

Operating Permits Section, EPA Region IX.)

NDEP has informed EPA that it intends to obtain the regulatory authority necessary to accept delegation of section 112 standards (existing and future) by incorporating section 112 standards into the Nevada Administrative Code by reference to the federal regulations. The details of this delegation mechanism will be set forth in an Implementation Agreement between NDEP and EPA.

### III. Administrative Requirements

#### A. Request for Public Comments

The EPA is requesting comments on all aspects of this proposed interim approval. Copies of NDEP's submittal and other information relied upon for the proposed interim approval are contained in a docket maintained at the EPA Regional Office. The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information submitted to, or otherwise considered by, EPA in the development of this proposed interim approval. The principal purposes of the docket are:

(1) to allow interested parties a means to identify and locate documents so that they can effectively participate in the approval process, and

(2) to serve as the record in case of judicial review. The EPA will consider any comments received by September 6, 1995.

#### B. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this action from Executive Order 12866 review.

#### C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The EPA's actions under section 502 of the Act do not create any new requirements, but simply address operating permits programs submitted to satisfy the requirements of 40 CFR part 70. Because this action does not impose any new requirements, it does not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### D. Unfunded Mandates Act

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under Section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with

statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the proposed approval action promulgated today does not include a federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This federal action approves pre-existing requirements under state law, and imposes no new federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to state, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 70

Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Intergovernmental relations, Operating permits, and Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: July 28, 1995.

**Nora L. McGee,**

*Acting Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 95-19402 Filed 8-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### 40 CFR Parts 433, 438 and 464

[FRL-5271-9]

RIN 2040-AB79

#### Comment Period Extension on Proposed Rulemaking for the Metal Products and Machinery Phase I Point Source Category

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of comment period extension.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing an extension of the comment period for the proposed regulations. The proposed pretreatment standards and effluent limitations guidelines were published in the **Federal Register** on May 30, 1995 (60 FR 28210).

**DATES:** The original date for submission of written comments on the proposed regulations was August 28, 1995. This date is being changed to October 27, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be submitted to Mr. Steven Geil at U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by mail at U.S. EPA, Engineering and Analysis Division (Mail Code 4303),

Office of Science and Technology, 401 M. Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Geil, (202) 260-9817.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The extended comment period for the proposed rulemaking now ends on October 27, 1995. All written comments submitted in accordance with the instructions in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be incorporated into the Record and considered before promulgation of the final rule.

Dated: July 28, 1995.

**Robert Perciasepe,**

*Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.*

[FR Doc. 95-19252 Filed 8-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

#### 46 CFR Parts 12 and 16

[CGD 93-051]

#### Proof of Commitment To Employ Aboard U.S. Merchant Vessels

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is scheduling a public meeting to discuss proof of commitment to employ aboard U.S. merchant vessels. The purpose of the meeting is to receive feedback on how the elimination of the letter of commitment is affecting the maritime industry. Until June 1994, a letter of commitment (proof of commitment) for employment aboard a U.S. merchant vessel was required for an applicant to receive an original, entry level merchant mariner's document to ensure that the applicant intended to work in the maritime industry. With no other criteria to obtain a merchant mariner's document, the Coast Guard determined in 1937 that the letter of commitment was necessary to deter persons from obtaining the card for identification purposes only. In recent years the Coast Guard recognized that the letter of commitment placed the mariner in the awkward situation of being told by a company or union that they could not work without a merchant mariner's document, sending the applicant to the Coast Guard for the document, and the Coast Guard could not issue the document without the company or union issuing a letter of commitment. With the advent of user fees and chemical testing requirements to obtain a merchant mariner's document, the