TABLE 2—SCREENING ANALYSIS—SUMMARY OF COSTS

Baseline tanker model	Measure	New total cargo oil	Cargo oil shut-out		One-time refit (ROM) costs (M$)	Opportunity costs per year	
		(Bbls) (cu.m.)	(Bbls) (cu.m)	% Initial		International	U.S. coastal
70,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL ...	1.a. PL/Spaces, 30% coverage.	523,444 83,221	7,072 1,124	1.3	1.9	$6,402,000	$9,918,000
70,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL ...	1.b. PL/SBT, 30% coverage, with ballast to max. feasible draft.	470,283 74,769	60,233 9,576	11.4	0.5	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL ...	1.c. PL/CBT, 30% coverage, empty to extent feasible.	470,283 74,769	60,233 9,576	11.4	0.2	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, MARPOL '73	2.a. HBL all tanks	389,854 61,982	153,655 24,429	28.3	0	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, MARPOL '73	2.b. HBL, equivalent to Regulation 13G.	477,892 75,979	65,617 10,432	12.1	0	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL ...	3. PL/Spaces as in 1.c. and HBL as in 2.b.	443,948 70,582	86,567 13,763	16.3	0.2	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, MARPOL '73	4. Retrofit double bottom ...	484,209 76,983	59,300 9,428	10.9	9.7	6,402,000	9,918,000
70,000 dwt, MARPOL '73	5. Retrofit double sides	502,573 79,903	40,936 6,508	7.5	13.6	6,402,000	9,918,000
12,700 dwt, Tank Barge	6. PL/Spaces (install bulkheads).	237,072 37,691	12,844 2,042	5.1	2.8	(*)	(*)
12,700 dwt, Tank Barge	7. PL/Spaces using existing cargo tanks.	207,712 33,204	42,203 6,710	16.9	0.3	(*)	(*)
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	1.a. PL/Spaces, 30% coverage.	2,031,370 322,962	46,597 7,408	2.2	12.4	$11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	1.b. PL/SBT, 30% coverage, with ballast to max. feasible draft.	1,657,648 263,545	420,319 66,825	20.2	1.8	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	1.c. PL/CBT, 30% coverage, empty to extent feasible.	1,657,648 263,545	420,319 66,825	20.2	0.4	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, MARPOL '73 ..	2.a. HBL all tanks	1,134,047 180,299	932,159 148,201	45.1	0	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, MARPOL '73 ..	2.b. HBL, equivalent to Regulation 13G.	1,495,725 237,801	570,481 90,699	27.6	0	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	3. PL/Spaces as in 1.c	1,425,814 226,686	652,153 103,684	31.4	0.4	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	4. Retrofit double bottom ...	1,929,181 306,715	148,786 23,655	7.2	26.6	11,279,000	12,143,000
264,000 dwt, Pre-MARPOL .	5. Retrofit double sides	1,921,087 305,428	156,880 24,942	7.5	39.9	11,279,000	12,143,000
31,000 dwt, Tank Barge	6. PL/Spaces (install bulkheads).	97,015 15,424	6,483 1,031	6.3	1.4	(*)	(*)
31,000 dwt, Tank Barge	7. PL/Spaces using existing cargo tanks.	68,281 10,856	35,217 5,599	34	0.2	(*)	(*)

*Opportunity costs were not calculated for tank barges. However, if the opportunity costs for tank vessels were extrapolated to apply to tank barges and required shipyard time is accounted for, tank barge opportunity costs would range from $2,506,000 to $5,859,000.

[FR Doc. 96–3685 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FL–59–1–6928b; FRL–5400–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Florida: Title V, Section 507, Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Assistance Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted on August 12, 1994, by the State of Florida for the purpose of including the Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Assistance Program into the Florida Administrative Code, Chapters 17–202.100 through 17.202.400. In the final rules section of this Federal Register, the 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 that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed 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. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: To be considered, comments must be received by March 22, 1996.

ADDRESS: Written comments should be addressed to: Ms. Kimberly Bingham, Regulatory Planning and Development Section, Air Programs Branch, Air, Pesticides & Toxics Management Division, Region 4 Environmental Protection Agency, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

Copies of the material submitted by the State of Georgia may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (Air Docket 6102), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 Air Programs Branch, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Twin Towers Office Building, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, Florida 32399–2400.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Kimberly Bingham, Regulatory Planning and Development Section, Air Programs Branch, Air, Pesticides & Toxics Management Division, Region 4 Environmental Protection Agency, 345 Courtland Street, NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30365. The telephone number is 404/347–3555 ext. 4195.

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

Dated: December 11, 1995.

Patrick M. Tobin,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–3791 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 52

[MI37–01–6713b; FRL–5422–6]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Michigan; Site-Specific SIP Revision for the Enamalum Corporation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposed to approve a revision to the Michigan State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone that was submitted on August 26, 1994. This revision is a site-specific SIP revision that determines the appropriate reasonably available control technology (RACT) level for volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from the Enamalum Corporation Novi, Michigan facility. This proposed approval of the site-specific SIP revision, submitted by the State of Michigan, would allow for a limit higher than that found in the control technology guidance (CTG) document for this source category. This proposed approval is based upon the argument that the Enamalum Corporation facility cannot afford the controls normally required by the State's RACT rule. In the final rules of this Federal Register, the EPA is approving this action as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. 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 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. The EPA 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 action must be received by March 22, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Toxics and Radiation Branch (AT–18J), EPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas Aburano at (312) 353–6960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the Direct Final Rule which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register. Copies of the request and the EPA's analysis are available for inspection at the following address: (Please telephone Douglas Aburano at (312) 353–6960 before visiting the Region 5 office.) EPA, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: February 2, 1996.

Michelle D. Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–3792 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 186

[OPP–300397A; FRL–5348–8]

RIN 2070–AC18

Proposed Revocation of Feed Additive Regulations; Reopening and Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; Reopening and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is reopening and extending until (insert date 45 days after publication in the Federal Register), the comment period for a proposed rule that was published in the Federal Register of September 21, 1995 (60 FR 49141) that proposed the revocation of certain section 409 feed additive regulations established under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) for 16 chemicals. The original comment period on the proposal closed on December 19, 1995, but because of the unavailability of certain documents in the docket, the comment period is being extended.

DATES: Written comments, identified by the document control number [OPP–300397A], must be received on or before April 8, 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