

of a pesticide, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein, may request within 30 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register** that this rulemaking proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with section 408(e) of the FFDCFA.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the document control number, [FAP 4H5683/P600]. All written comments filed in response to this petition will be available in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, at the address given above from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to all the requirements of the Executive Order (i.e., Regulatory Impact Analysis, review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). Under section 3(f), the order defines "significant" as those actions likely to lead to a rule (1) having an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities (also known as "economically significant"); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of this Executive Order, EPA has determined that this rule is not "significant" and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Parts 180, 185, 186

Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Food additives, Feed additives, Pesticides and pests, Processed foods, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Daniel M. Barolo,
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR parts 180, 185, and 186 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. In part 180:
a. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

b. In § 180.396, the existing text is designated as paragraph (a), and the table therein is amended by removing the entry for sugarcane, and new paragraph (b) is added, to read as follows:

§ 180.396 Hexazinone; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

(b) A tolerance with regional registration, as defined in § 180.1(n) and which excludes use of hexazinone on sugarcane in Florida, is established for combined residues of the herbicide hexazinone (3-cyclohexyl-6-(dimethylamino)-1-methyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4(1H,3H)-dione) and its metabolites (calculated as hexazinone) in or on the following raw agricultural commodity:

Commodity	Parts per million
Sugarcane	0.2

PART 185—[AMENDED]

2. In part 185:
a. The authority citation for part 185 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 348.

b. By adding new § 185.3575, to read as follows:

§ 185.3575 Hexazinone; tolerances for residues.

A food additive tolerance with regional registration, as defined in § 180.1(n) and which excludes use of hexazinone on sugarcane in Florida, is established for combined residues of the herbicide hexazinone (3-cyclohexyl-6-(dimethylamino)-1-methyl-1,3,5-

triazine-2,4(1H,3H)-dione) and its metabolites (calculated as hexazinone) in or on the following commodity:

Commodity	Parts per million
Sugarcane, molasses	0.5

PART 186—[AMENDED]

3. In part 186:
a. The authority citation for part 186 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 348.

b. By adding new § 186.3575, to read as follows:

§ 186.3575 Hexazinone; tolerances for residues.

A feed additive tolerance with regional registration, as defined in § 180.1(n) and which excludes use of hexazinone on sugarcane in Florida, is established for combined residues of the herbicide hexazinone (3-cyclohexyl-6-(dimethylamino)-1-methyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4(1H,3H)-dione) and its metabolites (calculated hexazinone) in or on the following feed commodity:

Commodity	Parts per million
Sugarcane, molasses	0.5

[FR Doc. 95-6931 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR Parts 4 and 5

[CGD 95-023]

Marine Safety Investigation Process Review

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard conducts marine casualty investigations to determine the causes of casualties. The findings of an investigation may lead to proceedings for the suspension or revocation of a merchant mariner's license, certificate of registry, or document, the assessment of a civil penalty, or to criminal prosecution. The Coast Guard is reviewing its marine safety investigation process to identify possible improvements, and is seeking input from the public.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Mr. W.D. Rabe, Commandant (G-MMI), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001, or may be made by telephone at (202) 267-1430, or by fax at (202) 267-1416.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. W.D. Rabe, Marine Investigation Division, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection, telephone, (202) 267-1430.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this process by submitting written data, views, or arguments, or verbal comments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (CGD 95-023) and the specific question to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all written comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing.

Drafting Information

The principal persons involved in drafting the document are Mr. W.D. Rabe, Project Manager, and Commander P.A. Popko, Assistant Division Chief, Merchant Vessel Inspection and Documentation Division, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

Background and Purpose

The marine casualty investigation process is the main feedback loop for Coast Guard prevention programs. This measurement function has never been more important as limited resources must be focused on those activities which will be most effective in minimizing the risks to personnel and the environment.

Under the authority of 46 U.S.C. Chapter 63, the Coast Guard conducts marine casualty investigations. Section 6301 of Title 46, U.S. Code, requires the Secretary to issue regulations for the investigation of marine casualties. This authority has been delegated to the Coast Guard which has promulgated regulations and procedures for the reporting and investigation of marine casualties. These regulations appear in 46 CFR parts 4 and 5. Under current law and regulations, the marine industry has a duty to report marine casualties, as defined in law and regulations, to the

Coast Guard. There is more confusion regarding which casualties must be reported and a general concern that there is little benefit in reporting and investigation many of the "minor" casualties.

The Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security, and Environmental Protection has established a Quality Action Team (QAT) to review the investigation process. The QAT will examine the process and recommend improvements. It will consider public comment during its review. The review will address collection and analysis of casualty data, casualty reporting requirements, casualty investigation procedures, investigator training and qualification requirements, and the use of investigations for Suspension and Revocation proceedings, civil penalty assessments, and potential criminal prosecutions.

The QAT specifically solicits responses to the following questions:

1. What changes would you recommend to the reporting requirements for marine casualties in 46 CFR part 4?
2. How could the reporting criteria be improved to help eliminate confusion concerning which incidents are reportable to the Coast Guard?
3. How could the Coast Guard satisfy its need for data collection on marine casualties while reducing some of the burden on industry to report casualties?
4. Would electronic or batch reporting of minor casualties be beneficial?
5. What would be the pros and cons of limiting Coast Guard activity on certain casualties to data collection while reserving in depth investigation to those casualties from which important lessons can be learned?
6. What would be the pros and cons of the Coast Guard not investigating those cases which the National Transportation Safety Board is investigating to reduce duplication of effort?

The QAT will consult with the marine industry to obtain insight on where investigation processes can be improved to benefit both the Coast Guard and industry. Small study groups may be formed, if appropriate, and public meetings may be held to get input from a broad interest base. If the Coast Guard decides to hold public meetings, the dates, times, and locations will be announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 15, 1995.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Acting Chief, Office of Marine Safety Security and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 95-6950 Filed 3-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 2 and 15

[ET Docket No. 95-19; FCC 95-46]

Streamlining the Equipment Authorization Procedures for Digital Devices

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposal would streamline the equipment authorization requirements for personal computers and personal computer peripherals by relaxing the equipment authorization from certification to a new type of authorization based on a manufacturer's or supplier's declaration of compliance. It would also permit authorization of individual components of personal computers and would require testing laboratories to be accredited by the National Institute of Standards and technology under its National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program. These changes would allow manufacturers and suppliers to market new equipment without having to submit an application for equipment authorization and await FCC approval. This would save industry approximately \$250 million annually and would stimulate the creation of jobs and competition in the computer industry by relaxing regulations that are particularly burdensome for small businesses.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 5, 1995, and reply comments on or before July 5, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John A. Reed, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 776-1627.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket No. 95-19, adopted February 7, 1995, and released February 7, 1995. The complete text of this Notice of Proposed Rule Making is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington,