

Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs 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 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 (32)(e) of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation. There are no expected environmental consequences of the proposed action that would require further analysis and documentation.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Regulations

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub.L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. From 6:30 a.m. on July 15, 2004, until 9 p.m. on October 15, 2004, in § 117.869, suspend paragraph (a) and add a new paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 117.869 Columbia River.

* * * * *

(d) The draws of the Interstate 5 Bridges, mile 106.5, between Portland, OR, and Vancouver, WA, need not open for the passage of vessels from 6:30 a.m. on July 15, 2004, to 9 p.m. on August 6, 2004, and at no other time until 9 p.m. on October 15 except for scheduled openings on signal at 9 p.m. on August 6 and 20 and September 3 and 17 and October 1, 2004.

Dated: August 21, 2003.

Jeffrey M. Garrett,

*Rear Admiral, Coast Guard Commander,
Thirteenth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 03–22564 Filed 9–4–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 70

[NE 190–1190; FRL–7553–1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Nebraska

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve a revision to the Nebraska State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Operating Permits Program. On September 5, 2002, the state updated its air program construction and operating permitting rules, its definitions rule, and emission inventory reporting rule. Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between the state and Federally-approved rules, and ensure Federal enforceability of the state's revised air program rules.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by October 6, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted either by mail or electronically. Written comments should be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Electronic comments should be sent either to Wayne Kaiser at kaiser.wayne@epa.gov or to <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is an alternative method for submitting electronic comments to EPA. To submit comments, please follow the detailed instructions described in “What action is EPA taking” in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551–7603 or by e-mail at kaiser.wayne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all

public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on part of this rule and if that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those parts of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 22, 2003.

Cecilia Tapia,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 03–22540 Filed 9–4–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 194

[FRL–7553–2]

Central Characterization Project Waste Characterization Program Documents Applicable to Transuranic Radioactive Waste From the Hanford Site Proposed for Disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability; opening of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, or “we”) is announcing an inspection for the week of September 8, 2003, at the Hanford Site in Washington. With this action, we also announce availability of Department of Energy (DOE) documents in the EPA Docket, and solicit public comments on the documents available in the docket for a period of 30 days. The following DOE documents, entitled “CCP–PO–001—Revision 6, 6/11/03—CCP Transuranic Waste Characterization Quality Assurance Project Plan” and “CCP–PO–002—Revision 6, 6/11/03—CCP Transuranic Waste Certification Plan,” are available for review in the public dockets listed in **ADDRESSES**. We will consider public comments received on or before the due date mentioned in **DATES**. In accordance with EPA's WIPP Compliance Criteria, we will conduct an inspection of the Central Characterization Project (CCP) at Hanford to verify that, using the systems and processes developed as part of the DOE Carlsbad Office's CCP, DOE can