

i.e., NVOCCs and ocean carriers handling the importer's/consignee's shipments. CBP agrees that the statute is designed to protect the identities of importers and consignees (and their shippers if desired) for reasons that are related to their own competitive well being, not for reasons related to the competitive well being of the NVOCCs and ocean carriers filing manifest information in accordance with the "24-hour rule."

Thus, upon review of the comments and further review of the matter, CBP recognizes that allowing these other parties to file confidentiality requests for their importer and consignee clients will not further the intent of the law's confidentiality provision to protect the interests of the importers/consignees, but will instead serve the interests of these other parties at the expense of users of manifest information whose interest this law is also intended to serve. Importers and consignees *already* enjoy the benefits of this law through the current regulation, which allows confidentiality requests to be made by their authorized employees, attorneys, or officials.

Moreover, CBP is further persuaded by several of the other comments opposing the proposed amendment and submits that the weight of these other comments, taken together, provides additional support for a decision to abandon the NPRM. Primary among these other reasons against adoption of the proposal are that the proposal, if adopted, would cause some degree of harm to certain elements of the trade community without producing a beneficial impact on the law's beneficiaries or achieving a result mandated by law; the proposal would create an unacceptable operational burden on CBP; and it would create additional operational burdens on all involved parties, including the importers and consignees who may request confidentiality under the current regulation without preparing a power of attorney or authorization letter. Also, the proposed amendment raised a number of significant questions, as made clear by the comments for and against, and as discovered by CBP during its further review of the matter, indicating that amending the process as proposed is more complicated and problematic than initially contemplated. This recommends to an additional extent abandonment of the project.

In summary, it is clear that there is no consensus among members of the trade community on the value of adopting the proposed regulation and that the greater weight of the comments is persuasively against adoption. Also, the proposed

regulation, if adopted, would have presented a considerable challenge to administrative efficiency for both CBP and importers and consignees.

Dated: August 7, 2003.

Robert C. Bonner,

Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection.

[FR Doc. 03-20567 Filed 8-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[REG-209377-89]

RIN 1545-BA69

At-Risk Limitations; Interest Other Than That of a Creditor; Correction

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Correction to notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document contains a correction to a notice of proposed rulemaking relating to the treatment, for purposes of the at-risk limitations, of amounts borrowed from a person who has an interest in an activity other than that of a creditor or from a person related to a person (other than the borrower) with such an interest.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tara P. Volungis (202) 622-3080 (not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The proposed regulations that are the subject of this correction are under section 465 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Need for Correction

As published, the proposed regulations REG-209377-89, contains an error that may prove to be misleading and is in need of clarification.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication of the proposed regulations REG-209377-89, which is the subject of FR Doc. 03-17090, is corrected as follows:

1. On page 40583, column 3, in the preamble, under the paragraph heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** paragraph 1, lines 4 and 5, the language "requests for a public hearing, [Insert Name], 202-622-7180 (not toll-free" is corrected to read "requests for a public

hearing, Sonya Cruse, 202-622-4693 (not toll-free".

Cynthia E. Grigsby,

Chief, Regulations Unit, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration).

[FR Doc. 03-20666 Filed 8-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-7542-8]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of intent to partially delete the Monticello Mill Tailings (USDOE) Superfund Site from the National Priorities List.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8 is issuing a notice of intent to partially delete the Monticello Mill Tailings (USDOE) Superfund Site (the Site) located in Monticello, Utah, from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comments on this notice of intent. The NPL, promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, is found at appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). The EPA has determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA, other than operation and maintenance and five-year reviews, have been completed. However, this partial deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund. The State of Utah, through the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ), concurs with the decision for partial deletion of the Site from the NPL provided that no adverse comments are received during the public comment period.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register**, we are publishing a direct final notice of partial deletion of the Site without prior notice of intent to partially delete because we view this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipate no adverse comments. We have explained our reasons for this partial deletion in the preamble to the direct final partial deletion. If we receive no adverse comments on this notice of intent to partially delete or the direct