

Analysis Check List" and a "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are not required for this rule.

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 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 temporary § 165.T08–153 to read as follows: § 165.T08–153 Safety Zone; 100 Feet East and West of the Louisa Bridge, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 134 West of the Harvey Locks, Louisa, LA.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: all waters within 100 feet east and west of the Louisa Bridge located on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at mile 134 West of the Harvey Locks, Louisa, Louisiana.

(b) *Effective Date.* This rule is effective from 7 a.m. CDT on January 19, 2004, until 5 p.m. CDT on January 23, 2004.

(c) *Periods of Enforcement.* The safety zone in this section will be enforced from 7 a.m. until 5 p.m. CDT each day of the effective period.

(d) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into the zone established in this section is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Morgan City.

(2) Vessels requiring entry into or passage through the safety zone established in this section must request permission from the Captain of the Port Morgan City, or a designated representative. They may be contacted on VHF Channel 13 or 16, or by telephone at (985) 380–5320.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port Morgan City and designated on-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel are commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the U.S. Coast Guard.

Dated: November 17, 2003.

S.P. Garrity,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Morgan City.

[FR Doc. 03–31893 Filed 12–24–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP San Francisco Bay 03–030]

RIN 1625–AA00

Security Zone; Suisun Bay, Concord, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary security zone in the navigable waters of the United States adjacent to the Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), California (formerly United States Naval Weapons Center Concord, California). In light of recent terrorist actions against the United States, the security zone is necessary to ensure the safe onloading and offloading of military equipment and to ensure the safety of the nearby public from potential subversive acts. The security zone will prohibit all persons and vessels from entering, transiting through or anchoring within a portion of the Suisun Bay surrounding the MOTCO unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) or his designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 7 a.m. PST on December 21, 2003, to 11:59 p.m. PST on January 3, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket [COTP San Francisco Bay 03–030] and are available for inspection or copying at Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, Coast Guard Island, Alameda, California, 94501, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Doug Ebberts, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, at (510) 437–3073.

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 a NPRM.

Additionally, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** as the schedule and other logistical details were not known until a date fewer than 30 days prior to the start date of the military operation. Publishing a NPRM and delaying this rule's effective date would be contrary to the public interest since the safety and security of the people, ports, waterways, and properties of the Port Chicago and Suisun Bay areas would be jeopardized without the protection afforded by this security zone. Any delay in implementing this rule would be contrary to the public interest since immediate action is necessary to ensure the protection of all cargo vessels, their crews, the public and national security.

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 and 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 rulemaking, to address the aforementioned security concerns, United States Army officials have requested that the Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, California, establish a temporary security zone in the navigable waters of the United States surrounding the Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), California, to safeguard vessels, cargo and crew engaged in military operations. This temporary security zone is necessary to safeguard the MOTCO terminal and the surrounding property from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents or criminal acts. This zone is also necessary to protect military operations from compromise and interference and to specifically protect the people, ports, waterways, and properties of the Port Chicago and Suisun Bay areas.

Discussion of Rule

In this temporary rule, the Coast Guard is establishing a fixed security zone around Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), California, encompassing the navigable waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within a line connecting the following coordinates: latitude 38°03'07" N and longitude 122°03'00" W; thence to latitude 38°03'15" N and longitude 122°03'04" W; thence to latitude 38°03'30" N and longitude 122°02'35" W; thence to latitude 38°03'50" N and longitude 122°01'15" W; thence to latitude 38°03'41" N and longitude 122°00'03" W; thence to

latitude 38°03'18" N and longitude 121°59'31" W, and along the shoreline back to the beginning point. The area encompassed by these connecting points includes the Seal Island Channel, all of the Port Chicago Reach section of the deepwater channel, and a small portion of both the Roe Island Channel and Middle Ground West Reach sections of the deepwater channel. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering, transiting through or anchoring within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) or his designated representative.

Vessels or persons violating this section will 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, will also face 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, and a civil penalty of not more than \$25,000 for each day of a continuing violation. The Captain of the Port will 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 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).

