

instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

(3) All persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or the designated on-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel. On-scene Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard Auxiliary, and local, state and federal law enforcement vessels.

(4) The Captain of the Port or his designated representative will notify the maritime community of periods during which these zones will be enforced. The Captain of the Port or his designated representative will identify designated Very Important Person vessel transits by way of marine information broadcast. Emergency response vessels are authorized to move within the zone, but must abide by restrictions imposed by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

(c) *Authority.* In addition to 33 U.S.C. 1231 and 50 U.S.C. 191, the authority for this section includes 33 U.S.C. 1226.

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from:

(1) 12:01 a.m. e.d.t., on July 26, 2004, until 2 a.m. e.d.t., on July 30, 2004, with respect to the Charles River Zone described in paragraph (a)(1).

(2) 8 a.m. e.d.t., on July 24, 2004 until 10 p.m. e.d.t., on July 31, 2004, with respect to the Logan Airport DNC Zone described in paragraph (a)(2).

(3) 8 a.m. e.d.t., on July 24, 2004, until 10 p.m. e.d.t., on July 31, 2004, with respect to the moving security zones described in paragraph (a)(3) around designated Very Important Person vessels carrying specified protectees, as deemed necessary by the USSS or U.S. Capitol Police, 15 minutes prior to and while they are onboard the vessel.

Dated: May 5, 2004.

Brian M. Salerno,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Boston, Massachusetts.

[FR Doc. 04-11589 Filed 5-20-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA302-0454; FRL-7665-8]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and oxides of sulfur (SO_x) emissions from facilities emitting 4 tons or more per year of NO_x and/or SO_x in the year 1990 or any subsequent year. We are proposing to approve local rules to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). These rules are part of the SCAQMD's Regional Clean Air Incentives Market (RECLAIM) program. We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 or e-mail to steckel.andrew@epa.gov, or submit comments at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions, EPA's technical support documents (TSDs), and public comments at our Region IX office during normal business hours by appointment. You may see 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.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 21865 E. Copley Dr., Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182.

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

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

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

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rules did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action.
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. Public comment and final action.
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rules Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this proposal with the dates that they were adopted by local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SCAQMD	2007	Trading Requirements	12/05/03	02/20/04
SCAQMD	2011	Requirements for Monitoring, Reporting, and Recordkeeping for Oxides of Sulfur (SO _x) Emissions.	12/05/03	02/20/04
SCAQMD	2012	Requirements for Monitoring, Reporting, and Recordkeeping for Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x) Emissions.	12/05/03	02/20/04

On March 19, 2004, these rule submittals were found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are There Other Versions of These Rules?

We approved previous versions of Rules 2007, 2011 and 2012 into the SIP on September 4, 2003.

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule Revisions?

The RECLAIM program is intended to allow facilities subject to the program to meet their emission reduction requirements in the most cost-effective manner. The program was designed to provide incentives for industry to reduce emissions and develop innovative pollution control technologies, as well as give facilities added flexibility in meeting emission reduction requirements. Each facility under the program was given an allocation of RECLAIM Trading Credits (RTCs) based on a declining balance equivalent to the emissions levels that would have occurred if the facility continued to operate under the then current command-and-control regulations. Facilities within the RECLAIM program must reconcile their emissions with their RTC holdings and have the option of doing so by either installing control equipment, modifying their activity, or purchasing RTCs from other facilities.

Beginning in June 2000, RECLAIM program participants experienced a sharp and sudden increase in NO_x RTC prices for both the 1999 and 2000 compliance years. In response to this SCAQMD adopted and EPA subsequently approved into the California SIP rule amendments designed to lower and stabilize RTC prices by increasing supply, reducing demand, and increasing the exchange of RTC trading information. Those rule revisions separated power producing facilities from the rest of the RECLAIM market and RTC trading by power producers was limited to isolate the rest of the market from the power producers' RTC demands. For further information on this previous modification to the RECLAIM program see EPA's proposed approval of the RECLAIM program rule amendments dated May 13, 2002 (67 FR 31998).

