

publication of this meeting notice prior to today's date.

The agenda planned for the meeting includes discussion of issues relating to the development of changes in response to the Harvard Cost Study. The meeting will be open to the public without advance registration. Public attendance may be limited to the space available. Members of the public may be allowed to make statements during the meeting, to the extent time permits, and file written statements with the committee for its consideration. Written statements should be submitted to the address listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

Dated: April 29, 2004.

**William O. Russell,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public and Voucher Programs.*

[FR Doc. 04-10106 Filed 5-3-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-33-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-04-033]

RIN 1625-AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hutchinson River, NY

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change the drawbridge operating regulations governing the operation of the Pelham Parkway Bridge, mile 0.4, across the Hutchinson River, New York. This change would allow the bridge owner to require a thirty-minute advance notice for bridge openings between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. from July 1, 2004 through May 1, 2005. This action is necessary to facilitate bridge painting operations.

**DATES:** Comments must reach the Coast Guard on or before June 3, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments to Commander (obr), First Coast Guard District Bridge Branch, One South Street, Battery Park Building, New York, New York, 10004, or deliver them to the same address between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (212) 668-7165. The First Coast Guard District, Bridge 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 First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Judy Leung-Yee, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (212) 668-7195.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments or related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD01-04-033), 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 if 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 now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the First Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

##### Background and Purpose

The Pelham Parkway Bridge has a vertical clearance of 13 feet at mean high water and 20 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The existing operating regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.793(a), require the draw to open on signal at all times.

The owner of the bridge, New York City Department of Transportation, requested a thirty-minute advance notice for bridge openings at the Pelham Parkway Bridge between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. from July 1, 2004 through May 1, 2005, to facilitate bridge painting operations at the bridge.

This rulemaking is necessary to facilitate the safe removal of construction personnel and equipment from the bridge after a request to open the bridge is received.

##### Discussion of Proposal

This proposed change would allow the owner of the Pelham Parkway Bridge to require a thirty-minute advance notice for bridge openings between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. from July 1, 2004 through May 1, 2005, to facilitate the safe evacuation of construction personnel and equipment from the draw after a bridge opening request is received.

The Coast Guard believes this rule is reasonable in order to provide for the safety of the construction personnel working on the bridge, and because the Hutchinson River is navigated predominantly by commercial vessels that already provide advance notice for their bridge openings.

The bridge painting work is best accomplished during the warmer weather conditions. As a result, we have implemented a shortened 30-day comment period for this proposed rule to insure this rulemaking becomes effective by the requested start date to take advantage of the better weather conditions for bridge painting.

##### 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 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.

This conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge will continue to open on signal for vessel traffic provided the thirty-minute notice is given.

##### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we 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 section 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 conclusion is based on the fact that the bridge will continue to open on signal for vessel traffic provided the thirty-minute notice is given.

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.

#### 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 E.O. 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 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 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 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 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 (3)(e), of the Instruction, from further environment documentation because it has been determined that the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges are categorically excluded.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

#### Regulations

For the reasons set out 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. From July 1, 2004 through May 1, 2005, § 117.793 is temporarily amended by adding a new paragraph (d) to read as follows:

#### § 117.793 Hutchinson River (Eastchester Creek).

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) The draw of the of the Pelham Parkway (Shore Road) Bridge, at mile 0.4, shall open on signal; except that from July 1, 2004 through May 1, 2005, between 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. each day, the draw shall open after at least a thirty-minute advance notice is given by calling the New York City Highway Radio (Hotline) Room.

Dated: April 22, 2004.

**John L. Grenier,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 04–10114 Filed 5–3–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD05–04–067]

RIN 1625–AA00

#### Security Zone; Captain of the Port Hampton Roads Zone

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes establishing security zones around passenger vessels and vessels carrying Certain Dangerous Cargo (CDC) while they are in the navigable waters of the Captain of the Port (COTP) Hampton Roads zone. These security zones would mitigate potential terrorist acts and would enhance the public and maritime safety and security. These proposed security zones would prohibit entry into or movement within 100-yards of passenger vessels and vessels carrying CDC.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before June 3, 2004.