

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 Mr. Alston Colihan, Project Manager, Office of Boating Safety, by telephone at (202) 267-0981 or by e-mail at acolihan@comdt.uscg.mil.

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 would 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.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed 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 (34)(a) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. The proposed rule to remove the requirement to separate the 2-character country of origin code from the 12-character HIN by means of borders or on a separate label relates to the documentation of vessels and is not expected to have any environmental impact.

A draft "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a draft "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether the rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 181

Labeling, Marine safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 181 as follows:

PART 181—MANUFACTURER REQUIREMENTS

1. The authority citation for part 181 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 4302 and 4310; Pub. L. 103-206, 107 Stat. 2439; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.

2. Revise § 181.27 to read as follows:

§ 181.27 Information displayed near hull identification number.

With the exception of the characters "US-", which constitute the country of origin code for the United States, if information is displayed on the boat within 2 inches of the hull identification number (HIN), that information must be separated from the HIN by means of borders or must be on a separate label, so that it will not be interpreted as part of the hull identification number.

Dated: June 12, 2003.

David S. Belz,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Operations.

[FR Doc. 03-15640 Filed 6-19-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[W1116-01-7346b; FRL-7515-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Revised Motor Vehicle Emissions Inventories and Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets Using MOBILE6

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing approval of a revision to the Wisconsin State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the attainment and maintenance of the one-hour national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone. Specifically, EPA is approving Wisconsin's revised 2007 motor vehicle emission inventories and 2007 Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEB) recalculated using MOBILE6 for the Milwaukee severe ozone area and the Sheboygan ozone maintenance area. EPA is also proposing approval of a new

2012 projected MVEB for the Sheboygan ozone maintenance area.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's request as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The rationale for approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If EPA receives no written adverse comments, EPA will take no further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives written adverse comment, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that the rule will not take effect. In that event, EPA will address all relevant public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. In either event, EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this action must be received by July 21, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to: Carlton Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), USEPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

A copy of the plan revision request is available for inspection at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. (Please telephone Michael Leslie at (312) 353-6680 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Leslie, Environmental Engineer, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), USEPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6680.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document whenever "we," "us," or "our" are used we mean the EPA.

- I. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?
- II. Where Can I Find More Information About this Proposal and Corresponding Direct Final Rule?

I. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?

On January 31, 2003, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources submitted a revision to the Wisconsin SIP for the attainment and maintenance of the one-hour NAAQS for ozone. Specifically, the submittal included revised 2007 motor vehicle emission inventories and 2007 MVEB recalculated using MOBILE6 for the Milwaukee severe ozone area and the Sheboygan ozone maintenance area. The

submittal also included of a new 2012 projected MVEB for the Sheboygan ozone maintenance area. EPA is proposing to approve the SIP revision request.

II. Where Can I Find More Information About This Proposal and Corresponding Direct Final Rule?

For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4201 *et seq.*

Date: June 9, 2003.

Bharat Mathur,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 03-15519 Filed 6-19-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[R1-7218c; A-1-FRL-7513-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island; Nitrogen Oxides Budget and Allowance Trading Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. These SIP revisions make minor technical corrections to the nitrogen oxides (NO_x) budget and trading programs in these states. Each State's SIP revision adjusts the baseline and emissions budgets for highway mobile and non-electric generating point sources such that they are consistent with those in EPA's March 2, 2000 "Technical Amendment to the Finding of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking for Certain States for Purposes of Reducing Regional Transport of Ozone" (65 FR 11222). The technical revisions do not affect the regulatory programs in these states, however, the changes are needed to fully approve the programs as meeting the EPA's regulation "Finding of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking for Certain States in the Ozone Transport Assessment Group Region for Purposes of Reducing Regional Transport of Ozone," otherwise known as the "NO_x SIP Call." The intended effect of this action is to propose approval of the SIP revisions for the Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island NO_x budget trading

programs as meeting Phase I and II of the EPA's NO_x SIP Call. This action is being taken in accordance with section 110 of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 21, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to David Conroy, Unit Manager, Air Quality Planning, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAQ). Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-New England, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA. Copies of the documents specific to the SIP approval for Connecticut are available at the Bureau of Air Management, Department of Environmental Protection, State Office Building, 79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106-1630. Copies of the documents specific to the SIP approval for Massachusetts are available at the Division of Air Quality Control, Department of Environmental Protection, One Winter Street, 8th Floor, Boston, MA 02108. Copies of the documents specific to the SIP approval for Rhode Island are available at the Office of Air Resources, Department of Environmental Management, 235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI 02908-5767.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Brown at (617) 918-1532 or via e-mail at brown.dan@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving each 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, 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 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 adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this 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.