

is the same as the definition of that term in section 3(17) of the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003, Public Law 108-187 (Dec. 16, 2003).

(13) The definition of the term "sexually oriented material" is the same as the definition of that term in section 5(d)(4) of the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003, Public Law 108-187 (Dec. 16, 2003).

(d) Severability—The provisions of this part are separate and severable from one another. If any provision is stayed or determined to be invalid, it is the Commission's intention that the remaining provisions shall continue in effect.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04-1916 Filed 1-28-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Francisco Bay 03-026]

RIN 1625-AA00

Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, Oakland Estuary, Alameda, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a security zone extending approximately 150 feet into the navigable waters of the Oakland Estuary, Alameda, California, surrounding the United States Coast Guard Island Pier. This action is necessary to provide for the security of the military service members on board vessels moored at the pier and the government property associated with these valuable national assets. This security zone would prohibit all persons and vessels from entering, transiting through, or anchoring within a portion of the Oakland Estuary surrounding the Coast Guard Island Pier unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) or his designated representative.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before March 29, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to the Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, Coast Guard Island, Alameda, California 94501. The Waterways Management Branch maintains the public docket for

this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in the preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Waterways Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Doug Ebbers, Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, (510) 437-3073.

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 San Francisco Bay 03-026), 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 they 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 the Waterways Management Branch at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining 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 separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, and Flight 93, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has issued several warnings concerning the potential for additional terrorist attacks within the United States. In addition, the ongoing hostilities in Afghanistan and the conflict in Iraq have made it prudent for U.S. ports to be on a higher state of alert because Al-Qaeda and other organizations have declared an ongoing intention to conduct armed attacks on U.S. interests worldwide.

The threat of maritime attacks is real as evidenced by the attack on the USS

Cole and the subsequent attack in October 2002 against a tank vessel off the coast of Yemen. These threats manifest a continuing threat to U.S. assets as described in the President's finding in Executive Order 13273 of August 21, 2002 (67 FR 56215, September 3, 2002) that the security of the U.S. is endangered by the September 11, 2001 attacks and that such aggression continues to endanger the international relations of the United States. See also Continuation of the National Emergency with Respect to Certain Terrorist Attacks (67 FR 58317, September 13, 2002), and Continuation of the National Emergency with Respect to Persons Who Commit, Threaten To Commit, Or Support Terrorism (67 FR 59447, September 20, 2002). The U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD) in Advisory 02-07 advised U.S. shipping interests to maintain a heightened status of alert against possible terrorist attacks. MARAD more recently issued Advisory 03-05 informing operators of maritime interests of increased threat possibilities to vessels and facilities and a higher risk of terrorist attack to the transportation community in the United States. The ongoing foreign hostilities have made it prudent for U.S. ports and waterways to be on a higher state of alert because the Al-Qaeda organization and other similar organizations have declared an ongoing intention to conduct armed attacks on U.S. interests worldwide.

In its effort to thwart terrorist activity, the Coast Guard has increased safety and security measures on U.S. ports and waterways. As part of the Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-399), Congress amended section 7 of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA), 33 U.S.C. 1226, to allow the Coast Guard to take actions, including the establishment of security and safety zones, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism against individuals, vessels or public or commercial structures. The Coast Guard also has authority to establish security zones pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the Magnuson Act of August 9, 1950 (50 U.S.C. 191 *et seq.*) and implementing regulations promulgated by the President in subparts 6.01 and 6.04 of part 6 of title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

In this particular proposed rulemaking, to address the aforementioned security concerns and to take steps to prevent a terrorist attack against these valuable national assets, the Coast Guard is proposing to establish a permanent security zone around and under the United States Coast Guard Island Pier. This security zone would help the Coast Guard to

prevent vessels or persons from engaging in terrorist actions against Coast Guard Cutters that moor at the Coast Guard Island Pier. Due to heightened security concerns and the catastrophic impact a terrorist attack on a Coast Guard Cutter would have on the crew on board and surrounding government property, it is prudent for the Coast Guard to establish a security zone for this location.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a fixed security zone around and under the Coast Guard Island Pier that encompasses all waters of the Oakland Estuary, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within approximately 150 feet of the pier. The perimeter of the security zone would commence at a point on land approximately 150 feet north of the northern end of the Coast Guard Island Pier at latitude 37°46'53.6" N and longitude 122°15'06.1" W; thence out to the edge of the charted channel at latitude 37°46'52.3" N and longitude 122°15'07.9" W; thence along the edge of the charted channel to latitude 37°46'42.2" N and longitude 122°15'50.5" W; thence to a point on land approximately 150 feet south of the southern end of the Coast Guard Island Pier at latitude 37°46'52.3" N and longitude 122°15'48.8" W, thence along the shoreline back to the beginning point, latitude 37°46'53.6" N and longitude 122°15'06.1" W.

