

specifies silica gel. Silica gel is more effective, reliable and economical.

Other possible changes. The Commission is considering several other possible changes. For example, the Commission is considering some changes to the organization of the standard to consolidate it and make it easier to understand. The Commission is also considering: Specifying that tape can be used to secure specimens in the specimen holder; specifying the purpose of brushing specimens and when replacing the brush is necessary; specifying the details of specimen conditioning; and requiring only the type of laundering/drycleaning specified on a garment's care label. The Commission is also considering clarifying and amending regulations concerning fabrics exempted from testing for guaranties. See 16 CFR 1610.37(d).

4. Existing Relevant Standards

The Commission staff conducted a review to find other relevant textile standards. The staff found three relevant standards with modern dry cleaning methods and/or laundering methods.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D 1230-94, Standard Test Method for Flammability of Apparel Textiles. This voluntary standard provides methods for testing and evaluating the flammability of textile fabrics used as apparel in both original state condition and after refurbishment. The standard specifies two dry cleaning options. However, only one—any commercial dry cleaning operation in a closed environment for one cycle—is still available. After the fabric is dry cleaned, it is laundered using home-type washing and drying machines. The standard refers to the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists (AATCC) Test Method 135 entitled Dimensional Changes in Automatic Home Laundering of Woven and Knit Fabrics. This voluntary standard specifies the type of detergent, washing and drying conditions and washer and dryer specifications. An analysis of the laboratory test data from an ASTM interlaboratory round robin conducted in 1991 indicates that for specimens subjected to ASTM D 1230 (both dry cleaning and machine laundering followed by tumble drying procedures specified in AATCC Test Method 135), this flammability test was as stringent or more stringent than the refurbishing procedure in 16 CFR part 1610.

British Standards Institution ("BSI") BS EN ISO 3175: 1996 Textile—Evaluation of Stability to Machine Drycleaning. The purpose of this

standard is to determine whether normal to very sensitive fabrics can be dry cleaned by examining dimensional changes after three to five cleaning treatments. It uses a commercial dry cleaning machine containing perchloroethylene and a detergent followed by some form of steam treatment and/or hot pressing (a lesser drying temperature or line drying is used for fabrics containing heat sensitive fibers). This standard uses a modern procedure, a commercial dry cleaning machine, but such a machine would not necessarily be available in the U.S. and would have to have appropriate environmental controls installed. The standard does not have a laundering procedure.

Canadian General Standards Board ("CGSB") CAN/CGSB-4.2 No. 30.3-94, Procedure for the Removal of Non-permanent Flame-retardant Treatments from Textile Products. The purpose of this dry cleaning and laundering standard is to test fabrics for the presence of nonpermanent flame-retardant treatments applied to textile products. The procedures specify that the fabric should be initially dry cleaned in either a coin-operated perchloroethylene dry cleaning machine or in any commercial dry cleaning operation. This is followed by laundering in a domestic-type washing machine using neutral chip soap and dried according to the care instructions provided by the fabric manufacturer. One dry cleaning and one laundering cycle are recommended. The washing machine specified in this standard is not currently available in the U.S.

5. Invitations to Comment

In accordance with section 4(g) of the FFA, the Commission invites comments on this notice, specifically:

1. Comments concerning the risk of injury identified in this notice, the regulatory alternatives discussed above, and other alternatives to address the risk of injury;

2. an existing standard or portion of a standard as a proposed rule;

3. a statement of intention to modify or develop a voluntary standard to address the risk of injury identified in the notice along with a description of a plan to modify or develop the standard.

In addition, the Commission is interested in obtaining further information and comments about the possible changes to the clothing flammability standard discussed above, such as:

1. Modernizing the flammability tester;

2. updating the prescribed dry cleaning method;

3. updating the laundering method described in the standard;

4. revising or clarifying confusing test procedures;

5. developing standardized language for interpreting and reporting test results;

6. reorganizing some text of the rule for clarity; and

7. clarifying or amending the exemptions from the requirements for testing to support guaranties at 1610.37(d).

Dated: September 9, 2002.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

List of Relevant Documents

1. Briefing memorandum from Jacqueline Elder, Acting Assistant Executive Director, EXHR and Margaret Neily, Project Manager, Directorate for Engineering Sciences, to the Commission, "Amending the Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles, 16 CFR 1610," May 29, 2002.

2. Memorandum from Weiying Tao, Division of Electrical Engineering, to Margaret Neily, Project Manager, "Amending the Flammability Tester Specifications, the Dry Cleaning and Washing Procedures of the CPSC Flammability Regulations in 16 CFR 1610," February 28, 2002.

3. Memorandum from Weiying Tao, Division of Electrical Engineering, to Margaret Neily, Project Manager, "Alternate Dry Cleaning and Washing Requirements of Apparel Specified in Standards Other than 16 CFR Part 1610 Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles," March 1, 2002.

4. Memorandum from Weiying Tao, (previously) on detail to ESME, to Margaret Neily, Project Manager, "Proposed Revisions for the Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles," March 25, 2002.

[FR Doc. 02-23273 Filed 9-11-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD05-02-054]

RIN 2115-AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Manasquan River, NJ

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the regulations that govern the operation of the Route 70 Bridge across the Manasquan River. The proposed rule would limit the required openings of the draw year-round from 7 a.m. to

11 p.m. to once an hour with no openings required from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays. This change would reduce traffic delays while still providing for the reasonable needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before November 12, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments and related material to Commander (Aowb), Fifth Coast Guard District, Federal Building, 4th Floor, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004, or they may be hand delivered to the same address between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. The telephone number is (757) 398-6222. Commander (Aowb), Fifth Coast Guard District maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the above address between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann B. Deaton, Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, at (757) 398-6222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related material. If you do so, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this rulemaking (CGD05-02-054), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and related material in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying. If you would like to know they reached us, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for a meeting by writing to the Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District, at the address under **ADDRESSES** explaining why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Background and Purpose

The S70 Bridge is a movable bridge (single-leaf bascule) owned and operated by the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) connecting the Borough of Point Pleasant and Brick Township in Ocean County with Brielle Borough and Wall Township in Monmouth County. Currently, 33 CFR 117.727 requires the draw of the S70 bridge, mile 3.4 at Riviera Beach, to open on signal from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. The draw need not be opened from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. In the closed position to vessels, the bridge has a vertical navigation clearance of 15 feet at mean high water.

On behalf of residents and business owners in the area, NJDOT has requested to change the existing regulations for the S70 Bridge in an effort to balance the needs of mariners and vehicle drivers transiting in and around this seaside resort area. Route 70 is a principal arterial highway that serves as a major evacuation route in the event of tidal emergencies. Bridge openings at peak traffic hours during the tourist season often cause considerable vehicular traffic congestion while accommodating relatively few vessels. To ease traffic congestion, NJDOT has requested that the bridge operating schedule be changed. A review of NJDOT yearly drawbridge logs for 1999, 2000, and 2001, show that the bridge opened for vessels 1028, 1026, and 1020 times, respectively. However, during the peak boating season from May through September, the logs reveal from 1999 to 2001, the bridge opened 750, 792 and 794 times, respectively. With an average of only five openings per day during the peak boating season, NJDOT contends that the effect of the proposed change on vessel traffic through the bridge would be. Also, NJDOT officials, residents and business owners point out that from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays, vehicular traffic congestion is at its peak. During the peak boating season from May through September, the logs reveal from 1999 to 2001, the bridge opened from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays 36, 35, and 26 times, respectively. Limiting the openings of the draw year-round from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. to once an hour and no openings required from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays would enhance vehicular traffic without significantly affecting vessel traffic.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to amend § 117.727, which governs the S70 Bridge. The draw currently opens on signal from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. and need not be opened from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m.

The current regulation would be changed to state that the draw of Route 70 Bridge, mile 3.4 at Riviera Beach, need open on signal only on the hour; except that from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. and on Fridays from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m., the draw need not be opened.

The proposed rule would also change the name of the bridge from “S70” to “Route 70.” The name change will accurately reflect the name of this bridge.

Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it 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).

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary.

We reached this conclusion based on the fact that the proposed changes have only a minimal impact on maritime traffic transiting the bridge. Mariners can plan their transits in accordance with the scheduled bridge openings, to further minimize delay.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the rule only adds minimal restrictions to the movement of navigation, and mariners who plan their transits in accordance with the scheduled bridge openings can minimize delay.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental

jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Ann B. Deaton, Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, (757) 398–6222.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of

Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

To help the Coast Guard establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Indian and Alaskan Native tribes, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 36361, July 11, 2001) requesting comments on how to best carry out the Order. We invite your comments on how this proposed rule might impact tribal governments, even if that impact may not constitute a “tribal implication” under the Order.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. It has not been designated by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Environment

We have considered the environmental impact of this proposed rule and concluded that, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, this rule is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation. A “Categorical Exclusion Determination”

is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed 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 authority of Pub.L. 102–587, 106 Stat. 5039.

2. Section 117.727 is revised to read as follows:

§ 117.727 Manasquan River.

The draw of the Route 70 Bridge, mile 3.4, at Riviera Beach, shall open on signal on the hour; except that from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Fridays and from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. daily, the draw need not be opened.

Dated: August 26, 2002.

Arthur E. Brooks,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 02–23115 Filed 9–11–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[UT–001–0021b, UT–001–0041b; FRL–7264–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program; Utah County

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan revision submitted by the Governor of Utah on December 7, 2001. This SIP submittal consists of a revision to Utah’s rule R307–110–34 and section X, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program, Part D, Utah County. This SIP submittal satisfies one of the conditions of EPA’s June 9, 1997 interim approval of Utah County’s improved vehicle I/M program SIP. The other condition of EPA’s interim approval was submittal of a demonstration that Utah County’s decentralized I/M program can obtain the same emission reduction credits as a centralized I/M program. The State