

Tulsa, OK, Richard Lloyd Jones Jr, VOR RWY 1L, Amdt 4C

Manassas, VA, Manassas Regional/Harry P. Davis Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 16L, Orig-A

. . . Effective August 5, 2004

Platinum, AK, Platinum, RNAV (GPS) RWY 13, Orig

Platinum, AK, Platinum, GPS RWY 13, Orig, CANCELLED

Wales, AK, Wales, RNAV (GPS) RWY 18, Orig

Wales, AK, Wales, RNAV (GPS) RWY 36, Orig

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, NDB RWY 31, Amdt 22

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, VOR/DME RWY 20, Amdt 13B

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, ILS OR LOC RWY 13, Amdt 6

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, ILS OR LOC RWY 31, Amdt 21

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, COPTER ILS OR LOC RWY 31, Amdt 1

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 2, Amdt 1

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 13, Orig

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 20, Orig

Rochester, MN, Rochester Intl, RNAV (GPS) RWY 31, Orig

Oklahoma City, OK, Will Rogers World, RNAV (GPS) RWY 17R, Amdt 1B

Oklahoma City, OK, Will Rogers World, RNAV (GPS) RWY 35L, Amdt 1A

Bristol/Johnson/Kingsport, TN, Tri-Cities Rgnl TN/VA, NDB RWY 5, Amdt 17

Bristol/Johnson/Kingsport, TN, Tri-Cities Rgnl TN/VA, NDB RWY 23, Amdt 19

The FAA published an Amendment in Docket No. 30410, Amdt. No. 3094 to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (Vol 69, FR No. 76, Page 21181; dated April 20, 2004) under Section 97.33 effective 10 Jun 2004, which is hereby rescinded:

Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 2, Orig

Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, RNAV (GPS) RWY 20, Orig

Urbana, OH, Grimes Field, VOR-A, Amdt 5C [FR Doc. 04-10814 Filed 5-17-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

#### 21 CFR Part 1

[Docket No. 2002N-0278]

#### Prior Notice of Imported Food Under the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Interim final rule; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is extending to July 13, 2004, the comment period on the prior notice interim final rule (IFR) that appeared in the **Federal Register** of October 10, 2003 (68 FR 58974). The prior notice IFR requires the submission to FDA of prior notice of food, including animal feed, that is imported or offered for import into the United States. FDA reopened the comment period for 30 days in the **Federal Register** of April 14, 2004 (69 FR 19766), to solicit comments on the "Joint FDA-CBP Plan for Increasing Integration and Assessing the Coordination of Prior Notice Timeframes" and to ensure that those who comment on this IFR would have had the benefit of our outreach and education efforts and would have had some experience with the systems, timeframes, and data elements of the prior notice system. In response to a request from the Government of Canada, FDA is extending the comment period for an additional 60 days. Accordingly, the comment period for the prior notice rulemaking, including the comment period for the "Joint FDA-CBP Plan for Increasing Integration and Assessing the Coordination of Prior Notice Timeframes," is extended to July 13, 2004.

**DATES:** Submit written or electronic comments no later than July 13, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by Docket 2002N-0278, by any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- Agency Web site: <http://www.fda.gov/dockets/ecomments>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the agency Web site.

- E-mail: [fdadockets@oc.fda.gov](mailto:fdadockets@oc.fda.gov). Include Docket No. 2002N-0278 in the subject line of your e-mail message.

- FAX: 301-827-6870.

- Mail/Hand delivery/Courier [For paper, disk, or CD-ROM submissions]: Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

**Instructions:** All submissions received must include the agency name and Docket No. or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.fda.gov/dockets/ecomments>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the

"Comments" heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**Docket:** For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.fda.gov/dockets/ecomments> and/or the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** May D. Nelson, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-24), Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740, 301-436-1722.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** FDA issued this rule as an IFR, with an opportunity for public comment for 75 days. Moreover, to ensure that those that comment on this IFR would have had the benefit of actual experience with the systems, timeframes, and data elements, FDA reopened the comment period for an additional 30 days on April 14, 2004 (to close on May 14, 2004). On April 29, 2004, FDA received a request from the Government of Canada to extend the comment period for an additional 60 days (Comment EXT1, 2002N-0278) (69 FR 19763). According to the Canadian government, the 30-day comment period does not allow Canada to consult adequately with its stakeholders and formally explore with FDA effective alternatives in response to FDA's request for comments. Additionally, Canada states it is concerned that its industry is not yet fully aware of the prior notice IFR's impact since during the initial period of implementation feedback to affected industries from FDA and Customs and Border Protection concerning noncompliance was minimal. The Government of Canada submitted this request with the understanding that such an extension would not interfere with the issuance of the prior notice final rule, which FDA plans to publish in March 2005. FDA intends to publish a final rule in an expeditious manner while carefully considering the comments we receive.

