

from 1 May through 31 October, between 12 midnight and 8 a.m., and from 1 November through 30 April, between 8 p.m. to 8 a.m. At all other times the bridge will open on signal. This change to the regulations is being proposed due to infrequent request for openings during the above time periods and will relieve the bridge owner of the burden of having personnel at the bridge at all times.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposal is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation, under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT, is unnecessary. This conclusion is based on the fact that the regulation will not prevent mariners from transiting the bridge. It will only require that mariners plan their transits.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this action will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. "Small entities" include independently owned and operated small businesses that are not dominant in their fields and that otherwise qualify as "small business concerns" under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632). Because of the reasons discussed in the Regulatory Evaluation above, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this action, if adopted, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Collection of Information

This rule contains no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Federalism

The Coast Guard has analyzed this proposal in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has determined that this proposed regulation does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environment

The Coast Guard considered the environmental impact of this proposal and concluded that, under section 2.B.2.e(32)(e) of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B, this proposal is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A Categorical Exclusion Determination is available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons set out 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; 49 CFR 1.46; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g); section 117.255 also issued under the authority of Pub. L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.802 is added to read as follows:

§ 117.802 New Rochelle Harbor.

(a) The draw of the Glen Island Bridge, mile 0.8 over New Rochelle Harbor, shall open on signal, except as follows:

(1) The draw need not open from 1 May through 31 October, between 12 midnight and 8 a.m.

(2) The draw need not open from 1 November through 30 April, between 8 p.m. and 8 a.m.

(b) The owners of the bridge shall provide, and keep in good legible condition, clearance gauges for each draw with figures not less than twelve (12) inches high, designed, installed and maintained according to the provisions of § 118.160 of this chapter.

Dated: January 17, 1995.

R.R. Clark,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, First Coast Guard District.
[FR Doc. 95–2090 Filed 1–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 51, 52, 60, 61, and 64

[FRL–5147–3]

Enhanced Monitoring Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of comment period extension.

SUMMARY: This document extends until February 3, 1995 the public comment period on a limited number of specific issues concerning the proposed Enhanced Monitoring Program, 40 CFR parts 51, 52, 60, 61, and 64. The proposal was published on October 22, 1993 (58 FR 54648). On December 28, 1994, the public comment period was reopened to solicit comment on a limited number of specific issues (59 FR 66844). At the request of several commenters, EPA is extending the comment period for an additional seven days. The extension is limited to this short period because the enhanced monitoring rulemaking is subject to a court-ordered deadline of April 30, 1995, established by a consent decree in *Sierra Club v. Browner*, No. 93–0124 (NHJ)(D.D.C.). The extension of the public comment period is limited to the issues identified in the notice published December 28, 1994.

In addition, the EPA encourages public comment on the Enhanced Monitoring Reference Document and the associated Data Quality Objectives (DQO) process referenced in the notice published December 28, 1994 (see 59 FR 66844, 66846), not only during this public comment period but afterwards as well. In this manner, the Enhanced Monitoring Reference Document can be updated on a regular basis.

DATES: Comments on the limited number of specific issues identified in the December 28, 1994 notice must be received by February 3, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be mailed (in duplicate, if possible) to: EPA Air Docket (6102), Attention: Docket No. A–91–52, Room M–1500, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460. Docket: Supporting information used in developing the proposed regulations is contained in Docket No. A–91–52. This docket is available for public inspection and copying between 8 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays, and is located at EPA Air Docket (6102), Room M–1500, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Throwe, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Manufacturing, Energy and Transportation Division, at (202) 564–7013.

Dated: January 25, 1995.

Steven A. Herman,

Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

[FR Doc. 95-2158 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 52

[MT23-1-6402b; FRL-5128-2]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; State Implementation Plan for East Helena SO₂ Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to fully approve the State implementation plan (SIP) submitted by the State of Montana to achieve attainment of the primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for sulfur dioxide (SO₂). The SIP was submitted by Montana to satisfy certain federal requirements for an approvable nonattainment area SO₂ SIP for East Helena. In the Final Rules Section of this **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 adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives 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 rule. 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.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by February 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Meredith A. Bond at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, Air Programs Branch (8ART-AP), 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2405; and Montana Department of Health and Environmental Sciences, Air Quality Bureau, 836 Front Street, P.O. Box 200901, Helena, Montana 59620-0901.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Meredith Bond at (303)293-1764.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final notice which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental Protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur dioxide.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: December 14, 1994.

William P. Yellowtail,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-2018 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 52

[IL105-1-6841b; FRL-5139-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision request submitted by the State of Illinois on October 25, 1994, for the purpose of requiring the installation of pressure/vacuum (P/V) relief valves on storage tank vent pipes at certain gasoline dispensing operations in the Chicago and Metro-East St. Louis (Metro-East) ozone nonattainment areas. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the USEPA is approving this action as a direct final rule without prior proposal because USEPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If USEPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. USEPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before February 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR18-J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the State submittal and USEPA's analysis of it are available for inspection at: Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR18-J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Francisco Acevedo, Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6061.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: December 29, 1994.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-2016 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

Occupant Crash Protection; Denial of Petition for Rulemaking

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document announces the denial of a petition for rulemaking submitted by the Institute for Injury Reduction (IIR). The petitioner requested "rulemaking or other action" to require manufacturers to provide a specific warning for occupants to use lap belts in new vehicles with automatic safety belts. However, under a new statutory requirement, automatic safety belts are rapidly being replaced by the combination of air bags and manual lap/shoulder belts. Hence, the agency expects any safety concerns with automatic safety belts to become moot. Therefore, the petition is denied.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Dan Cohen, Chief, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, National Highway