The submitted rule revisions that are the subject of today's notice of proposed rulemaking allow power producing facilities to re-enter the general trading market of the RECLAIM program. Further rule revisions adopted by SCAQMD clarify the Continuous

Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS) requirements for modified equipment operated at RECLAIM facilities. With regard to the power producing facilities, Rule 2007—Trading Requirements has been revised to lift the trading restrictions that were placed on power producers under the previous amendments to the RECLAIM program. The currently submitted changes to Rule 2007 allow power producers to use RECLAIM trading credits (RTCs) to reconcile emissions, and to sell or transfer RTCs below their original allocation after compliance year 2003. Rule 2011—Requirements for Monitoring, Reporting, and Recordkeeping for Oxides of Sulfur (SO_x) Emissions; and Rule 2012—Requirements for Monitoring, Reporting, and Recordkeeping for Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) Emissions have been amended to clarify that the 90-day recertification period for CEMS applies to new CEMS or when a component of an existing CEMS is added to an existing or modified major RECLAIM source.

The TSD has more information about these rules.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A) and 182(f) of the Act), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193 of the Act). The SCAQMD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rules 2007, 2011, and 2012 must fulfill RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to help evaluate enforceability and RACT requirements consistently include the following:

1. "State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble; Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 Implementation of Title I; Proposed Rule," (the NO_x Supplement), 57 FR 55620, November 25, 1992.
2. "Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations," EPA, May 25, 1988 (the Bluebook).
3. "Guidance Document for Correcting Common VOC & Other Rule Deficiencies," EPA Region 9, August 21, 2001 (the Little Bluebook).
4. "Improving Air Quality with Economic Incentive Programs," January 2001, Office of Air and Radiation, EPA-452/R-01-001 (EIP Guidance). This

guidance applies to discretionary economic incentive programs (EIPs) and represents the agency's interpretation of what EIPs should contain in order to meet the requirements of the CAA.

B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

We believe these rules are consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. Public Comment and Final Action

Because EPA believes the submitted rules fulfill all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve them as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate these rules into the federally enforceable SIP.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications because it will 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, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This

action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely proposes to approve state rules implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This proposed rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: May 11, 2004.

Laura Yoshii,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region IX.
[FR Doc. 04-11559 Filed 5-20-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 04-1202, MM Docket No. 00-127, RM-9894]

Digital Television Broadcast Service; Jamestown, ND

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, seeking the substitution of DTV channel 18 for DTV channel 14 at Jamestown, North Dakota, proposed by Red River Broadcast Company, licensee of station KJRR-DT, DTV channel 14. DTV Channel 18 can be allotted to at reference coordinates 46-55-27 N. and 98-46-19 W., with a power of 1000, a height above average terrain HAAT of 135 meters. Since the community of Jamestown is located within 400 kilometers of the U.S.-Canadian border, concurrence from the government must be obtained for this allotment. This Further Notice does not afford an additional opportunity to file counterproposals in response to Red River's initial proposal to substitute DTV channel 30 for DTV channel 14, but only to Red River's new proposal to substitute DTV channel 18 at Jamestown.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before June 28, 2004, and reply comments on or before July 13, 2004.

ADDRESSES: The Commission permits the electronic filing of all pleadings and comments in proceedings involving petitions for rule making (*except in broadcast allotment proceedings*). See *Electronic Filing of Documents in Rule Making Proceedings*, GC Docket No. 97-113 (rel. April 6, 1998). Filings by paper can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. The Commission's contractor, Natek, Inc., will receive hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary at 236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE., Suite 110, Washington, DC 20002. The filing hours at this location are 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes must be disposed of before entering the building. Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743. U.S.

Postal Service first-class mail, Express Mail, and Priority Mail should be addressed to 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: David A. O'Connor, Holland & Knight LLP, 2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Suite 100, Washington, DC 20006-6801 (Counsel for Red River Broadcast Company).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Media Bureau, (202) 418-1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 00-127, adopted April 29, 2004, and released May 7, 2004. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. This document may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 202-863-2893, facsimile 202-863-2898, or via e-mail qualexint@aol.com.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Digital television broadcasting, Television.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334 and 336.