

benefit rolls if your completion of or your continuation in the program will provide you with—

(i) Work experience (*see* § 416.965) so that you would be more likely able to do your past relevant work (*see* § 416.960(b)), despite a possible future reduction in your residual functional capacity (*see* §§ 416.945, 416.961, and 416.967); or

(ii) Education (*see* § 416.964), work experience, or skills (*see* § 416.968) so that you would be more likely able to do other work which exists in the national economy, despite a possible future reduction in your residual functional capacity (*see* §§ 416.945, 416.961, and 416.967).

(2) If you are a student age 18 through age 21 participating in an individualized education program described in paragraph (c)(4) of this section, we will find that your completion of or continuation in the program will increase the likelihood that you will not have to return to the disability or blindness benefit rolls.

Subpart N—[Amended]

16. The authority citation for subpart N of part 416 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 702(a)(5), 1631, and 1633 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 902(a)(5), 1383, and 1383b).

17. Section 416.1402 is amended by revising paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 416.1402 Administrative actions that are initial determinations.

* * * * *

(j) Whether your completion of, or continuation for a specified period of time in, an appropriate program of vocational rehabilitation services, employment services, or other support services will increase the likelihood that you will not have to return to the disability or blindness benefit rolls, and thus, whether your benefits may be continued even though you are not disabled or blind;

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 03–19541 Filed 7–31–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[CGD07–03–110]

RIN 1625–AA01

Special Anchorage Area; Okeechobee Waterway, St. Lucie River, Stuart, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to extend the special anchorage area that begins on the Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile markers 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River in Stuart, Florida to include 17 additional moorings. This proposed rule would improve safety for vessels anchoring within and transiting through this high traffic area and also reduce negative impacts on the ecosystem by providing a designated safer area for vessels to anchor.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 30, 2003.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation Branch, 909 SE. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33131–3050. Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation Branch, maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation Branch, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joe Embres, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation Branch, at (305) 415–6750.

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 (CGD07–03–110), 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 they reached us, please enclose a 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 Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation 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 later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The City of Stuart has asked the Coast Guard to extend the current special anchorage field that begins on the Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile markers 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River. The City would like to extend the anchorage area by adding 9.73 acres and installing 17 additional moorings. The proposed rule is intended to reduce the risk of vessel collisions by enlarging the current anchorage area and to provide notice to mariners of the additional 9.73 acres. This proposed rule would allow vessels 65 feet in length and under to anchor without exhibiting anchor lights as required by the navigation rules at 33 CFR 109.10. The City of Stuart has coordinated with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regarding this proposal. The DEP determined that properly managed mooring and anchorage fields located in appropriate areas will encourage vessels to utilize them for safety purposes, and, as a side benefit, the ecosystem will incur less detrimental impacts.

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.

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, because the moorings are limited in number and size (17 moorings totaling 9.73 acres).

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 (Public Law 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 the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG-FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information requirements 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. Although 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 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 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)(f), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(f), of the Instruction, an “Environmental Analysis Check List” and a “Categorical Exclusion Determination” are not required for this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035 and 2071; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1 and 33 CFR 1.05–1(g).

2. Section § 110.73c is revised to read as follows:

§ 110.73c Okeechobee Waterway, St. Lucie River, Stuart, FL.

The following is a special anchorage area: Beginning on the Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile marker 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River, bounded by a line beginning at 27°12′06.583″ N, 80°15′33.447″ W; thence to 27°12′07.811″ N, 80°15′38.861″ W; thence to

27°12'04.584" N, 80°15'41.437" W; thence to 27°11'49.005" N, 80°15'44.796" W; thence to 27°11'47.881" N, 80°15'38.271" W; thence to 27°11'46.82" N, 80°15'37.9647" W; thence to 27°11'43.49" N, 80°15'40.74" W; thence to 27°11'40.44" N, 80°15'44.64" W; thence to 27°11'41.40" N, 80°15'47.70" W; thence to 27°11'42.51" N, 80°15'49.36" W; thence to 27°11'47.99" N, 80°15'44.78" W; thence to the point of beginning. All coordinates reference Datum NAD:83.

