

written comments was May 1, 1995. On April 5, 1995 the Coast Guard published a second notice in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 17287) announcing a series of regional public meetings to be held on the same topics. The deadline for written comments in this notice was June 5, 1995.

At the April 20, 1995 public meeting and in written comments to the docket, several commentors requested an extension of the May 1, 1995 comment period. The issues discussed in the notice and at the public meeting are important and require careful thought and evaluation. Since the regulatory reform initiative is an ongoing process, a longer comment period can be accommodated. In addition to receiving comments on the regulatory policy announced in this notice, comments on the issues raised in the two prior notices may be submitted. To provide maximum value on this notice, comments should be received by December 8, 1995. However, late comments will be accepted and evaluated to the extent practicable.

In response to the **Federal Register** notice and public meetings, the Coast Guard has received and is still receiving comments suggesting specific regulations for review and identifying reasons why those regulations should be either amended or eliminated. The Coast Guard will fully evaluate each suggestion and may initiate appropriate rulemaking projects at a later date. However, the Coast Guard has already made a preliminary determination to proceed immediately with at least two regulatory reinvention initiatives. The first is to purge the Code of Federal Regulations of obsolete and out-of-date regulations. A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) proposing a wide range of rescissions was published in the **Federal Register** of May 9, 1995 (60 FR 24748). This first set of obsolete and out-of-date regulations has minimal impact on the public and no controversy or objection is expected. Additional obsolete and out-of-date regulations will be proposed for elimination or revision in later rulemaking documents.

Second, the Coast Guard has established a goal of eliminating any Coast Guard induced differential between requirements that apply to U.S. vessels in international trade and those that apply to similar vessels in international trade that fly the flag of responsible foreign nations. The Coast Guard will carefully evaluate every existing and newly proposed regulation. To the maximum extent possible, requirements that create an unwarranted differential between U.S. and responsible international standards will

be eliminated. There are several new rulemaking projects under development that reflect this new Coast Guard policy.

The U.S. maritime industry conducted several studies, some of which indicated that industry competitiveness has been adversely impacted by the cost differential between building a vessel to U.S. standards and building it to some foreign standards. The industry reported that differential was from 0% to 15% of the total construction cost. However, all of these industry studies were conducted prior to implementation of the 1981 and 1983 amendments to the 1974 Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Convention. The Convention and its amendments have greatly reduced the gap between U.S. and international standards.

The U.S. has sometimes unilaterally adopted more stringent standards than the international regulations promulgated by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), a specialized agency of the United Nations. A Maritime Administration sponsored study conducted in 1979 reported that the portion of the total construction cost differential directly attributable to discretionary requirements imposed by the Coast Guard was less than one-half of one percent. However, even a one-half of one percent differential in construction costs should be avoided if it does not result in needed additional safety or environmental protection.

In the past, international standards were in large part inadequate or nonexistent which required the United States to adopt high quality standards of its own. This situation has changed in recent years. Great strides have been taken by the responsible members of the international community to adopt standards that provide levels of safety and environmental protection that are generally equivalent to U.S. standards. The IMO has adopted a wide range of safety and environmental protection requirements that parallel many of the standards that apply to U.S. vessels. However, the IMO requirements are in some cases general in nature and need amplifying national regulations. In addition, IMO requirements do not constitute a complete ship construction standard. They must be used together with classification society standards and flag state requirements. Responsible foreign flag states and classification societies now have standards that are equivalent to U.S. standards. Because these responsible flag states and classification societies now assure high levels of protection, it is no longer desirable for the United States to apply

different requirements to U.D. vessels. Accordingly, in cooperation with the American Bureau of Shipping, the Coast Guard has identified various U.S. regulations that differ from the best international standards. The Coast Guard is now carefully evaluating each of those regulations to determine if it makes necessary additional safety or environmental protection contributions. Those regulations that do not provide necessary added levels of protection will be proposed for elimination.

Because of the global nature of maritime commerce, it is seldom effective for an individual nation to require substantially different standards for its vessels engaged in international trade. Ships of every nationality call at ports all over the world. Substandard performers pose a risk to their host nations everywhere. For this reason, IMO recently formed the Flag State Implementation Subcommittee (FSI) to develop strong international standards for nations that flag vessels (flag states) and for nations that host vessels (port states). By working closely with the FSI the Coast Guard will assure both a high and a level playing field for U.S. flag vessels in international trade.

