

50 feet to 100 feet from existing structures.

(c) Equipment shelter—DGPS transmitting equipment will be housed in existing equipment facilities with the possible exception of Fort Macon, NC, which may require upgrading the structure to hold the additional electronic equipment.

(d) Utilities—The Coast Guard proposes to use available commercial power as the primary source for the electronic equipment. A telephone line will be required at each site to allow for remote monitoring and operation.

#### Description of Each Site

Charleston, SC—The site is co-located at the Charleston Light Station, which is on Sullivans island.

Cape Canaveral, FL—Located approximately 10 miles Northeast of Cocoa Beach on the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station.

Miami, FL—Located approximately 12 miles Northeast of Coral Gables on the Virginia Key island.

Cape Henry, VA—This site is located on the Fort Story Military Reservation, which is adjacent to the Cape Henry Light. The light is listed on the National Register. The Coast Guard and VA SHPO agree the proposed project will have no adverse effect on the historic property. The radiobeacon equipment has already been partially upgraded and is transmitting prototype DGPS signals for test and evaluation purposes.

Fort Macon, NC—The site is co-located at the USCG Base Fort Macon, which is near the historic Fort Macon. The Coast Guard and NC SHPO agree that the proposed project will have no adverse effect on the historic property.

Implementation of a DGPS service in the Atlantic Intercoastal Regional is determined to have no significant effect on the quality of the human environment or require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Dated: January 19, 1995.

#### G.A. Penington,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Chief, Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services.  
[FR Doc. 95-2093 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

#### [CGD 95-006]

#### Discontinuance of Coast Guard High Frequency Morse Radiotelegraphy Services

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Coast guard intends to discontinue all high frequency Morse

(HFCW) radiotelegraph services. More effective means of communication are now in use, and vessels in maritime areas over which the United States exercises responsibility for search and rescue no longer rely on HFCW radiotelegraphy as a primary means of communication.

DATES: All Coast Guard HFCW radiotelegraphy services will be discontinued on April 1, 1995.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Adolph Keyes, Chief, Telecommunications Policy Section (G-TTM), Office of Command, Control and Communication, U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001, telephone (202) 267-6598, telefax (202) 267-4617, or telex 892427 (COASTGUARD WASH). Normal office hours are between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. (EST), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Since 1959, the Coast Guard has used high frequency Morse radiotelegraphy (HFCW) to communicate with government and merchant ships, primarily to broadcast safety, warnings and navigation information, receive position and meteorological reports from ships, and to communicate with ships at sea reporting a distress alert or medical or vessel emergency.

The Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) amendments to the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention were adopted in 1988 and initial provisions entered into force in February, 1992. GMDSS methods provide the mariner with improved means for initiating or relaying distress alerts, and receiving safety information pertinent to its area of operation. Components of the GMDSS now available include navigational telex (NAVTEX), simplex teletype over radio (SITOR), emergency position indicating radio beacons (EPIRB), search and rescue radar transponders (SARTS) and International Maritime Satellite (INMARSAT). NAVTEX, SITOR and INMARSAT's SafetyNet provide the mariner with the same components of information the Coast Guard currently broadcasts over high frequency Morse (HFCW) radiotelegraphy. Government and merchant vessels no longer rely on high frequency Morse (HFCW) radiotelegraphy as their primary means of safety radiocommunications when operating within maritime areas, where the United States exercises responsibility for search and rescue and navigational safety.

U.S. commercial coast radio stations provide adequate radio frequency and time of day coverage of maritime areas

to ensure a high probability of reception of distress and safety alerts. Provisions exist under the Communications Act for prompt processing of distress and safety messages and forwarding to the appropriate U.S. Coast Guard rescue coordination center.

The U.S. Coast guard will continue to provide HF SITOR service from Communication Stations Kodiak (NOJ), Honolulu (NMO), and Guam (NRV), and Communications Area Master Stations San Francisco (NMC) and Portsmouth (NMN). Additionally, government and merchant vessels can contact designated commercial coast radio stations on HFCW to pass safety, medical emergency and Automated-Mutual Assistance Vessel Rescue (AMVER) reports to the Coast Guard at no cost to the originator. More information concerning Coast Guard distress and safety radio circuits can be obtained from the Coast Guard Navigation Information Service computer bulletin board, accessible by modem at (703) 313-5910, or by Internet from "Telnet fedworld.gov".

The Coast Guard believes the current implemented provisions of GMDSS and commercial coast radio station operating Morse telegraphy services (HFCW) within the high frequency bands are sufficient to ensure distress and safety communication services. Therefore, effective 1 April 1995, the Coast Guard proposes to cease all high frequency Morse (HFCW) radiotelegraphy services currently operated from Coast Guard Communication Stations Kodiak, Honolulu, and Guam, and Communications Area Master Stations San Francisco and Portsmouth.

