vessels. The Coast Guard would assign a patrol and issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners to advise mariners of established safety zone in advance of the naval aircraft carrier's arrival and departure. This proposed safety zone would be effective only during the time indicated in the Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposal 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. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. This conclusion is based on the limited duration of the moving safety zone, the extensive advisories that would be made to the affected maritime community and the minimal restrictions the safety zone regulations would place on vessel traffic. These regulations would be effective for a total of approximately 1½ hours for each inbound or outbound transit by a total of naval aircraft carrier.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposal will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' include independently owned and operated small businesses that are not dominant in their field and that otherwise qualify as ''small business concerns'' under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605 (b) that this proposal, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. These proposed regulations would have a limited effect on small entities, because of the limited duration of the proposed regulations, the extensive advisories that would be made to the affected maritime community and the minimal restrictions the safety zone regulations would place on vessel traffic.

Collection of Information

These proposed regulations contain no collection-of-information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Federalism

This proposal has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612 and it has been determined that the proposed rulemaking does not have sufficient Federalism implication to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposal and has concluded that under paragraph 2.B.2.e(34)(b) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B (as revised by 59 FR 38654, July 29 1994), this proposal is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. Pursuant to 2.B.2.e(34)(g) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B, a Categorical Exclusion Determination and Environmental Analysis Checklist has been created. Both the Categorical Exclusion Determination and Environmental Analysis Checklist are available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reports and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

Proposed Regulations

For the reasons stated in the Preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; 49 CFR 1.46.

2. A new section § 165.711 is added to read as follows:

§ 165.711 Safety Zone; Port Everglades, Fort Lauderdale, Fl.

(a) *Regulated Area.* A moving safety zone is established in the following area:

(1) Around naval aircraft carriers entering Port Everglades in an area 700 yards forward, 500 yards astern and 350 yards on either side of the vessel beginning at the Port Everglades Sea Buoy, in approximate position 26° – 05.5′N, 80° – 04.8′W, and continuing until the vessel is safely moored, in approximate position 26° – 04.9′N, 80° – 06.9′W. All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 83.

(2) Around naval aircraft carriers departing Port Everglades in an area 700 yards forward, 500 yards astern and 350 yards on either side beginning at the pier, in approximate position 26° – 04.9′N, 80° – 06.9′W, and continuing until the stern passes the Port Everglades Sea Buoy, in approximate position 26° – 05.5′N, 80° – 04.8′W. All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 83.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) No person or vessel may enter, transit, or remain in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Miami, Florida, or a Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer designated by him.

(2) Vessels encountering emergencies which require transit through the moving safety zone should contact the Coast Guard patrol craft on VHF Channel 16. In the event of an emergency, the Coast Guard patrol craft may authorize a vessel to transit through the safety zone with a Coast Guard designated escort.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of on-scene patrol personnel. On-scene patrol personnel include Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officers. Coast Guard Auxiliary and local or state officials may be present to inform vessel operators of this regulation and other applicable laws.

Dated: December 6, 1996.

D.F. Miller,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port , Miami, FL.

[FR Doc. 97–5718 Filed 3–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[PA 098–4032; FRL–5700–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; 15 Percent Rate-of-Progress Plan and 1990 VOC Emission Inventory for the Pittsburgh Ozone Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking, correction.

SUMMARY: This action corrects and clarifies the proposed action which was published on Wednesday, January 22, 1997 (62 FR 3254–3260). This action pertains to the State Implementation

Plan (SIP) revision submitted by Pennsylvania on March 22, 1996 consisting of the 15% Rate-of-Progress Plan and the 1990 Volatile Organic Compound 1990 Emission Inventory (the 15% Plan SIP) for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley ozone nonattainment area.

DATES: March 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marcia L. Spink, (215)566–2104.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 22, 1997 (62 FR 3254–3260), EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking proposing conditional approval of the 15% Plan SIP revision submitted by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) on March 22, 1996 consisting of the 15% Plan and 1990 Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emission Inventory for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley ozone nonattainment area (the Pittsburgh area).

Need for Correction/Clarification

As published, the January 22, 1997 proposal notice states that EPA is proposing conditional approval of the 15% Plan SIP revision for the Pittsburgh area. In fact, the notice should read that EPA is proposing conditional interim approval of this SIP revision. The error is typographical in nature; the notice clearly indicates and fully explains that this 15% Plan SIP relies upon reductions from the enhanced Inspection & Maintenance (I/M) SIP submitted by Pennsylvania. Therefore, as indicated in the January 22, 1997 proposal notice, approval of the 15% Plan SIP for the Pittsburgh area approval is dependent upon approval of Pennsylvania's enhanced I/M SIP. On October 3, 1996 (61 FR 51638), EPA proposed conditional interim approval of Pennsylvania's enhanced I/M SIP. On January 28, 1997 (62 FR 4019), EPA promulgated final conditional interim approval of Pennsylvania's enhanced I/M SIP. Given that full final approval of the 15% Plan SIP is dependent and conditioned upon full final approval of enhanced I/M SIP, EPA must keep its actions on both SIP revisions consistent.

Correction/Clarification of Publication

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking published on January 22, 1997 (62 FR 3254–3260, FR Doc. 97–1493), is being corrected throughout its text to read that EPA is proposing conditional interim approval of the 15% Plan SIP for the Pittsburgh area.

Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and, is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4), or require prior consultation with State officials as specified by Executive Order 12875 (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), or involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

EPA does not believe that it is necessary to subject this corrective action pertaining to the 15% Plan SIP for the Pittsburgh area to notice-and-comment requirements. Under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute, it is not subject to the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 25, 1997.

Stanley L. Laskowski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 97–5621 Filed 3–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 52

[OR59–7274b, OR60–7275b; FRL–5696–7]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Oregon for the purpose of approving two source-specific Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions standards: Cascade General, Inc., a ship repair yard in Portland, Oregon; and, White Consolidated, Inc. (doing business as Schrock Cabinet Co.) a wood cabinet manufacturing facility in Hillsboro, Oregon. These SIP revisions are required by the Clean Air Act (CAA) and were submitted by the State. In the Final Rules Section of this Federal Register, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment 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 proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If the 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 proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by April 7, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Montel Livingston, Environmental Protection Specialist (OAQ–107), Office of Air Quality, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Office of Air Quality, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101.

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 811 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204–1390.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denise Baker, Office of Air Quality (OAQ–107), EPA, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553–8087.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action which is located in the Rules Section of this Federal Register.

Dated: February 21, 1997.

Jane S. Moore,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–5643 Filed 3–6–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 52

[OR65–7280; FRL–5700–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the State of Oregon