

all persons and vessels must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or his or her designated representative.

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

(c) *Effective period.* This section is effective from 7:30 a.m. through 2 p.m. on April 17, 2008.

Dated: February 25, 2008.

**Brian D. Kelley,**

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

[FR Doc. E8-4463 Filed 3-6-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

## POSTAL SERVICE

### 39 CFR Part 111

#### New Standards Prohibit the Mailing of Replica or Inert Munitions

**AGENCY:** Postal Service™.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service is proposing new standards to prohibit the mailing of replica or inert munitions such as grenades or other simulated explosive devices.

**DATES:** We must receive your comments on or before April 7, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail or deliver written comments to the Manager, Mailing Standards, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant, Plaza, SW., Room 3436, Washington, DC 20260-3436. You may inspect and photocopy all written comments at USPS Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant, Plaza, SW., 11th Floor N, Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael F. Lee, 202-268-7263.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Current Postal Service standards do not prohibit look-alike weapons from the mail. In order to ensure safety of postal employees and prevent damage to postal property or other mailpieces, inert munitions have been handled as "live ammunition" when found in the mail. In the past, facilities have been evacuated when inert replicas have been identified in the mailstream. In 2006, the Postal Service recorded 849 suspicious incidents involving mail that exhibited characteristics of possible explosives. Postal facilities were evacuated on 100 separate occasions due to these occurrences. Postal Inspectors or local emergency first responders reacted to each of these occurrences to assess the items.

Evacuations cost the Postal Service time and money, create unnecessary stress for employees, and can impact service commitments.

Most importantly, employee safety can be jeopardized when facsimiles of potentially dangerous items are permitted in the mail. Both real and replica explosives have been found in the mail and the replicas often are not readily distinguishable from the real articles. The Postal Service is concerned that without prohibition of these types of mail pieces, continued exposure to replicated munitions, over time, will lead to desensitized reactions should an employee encounter items in the mail that should be regarded as dangerous.

This proposed rule is part of our ongoing commitment to increase the safety of the mail and provide a safe working environment for our employees.

Although we are exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act [5 U.S.C. of 553(b), (c)] regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), the Postal Service invites public comment on the following proposed revisions to *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), incorporated in the *Code of Federal Regulations*. See 39 CFR 111.1.

#### List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111

Administrative practice and procedure, Postal Service.

#### PART 111—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 416, 3001-3011, 3201-3219, 3403-3406, 3621, 3622, 3626, 3632, 3633 and 5001.

2. Revise the following sections of *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service*, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM) as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

#### 600 Basic Standards for All Mailing Services

##### 601 Mailability

\* \* \* \* \*

#### 11.0 Other Restricted and Nonmailable Matter

\* \* \* \* \*

[Renumber current 11.5 through 11.20 as 11.6 through 11.21. Insert new 11.5 to read as follows:]

#### 11.5 Replica or Inert Munitions

Replica or inert munitions that bear a realistic appearance, such as simulated

grenades or other simulated explosive devices, are not permitted in the mail.

\* \* \* \* \*

We will publish an appropriate amendment to 39 CFR part 111 to reflect these changes if the proposal is adopted.

**Neva R. Watson,**

*Attorney, Legislative.*

[FR Doc. E8-4459 Filed 3-6-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 122

[EPA-HQ-OW-2005-0037; FRL-8539-9]

RIN 2040-AE94

#### Revised National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Regulations for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations; Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

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

**ACTION:** Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This action is a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM) to EPA's June 30, 2006, notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) revising the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), in response to the order issued by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Waterkeeper Alliance et al. v. EPA*, 399 F.3d 486 (2d Cir. 2005). In the June 2006 NPRM, EPA proposed to require only CAFOs that discharge or propose to discharge to seek coverage under a permit. In this SNPRM, EPA is proposing a voluntary option for CAFOs to certify that the CAFO does not discharge or propose to discharge based on an objective assessment of the CAFO's design, construction, operation, and maintenance. The June 2006 proposal also discussed the terms of the nutrient management plan (NMP) that would need to be incorporated into NPDES permits. This SNPRM proposes a framework for identifying the terms of the NMP and three alternative approaches for addressing rates of application of manure, litter, and process wastewater when identifying terms of the NMP to be included in the permit. This supplemental proposal focuses solely on certification and terms of the NMP and is not opening any other provisions of the June 2006 proposal and existing NPDES regulations or