Dated: January 13, 1995.

#### D.E. Ciancaglini,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Command, Control and Communications.  
[FR Doc. 95-2092 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

#### [CGD 95-005]

#### Area To Be Avoided Off the Washington Coast

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard will conduct a public meeting to obtain information on whether the applicability of an area to be avoided (ATBA) off the Washington Coast should be expanded to include vessels and barges other than those carrying cargoes of oil or hazardous materials.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held February 23, 1995, from 9:00 a.m. until the last speaker is heard. Written comments must be received not later than March 3, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in the North Auditorium on the fourth floor of the Federal Building, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98174. Written comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G-LRA), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street SW, Washington, DC 20593-0001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, Coast Guard Headquarters, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday, through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Margie G. Hegy, Project Manager, Vessel Traffic Services Division, phone (202) 267-0415. This telephone is equipped to take messages on a 24-hour basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** An ATBA is a defined area that all ships or certain classes of ships are encouraged to avoid because navigation is particularly hazardous or it is exceptionally important to avoid casualties within the area. On December 7, 1994, the Maritime Safety Committee of the International Maritime Organization adopted an ATBA proposed by the U.S. off the Washington coast in the vicinity of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. The ATBA will go into effect on June 7, 1995.

In order to reduce the risk of marine casualty and resulting pollution and damage to the environment of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, all vessels, including barges, carrying cargoes classified by the United States as hazardous materials (e.g., oil or chemicals) should avoid the area bounded by a line connecting the following points:

Latitude	Longitude
(1) 48°23.3'N .....	124°38.2' W
(2) 48°23.5'N .....	124°38.2' W
(3) 48°25.3'N .....	124°46.9' W
(4) 47°51.7'N .....	125°15.5' W
(5) 47°07.7'N .....	124°47.5' W
(6) 47°07.7'N .....	124°11.0' W

Because of concerns raised shortly before IMO considered the U.S. proposal, the U.S. delegation informed the Committee that the issue of spending this ATBA to include other categories of commercial vessels would

be considered further at the national level and, if appropriate, an amendment would be submitted for IMO consideration. This meeting will give the public an opportunity to provide information and documentation as we reconsider this issue.

In addition to information you wish to provide, the Coast Guard is also interested in your response to the following questions:

1. What interest or industry group do you represent?
2. If an Agent, do you represent U.S. or foreign flag vessels?
3. Do you currently own, operate, or charter commercial vessels that have occasion to operate within the Marine Sanctuary? If yes, please describe number, type, length, gross tons, amounts of bunker fuel carried, and type/quantity of cargo.
4. What measure (e.g., length, gross tonnage, barrels of product and/or bunker carried) do you recommend be used to establish applicability for the ATBA? Why?
5. Are there products/cargo other than petroleum that should be included in the applicability? If so, why and how should they be classified/identified? What threat do they pose to the sanctuary resources?
6. It has been suggested that the applicability of the ATBA be expanded to include all vessels greater than 500 gross tons regardless of the quantity or type of cargo carried. What impact (e.g., economic, extra steaming time, safety) would this have on your business/industry?
7. If you have a specific proposal to expand the applicability, quantify the benefit to the environment that would result. What is your proposal based on? Why should these vessels be included?
8. How many vessels (or vessel transits) per year are potentially affected by the current ATBA applicability? How many by expanding the applicability to include the vessels as suggested in number 6 or 7 above?
9. Prior to creation of the ATBA, where have your vessels historically transited during coastal transits (i.e., how many miles offshore)? If you call on a coastal port within the Sanctuary, describe your approach/ track line to the port.
10. Are there industry or company policies which establish vessel routes? If so, what are they?

Attendance is open to the public. With advance notice, and as time permits, members of the public may make oral presentations during the meeting. Persons wishing to make oral

presentations should notify the person listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** no later than two days before the meeting. Written material may be submitted prior to, during, or after the meeting.

Dated: January 23, 1995.

**G.A. Penington,**

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

[FR Doc. 95-2091 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-14-M**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

[Docket No. 94-93; Notice 2]

**Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 260E Passenger Cars are Eligible for Importation**

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 1992 Mercedes-Benz 260E passenger cars are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 1992 Mercedes-Benz 260E passenger cars not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they are substantially similar to a vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards (the 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E), and they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The decision is effective on January 27, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ted Bayler, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5306).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** 1992 Mercedes-Benz 300E.

**Background**

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115 (formerly section 114 of the Act), and of the same model year as the