

14. Optional Coverage for Fresh Fruit Quality Adjustment.

(a) In the event of a conflict between the Apple Crop Insurance Provisions and this option, this option will control.

(b) In return for payment of the additional premium designated in the actuarial documents, this option provides for quality adjustment of fresh apple production as follows:

(1) You must elect this option on or before the sales closing date for the initial crop year for which you wish to insure your apples under this option. This option will continue in effect until canceled by either you or us for any succeeding crop year by written notice to the other party on or before the cancellation date.

(2) To be eligible for this option, you must have elected to insure your apples at the additional coverage level. If you elect Catastrophic Risk Protection (CAT) after this option is effective, it will be considered as notice of cancellation of this option by you.

(3) This option will apply to all your apple acreage designated in your acreage report as grown for fresh apples and that meets the insurability requirements specified in the Apple Crop Insurance Provisions, except any acreage specifically excluded by the actuarial documents. Any acreage designated in your acreage report as grown for processing apples are not eligible for coverage under this option.

(4) In lieu of sections 12(c)(1)(iii) and (iv) and (2), the production to count for appraised and harvested production for a unit will include all fresh apple production in accordance with this option.

(5) If appraised or harvested fresh apple production is damaged by an insured cause of loss to the extent that 80 percent or more of the fresh apples do not grade U.S. Fancy or better, in accordance with applicable USDA Standards for Grades of Apples, the following adjustments will apply:

(i) Production to count with 21 through 40 percent of the fresh apples not grading U.S. Fancy or better will be reduced 2 percent for each full percent in excess of 20 percent.

(ii) Production to count with 41 through 50 percent of the fresh apples not grading U.S. Fancy or better will be reduced 40 percent plus an additional 3 percent for each full percent in excess of 40 percent.

(iii) Production to count with 51 percent through 64 percent of the fresh apples not grading U.S. Fancy or better will be reduced 70 percent plus an additional 2 percent for each full percent in excess of 50 percent.

(iv) Production to count with 65 percent or more of the fresh apples not grading U.S. Fancy or better will not be considered as production to count.

The following is an example of loss under the Quality Option Fresh Fruit Coverage: You have 100 percent share and designated 10 acres of fresh apples and 5 acres of processing apples in the unit on the acreage report, with a 600 bushels per acre guarantee for both fresh and processing apples and a price election of \$9.10 per bushel for fresh apples and \$4.76 per bushel for processing apples that graded U.S. No. 1 Processing or better. You are only able to harvest 5,000 bushels of fresh apples, and of those only 2,750 bushels of apples grade U.S. Fancy or better, and 1,000 bushels of processing apples. Your indemnity would be calculated as follows:

(1) 10 acres  $\times$  600 bushels = 6,000 bushels guarantee of fresh apples; 5 acres  $\times$  600 bushels = 3,000 bushels guarantee of processing apples;

(2) 6,000 bushels  $\times$  \$9.10 price election = \$54,600.00 value of guarantee for fresh apples; 3,000 bushels  $\times$  \$4.76 price election = \$14,280.00 value of guarantee for processing;

(3) \$54,600.00 + \$14,280.00 = \$68,880.00 total value guarantee;

(4) 5,000 bushels of fresh apples would be adjusted as follows: 2,750 / 5000 = 55 percent; 5,000  $\times$  .45 (40 percent reduction, plus an additional 3 percent for each full percent in excess of 40 percent) = 2,250 bushels  $\times$  \$9.10 = \$20,475.00 value of the fresh bushels; 1,000 bushels of processing apples  $\times$  \$4.76 price election = \$4,760.00 value of production to count.

(5) \$20,475.00 + \$4,760.00 = \$25,235.00 total value of production to count;

(6) \$68,880.00 - \$25,235.00 = \$43,645.00 loss; and

(7) \$43,645.00  $\times$  100 percent share = \$43,645.00 indemnity payment.

Signed in Washington, DC, on March 24, 2004.

**Ross J. Davidson, Jr.,**

*Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 04-6938 Filed 3-26-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-08-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 165**

[CGD09-04-001]

RIN 1625-AA00

**Security Zone; Professional Golfer's Association Championship Tour, Sheboygan, WI; Lake Michigan**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary security zone for a portion of Lake Michigan in Sheboygan, WI for the Professional Golfers' Association (PGA) Championship Tour. This action is necessary to ensure the waterside security to protect the international high-profile participants and spectators during this event. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic for a portion of Lake Michigan off of Sheboygan, WI.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before May 28, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments and related material to Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Milwaukee, 2420 South Lincoln Memorial Drive, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207. Marine Safety Office (MSO) Milwaukee maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at MSO Milwaukee between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marine Science Technician Chief McClintock, U.S. Coast Guard MSO Milwaukee, at (414) 747-7155.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Request for Comments**

