

(2) From 6:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays:

(i) Need not open for the passage of recreational or commercial vessels that do not qualify under paragraph (i)(2)(ii) of this section.

(ii) Need not open for commercial cargo vessels, including tugs, and tugs with tows, unless 2 hours advance notice has been given to the Centerville Turnpike bridge at (757) 547-3632.

(3) From 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, the draw need only be opened on the hour and half hour.

(4) If any vessel is approaching the bridge and cannot reach the draw exactly on the hour or half hour, the drawtender may delay the opening ten minutes past the hour or half hour for the passage of the approaching vessel and any other vessels that are waiting to pass.

(5) Shall open on signal at all other times.

Dated: October 3, 2003.

**Sally Brice-O'Hara,**

*Rear Admiral, U. S. Coast Guard,  
Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 03-26131 Filed 10-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD05-03-153]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety/Security Zone; Cove Point Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal, Chesapeake Bay, MD

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a safety/security zone at the Cove Point Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Terminal under 33 CFR 165.502. This is in response to the re-opening of the terminal by Dominion Power in July 2003. This safety and security zone is necessary to help ensure public safety and security. The zone will prohibit vessels and persons from entering a well-defined area of 500 yards in all directions around the Cove Point LNG Terminal.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from September 26, 2003, through January 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 [CG05-03-153] and are available for inspection or copying at Commander, U.S. Coast Guard Activities, 2401 Hawkins Point Road, Building 70, Port Safety, Security and Waterways Management Branch, Baltimore, Maryland, 21226-1791 between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Dulani Woods, at Coast Guard Activities Baltimore, Port Safety, Security and Waterways Management Branch, at telephone number (410) 576-2513.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Regulatory Information

On March 20, 2003, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** entitled "Safety and Security Zone; Cove Point Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal, Chesapeake Bay, Maryland" (68 FR 13647). In it we proposed a permanent safety and security zone. We received six letters commenting on the proposed rule. And in response to a request for a public meeting, we announced a June 5, 2003 public meeting and reopened the comment period to June 12, 2003. (68 FR 26247, May 15, 2003).

On August 1, 2003, we published a temporary final rule (TFR) entitled "Safety and Security Zone; Cove Point Natural Gas Terminal, Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, to provide temporary protection while the rulemaking for the permanent rule was underway (68 FR 45165). That TFR expired September 26, 2003.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The Coast Guard is currently reviewing the additional comments received during the re-opened comment period and public meeting and requires more time to develop the final rule based on these additional comments. The Coast Guard believes it is in the best interest of public safety to establish this temporary safety and security zone while it continues to consider comments that may affect the final rule.

##### Background and Purpose

In preparation for the re-opening of the LNG terminal at Cove Point, MD, the Coast Guard is evaluating the current safety zone established in 33 CFR 165.502. This safety zone was established during the initial operation of the terminal in 1979 and includes both the terminal and associated

vessels. To better manage the safety and security of the LNG terminal, this rule incorporates necessary security provisions and changes the size of the zone. This rule establishes a 500 yard combined safety zone and security zone in all directions around the LNG terminal at Cove Point.

Based on the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center buildings in New York, NY and the Pentagon building in Arlington, VA, there is an increased risk that subversive activity could be launched by vessels or persons in close proximity to the Cove Point LNG Terminal. 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 Espionage Act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the Magnuson Act of August 9, 1950 (50 U.S.C. 191 *et seq.*) ("Magnuson Act"), section 104 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of November 25, 2002, and by 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.

##### Discussion of This Rule

This temporary final rule is identical to the previous TFR published in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 45165) on August 1, 2003. The Coast Guard was unable to publish an extension to that rule, but the practical effect of this new TFR is the same—to continue to provide a temporary safety and security zone in this area.

The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety and security zone on specified waters of the Chesapeake Bay near the Cove Point Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal to reduce the potential threat that may be posed by vessels or persons that approach the terminal. The zone will extend 500 yards in all directions from the terminal. The effect will be to prohibit vessels or persons entry into the safety and security zone, unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland. Federal, state and local agencies may assist the Coast Guard in the enforcement of this rule.

##### 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). This regulation is of limited size, and vessels may transit around the zone.

There may be some adverse effects on the local maritime community that has been using the area as a fishing ground. Since the terminal has not been in operation, the Coast Guard has not enforced the current zone under 33 CFR 165.502. Commercial vessel operators have been using the area on a regular basis for commercial fishing, passenger tours, and fishing parties. Enforcement of the proposed zone or the current zone will prohibit these commercial vessel operators from using this area.

#### 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 will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule will affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of the Chesapeake Bay near the Cove Point LNG Terminal.

#### 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 the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process.

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 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 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 rule will not result in such an 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.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 will 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 establishes a security zone. A final "Categorical Exclusion Determination" will be available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES.

