

the Escanaba VORTAC 101 radial, extending from the 4.2-mile radius to 7.4 miles east, and within 2.6 miles each side of the Escanaba VORTAC 266 radial extending from the 4.2-mile radius to 7 miles west of the VORTAC.

* * * * *

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on May 6, 1996.

Maureen Woods,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division.

[FR Doc. 96-13421 Filed 5-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 67

[CGD 95-052]

RIN 2115-AF15

Testing of Obstruction Lights and Fog Signals on Offshore Facilities

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of termination and withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This rulemaking project was initiated as part of the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative (PRRI). It was intended to improve the quality of tests performed on obstruction lights and fog signals, while reducing the administrative burden on the public, and minimizing costs borne by the Coast Guard. Comments to the rulemaking raised several substantial issues which require further study. Therefore, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 95-052.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Chad Asplund, Project Manager, Short Range Aids to navigation Division, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, (202) 267-1386.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 10, 1996, the Coast Guard published a notice requesting comments in the Federal Register (61 FR 708). The notice asked (1) whether the flash characteristics of obstruction lights should be changed from a quick-flashing rhythm to a Morse "U"; (2) whether the candlepower requirements on obstruction lighting should be adapted to the new transmissivity tables developed by the Coast Guard; and (3) whether lights and fog signals should be tested independent laboratories rather than by the Coast Guard.

On March 27, 1996, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the Federal Register (61 FR 13472). The Coast Guard proposed a new rule on only one of the three issues investigated in the notice,

specifically, that lights and fog signals would be tested by independent laboratories rather than by the Coast Guard.

The NPRM's approach was in keeping with the goals of the PRRI to make government work better and cost less by finding ways to reduce financial and regulatory burdens on industry while improving governmental efficiency. It proposed to achieve this by (1) consolidating permit applications in headquarters rather than requiring an application to each Coast Guard district; and (2) having independent laboratories test all devices and submit the results to the Coast Guard rather than requiring Coast Guard involvement in the testing of lights or fog signals. In spite of the Coast Guard's intent to reduce burdens, comments indicated that the NPRM, as proposed, was too general to accomplish either the project's goals or the goals of PRRI.

Specifically, comments questioned how independent laboratories would be designated or certified by the Coast Guard, and what standards would be used by the independent laboratories in evaluating lights and fog signals. Comments also expressed concern over the timetable for implementation, with several pointing out that retrofitting all existing structures would impose a high cost on the regulated community without providing any proven reduction in risk.

The Coast Guard has determined that the concerns raised by the comments to this docket require further examination of this area before any rulemaking is undertaken. The Coast Guard seeks to promulgate rules that will improve maritime safety while accomplishing PRRI goals. Because the current rulemaking may do neither, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 95-052 but will continue to investigate the feasibility of implementing these concepts in the future.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

Rudy K. Peschel,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services.

[FR Doc. 96-13419 Filed 5-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 141 and 142

[WH-FRL-5511-6]

Drinking Water; National Primary Drinking Water Regulations; Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Requirements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Announcement of extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is announcing an extension of the public comment period for the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) for the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Regulations (ESWTR) (59 FR 38832, July 29, 1994). The NPDWR consists of a set of regulatory options related to treatment techniques for microbiological pathogens. The NPDWR also includes proposed monitoring, reporting, and public notification requirements for these compounds. The comment period is being extended from May 30, 1996 until August 30, 1996.

DATES: Comments should be postmarked or delivered by hand on or before August 30, 1996. Comments received after this date may not be considered.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to the ESWTR Docket Clerk, Water Docket (MC-4101); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, or hand deliver to the Water Docket, Room 2616, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC.

The proposed rule with supporting documents and all comments received are available for review at the Water Docket at the address above. For access to Docket materials, call (202) 260-3027 between 9 am and 3:30 pm for an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: General information may be obtained from the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, telephone (800) 426-4791; Stig Regli, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4603), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260-7379; or Paul Berger, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4603), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260-3039.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 29, 1994 EPA proposed two drinking water regulations: the Disinfectant/Disinfection Byproducts (D/DBP) and

Enhanced Surface Water Treatment (ESWTR) rules. These proposals were the product of a negotiated rulemaking. The negotiators included State and local health and regulatory agency staff and elected officials, consumer groups, environmental groups, and representatives of public water systems.

