

establish a post-hearing comment period for parties who participated in the hearing. During the first part of this period, the participants may submit additional data and information to OSHA, and during the second part of this period, they may submit briefs, arguments, and summations.

*Notice of Intention To Appear To Provide Testimony at the Informal Public Hearings*

Hearing participants must file a Notice of Intention to Appear that provides the following information: The name, address, and telephone number of each individual who will provide testimony; the capacity (e.g., name of the establishment/organization the individual is representing; the individual's occupational title and position) in which the individual will testify; approximate amount of time requested for the individual's testimony; specific issues the individual will address, including a brief description of the position that the individual will take with respect to each of these issues; and any documentary evidence the individual will present, including a brief summary of the evidence.

OSHA emphasizes that, while the hearing is open to the public and interested parties are welcome to attend, only a party who files a proper Notice of Intention to Appear may ask questions and participate fully in the hearing. A party who did not file a Notice of Intention to Appear may be allowed to testify at the hearing if time permits, but this determination is at the discretion of the presiding ALJ.

*Hearing Testimony and Documentary Evidence*

The Agency will review each submission and determine if the information it contains warrants the amount of time requested. OSHA then will allocate an appropriate amount of time to each presentation, and will notify the participants of the time allotted to their presentations. Prior to the hearing, the Agency will notify the participant if the allotted time is less than the requested time, and will provide the reasons for this action. OSHA may limit to 10 minutes the presentation of any participant who fails to comply substantially with these procedural requirements. The Agency may also request a participant to return for questions at a later time.

*Certification of the Record and Final Determination After the Informal Public Hearing*

Following the close of the hearing and post-hearing comment period, the ALJ

will certify the record to the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health. This record will consist of all of the written comments, oral testimony, documentary evidence, and other material received during the hearing. Following certification of the record, OSHA will review the proposed provisions in light of all the evidence received as part of the record, and then will issue the final determinations based on the entire record.

**Authority**

John L. Henshaw, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, directed the preparation of this document. It is issued under Section 6(b) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 655), Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5-2002 (67 FR 65008), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC on November 6, 2003.

**John L. Henshaw,**

*Assistant Secretary of Labor.*

[FR Doc. 03-28357 Filed 11-10-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-26-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 165**

**[COTP San Francisco Bay 03-002]**

**RIN 1625-AA00**

**Security Zones; San Francisco Bay, California**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish moving and fixed security zones extending 100 yards around and under all High Interest Vessels (HIVs) located in the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports, California. These security zones are necessary security measures and are intended to protect the public and ports from potential subversive acts. Entry into these security zones would be prohibited, unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port San Francisco Bay, or his designated representative.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before January 12, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to the Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard

Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, Coast Guard Island, Alameda, California 94501. The Waterways Management Branch maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Waterways Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant Doug Ebberts, Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, (510) 437-3073.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (COTP San Francisco Bay 03-002), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

**Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the Waterways Management Branch at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a separate notice in the **Federal Register**.

**Background and Purpose**

Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia and Flight 93, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has issued several warnings concerning the potential for additional terrorist attacks within the United States. In addition, the ongoing hostilities in Afghanistan and Iraq have made it prudent to 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.

In its effort to thwart terrorist activity, the Coast Guard has increased safety and security measures on U.S. ports and waterways. As part of the Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-399), Congress amended section 7 of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA), 33 U.S.C. 1226, to allow the Coast Guard to take actions, including the establishment of security and safety zones, to prevent or respond to acts of terrorism against individuals, vessels or public or commercial structures.

The Coast Guard also has authority to establish security zones pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the Magnuson Act of August 9, 1950 (50 U.S.C. 191 *et seq.*) and implementing regulations promulgated by the President in subparts 6.01 and 6.04 of part 6 of title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

In this particular proposed rulemaking, to address the aforementioned security concerns and to take steps to prevent the catastrophic impact that a terrorist attack against a High Interest Vessel (HIV) would have on the public interest, the Coast Guard is proposing to establish permanent security zones around and under HIVs entering, departing, moored or anchored within the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports. These security zones would help the Coast Guard prevent vessels or persons from engaging in terrorist actions against HIVs. Due to these heightened security concerns and the catastrophic impact a terrorist attack on an HIV would have on the crew and passengers on board and surrounding communities, security zones are prudent for these types of vessels.