#### 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 amends 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. From September 26, 2003, through January 5, 2004, add § 165.T05–153 to read as follows:

**§ 165.T05-153 Safety and Security Zone; Cove Point Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal, Chesapeake Bay, Maryland.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety and security zone: All waters of the Chesapeake Bay, from surface to bottom, encompassed by lines connecting the following points, beginning at 38°24'27" N, 076°23'42" W, thence to 38°24'44" N, 076°23'11" W, thence to 38°22'55" N, 076°22'27" W, thence to 38°23'37" N, 076°22'58" W, thence to beginning at 38°24'27" N, 076°23'42" W. These coordinates are based upon North American Datum (NAD) 1983. This area is 500 yards in all directions from the Cove Point LNG terminal structure.

(b) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in §§ 165.23 and 165.33 of this part, entry into or movement within this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland or his designated representative. Designated representatives include any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number (410) 576-2693 or via VHF Marine Band Radio channel 16 (156.8 MHz) to seek permission to transit the area. If permission is granted, all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

(c) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the zone by Federal, State, local, and private agencies.

Dated: September 26, 2003.

**Curtis A. Springer,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Baltimore, Maryland.*

[FR Doc. 03-26128 Filed 10-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

---

**DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN AFFAIRS**

**38 CFR Part 3**

**RIN 2900-AL55**

**Disease Associated With Exposure to Certain Herbicide Agents: Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia**

**AGENCY:** Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document amends the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) adjudication regulations concerning presumptive service connection for certain diseases for which there is no record during service. This amendment

is necessary to implement the decision of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that there is a positive association between exposure to herbicides used in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era and the subsequent development of chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL). The effect of this amendment is to establish presumptive service connection for that condition based on herbicide exposure.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* October 16, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cheryl Konieczny, Regulations Staff, Compensation and Pension Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420, telephone (202) 273-6779.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a document published in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2003 (68 FR 14567-14570), VA proposed to amend its adjudication regulations to provide for a presumption of service connection for CLL based on herbicide exposure. VA provided a 60-day comment period which ended on May 27, 2003. We received a written comment from Vietnam Veterans of America (VVA) and a joint written comment from two individuals.

**Comments Supporting the Proposed Rule**

The joint comment from two individuals expressed support for the proposed rule.

**Outreach Mechanisms**

One commenter urged that the final rule specifically state that VA will develop and implement outreach mechanisms by which attempts will be made to contact all in-country Vietnam veterans who are eligible for this benefit.

VA has already initiated a number of outreach activities. In January 2003, VA issued a news release concerning the Secretary's decision regarding CLL. This news release has also been distributed at health fairs, health care conferences, and on the National Mall in conjunction with Public Service Recognition Week. An article conveying this information can currently be found on VA's Web site. The lead article of the July issue of the Agent Orange Review, which will be sent to hundreds of thousands of Vietnam veterans, is about the Secretary's decision regarding CLL. Further, outreach efforts are procedural in nature, and are outside the scope of this rulemaking; therefore, no change is made based on this comment.

**Establish a Retroactive Effective Date**

The same commenter urged that the final rule state that compensation for

CLL will be retroactive for those eligible in-country Vietnam veterans who had previously applied for benefits based on CLL and were denied. We will make no change based on this comment because VA does not have authority to award such retroactive benefits. As explained below, existing statutes make clear that VA may not award retroactive benefits based on this final rule for any period before the date this final rule is published in the **Federal Register**.

Those statutes prohibit VA from granting benefits retroactive to the date of a previously denied claim. No statute or judicial decision authorizes VA to ignore those statutory requirements for purposes of this final rule.

Title 38 U.S.C. 1116(c)(2) clearly and unambiguously requires that regulations promulgated as a result of a decision of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that a positive association exists between exposure to herbicides and a specified condition or disease "shall be effective on the date of issuance." The effective date established by this rule is in accordance with 38 U.S.C. 1116(c)(2). Under 38 U.S.C. 5110(g), when benefits are awarded based on a new regulation, the effective date of the award may not be earlier than the effective date of the regulation. In view of 38 U.S.C. 1116(c)(2) and 5110(g), VA does not have authority to provide in this rule for assignment of an effective date earlier than the date on which this rule is issued.

We note that a series of orders from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in the class-action litigation in *Nehmer v. U.S. Veterans' Administration* requires VA to pay retroactive benefits for certain diseases associated with herbicide exposure, in certain circumstances, in a manner that would otherwise be prohibited by 38 U.S.C. 1116(c)(2) and 5110(g). We conclude, however, that those orders do not apply to benefits based on a disease for which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs establishes a presumption of service connection after September 30, 2002.

The *Nehmer* court orders rely upon a May 1991 Final Stipulation and Order between the parties to that litigation. The 1991 stipulation and order required VA to accord retroactive effect to presumptions of service connection established by VA pursuant to the Agent Orange Act of 1991, Public Law 102-4. The Agent Orange Act of 1991, Public Law 102-4, established a sunset date of September 30, 2002, for the Secretary to establish such presumptions. Accordingly, the *Nehmer* stipulation and order applies only to awards based on presumptions established within the