

The EPA issued a second ESD dated October 25, 1999, to permit use of ferrous sulfate treatment on the north and south plume, and a third ESD dated September 10, 2003, to eliminate the extended 30-year monitoring of the Site after completion of the remedial action on both the North and South Plumes.

The State of Texas (TCEQ) concurred with the Record of Decisions for OU-1 on September 8, 1986 and for OU-2 on March 18, 1988. The stated ESDs dated June 28, 1995; October 24, 1999; and September 10, 2003, respectively, had formal written concurrences from both TCEQ and Sequa.

Cleanup Standards

On January 1, 1991, the Primary Drinking Water Standard for chromium changed from 0.05 mg/l to 0.10 mg/l total chromium. The ground water cleanup standard for chromium on the Site was revised accordingly. Despite the change in the drinking water standard, concentrations of chromium in the North and South plumes, still exceeded the MCL of 0.10 mg/l.

Operation and Maintenance and Five-Year Review

As of June 2002, all wells at the Odessa Chromium #2 Site had met the project cleanup goal of remaining below the 0.1 mg/l MCL for total chromium for a period of three consecutive months. The EPA issued an ESD on September 10, 2003, which contained sampling results from more than eight years of quarterly monitoring for both the North Plume and the South Plume. After evaluation of these data, it was determined that the 30-year monitoring period requirement could be discontinued. Because this remedy will not result in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, Operation and Maintenance activities and five-year reviews are not required for this Site.

Community Involvement

Public participation activities have been satisfied as required in CERCLA section 113(k), 42 U.S.C. 9613(k), and CERCLA section 117, 42 U.S.C. 9617. Documents in the Deletion Docket for the Odessa Chromium 2 Site which EPA relied on for recommendation of the deletion from the NPL are available to the public in the information repositories which can be found at the Ector County Library, Odessa, Texas; Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission, Midland International Airport, Midland, Texas; the EPA

Region 6 Library in Dallas, Texas; and the TCEQ Library in Austin, Texas.

V. Deletion Action

The EPA, with concurrence of the State of Texas, through the TCEQ, has determined that all appropriate responses under CERCLA have been completed, and that no further response actions, under CERCLA are necessary. Therefore, EPA is deleting the Odessa Chromium 2, North and South Plumes, Superfund Site from the NPL. This deletion includes the deletion of both OU-1 and OU-2 from the NPL.

Because EPA considers this action to be noncontroversial and routine, EPA is taking it without prior publication of a notice of intent to delete. This action will be effective July 19, 2004, unless EPA receives adverse comments by June 21, 2004, on a parallel notice of intent to delete published in the "Proposed Rule" section of today's **Federal Register**. If adverse comments are received within the 30-day public comment period on the proposal, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of this direct final notice of deletion before the effective date of the deletion and it will not take effect, and EPA will prepare a response to comments and continue with the deletion process on the basis of the notice of intent to delete and the comments already received. There will be no additional opportunity to comment.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous waste, Hazardous substances, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Dated: April 28, 2004.

Richard E. Greene,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

■ For the reasons set out in this document, 40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:

PART 300—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 300 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

Appendix B—[Amended]

■ 2. Table 1 of Appendix B to Part 300 is amended by removing the entry for the

Odessa Chromium 2 (Andrews Highway), Odessa, Texas.

[FR Doc. 04–11218 Filed 5–19–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

46 CFR Part 310

[Docket No. MARAD 2004–17759]

RIN 2133–AB58

Deferment of Service Obligations of Midshipmen Recipients of Scholarships or Fellowships

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT.
ACTION: Interim final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Maritime Administration (MARAD, we, us, or our) is amending its regulations so that the Maritime Administrator's authority to defer service obligations of United States Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA) midshipmen recipients of scholarships or fellowships of national significance is not conditioned on enrollment in postgraduate marine or maritime-related courses of study.

