

any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Words of Issuance and Proposed Regulatory Text

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Add § 117.800 to read as follows:

§ 117.800 Mill Neck Creek.

The draw of the Bayville Bridge, mile 0.1, at Oyster Bay, New York, shall open on signal between 7 a.m. and 11 p.m., from May 1 through October 31, and between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, from November 1 through April 30. At all other times the draw shall open on signal provided at least a two-hour advance notice is given by calling the number posted at the bridge.

Dated: February 28, 2008.

Timothy S. Sullivan,
*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. E8–4470 Filed 3–6–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2008–0114]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zone; Anacostia River, Washington, DC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary security zone encompassing certain waters of the Anacostia River in order to safeguard the public and high-ranking public officials attending a papal Mass on April 17, 2008, from terrorist acts and incidents. This action is necessary to ensure the safety of persons and

property, and prevent terrorist acts or incidents. This rule would prohibit vessels and people from entering the security zone and would require vessels and persons in the security zone to depart the security zone, unless specifically exempt under the provisions in this rule or granted specific permission from the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Baltimore.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before April 7, 2008.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Coast Guard docket number USCG–2008–0114 to the Docket Management Facility at the U.S. Department of Transportation. To avoid duplication, please use only one of the following methods:

(1) *Online:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) *Mail:* Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

(3) *Hand delivery:* Room W12–140 on the Ground Floor of the West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

(4) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call Mr. Ronald Houck, at Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, at telephone number (410) 576–2674 or (410) 576–2693. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation (DOT) to use the Docket Management Facility. Please see DOT's "Privacy Act" paragraph below.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2008–0114),

indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an e-mail address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission. You may submit your comments and material by electronic means, mail, fax, or delivery to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**; but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, 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. Given the amount of time remaining before the papal Mass, after considering comments we anticipate making the temporary final rule effective less than 30 days after publication. If we do so, we will explain in that publication, as required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), our good cause for doing so.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time, click on "Search for Dockets," and enter the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2008–0114) in the Docket ID box, and click enter. You may also visit either the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the DOT West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays; or the Commander, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, 2401 Hawkins Point Road, Building 70, Waterways Management Division, Baltimore, Maryland, 21226–1791 between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the Department of Transportation's Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register**

published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477), or you may visit <http://DocketsInfo.dot.gov>.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one to the Docket Management Facility 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 ongoing hostilities in Afghanistan and Iraq 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. Due to increased awareness that future terrorist attacks are possible, the Coast Guard, as lead federal agency for maritime homeland security, has determined that the Coast Guard Captain of the Port Baltimore must have the means to be aware of, deter, detect, intercept, and respond to asymmetric threats, acts of aggression, and attacks by terrorists on the American homeland while still maintaining our freedoms and sustaining the flow of commerce. This security zone is part of a comprehensive port security regime designed to safeguard human life, vessels, and waterfront facilities against sabotage or terrorist attacks.

The Vatican has announced that during his scheduled visit to the United States, Pope Benedict XVI will be conducting Mass at Nationals Park, the new baseball stadium in southeast Washington, DC, on Thursday, April 17, 2008. The 2-hour papal Mass is scheduled to occur at 10 a.m., with "pre-Mass events" scheduled. Up to 45,000 attendees can be expected during the event. The security of high-ranking officials and the public at large in Washington, DC requires that persons and vessels be kept at a safe distance from the waterfront stadium during the papal Mass.

The Captain of the Port Baltimore is proposing to establish a security zone to address the aforementioned security concerns and to take steps to prevent the catastrophic impact that a terrorist attack against a large number of participants attending the papal Mass, and the surrounding waterfront area and communities, in Washington, DC. This temporary security zone would apply to all waters of the Anacostia River, from shoreline to shoreline, from a line

connecting the following points, beginning at 38°51'50" N, 077°00'41" W thence to 38°51'44" N, 077°00'26" W, upstream to the Officer Kevin J. Welsh Memorial (11th Street) Bridge. Interference with normal port operations will be kept to the minimum considered necessary to ensure the security of life and property on the navigable waters immediately before, during, and after the scheduled event. This zone will help the Coast Guard to prevent vessels or persons from bypassing security measures for the event and engaging in terrorist actions against a large number of participants during this highly-publicized papal Mass.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a security zone on all waters of the Anacostia River, from shoreline to shoreline, from a line connecting the following points, beginning at 38°51'50" N, 077°00'41" W thence to 38°51'44" N, 077°00'26" W, upstream to the Officer Kevin J. Welsh Memorial (11th Street) Bridge, between 7:30 a.m. through 2 p.m. local time, on April 17, 2008, to ensure the security of participants immediately prior to, during, and following the highly-publicized Mass to be conducted by Pope Benedict XVI at Nationals Park.

Vessels underway at the time this security zone is implemented would have to immediately proceed out of the zone. We will issue written and broadcast Notices to Mariners to further publicize the security zone and any revisions to the zone. Except for Public vessels and vessels at berth, mooring or at anchor, this rule would require all vessels in the designated security zone as defined by this rule to depart the security zone for the duration of its 6½ hour effective period.

Regulatory Evaluation

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analysis based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Executive Order 12866

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.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that

a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. The operational restrictions of the security zone are tailored to provide the minimal disruption of vessel operations necessary to provide immediate, improved security for persons, vessels, and the waters of the Anacostia River.

