

in advertisements or in writing at time of sale?

### Regulatory Analysis and Notices

The Department has determined that this action is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866 or under the Department's Regulatory Policies and Procedures. The Department has placed a regulatory evaluation that examines the estimated costs and impacts of the proposal in the docket.

The Department certifies that this rule, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Although many ticket agents and some air carriers are small entities, the Department believes that the costs of notification will be minimal. The Department seeks comment on whether there are unidentified small entity impacts that should be considered. If comments provide information that there are significant small entity impacts, the Department will prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis at the final rule stage.

The Department does not believe that there would be sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism assessment.

### Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposed rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 2507 *et seq.*).

### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 259

Air carriers, Foreign air carriers.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Department proposes to amend Title 14, Chapter II, Subchapter A by adding a new part 259 to read as follows:

### PART 259—DISINSECTION OF AIRCRAFT

- Sec.  
259.1 Purpose.  
259.2 Applicability.  
259.3 Definitions.  
259.4 Notice requirement.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 40113(a) and 41712.

#### § 259.1 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to ensure that ticket agents in the United States, air carriers and foreign air carriers tell consumers when the air transportation they are proposing to buy requires that the aircraft cabin will be sprayed with insecticide while passengers and crew are on board.

#### § 259.2 Applicability.

This rule applies to:

(a) Direct air carriers and foreign direct air carriers operating aircraft in which the initial flight segment of flights outbound from the United States is disinfected by spraying the aircraft cabin with insecticide while passengers and crew are on board.

(b) Ticket agents doing business in the United States that sell passenger air transportation services on flights described above.

#### § 259.3 Definitions.

(a) Carrier means any direct air carrier or foreign air carrier as defined in 49 U.S.C. 40102(2) or 49 U.S.C. 40102(21), respectively, that is engaged in passenger air transportation, including by wet lease.

(b) Ticket agent has the meaning ascribed to it in 49 U.S.C. 40102(40).

#### § 259.4 Notice requirement.

In any direct oral communication with a prospective customer concerning a flight that will be required to be sprayed with insecticide while passengers are on board, a ticket agent in the United States or a carrier shall verbally deliver the following warning:

Federal regulations require that we warn you that during Flight Number [identify flight number], the airplane cabin will be sprayed with insecticide while passengers are on board. This is a requirement of the Government of [identify name of country].

Further, upon request, the ticket agent in the United States or the carrier shall immediately provide the name of the insecticide used on that flight.

Issued in Washington, DC on December 12, 1994.

**Patrick V. Murphy,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 95-1260 Filed 1-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-M

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

#### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

#### 27 CFR Part 24

[Notice No. 805; Notice No. 800]

RIN 1512-AB26

#### Materials and Processes Authorized for the Production of Wine and for the Treatment of Juice, Wine and Distilling Material; Reopening of Comment Period and Correction (93F-059P)

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of comment period and correction.

**SUMMARY:** In Notice No. 800 (59 FR 49870), published in the **Federal Register** on September 30, 1994, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) solicited comments from winemakers, consumers and other interested parties as to whether the use of certain materials and processes is acceptable in "good commercial practice" in the production, cellar treatment and finishing of wine. ATF is reopening the comment period in order to allow all interested persons more time to prepare and submit comments. This notice also makes editorial correction to the text of the proposed regulations as described in the supplementary information below:

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by March 20, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Chief, Wine, Beer and Spirits Regulations Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, P.O. Box 50221, Washington, DC 20091-0221; Notice No. 800.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert White, Wine, Beer and Spirits Regulations Branch, 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20226; telephone (202) 927-8230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On September 30, 1994, ATF published a notice of proposed rulemaking, Notice No. 800 (59 FR 49870), in the **Federal Register**. In the notice, ATF proposed the use of three wine treating processes and one wine treating material in the production, cellar treatment, and/or finishing of wine. The processes included the spinning cone column, reverse osmosis and ion exchange used in combination within a closed system, and ultrafiltration at transmembrane pressures below 200 pounds per square inch (psi).

The new wine treating material proposed was urease enzyme, derived from *Lactobacillus fermentum*. This new material was proposed to be used to reduce levels of naturally occurring urea in wine to help prevent the formation of ethyl carbamate during storage.