DATES: This interim final rule is effective on May 20, 2004. However, MARAD will consider comments received not later than June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments [identified by DOT DMS Docket Number MARAD 2004–17759] by any of the following methods:

- Web site: <http://dms.dot.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Nassif Building, Room PL–401, Washington, DC 20590–001.
- Hand Delivery: Room PL–401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Identification Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://dms.dot.gov> including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading under Regulatory Notices.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://dms.dot.gov> at any time or to Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rita Jackson, Academies Program Officer, Office of Policy and Plans, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Room 7302, Washington, DC 20590; telephone: (202) 366-0284.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 46 App. U.S.C. 1295b(e)(5) states that the Maritime Administrator, relying on a delegation of authority from the Secretary may defer the service obligation of any student graduating from the USMMA for up to two years provided that student is enrolled in an approved course of study.

46 CFR 310.58(g) states that the Maritime Administrator may grant a deferment of a service obligation contract, for up to two years only for graduate students enrolled in a marine or maritime-related graduate course of study approved by the Administrator.

The differences in the terms of 46 App. U.S.C. 1295b(e)(5) and 46 CFR 310.58 may hinder midshipmen with superior credentials from pursuing postgraduate scholarships and fellowships. Specifically, since service obligations may be deferred only if postgraduate course work involves a marine or maritime-related course of study, graduate studies are limited.

The Administrator's discretion to defer the service obligations of USMMA midshipmen recipients of scholarships is not limited by the U.S. Code. Therefore, we are amending 46 CFR 310.58(g) to reflect the terms of 46 App. U.S.C. 1295b(e)(5) so that the amended regulation will not condition the Administrator's ability to defer the service obligations of recipients of scholarships and fellowships of national significance on enrollment in a marine or maritime-related course of study.

Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), and Department of Transportation (DOT) Regulatory Policies and Procedures

This interim final rule is not considered a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and therefore, was not reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. This interim final rule is not likely to result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or

more. This interim final rule is also not significant under the Regulatory Policies and Procedures of the Department of Transportation (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). The costs and overall economic impact of this rulemaking are so minimal that no further analysis is necessary.

Administrative Procedure Act

The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553) provides an exception to notice and comment procedures when they are unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. MARAD finds that under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B) good cause exists for not providing notice and comment since this interim final rule only expands the subject area of courses of study that may be approved by the Maritime Administrator. Accordingly, opportunity for public comment is unnecessary. However, we are requesting public comment on this interim final rule. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), MARAD finds that, for the same reason listed above, good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Federalism

We analyzed this interim final rule in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in E.O. 13132 ("Federalism") and have determined that it does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement. The regulations have no substantial effects on the States, the current Federal-State relationship, or the current distribution of power and responsibilities among the various local officials. Therefore, consultation with State and local officials was not necessary.

Regulatory Flexibility

The Maritime Administrator certifies that this interim final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This interim final rule merely broadens the area of consideration for courses of study that may allow deferred service obligations.

Executive Order 13175

MARAD does not believe that this interim final rule will significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments when analyzed under the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments). Therefore, the funding and consultation

requirements of this Executive Order do not apply.

Environmental Assessment

We have analyzed this interim final rule for purposes of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and have concluded that under the categorical exclusions provision in section 4.05 of Maritime Administrative Order (MAO) 600-1, "Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts," 50 FR 11606 (March 22, 1985), neither the preparation of an Environmental Assessment, an Environmental Impact Statement, nor a Finding of No Significant Impact for this rulemaking is required. This rulemaking has no environmental impact.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rulemaking contains no new or amended information collection or recordkeeping requirements that have been approved or require approval by the Office of Management and Budget.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This interim final rule will not impose an unfunded mandate under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. It will not result in costs of \$100 million or more, in the aggregate, to any of the following: State, local, or Native American tribal governments, or the private sector. This interim final rule is the least burdensome alternative that achieves the objective of U.S. policy.

Privacy Act

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (volume 65, number 70, pages 19477-78), or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

List of Subjects in 46 CFR Part 310

Grant-programs-education, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Schools, Seamen.

■ Accordingly, 46 CFR part 310 is amended as follows:

PART 310—MERCHANT MARINE TRAINING

■ 1. The authority citation for part 310 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 App. U.S.C. 1295; 49 CFR 1.66.

■ 2. In § 310.58, revise paragraph (g) to read as follows:

§ 310.58 Service obligation for students enrolled after April 1, 1982.