On February 10, 2003, we issued a rule under docket COTP San Francisco Bay 03-002 and published this rule in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 9003, February 27, 2003) creating temporary section 165.T11-077 of Title 33 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Under temporary section 165.T11-077, the Coast Guard established 100-yard moving and fixed security zones around all HIVs that are anchored, moored or underway within the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports.

Though temporary section 165.T11-077 expired at 11:59 p.m. P.s.t. on May 31, 2003, it was effectively and seamlessly extended by a change in effective period temporary rule that was issued on May 19, 2003. This change in the effective period of the temporary rule is found under docket COTP San Francisco Bay 03-002 and was published in the **Federal Register** (68

FR 32368, May 30, 2003), under the same previous temporary section 165.T11-077, and extended the rule to 11:59 p.m. P.d.t. on September 30, 2003. On September 11, 2003, a second change in effective period temporary rule was issued, under docket COTP San Francisco Bay 03-002 and was published (68 FR 55445, September 26, 2003), under the same previous temporary section 165.T11-077, further extending the rule to 11:59 p.m. P.s.t. on March 31, 2004. The Captain of the Port has determined there is a need for continued security regulations exists.

We propose to create permanent security zones in the same areas currently protected by temporary security zones under § 165.T11-077. Our proposed rule would amend § 165.1183, Security Zones; Cruise Ships and Tank Vessels, San Francisco Bay and Delta ports, California (see 67 FR 79856, December 31, 2002), which contains permanent security zones for cruise ships and tank vessels. In this NPRM, the Coast Guard is proposing to amend § 165.1183 to include HIVs as protected vessels along with cruise ships and tank vessels. The Coast Guard will utilize the extended effective period of the § 165.T11-077 to engage in notice and comment rulemaking to develop permanent regulations tailored to the present and foreseeable security environment with the Captain of the Port (COTP) San Francisco Bay.

#### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish moving and fixed security zones around all HIVs that are anchored, moored or underway within the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports. These security zones are activated when any HIV passes shoreward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W & 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively) and remains in effect while the vessel is underway, anchored or moored within in the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports. When activated, this security zone would encompass all waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 100 yards ahead, astern and extending 100 yards along either side of any HIV in the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports.

This security zone is automatically deactivated when the HIV passes seaward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W & 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively) on its departure from port. Vessels and people may be allowed to enter an established security zone on a case-by-case basis

with authorization from the Captain of the Port.

These security zones are needed for national security reasons to protect HIVs, the public, transiting vessels, adjacent waterfront facilities and the ports from potential subversive acts, accidents or other events of a similar nature. Entry into these zones would be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

Vessels or persons violating this section would be subject to the penalties set forth in 33 U.S.C. 1232 and 50 U.S.C. 192. Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1232, any violation of the security zone described herein, is punishable by civil penalties (not to exceed \$27,500 per violation, where each day of a continuing violation is a separate violation), criminal penalties (imprisonment up to 6 years and a maximum fine of \$250,000) and in rem liability against the offending vessel. Any person who violates this section using a dangerous weapon or who engages in conduct that causes bodily injury or fear of imminent bodily injury to any officer authorized to enforce this regulation, also faces imprisonment up to 12 years. Vessels or persons violating this section are also subject to the penalties set forth in 50 U.S.C. 192: seizure and forfeiture of the vessel to the United States, a maximum criminal fine of \$10,000, and imprisonment up to 10 years.

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

#### Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. Although this proposed rule restricts access to the waters encompassed by the security zones, the effect of this proposed rule

would not be significant because: (i) The zones would encompass only a small portion of the waterway; (ii) vessels would be able to pass safely around the zones; (iii) vessels 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; and (iv) vessels are able to safely transit around the zones while a vessel is moored or at anchor in the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports.

The size of the proposed zones are the minimum necessary to provide adequate protection for HIVs, their crews and passengers, other vessels operating in the vicinity of HIVs, adjoining areas and the public. The entities most likely to be affected are commercial vessels transiting the main ship channel en route to the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports and pleasure craft engaged in recreational activities and sightseeing. The proposed security zones would prohibit any commercial vessels from meeting or overtaking an HIV in the main ship channels, effectively prohibiting use of the channels. However, the moving security zones would only be effective during HIV transits, which would last for approximately 30 minutes.

