09–05–016), and are available for inspection or copying at U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office (MSO) Buffalo, 1 Fuhrmann Blvd, Buffalo, New York 14203 between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m. (local), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Craig A. Wyatt, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Buffalo, at (716) 843–9570.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

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. This safety zone is temporary in nature and limited time existed for an NPRM. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard also finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Delaying this rule would be impracticable and contrary to public interest since immediate action is needed to minimize potential danger to the public during the fireworks demonstration.

Background and Purpose

Temporary safety zones are necessary to ensure the safety of vessels and spectators from the hazards associated with fireworks displays. Based on recent accidents that have occurred in other Captain of the Port zones, and the

explosive hazard of fireworks, the Captain of the Port Buffalo has determined fireworks launches in close proximity to watercraft pose significant risks to public safety and property.

The likely combination of large numbers of inexperienced recreational boaters, congested waterways, darkness punctuated by bright flashes of light, alcohol use, and debris falling into the water could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities.

Discussion of Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a safety zone consisting of a portion of the navigable waters of Presque Isle Bay, Erie, Pennsylvania. The Coast Guard will notify the public in advance, by way of Ninth Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners, marine information broadcasts, and for those who request it from Marine Safety Office Buffalo, by facsimile (fax).

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 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 this rule under that Order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

This determination is based on the minimal time that vessels will be restricted from the zone, and the zone is in areas where the Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the zone’s activation.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule will have a significant 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 may affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of commercial vessels intending to transit a portion of an activated safety zone.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This safety zone is only in effect from 10 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. (local) on the day of the event. Vessel traffic can safely pass outside the safety zone during the event. In cases where traffic congestion is greater than expected or blocks shipping channels, traffic may be allowed to pass through the safety zone under Coast Guard or assisting agency escort with the permission of the Captain of the Port Buffalo. Additionally, the Coast Guard has not received any negative reports from small entities affected during these displays in previous years.

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 rule so that they can better evaluate its effects and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Marine Safety Office Buffalo (*see ADDRESSES*.)

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 effect 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 will 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. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs 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 M16475.1D, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f) and have determined that there are no factors in this case that 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 (34)(g), of the Instruction from further environmental documentation. Paragraph (34)(g) is applicable to this event because this rule establishes a safety zone.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are not required for this.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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(g), 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. Add new temporary § 165.T09–016 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–016 Safety Zone; Presque Isle Bay, Dobbins Landing, Erie, PA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: All waters of Presque Isle Bay within an 800-foot radius around the fireworks launch platform located at 42°08′19″ N, 080°05′30″ W. These coordinates are based upon NAD 83.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited

unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Buffalo.

(2) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his designated on-scene representative.

(c) *Effective time and date.* This section is effective from 10 p.m. through 10:30 p.m. (local) on June 21, 2005.

Dated: May 19, 2005.

K.C. Burke,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port Buffalo.

[FR Doc. 05–10941 Filed 6–1–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 70

[AZ–ND–127; FRL–7919–5]

Notice of Deficiency for Clean Air Operating Permits Program; Maricopa County, AZ

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of deficiency.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to its authority under section 502(i) of the Clean Air Act, EPA is publishing this notice of deficiency for the Clean Air Act title V operating permits program of Maricopa County, Arizona. The notice of deficiency is based upon EPA’s finding that Maricopa County’s title V program does not comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Act or with the implementing regulations of the Operating Permit Program in two respects: permit fees and permit processing. With respect to permit fees, specific deficiencies include the following: Maricopa County has failed to demonstrate that its title V program requires owners or operators of Operating Permit Program sources to pay fees that are sufficient to cover the costs of the County’s title V program, and has failed to adequately ensure that its title V program funds are used solely for title V permit program costs; and Maricopa County’s fee rule and the implementation of this rule have contributed to delay in issuance of initial title V permits. With respect to permit processing, specific deficiencies include the following: Maricopa County has issued title V permits that do not assure compliance with all applicable requirements; Maricopa County’s processing of permit revisions is deficient; and Maricopa County has not

demonstrated that it is providing sufficient staffing. Publication of this action is a prerequisite for withdrawal of Maricopa County’s title V program approval, but does not effect such withdrawal.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 17, 2005. Because this Notice of Deficiency is an adjudication and not a final rule, the Administrative Procedure Act’s 30-day deferral of the effective date of a rule does not apply.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gerardo Rios, EPA, Region 9, Air Division (AIR–3), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 972–3974, or r9airpermits@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. Description of Action
- III. Federal Oversight and Sanctions
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. Background

The Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) requires all State and local permitting authorities to develop operating permits programs that meet the requirements of title V of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7661–7661f, and its implementing regulations, 40 CFR part 70. On November 15, 1993, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) submitted, on behalf of Maricopa County, a proposed title V program to the Administrator for approval. Maricopa County’s title V program was granted final interim approval by EPA on November 29, 1996 and was granted full approval on November 30, 2001.

In March 2002, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) issued a report on the progress of title V permit issuance based on its evaluation of several selected state and local air pollution control agencies. In response to OIG’s recommendations, EPA made a commitment in July 2002 to conduct comprehensive title V program evaluations throughout the nation. EPA Region 9 began its program evaluations in 2003, with Maricopa County Environmental Services Department (MCESD) as the second permitting agency on its program evaluation schedule. Region 9 informed MCESD of the start of the title V program evaluation in a letter, dated May 27, 2004, in which Region 9 also expressed existing concerns about MCESD’s implementation of its title V permitting program. Over the next several months of EPA’s title V program evaluation, Region 9 learned more details of MCESD’s implementation practices and procedures, including many instances