* * * * *

(g) *Deferments.* In exceptional cases, the Administration may grant a deferment of all or part of the agreement under paragraph (a)(5) of this section and the service obligation contract, for a period not to exceed 2 years, only for graduates considered to have superior academic and conduct records while at the Academy and only for the purpose of entering a marine or maritime-related graduate course of study approved by the Administrator or for the purpose of pursuing studies as recipients of scholarships or fellowships of national significance; *Provided*, that any deferment of service as a commissioned officer under paragraph (a)(5)(iii) of this section and the service obligation contract shall be subject to the sole approval of the Secretary of the department which has jurisdiction over such service (including the Secretary of the department in which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to NOAA). A graduate shall make application for such deferment through the Superintendent of the Academy, who shall forward each application, together with the Superintendent's recommendation for approval or disapproval and an evaluation of the applicant's academic and conduct records, to the Academies Program Officer, Maritime Administration, Office of Policy and Plans, NASSIF Building, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590 for appropriate action.

Dated: May 13, 2004.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 04-11319 Filed 5-19-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-A121

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for *Astragalus pycnostachyus* var. *lanosissimus* (Ventura Marsh milk-vetch)

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), designate critical habitat pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), for *Astragalus pycnostachyus* var. *lanosissimus* (Ventura marsh milk-vetch). Approximately 420 acres (170 hectares) of land fall within the boundaries of the critical habitat designation. The designated critical habitat is located in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, California.

This critical habitat designation requires the Service to consult under section 7 of the Act with regard to actions carried out, funded, or authorized by a Federal agency. Section 4 of the Act requires us to consider economic and other relevant impacts when specifying any particular area as critical habitat. We solicited data and comments from the public on all aspects of this designation, including data on economic and other impacts of the designation.

DATES: This rule becomes effective June 21, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments and materials received, as well as supporting documentation used in the preparation of this final rule, will be available for inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2493 Portola Road, Suite B, Ventura CA 93003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Noda, Field Supervisor, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2493 Portola Road, Suite B, Ventura, CA 93003 (telephone 805/644-1766; facsimile 805/644-3958).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Designation of critical habitat provides little additional protection to species. In 30 years of implementing the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), we have found that the designation of statutory critical habitat provides little additional protection to most listed species, while consuming significant amounts of available conservation resources. The present system for designating critical habitat has evolved since its original statutory prescription into a process that provides little real conservation benefit, is driven by litigation and the courts rather than biology, limits our ability to fully evaluate the science involved, consumes enormous agency resources, and imposes huge social and economic costs. We have determined that additional agency discretion would allow our focus to return to those actions that provide the greatest benefit

to the species most in need of protection.

Role of Critical Habitat in Actual Practice of Administering and Implementing the Act

While attention to and protection of habitat is paramount to successful conservation actions, we have consistently found that, in most circumstances, the designation of critical habitat is of little additional value for most listed species, yet it consumes large amounts of conservation resources. [Sidle (1987) stated, "Because the ESA can protect species with and without critical habitat designation, critical habitat designation may be redundant to the other consultation requirements of section 7." Currently, only 445 species or 36 percent of the 1,244 listed species in the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the Service have designated critical habitat. We address the habitat needs of all 1,244 listed species through conservation mechanisms such as listing, section 7 consultations, the section 4 recovery planning process, section 9 protective prohibitions of unauthorized take, section 6 funding to the States, and the section 10 incidental take permit process. We conclude that it is these measures that may make the difference between extinction and survival for many species.

Procedural and Resource Difficulties in Designating Critical Habitat

We have been inundated with lawsuits for our failure to designate critical habitat, and we face a growing number of lawsuits challenging critical habitat determinations once they are made. These lawsuits have subjected the Service to an ever-increasing series of court orders and court-approved settlement agreements, compliance with which now consumes nearly the entire listing program budget. This leaves us with little ability to prioritize our activities to direct scarce listing resources to the listing program actions with the most biologically urgent species conservation needs.

The consequence of the critical habitat litigation activity is that limited listing funds are used to defend active lawsuits, to respond to Notices of Intent to sue relative to critical habitat, and to comply with the growing number of adverse court orders. As a result, listing petition responses, our own proposals to list critically imperiled species, and final listing determinations on existing proposals are significantly delayed. Litigation over critical habitat issues for species already listed and receiving the Act's full protection has precluded or