Although this regulation restricts access to portions of navigable waters, the effect of this regulation will not be

significant because the zone will encompass only a small portion of the waterway for a short duration. Vessels and persons may be allowed to enter these zones on a case-by-case basis with permission of the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

The size of the zone is the minimum necessary to provide adequate protection for MOTCO, vessels engaged in operations at MOTCO, their crews, other vessels operating in the vicinity, and the public. The entities most likely to be affected are commercial vessels transiting to or from Suisun Bay via the Port Chicago Reach section of the channel.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: the owners and operators of vessels intending to anchor or transit to or from Suisun Bay via the Port Chicago Reach section of the channel. Although the security zone will occupy a section of the navigable channel (Port Chicago Reach) adjacent to the Marine Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), vessels may receive authorization to transit through the zone by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, vessels engaged in recreational activities, sightseeing and commercial fishing will have ample space outside of the security zone to engage in these activities. Small entities and the maritime public will be advised of this security zone via public notice to mariners.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), we offer to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. If the rule will affect your small business, organization, or government jurisdiction and you have questions

concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for assistance in understanding this rule.

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 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 does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may 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. 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.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 final "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a final "Categorical Exclusion Determination" are available in the docket where located under **ADDRESSES**.

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 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 § 165.T11-099 to read as follows:

§ 165.T11-099 Security Zone; Navigable Waters of the United States Surrounding Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), Concord, California.

(a) *Location.* The security zone, which will be marked by lighted buoys, will encompass the navigable waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, surrounding the Military Ocean Terminal Concord, Concord, California, within a line connecting the following coordinates: latitude 38°03'07" N and longitude 122°03'00" W; thence to latitude 38°03'15" N and longitude 122°03'04" W; thence to latitude 38°03'30" N and longitude 122°02'35" W; thence to latitude 38°03'50" N and longitude 122°01'15" W; thence to latitude 38°03'41" N and longitude 122°00'03" W; thence to latitude 38°03'18" N and longitude 121°59'31" W, and along the shoreline back to the beginning point.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entering, transiting through or anchoring 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 Patrol Commander on scene on VHF-FM channel 13 or 16 or the Captain of the Port at telephone number 415-399-3547 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) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

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

(e) *Effective period.* This section becomes effective at 7 a.m. PST on December 21, 2003, and terminates at 11:59 p.m. PST on January 3, 2004.

Dated: December 17, 2003.

Gerald M. Swanson,

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

[FR Doc. 03-31892 Filed 12-24-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[TN-200328; FRL-7596-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Memphis-Shelby County; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; notice of administrative change.

SUMMARY: EPA is revising the format of 40 CFR part 52 for materials submitted by Memphis-Shelby County that are incorporated by reference (IBR) into the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The regulations affected by this format change have all been previously submitted by the local agency and approved by EPA.

This format revision will affect the "Identification of Plan" sections of 40 CFR part 52, as well as the format of the SIP materials that will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Federal Register (OFR), the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, and the Regional Office. The sections of 40 CFR part 52 pertaining to provisions promulgated by EPA or local-submitted materials not subject to IBR review remain unchanged.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective December 29, 2003.

ADDRESSES: SIP materials which are incorporated by reference into 40 CFR part 52 are available for inspection at the following locations: Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA 30303; Office of Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Room B-108, 1301 Constitution Avenue, (Mail Code 6102T) NW., Washington, DC 20460, and Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Anne Marie Hoffman at the above Region 4 address, by phone at (404) 562-9074, or by electronic mail at hoffman.anne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SIP is a living document which the State can

revise as necessary to address the unique air pollution problems in the state. Therefore, EPA from time to time must take action on SIP revisions containing new and/or revised regulations as being part of the SIP. On May 22, 1997, (62 FR 27968) EPA revised the procedures for incorporating by reference Federally-approved SIPs, as a result of consultations between EPA and OFR. The description of the revised SIP document, IBR procedures and "Identification of Plan" format are discussed in further detail in the May 22, 1997, **Federal Register** document. On June 30, 1999 EPA published a document in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 35009) beginning the new IBR procedure for Tennessee. In this document EPA is beginning the new IBR procedures for Memphis-Shelby County, Tennessee.

EPA has determined that today's rule falls under the "good cause" exemption in section 553(b)(3)(B) of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) which, upon finding "good cause," authorizes agencies to dispense with public participation and section 553(d)(3) which allows an agency to make a rule effective immediately (thereby avoiding the 30-day delayed effective date otherwise provided for in the APA). Today's rule simply codifies provisions which are already in effect as a matter of law in Federal and approved State programs. Under section 553 of the APA, an agency may find good cause where procedures are "impractical, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Public comment is "unnecessary" and "contrary to the public interest" since the codification only reflects existing law. Immediate notice in the CFR benefits the public by updating citations.

Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements

under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will 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, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. section 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of