Establishing security zones by notice-and-comment rulemaking gives the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed zones. We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking [CGD09-04-001], indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all

comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know that your submission reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

#### Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to MSO Milwaukee at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

#### Background and Purpose

This security zone is necessary to safeguard the PGA Championship Tour players and attendees from potential waterborne threats and hazards. Due to the high profile nature and extensive publicity associated with this event, the Captain of the Port (COTP) expects a significantly large number of spectators in confined areas adjacent to Lake Michigan. As such, the COTP is proposing to implement a security zone to ensure the safety and security of both participants and spectators in these areas beginning on August 9, 2004 and concluding on August 17, 2004. Security zone enforcement would occur daily between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m.

#### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a security zone that would include all waters and adjacent shoreline encompassed by the following coordinates: starting at 43°49.845' N, 087°43.079' W; then east to 43°49.28' N, 087°42.93' W; then north to 43°52.591' N, 087°43.426' W; then going west to 43°52.05' N, 087°43.33' W; then following the shoreline back to point of origin. These coordinates are based upon North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83). This security zone would be enforced daily from 7 p.m. until 8 p.m. on August 9, 2004 until 8 p.m. August 17, 2004.

The Coast Guard would notify the public about this security zone, in advance, by way of the Ninth Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners, the Broadcast Notice to Mariners, and, for those who request it, from MSO Milwaukee, by facsimile (fax).

#### Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed 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).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. This determination is based on the minimal time that vessels would be restricted from the zone.

#### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed 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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of commercial vessels intending to transit, moor or anchor in a portion of the activated security zone.

This security zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This rule would be in effect for only the 9 days of the event and vessel traffic can safely pass outside of the proposed security zone during the event.

If you think your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (*see* **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

#### Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on

them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact MSO Milwaukee (*see* **ADDRESSES**).

#### Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call 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 proposed rule under that Order and have determined that this rule 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 proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not affect 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 proposed 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 proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

### Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed 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. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a "tribal implication" under the Order.

### Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed 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 proposed rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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 (34)(g), of the Instruction, from further environmental documentation.

### 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 proposes to amend 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. Add § 165.T09–001 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–001 Security Zone; Professional Golfer's Association Championship Tour, Sheboygan, WI; Lake Michigan.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: All waters and adjacent shoreline encompassed by the following coordinates starting at 43°49.845' N, 087°43.079' W; then east to 43°49.28' N, 087°42.93' W; then north to 43°52.591' N, 087°43.426' W; then going west to 43°52.05' N, 087°43.33' W; then following the shoreline back to point of origin (NAD 83).

(b) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced daily between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., from 7 a.m. on August 9, 2004, until 8 p.m. on August 17, 2004.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into or remaining in this zone is prohibited unless authorized by Captain of the Port Milwaukee.

(2) Persons desiring to transit the area of the security zone may contact the Captain of the Port at telephone number (414) 747–7155 or on VHF channel 16 or VHF channel 21A 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.

Dated: March 15, 2004.

#### H.M. Hamilton,

*Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Milwaukee.*

[FR Doc. 04–6741 Filed 3–26–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Chapter I

[OAR–2003–0214, FRL–7640–3]

#### Petition to Amend Fuel Economy Testing and Calculation Procedures; Request for Comments

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

**ACTION:** Notice of petition for rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** EPA has received a petition from Bluewater Network requesting rulemaking to "revise the test procedures, calculation methods and/or correction factors employed in the calculations used to determine the fuel economy information relayed to

consumers and policy makers so that they more accurately reflect the actual, real-world fuel economy that vehicles are achieving on the road." Bluewater Network contends that EPA's fuel economy estimates do not accurately reflect results achieved in actual on-road operation; more accurate estimates would benefit both consumers and those involved in setting national energy policy. Before acting on the petition, EPA would like to solicit information and comments from other interested parties.

**DATES:** In order to receive full consideration, comments should be submitted by July 27, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted electronically, by mail, or through hand delivery/courier. Follow the detailed instructions as provided in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Holly Pugliese, 2000 Traverwood DR, Ann Arbor MI 48105. (734) 214–4288; [harrison.dan@epa.gov](mailto:harrison.dan@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. General Information

##### A. How Can I Get Copies Of Related Information ?

EPA has established an official public docket for this action under Docket ID No. OAR–2003–0214. The official public docket is the collection of materials that is available for public viewing at the Air and Radiation Docket in the EPA Docket Center, (EPA/DC) EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the Air and Radiation Docket is (202) 566–1744.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA's electronic public docket and comment system, EPA Dockets. You may use EPA Dockets at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket/> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket identification number.

Certain types of information will not be placed in the EPA Dockets. Information claimed as CBI and other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute, which is not