Dated: July 22, 2003.
H.E. Johnson, Jr.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.
[FR Doc. 03-19647 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

Destination Delivery Unit Rate Bound Printed Matter Mailer Requirements for Entry

AGENCY: Postal Service.
ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service™ proposes a revision to the *Domestic Mail Manual* (DMM) that would change the preparation requirements for bulk Bound Printed Matter (BPM) by requiring mailers to prepare destination delivery unit (DDU) rate BPM items by 5-digit scheme (optional) and 5-digit sorts. Currently, there is no requirement for mailers to unload and present bulk BPM mail by 5-digit sorts, as is the requirement for Parcel Select™ mailings prepared for the DDU rate. DMM E752.5.2 inadvertently omitted this requirement from the final ruling. All costing documentation and assumptions for this particular category of mail were based on the requirement that mailers would unload the drop shipment and, in multiple ZIP Code delivery units, separate the BPM items by 5-digit bundles. Specifically, separation by 5-digit ZIP Code or optional 5-digit scheme would be required for bedloaded packages, sacks, pallets, and pallet boxes containing a mixture of 5-digit ZIP Code packages destined for a specific delivery unit. **DATES:** Submit comments on or before September 2, 2003. **ADDRESSES:** Mail or deliver written comments to the Manager, Mailing Standards, U.S. Postal Service, 1735 N. Lynn St., Room 3025, Arlington, VA 22209-6038. Copies of all written

comments will be available for inspection and photocopying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the Postal Service Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., 11th Floor North, Washington, DC. Comments may also be submitted via fax to 202-268-5293, ATTN: Daniel Leonard. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dan Leonard at 202-268-4656. **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Current Postal Service standards for preparation of DDU rate mail for Package Services Destination Entry, prepared by 5-digit or 5-digit schemes, require parcels to be separated by 5-digit for DDU entry, upon request. The requirement for vehicle unloading of Parcel Select DDU drop shipments is in DMM E751.4.10c. This requirement was inadvertently missing from the requirements for DDU rate BPM mailings when they were published in *Postal Bulletin* 22039a (12-21-00, page 12). Both Parcel Select and BPM are subclasses of Package Services mail. The processing and handling costs and the need for separation by 5-digit ZIP Codes is the same for both at the delivery unit. If the mail is not separated by the driver into 5-digit containers provided by Postal Service employees, then the Postal Service will be forced to absorb the directly attributable costs associated with processing and handling this category of Package Services mail, which will raise costs in the future.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111
Postal Service.

PART 111—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows:
Authority: U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 3001-3011, 3201-3219, 3403-3406, 3621, 3626, 5001.
2. Revise the following section of the DMM as set forth below:

Domestic Mail Manual (DMM)

* * * * *

E Eligibility

* * * * *

E700 Package Services

* * * * *

E750 Destination Entry

* * * * *

E752 Bound Printed Matter

* * * * *

6.0 Deposit

* * * * *

6.9 Vehicle Unloading

Uploading of destination entry mailings is subject to these conditions:
* * * * *
[Revise the last sentence of item c to read as follows:]
* * * The driver may be required to place bedloaded packages, pieces, sacks, and the contents of mixed 5-digit pallets in containers provided by the delivery unit in order to maintain separation by 5-digit ZIP Codes or to place containerized mail so as to maintain the separation of 5-digit ZIP Codes.
* * * * *

Stanley F. Mires,
Chief Counsel, Legislative.
[FR Doc. 03-19553 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-7528-6]

Idaho: Proposed Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Idaho has applied to EPA for final authorization of certain changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA has reviewed Idaho's application, has preliminarily determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for final authorization, and is proposing to authorize the state's changes. **DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by September 15, 2003. **ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals (WCM-122), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle, Washington 98101. You can view and copy Idaho's application during normal business hours at the following addresses: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals, 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle, Washington, contact: Jeff Hunt, phone number: (206) 553-0256; or Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, 1410 N. Hilton, Boise, Idaho, contact: John Brueck, phone number (208) 373-0458. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection