

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not cause State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector, to spend \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. No action under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 is necessary.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 2

Administrative practice and procedure, Prisoners, Probation and Parole.

The Interim Rule

Accordingly, the U.S. Parole Commission is adopting the following amendment to 28 CFR part 2.

PART 2—[AMENDED]

- 1. The authority citation for 28 CFR part 2 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 18 U.S.C. 4203 (a) (1) and 4204 (a) (6).

- 2. Section 2.25 is added to read as follows:

§ 2.25 Hearings by video conference.

Parole determination hearings, including rescission hearings, may be conducted by a video conference between the hearing examiner and the prisoner.

§ 2.72 [Amended]

- 3. Amend § 2.72(a) as follows:
 - a. Remove the first sentence; and
 - b. Remove “The” from the beginning of the second sentence and add in its place “At the initial hearing the”.

§ 2.75 [Amended]

- 4. Amend § 2.75(d) by removing “in-person” from the second sentence.
- 5. Amend § 2.89 by adding the following entry in numerical order to read as follows:

§ 2.89 Miscellaneous provisions.

* * * * *

2.25 (Hearings by video conference)

* * * * *

Dated: January 28, 2004.

Edward F. Reilly, Jr.,

Chairman, U.S. Parole Commission.

[FR Doc. 04–2105 Filed 2–3–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–31–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[CGD07–03–110]

RIN 1625–AA01

Special Anchorage Area; St. Lucie River, Stuart, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is extending the Special Anchorage Area that begins on the Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile markers 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River in Stuart, Florida, to include 17 additional moorings. This rule will improve safety for vessels anchoring within and transiting through this high traffic area and also reduce negative impacts on the ecosystem by providing a safer designated area for vessels to anchor.

DATES: This regulation becomes effective on March 5, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket [CGD07–03–110] and are available for inspection or copying at the Seventh Coast Guard District, Room 406, 909 SE. First Avenue, Miami, FL, between 7:30 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joe Embres, Seventh Coast Guard District, Aids to Navigation Branch, at (305) 415–6750.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

On August 1, 2003, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled Special Anchorage Area; Okeechobee Waterway, St. Lucie River, Stuart, FL in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 45190). We did not receive any letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public hearing was requested, and none was held.

Background and Purpose

The City of Stuart has asked the Coast Guard to extend the current Special Anchorage Area that begins on the

Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile markers 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River. The City would like to extend the anchorage area by adding 9.73 acres and installing 17 additional moorings. This rule is intended to reduce the risk of vessel collisions by enlarging the current anchorage area and to provide notice to mariners of the additional 9.73 acres. This rule allows vessels not more than 65 feet in length to anchor without exhibiting anchor lights as required by the navigation rules at 33 CFR 109.10. The City of Stuart has coordinated with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regarding this proposal. The DEP determined that properly managed mooring and anchorage fields located in appropriate areas will encourage vessels to utilize them for safety purposes, and, as a side benefit, the ecosystem will incur less detrimental impact.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

The latitude and longitude positions defining the Special Anchorage Area were correct in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM), but were not in the proper order and have since been corrected.

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).

We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule will have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises small business, 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.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. Small entities may contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for assistance in understanding and participating in this rulemaking.

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 requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (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 this rule 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. Although this rule will not result in such 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 M16475.1D, 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)(f), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. Under figure 2–1, Paragraph (34)(f), 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 110

Anchorage grounds.

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The Authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035 and 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g). Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Section 110.73c is amended by revising the text before the note to read as follows:

§ 110.73c Okeechobee Waterway, St. Lucie River, Stuart, FL.

The following is a special anchorage area: Beginning on the Okeechobee Intracoastal Waterway between mile marker 7 and 8 on the St. Lucie River, bounded by a line beginning at 27°12'06.583" N, 80°15'33.447" W; thence to 27°12'07.811" N, 80°15'38.861" W; thence to 27°12'04.584" N, 80°15'41.437" W; thence to 27°11'49.005" N, 80°15'44.796" W; thence to 27°11'47.99" N, 80°15'44.78" W; thence to 27°11'42.51" N, 80°15'49.36" W; thence to 27°11'41.40" N, 80°15'47.70" W; thence to 27°11'40.44" N, 80°15'44.64" W; thence to 27°11'43.49" N, 80°15'40.74" W; thence to 27°11'46.82" N, 80°15'37.9647" W; thence to 27°11'47.881" N, 80°15'38.271" W; thence back to the original point. All coordinates reference Datum NAD:83.

* * * * *

Dated: January 16, 2004.

Fred M. Rosa, Jr.,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 04–2085 Filed 2–3–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD08–04–005]

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Corpus Christi—Port Aransas Channel—Tule Lake, Corpus Christi, TX

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.