#### Comments

In response to the request from the Government of Canada, we are extending the comment period an additional 60 days to close on July 13, 2004. Accordingly, we are seeking comments on all aspects of the prior notice IFR, including the specific questions we posed in the previous notice to reopen the comment period (see 69 FR 19763 at 19764), and the "Joint Food and Drug Administration-Customs Border Protection Plan for Increasing Integration and Assessing the

Coordination of Prior Notice Timeframes" (69 FR 19765).

To be timely, interested persons must submit to the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**) written or electronic comments on the prior notice IFR by July 13, 2004. Submit a single copy of electronic comments or two paper copies of any mailed comments, except that individuals may submit one copy. Comments are to be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Received comments may be seen in the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

This regulation was effective on December 12, 2003. We will address comments received during the entire reopened comment period and the previous comment period that closed on December 24, 2003, and will confirm or amend the IFR in a final rule. We, however, will not address any comments that have been previously considered during this rulemaking.

Dated: May 12, 2004.

**William K. Hubbard,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning.*

[FR Doc. 04-11247 Filed 5-13-04; 4:27 pm]

**BILLING CODE 4160-01-S**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[CA269-0452; FRL-7659-8]

#### Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is finalizing approval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions were proposed in the **Federal Register** on February 12, 2004, and concern oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from boilers, steam generators, and process heaters; stationary internal combustion engines; and stationary gas turbines. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This rule is effective on June 17, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You can inspect copies of the administrative record for this action at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours by appointment. You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP

revisions by appointment at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, Room B-102, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW. (Mail Code 6102T), Washington, DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue, Fresno, CA 93726.

A copy of the rule may also be available via the Internet at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdbltxt.htm>. Please be advised that this is not an EPA Web site and may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas C. Canaday, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4121, [canaday.tom@epa.gov](mailto:canaday.tom@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

### I. Proposed Action

On February 12, 2004 (69 FR 7098), EPA proposed to approve the following rules into the California SIP.

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

| Local agency   | Rule # | Rule title   | Adopted  | Submitted |
|----------------|--------|--|----------|-----------|
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4351   | Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters—Phase 1 ..... | 08/21/03 | 09/29/03  |
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4305   | Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters—Phase 2 ..... | 08/21/03 | 09/29/03  |
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4306   | Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters—Phase 3 ..... | 09/18/03 | 09/29/03  |
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4701   | Internal Combustion Engines—Phase 1 .....                    | 08/21/03 | 10/09/03  |
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4702   | Internal Combustion Engines—Phase 2 .....                    | 08/21/03 | 10/09/03  |
| SJVUAPCD ..... | 4703   | Stationary Gas Turbines .....                                | 04/25/02 | 06/18/02  |

We proposed to approve these rules because we determined that they complied with the relevant CAA requirements. Our proposed action contains more information on the rules and our evaluation.

### II. Public Comment and EPA Response

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received comments from the following party.

1. David R. Farabee, Pillsbury Winthrop L.L.P. (comments submitted on behalf of the Western States Petroleum Association); letter dated and hand-delivered March 12, 2004.

The comment and our response are summarized below.

*Comment #1:* The commenter requests clarification of the following statement we made in the proposed rule in connection with the Westside exemption: "In any event, the past issue of whether the Westside exemption was inconsistent with both ozone and PM-10 planning requirements or simply PM-10 (and not ozone) planning requirements has become moot in light of the need for additional NO<sub>x</sub> emissions reductions throughout San Joaquin Valley for both PM-10 and ozone planning purposes" (emphasis added). See 69 FR 7098, at 7100, column 1 (February 12, 2004).

*Response #1:* By the above statement, we simply intended to restate our conclusion that a regional exemption from NO<sub>x</sub> emission control requirements, such as the Westside exemption, was not approvable under the Act. We did not intend to prejudge future SIP submittals that provide for additional emissions reductions in San Joaquin Valley that are needed to attain the ozone and PM-10 NAAQS.

### III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted that change our assessment that the submitted rules comply with the relevant CAA requirements. Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the