The Coast Guard invites comment on this initial regulatory policy.

Dated: May 22, 1995.

J.C. Card,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 95-13269 Filed 5-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[MN-36-1-6752b; FRL-5020-2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Area for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The USEPA proposes to approve the request for redesignation to attainment for particulate matter (PM) in Olmsted County and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) in the Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) 131 Twin Cities and Pine Bend areas (excluding the St. Paul Park area). In addition, USEPA proposes to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision to the administrative order for PM for Rochester Public Utilities,

located in Rochester, Minnesota. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) submitted the proposed SIP revision and redesignation requests on September 7, 1994. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, USEPA is approving the SIP revision and requests to redesignation as a direct final rule because the Agency views this as noncontroversial 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 USEPA 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 USEPA will not institute a second comment period on this notice.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before June 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to: William L. MacDowell, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Enforcement Branch (AE-17J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the State submittal and USEPA's analysis are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following address: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (AR-17J), Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randy Robinson, Air Enforcement Branch, Regulation Development Section (AE-17J) United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6713.

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

Dated: April 19, 1995.

Valdas V. Adamkus,
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-13180 Filed 5-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 60

[AD-FRL-5211-5]

RIN 2060-AF00

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources Appendix A, Test Method 23

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This rule amends Method 23, entitled "Determination of Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins and Polychlorinated Dibenzofurans from Stationary Sources," to correct existing errors in the method, to eliminate the methylene chloride rinse of the sampling train, and to clarify the quality assurance requirements of the method.

DATES: *Comments.* Comments must be received on or before August 29, 1995.

Public Hearing. If anyone contacts EPA requesting to speak at a public hearing by June 14, 1995 a public hearing will be held on June 28, 1995, beginning at 10 a.m.

Request to Speak at Hearing. Persons wishing to present oral testimony must contact EPA by June 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted (in duplicate if possible) to Public Docket No. A-94-2 at the following address: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Mail Code: 6102, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. The Agency requests that a separate copy also be sent to the contact person listed below. The docket is located at the above address in room M-1500 Waterside Mall (ground floor), and may be inspected from 8:30 a.m.-12 p.m. and 1:30 p.m.-3 p.m., Monday through Friday. The proposed regulatory text and other materials related to this rulemaking are available for review in the docket or copies may be mailed on request from the Air Docket by calling 202-260-7548. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying docket materials.

Public Hearing. If anyone contacts EPA requesting a public hearing, it will be held at EPA's Emission Measurement Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Persons interested in attending the hearing or wishing to present oral testimony should notify Ms. Lala Cheek (MD-19), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5545.

Docket. A Docket, A-94-22, containing materials relevant to this rulemaking, is available for public

inspection and copying between 8:30 a.m.-12 p.m. and 1:30 p.m.-3 p.m., Monday through Friday, in at EPA's Air Docket Section (LE-131), Room M-1500 Waterside Mall (ground floor) 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC. 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary McAlister, Emission Measurement Branch (MD-19), Emissions, Monitoring, and Analysis Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone (919) 541-1062.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed regulatory text of the proposed rule is not included in this **Federal Register** document, but is available in Docket No. A-94-22 or by written or telephone request from the Air Docket (see **ADDRESSES**). If necessary, a limited number of copies of the Regulatory Text are available from the EPA contact persons designated earlier in this document. This document with the proposed regulatory language is also available on the Technology Transfer Network (TTN), one of EPA's electronic bulletin boards. TTN provides information and technology exchange in various areas of air pollution control. The service is free except for the cost of the phone call. Dial (919) 541-5742 for up to a 14400 bps modem. If more information on TTN is needed, call the HELP line at (919) 541-5384.

I. Summary

Method 23 was promulgated along with the New Source Performance Standard for municipal waste combustors (Subpart Ea). As promulgated, the method contained some errors. This action would correct those errors and would clarify some of the existing quality assurance requirements. In addition, the current procedure requires rinsing of the sampling train with two separate solvents which must be analyzed separately. Based on data the Agency has collected since promulgation of Method 23, we believe that one of these rinse steps and the resulting sample fraction can be eliminated. This could save as much as \$2000 per test run in analytical costs.

II. The Rulemaking

This rulemaking does not impose emission measurement requirements beyond those specified in the current regulations nor does it change any emission standard. Rather, the rulemaking would simply amend an existing test method associated with emission measurement requirements in