

Risks. This temporary 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 temporary 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 temporary 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. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs 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 temporary 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 proposed temporary rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Paragraph (32)(e) excludes the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges from the environmental documentation requirements of NEPA. Since this temporary rule will alter the normal operating schedule of the drawbridge, it falls within this exclusion.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

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; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05-1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102-587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.424 is suspended and a new temporary § 117.T426 is added to read as follows:

§ 117.T426 Belle River.

The draw of S70 bridge, mile 23.8 (Landside Route) shall open on signal from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. At all other times, the bridge will open on signal if at least four hours advance notice is given.

Dated: December 22, 2003.

R.F. Duncan,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04-386 Filed 1-8-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[COTP Pittsburgh-03-030]

RIN 1625-AA00

Security Zone; Ohio River Mile 119.0 to 119.8, Natrium, WV

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to remove an established security zone that encompasses all waters extending 200 feet from the water's edge of the left descending bank of the Ohio River, beginning from mile marker 119.0 and ending at mile marker 119.8. This security zone protects Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries (PPG), persons and vessels from subversive or terrorist acts. Under the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, owners or operators of this facility will be required to take specific action to improve facility security. As such, a security zone around this facility will no longer be necessary under normal conditions. This proposed rule would remove the established security zone.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 9, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh, Suite 1150 Kossman Bldg., 100 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1371. Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh 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 Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh, Suite 1150 Kossman Bldg., 100 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1371, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant (LT) Luis Parrales, Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at (412) 644-5808, ext. 2114.

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 Pittsburgh-03-030], 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 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 plan to hold a public meeting. However, you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that a public meeting 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

On March 24, 2003, the Coast Guard published a final rule entitled "Security Zone; Ohio River Mile 119.0 to 119.8, Natrium, West Virginia," in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 14150). That final rule established a security zone that encompasses all waters extending 200

feet from the water's edge of the left descending bank of the Ohio River, beginning from mile marker 119.0 and ending at mile marker 119.8. This security protects Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries (PPG), persons and vessels from subversive or terrorist acts.

Under the authority of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, the Coast Guard published a final rule on October 22, 2003 entitled "Facility Security" in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 60515) that established a permanent 33 CFR part 105. That final rule became effective November 21, 2003, and provides security measures for certain facilities, including PPG. Section 105.200 of 33 CFR requires owners or operators of this facility to designate security officers for facilities, develop security plans based on security assessments and surveys, implements security measures specific to the facility's operations, and comply with Maritime Security Levels. Under 33 CFR 105.115, the owner or operator of this facility must, by December 31, 2003, submit to the Captain of the Port, a Facility Security Plan as described in subpart D of 33 CFR part 105, or if intending to operate under an approved Alternative Security Program as described in 33 CFR 101.130, a letter signed by the facility owner or operator stating which approved Alternative Security Program the owner or operator intends to use. Section 105.115 of 33 CFR also requires the facility owner or operator to be in compliance with 33 CFR part 105 on or before July 1, 2004. As a result of these enhanced security measures, the security zone around PPG will no longer be necessary under normal conditions. The removal of this security zone would become effective on July 1, 2004.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

For the reasons stated above in *Background and Purpose*, we propose to remove 33 CFR 165.822, Security Zone; Ohio River, Mile 119.0 to 119.8, Natrium, WV. This proposed removal would become effective on July 1, 2004. We invite your comments on our proposed action to terminate this security zone.

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.

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 as this proposed rule removes a regulation that is no longer necessary.

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 would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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 the rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. If the proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or government jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact LT Luis Parrales, Marine Safety Office Pittsburgh at (412) 644–5808, ext. 2114.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A proposed 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 proposed 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(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation because this rule is not expected to result in any significant adverse environmental impact as described in NEPA.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), 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 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping 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, 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

§ 165.822 [Removed]

2. Remove § 165.822.

Dated: December 10, 2003.

W.W. Briggs,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Pittsburgh.

[FR Doc. 04–387 Filed 1–8–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122 and 123

[FRL–7608–5]

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Requirements for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Discharges During Wet Weather Conditions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On November 7, 2003, EPA published for public comment a proposed policy regarding NPDES permit requirements for treatment plants in publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) under peak wet weather flow conditions. The original comment period was to expire on January 9, 2004; today's action extends the comment period to February 9, 2004.

DATES: Written comments on this proposed policy must be received by EPA or postmarked by February 9, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery/courier. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions, contact Kevin Weiss (e-mail at weiss.kevin@epa.gov or phone at (202) 564–0742) at Office of Wastewater Management, United States Environmental Protection Agency, (Mailcode 4203M), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

This document extends the public comment period established in the **Federal Register** issued on November 7, 2003 (68 FR 63043). In that document, EPA requested comment on a proposed policy regarding NPDES permit requirements for treatment plants in publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) under peak wet weather flow conditions. EPA is extending the comment period, which was set to end on January 9, 2004 to February 9, 2004.

A. How Can I Get Copies of This Document and Other Related Information?

1. Docket

EPA has established an official public docket for this action under Docket ID No. OW–2003–0025. The official public docket consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received, and other information related to this action. Although a part of the official docket, the public docket does not include Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Water Docket in the EPA Docket Center, (EPA/DC) EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is

(202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the Water Docket is (202) 566–2426. You may copy 266 pages per day free of charge. Beginning with page 267, you will be charged \$0.15 per page plus an administrative fee of \$25.00.

2. Electronic Access

You may access this **Federal Register** document electronically through the EPA Internet under the **Federal Register** listings at <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/>.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select “search,” then key in the appropriate docket identification number.

Certain types of information will not be placed in the EPA Dockets. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute, which is not included in the official public docket, will not be available for public viewing in EPA's electronic public docket. EPA's policy is that copyrighted material will not be placed in EPA's electronic public docket but will be available only in printed, paper form in the official public docket. To the extent feasible, publicly available docket materials will be made available in EPA's electronic public docket. When a document is selected from the index list in EPA Dockets, the system will identify whether the document is available for viewing in EPA's electronic public docket. Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facility identified in section I.A.1. EPA intends to work toward providing electronic access to all of the publicly available docket materials through EPA's electronic public docket.

For public commenters, it is important to note that EPA's policy is that public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper, will be made available for public viewing in EPA's electronic public docket as EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, CBI, or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. When EPA identifies a comment containing copyrighted material, EPA will provide a reference to that material in the version of the comment that is placed in