##### Reopening of Comment Period

ATF has received a request from the Delegation of the European Commission (EC) to extend the comment period for 60 days. The EC stated that this additional time was necessary due to

the complicated technical issues raised in the proposed rulemaking.

ATF agrees that the proposed rulemaking contains several wine treating processes that are technically complex and that may require more time than usual to analyze and prepare comments for submission. Consequently, in order to allow all interested persons to comment fully, ATF has decided to reopen the comment period, which originally closed on November 29, 1994, for 60 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

All written comments received will be considered in the development of a decision on this matter. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views or suggestions presented will be particularly helpful in developing a reasoned regulatory decision on this matter.

#### Correction

In Notice No. 800, 59 FR 49870, on page 49874, in the "Reference or limitation" column of the table for reverse osmosis, the words "off flavors in wine" in the third line should be deleted. In addition, the word "virous" in the last line should be changed to read "vinous."

#### Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is Robert White, Wine, Beer and Spirits Regulations Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

#### List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 24

Administrative practice and procedure, Authority delegations, Claims Electronic funds transfers, Excise taxes, Exports, Food additives, Fruit juices, Labeling, Liquors, Packaging and containers, Reporting requirements, Research, Scientific equipment, Spices and flavorings, Surety bonds, Transportation, Warehouses, Wine and vinegar.

**Authority:** This notice is issued under the authority of 26 U.S.C. 7805.

Approved: January 5, 1995.

**Daniel R. Black,**

*Acting Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-1089 Filed 1-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### 36 CFR Part 68

RIN 1024-AC24

#### The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.  
**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) proposes to revise 36 CFR part 68, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects. Published in 1978, the standards apply to all proposed grant-in-aid projects assisted through the National Historic Preservation Fund, focusing primarily on development projects involving buildings. Seven approaches to project work are defined in that document: Acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Those standards are organized with general standards that apply to all historic preservation grant-in-aid projects, and specific standards that apply to specific grant-in-aid projects, as appropriate. This proposed revision reduces the work approaches from seven to four: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. The total number of standards is subsequently reduced from 77 to 34; the acquisition section is deleted; and protection and stabilization are consolidated under preservation. In addition, the citation referencing the Tax Reform Act of 1976 is deleted.

The revised Standards apply to all properties defined in the National Register of Historic Places: buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, objects, and districts. The goal of revision is to reduce the part in length, sharpen it in format and language and, in consequence, make it easier to understand and apply. Because of their broader application to all cultural property types, the revised standards are titled, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties". However, the philosophy of the revised standards remains unchanged and is consistent with existing historic preservation authorities.

**DATES:** Written comments will be accepted through February 17, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to: Chief, Preservation Assistance Division, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kay Weeks, (202) 343-9593.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Background

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects were codified December 7, 1978, at 36 CFR part 1207 (43 FR 57250), and redesignated at 36 CFR part 68 on July 1, 1981 (46 FR 34329). These Standards are applied to all proposed grant-in-aid projects assisted through the National Historic Preservation Fund (HPF). They have focused primarily on acquisition and development projects for buildings listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The NPS is proposing to revise 36 CFR part 68, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects, and replace it with broader standards to include all cultural property types. The proposed revision changes the title of the part to "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties". Revisions to the existing Standards began in 1990 in conjunction with the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, National Trust for Historic Preservation, and a number of other outside organizations. Standards have been evolving over time, with the majority of the concepts proposed here having been practiced successfully in field application. These practices are now being proposed as revisions to codified standards and are, in several ways, broader in approach and, most important, easier to use.

First, they may be applied to all historic resource types, including buildings, sites, landscapes, structures, objects, and districts.

Second, they eliminate the general and specific standards format, which tended to create a lengthy rule that was also confusing. In the existing rule, eight general standards apply to every project, even though the goals of work differ dramatically. In addition, specific standards apply to specific types of projects, thus acknowledging the differences in work approaches, but resulting in a total of 77 standards. The revised standards remedy organizational problems that had existed in the earlier standards and create a clearer document for the user. For example, the definitions of the different treatments are expanded to assist selection of the most appropriate one; § 68.4(a) relating to acquisition has been deleted because it is not a treatment; and protection and stabilization are consolidated under a single preservation treatment rather than being cited separately. As a result, the total number of treatments has been reduced from seven to four.