The group agreed to propose a disinfectant/disinfection byproduct rule to extend coverage to all community and non-transient, non-community water systems that use disinfectants, reduce the current total trihalomethane (TTHM) maximum contaminant level (MCL), regulate additional disinfection byproducts, set limits for the use of disinfectants, and reduce the level of compounds that may react with disinfectants to form byproducts. The group further agreed that revisions to the current Surface Water Treatment Rule might be required at the same time to ensure that microbial risk is not increased as byproduct rules go into effect, and to provide explicit control of *Cryptosporidium*. As a result, the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule was proposed with a number of options for microbial control, including the option to simply retain the requirements of the current Surface Water Treatment Rule. Data being collected through a separate Information Collection Rule (May 14, 1996, 61 FR 24354) and a research program will be used to identify the appropriate option.

The comment period for submission of formal written comments in response to the D/DBPR rule closed on December 29, 1994. The comment period for formal written comments in response to the ESWTR rule was listed in the proposed rule as closing on May 30, 1996. The reason a longer time was allowed for comments on the ESWTR was to allow time for the public to consider data being collected under the Information Collection Rule and the research program prior to that date. Due to delays in the initiation of data collection, the May 30, 1996 date no longer allows commenters time to consider the results of any of those data.

The Agency believes it would be useful to allow the public additional time in which to review the final Information Collection Rule and provide comments on its implications for the ESWTR. The Agency would also like to obtain comments on the ESWTR which are independent of the collection of subsequent data so that analysis of those comments may begin on a timely basis. An extension until August 30, 1996 in essence gives commenters 90 days to file those comments. Once at least eight months of data collected under the Information Collection Rule have been

collected and analyzed, the Agency will issue a Notice of Availability providing its analysis of the data and its recommendation for the appropriate regulatory option for the ESWTR. At that time, the Agency will reopen the public comment period for the ESWTR so that commenters can consider the data and EPA's analysis.

Please submit any references cited in your comments. EPA would appreciate an original and three copies of your comments and enclosures (including references). Commenters who want EPA to acknowledge receipt of their comments should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope. No facsimiles (faxes) will be accepted because EPA cannot ensure that they will be submitted to the Water Docket. To ensure that EPA can read, understand and therefore properly respond to comments, the Agency would prefer that commenters type or print comments in ink, and cite, where possible, the paragraph(s) in the proposed regulation (eg., 141.76(b)) to which each comment refers. Commenters should use a separate paragraph for each method or issue discussed.

Dated: May 21, 1996.

Robert Perciasepe,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96-13435 Filed 5-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 180

[OPP-300415A; FRL-5370-1]

RIN 2070-AC18

Proposed Revocation of Tolerances; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is extending until July 30, 1996, the comment period for a proposed rule that was published in the Federal Register of March 1, 1996 that proposed the revocation of 41 section 408 tolerances established under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) for 22 chemicals. The original comment period on the proposal ends on May 30, 1996, but because of the unavailability of certain documents in the docket and the Dicofoil Task Force's intentions to submit additional data, the comment period is being extended.

DATES: Written comments, identified by the docket number [OPP-300415A], must be received on or before July 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response Section, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202. Information submitted as a comment concerning this document may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as "Confidential Business Information" (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the Virginia address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number, [OPP-300415A]. No CBI should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic comments on this proposed rule may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found below in this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Niloufar Nazmi, Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. WF32C5, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-308-8028; e-mail: nazmi.niloufar@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Federal Register of March 1, 1996, (61 FR 8173), EPA issued a proposed rule proposing the revocation of 9 tolerances, and announcing its decision whether 41 section 408 tolerances for 22 pesticides should be revoked under EPA's policy concerning the coordination of its authorities under sections 408 and 409 of the FFDCA.