This security zone is needed for national security reasons to protect Coast Guard Cutters, their crews, the public, transiting vessels, and adjacent waterfront facilities from potential subversive acts, accidents or other events of a similar nature. Entry into this zone would be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

Vessels or persons violating this section would be subject to the penalties set forth in 33 U.S.C. 1232 and 50 U.S.C. 192. Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1232, any violation of the security zone described herein, is punishable by civil penalties (not to exceed \$27,500 per violation, where each day of a continuing violation is a separate violation), criminal penalties (imprisonment up to 6 years and a maximum fine of \$250,000) and in rem liability against the offending vessel. Any person who violates this section using a dangerous weapon or who engages in conduct that causes bodily injury or fear of imminent bodily injury to any officer authorized to enforce this regulation, also faces imprisonment up to 12 years. Vessels or persons violating this section are also

subject to the penalties set forth in 50 U.S.C. 192: Seizure and forfeiture of the vessel to the United States, a maximum criminal fine of \$10,000, and imprisonment up to 10 years.

The Captain of the Port would enforce this zone and may enlist the aid and cooperation of any Federal, State, county, municipal and private agency to assist in the enforcement of the regulation. This regulation is proposed under the authority of 33 U.S.C. 1226 in addition to the authority contained in 50 U.S.C. 191 and 33 U.S.C. 1231.

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. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. Although this proposed rule restricts access to the waters encompassed by the security zone, the effect of this proposed rule would not be significant because: (i) The zone would encompass only a small portion of the waterway; (ii) the zone does not encroach into the charted channel; (iii) vessels would be able to pass safely around the zone; and (iv) vessels may be allowed to enter this zone on a case-by-case basis with permission of the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative.

The size of the proposed zone is the minimum necessary to provide adequate protection for Coast Guard Cutters, their crews, other vessels operating in the vicinity, adjoining areas and the public. The entities most likely to be affected are tug and barge companies transiting the Oakland Estuary and pleasure craft engaged in recreational activities and sightseeing.

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. We expect this proposed rule may affect owners and operators of private and commercial vessels, some of which may be small entities, transiting the Oakland Estuary. The proposed security zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for several reasons: The zone does not extend into the charted channel, vessel traffic can pass safely around the area, and vessels engaged in recreational activities, sightseeing and commercial fishing have ample space outside of the security zone to engage in these activities. Small entities and the maritime public would be advised of this security zone via public notice to mariners.

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 Doug Ebberts, Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, San Francisco Bay, (510) 437–3073.

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 proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would 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 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.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 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)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation because we are establishing a security zone.

A draft “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a draft “Categorical Exclusion Determination” (CED) will be 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 165

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

For the reasons discussed 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(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 § 165.1190 to read as follows:

§ 165.1190 Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, Oakland Estuary, Alameda, CA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: All navigable waters of the Oakland Estuary, California, from the surface to the sea floor, 150 feet into the Oakland Estuary surrounding the Coast Guard Island Pier. The perimeter of the security zone would commence at a point on land approximately 150 feet north of the northern end of the Coast Guard Island Pier at latitude 37°46′53.6″ N and longitude 122°15′06.1″ W; thence

out to the edge of the charted channel at latitude 37°46′52.3″ N and longitude 122°15′07.9″ W; thence along the edge of the charted channel to latitude 37°46′42.2″ N and longitude 122°15′50.5″ W; thence to a point on land approximately 150 feet south of the southern end of the Coast Guard Island Pier at latitude 37°46′52.3″ N and longitude 122°15′48.8″ W, thence along the shoreline back to the beginning point, latitude 37°46′53.6″ N and longitude 122°15′06.1″ W.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Under § 165.33, entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, or his designated representative.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 415–399–3547 or on VHF–FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(c) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the security zone by local law enforcement as necessary.

Dated: January 7, 2004.

Gerald M. Swanson,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, California.

[FR Doc. 04–1858 Filed 1–28–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

37 CFR Part 11

[Docket No.: 2002–C–005]

RIN 0651–AB55

Changes to Representation of Others Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office or USPTO) is extending the public comment period on proposed rules, USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, published in the **Federal Register** on December 12, 2003 (68 FR 69442). This will allow additional time following publication on December 12, 2003, for public comments, including whether the Rules of Professional Conduct should include the revisions to the Model Rules as