#### **Small Entities**

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We expect this proposed rule may affect owners and operators of private and commercial vessels, some of which may be small entities, intending to transit or anchor in the small portions of the waterway that are affected by these security zones. The proposed security zones would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for several reasons: Vessel traffic can pass safely around the area and vessels engaged in recreational activities, sightseeing and commercial fishing have ample space outside of the security zones to engage in these activities. When a HIV is at anchor, vessel traffic would have ample room to maneuver around the security zones. Small

entities and the maritime public would be advised of these security zones via public notice to mariners.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (*see ADDRESSES*) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

#### **Assistance for Small Entities**

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Lieutenant Doug Ebbers, Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay, (510) 437–3073.

#### **Collection of Information**

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

#### **Federalism**

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

#### **Unfunded Mandates Reform Act**

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### **Taking of Private Property**

This proposed rule would not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental

Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

#### **Civil Justice Reform**

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

#### **Protection of Children**

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

#### **Indian Tribal Governments**

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

#### **Energy Effects**

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

#### **Environment**

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that there are no factors in this case that would limit the use of a categorical exclusion under section 2.B.2 of the Instruction. Therefore, this rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental

documentation because we are establishing a security zone.

A draft "Environmental Analysis Check List" and a draft "Categorical Exclusion Determination" (CED) are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. Comments on this section will be considered before we make the final decision on whether the rule should be categorically excluded from further environmental review.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

#### PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 165.1183 to read as follows:

##### **§ 165.1183 Security Zones; Cruise Ships, Tank Vessels and High Interest Vessels, San Francisco Bay and Delta ports, California.**

(a) *Definitions.* As used in this section—

(1) *Cruise ship* means a passenger vessel, except for a ferry, over 100 feet in length, authorized to carry more than 12 passengers for hire; making voyages lasting more than 24 hours, any part of which is on the high seas; and for which passengers are embarked or disembarked in the San Francisco Bay and Delta ports.

(2) *Tank vessel* means any self-propelled tank ship that is constructed or adapted primarily to carry oil or hazardous material in bulk as cargo or cargo residue in the cargo spaces. The definition of tank ship does not include tank barges.

(3) *High Interest Vessel* or *HIV* means any vessel deemed by the Captain of the Port or higher authority as a vessel requiring protection based upon risk assessment analysis of the vessel and is therefore escorted by a Coast Guard or other law enforcement vessel with an embarked Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer.

(b) *Location.* The following areas are security zones:

(1) *Zones for anchored vessels.* All waters, extending from the surface to

the sea floor, within 100 yards ahead, astern and extending 100 yards along either side of any cruise ship, tank vessel or HIV that is anchored at a designated anchorage within the San Francisco Bay and Delta port areas shoreward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W and 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively);

(2) *Zones for moored or mooring vessels.* The shore area and all waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 100 yards ahead, astern and extending 100 yards along either side of any cruise ship, tank vessel or HIV that is moored, or in the process of mooring, at any berth within the San Francisco Bay and Delta port areas shoreward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W and 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively); and

(3) *Zones for vessels underway.* All waters of the San Francisco Bay and Delta port areas, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 100 yards ahead, astern and extending 100 yards along either side of any cruise ship, tank vessel or HIV that is underway shoreward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W and 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively).

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, or his designated representative.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number 415–399–3547 or on VHF–FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to do so. 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) When a cruise ship, tank vessel or HIV approaches within 100 yards of a vessel that is moored, or anchored, the stationary vessel must stay moored or anchored while it remains within the cruise ship, tank vessel or HIV's security zone unless it is either ordered by, or given permission from, the COTP San Francisco Bay to do otherwise.

(d) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

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

Dated: October 24, 2003.

Gerald M. Swanson,

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

[FR Doc. 03–28329 Filed 11–10–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 355

[FRL–7585–4]

RIN 2050–AE42

##### Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act; Extremely Hazardous Substances List; Proposed Deletion of Phosmet

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to delete phosmet from the list of extremely hazardous substances (EHS) under the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA). EPA is proposing this change in response to a petition submitted by the registrant of the pesticide in which they argue that phosmet should be removed from the EHS list because there are no valid data that indicate the chemical meets the listing criteria. Facilities with phosmet on-site would no longer be required to comply with State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) and Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) requirements for the chemical phosmet. In addition, facilities with phosmet would no longer have to file an emergency and hazardous chemical inventory form and Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) under EPCRA for phosmet with their SERC, LEPC and local fire department for amounts less than 10,000 pounds.

**DATES:** *Comments:* Comments must be submitted on or before January 12, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted electronically, or through hand delivery/courier or by mail. Send an original and two copies of your comments to: SUPERFUND Docket Information Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 5305T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC, 20460, Attention Docket ID No. SFUND–2003–0007. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general information, contact the