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. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit, operate or anchor in a portion of the Anacostia River, from shoreline to shoreline, from a line connecting the following points, beginning at 38°51'50" N, 077°00'41" W thence to 38°51'44" N, 077°00'26" W, upstream to the Officer Kevin J. Welsh Memorial (11th Street) Bridge, from 7:30 a.m. through 2 p.m. on April 17, 2008. Although the security zone applies to the entire width of the river, this zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities due to a lack of seasonal vessel traffic associated with recreational boating and commercial fishing during the effective period. Vessels with a compelling need to enter the security zone and transit the security zone may seek permission from the Captain of the Port Baltimore. Also, before the effective period, we would issue maritime advisories widely available to users of the Anacostia River.

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 Mr. Ronald Houck, at Coast Guard Sector Baltimore, Waterways Management Division, at telephone number (410) 576-2674 or (410) 576-2693. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

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 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. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a "tribal implication" under the Order.

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.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

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 made a preliminary determination that this action is not likely to have a significant effect on the human environment. A preliminary "Environmental Analysis Check List" supporting this preliminary determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

Words of Issuance and Proposed Regulatory Text

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, 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.T08-012 to read as follows:

§ 165.T08-012 Security Zone; Anacostia River, Washington, DC.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: All waters of the Anacostia River, from shoreline to shoreline, from a line connecting the following points, beginning at 38°51'50" N, 077°00'41" W thence to 38°51'44" N, 077°00'26" W, upstream to the Officer Kevin J. Welsh Memorial (11th Street) Bridge. These coordinates are based upon North American Datum 1983.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into or remaining in the security zone described in paragraph (a) of this section is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Baltimore.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 410-576-2693 or on VHF 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.

(3) The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the security zone by Federal, State and local agencies.

(c) *Effective period.* This section is effective from 7:30 a.m. through 2 p.m. on April 17, 2008.

Dated: February 25, 2008.

Brian D. Kelley,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland.

[FR Doc. E8-4463 Filed 3-6-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

New Standards Prohibit the Mailing of Replica or Inert Munitions

AGENCY: Postal Service™.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service is proposing new standards to prohibit the mailing of replica or inert munitions such as grenades or other simulated explosive devices.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before April 7, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Mail or deliver written comments to the Manager, Mailing Standards, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant, Plaza, SW., Room 3436, Washington, DC 20260-3436. You may inspect and photocopy all written comments at USPS Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant, Plaza, SW., 11th Floor N, Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael F. Lee, 202-268-7263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Current Postal Service standards do not prohibit look-alike weapons from the mail. In order to ensure safety of postal employees and prevent damage to postal property or other mailpieces, inert munitions have been handled as "live ammunition" when found in the mail. In the past, facilities have been evacuated when inert replicas have been identified in the mailstream. In 2006, the Postal Service recorded 849 suspicious incidents involving mail that exhibited characteristics of possible explosives. Postal facilities were evacuated on 100 separate occasions due to these occurrences. Postal Inspectors or local emergency first responders reacted to each of these occurrences to assess the items.

Evacuations cost the Postal Service time and money, create unnecessary stress for employees, and can impact service commitments.

Most importantly, employee safety can be jeopardized when facsimiles of potentially dangerous items are permitted in the mail. Both real and replica explosives have been found in the mail and the replicas often are not readily distinguishable from the real articles. The Postal Service is concerned that without prohibition of these types of mail pieces, continued exposure to replicated munitions, over time, will lead to desensitized reactions should an employee encounter items in the mail that should be regarded as dangerous.

This proposed rule is part of our ongoing commitment to increase the safety of the mail and provide a safe working environment for our employees.

Although we are exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act [5 U.S.C. of 553(b), (c)] regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), the Postal Service invites public comment on the following proposed revisions to *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), incorporated in the *Code of Federal Regulations*. See 39 CFR 111.1.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111

Administrative practice and procedure, Postal Service.

PART 111—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 416, 3001-3011, 3201-3219, 3403-3406, 3621, 3622, 3626, 3632, 3633 and 5001.

2. Revise the following sections of *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM) as follows:

* * * * *

600 Basic Standards for All Mailing Services

601 Mailability

* * * * *

11.0 Other Restricted and Nonmailable Matter

* * * * *

[Renumber current 11.5 through 11.20 as 11.6 through 11.21. Insert new 11.5 to read as follows:]

11.5 Replica or Inert Munitions

Replica or inert munitions that bear a realistic appearance, such as simulated

grenades or other simulated explosive devices, are not permitted in the mail.

* * * * *

We will publish an appropriate amendment to 39 CFR part 111 to reflect these changes if the proposal is adopted.

Neva R. Watson,

Attorney, Legislative.

[FR Doc. E8-4459 Filed 3-6-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 122

[EPA-HQ-OW-2005-0037; FRL-8539-9]

RIN 2040-AE94

Revised National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Regulations for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations; Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This action is a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM) to EPA's June 30, 2006, notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) revising the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), in response to the order issued by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Waterkeeper Alliance et al. v. EPA*, 399 F.3d 486 (2d Cir. 2005). In the June 2006 NPRM, EPA proposed to require only CAFOs that discharge or propose to discharge to seek coverage under a permit. In this SNPRM, EPA is proposing a voluntary option for CAFOs to certify that the CAFO does not discharge or propose to discharge based on an objective assessment of the CAFO's design, construction, operation, and maintenance. The June 2006 proposal also discussed the terms of the nutrient management plan (NMP) that would need to be incorporated into NPDES permits. This SNPRM proposes a framework for identifying the terms of the NMP and three alternative approaches for addressing rates of application of manure, litter, and process wastewater when identifying terms of the NMP to be included in the permit. This supplemental proposal focuses solely on certification and terms of the NMP and is not opening any other provisions of the June 2006 proposal and existing NPDES regulations or