full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10e of the regulatory policies and procedures of DOT is unnecessary. The proposed regulation would last for only 4 hours each day of the event.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposal will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' include independently owned and operated small businesses that are not dominant in their field and that otherwise qualify as ''small business concerns'' under Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

For reasons set forth in the above Regulatory Evaluation, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposal, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Collection of Information

These proposed regulations contain no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Federalism

This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that the rulemaking does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposal and has concluded that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary. An Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact are available in the docket for inspection or copying where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. The Coast Guard has concluded that this proposed action would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Waterways.

Proposed Regulations

in consideration of the foregoing, Part 100 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, is proposed to be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 100 continues to read as follows:

PART 100—[AMENDED]

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 100.35.

2. A new section 100.714 is added to read as follows:

§ 100.714 Annual Miami Super Boat Race; Miami Beach, FL.

(a) *Definitions:* (1) *Regulated Areas.* The regulated area includes the race course area, the spectator area, and a buffer zone.

(i) The race course area is formed by a line joining the following points:

25°46.3′ N, 080°07.85′ W; thence to,
25°46.3′ N, 080°06.82′ W; thence to,
25°51.3′ N, 080°06.2′ W; thence to,
25°51.3′ N, 080°07.18′ W; thence along the shoreline to the starting point.

All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 1983.

(ii) A spectator area is established in the regulated area for spectator traffic and is defined by a line joining the following points, beginning from:

25° 51.3′ N, 080° 06.15′ W; thence to,
25° 51.3′ N, 080° 05.85′ W; thence to,
25° 46.3′ N, 080° 06.55′ W; thence to,
25° 46.3′ N, 080° 06.77′ W; and back to the starting point.

All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 1983.

(iii) A buffer zone of 300 feet is established between the race course and the spectator area.

(2) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander.* The Coast Guard Patrol Commander is a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard who has been designated by the Captain of the Port, Miami, Florida.

(b) *Special local regulations:* (1) Entry into the race course area by other than event participants is prohibited unless otherwise authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander. At the completion of scheduled races and departure of participants from the regulated area, traffic may resume normal operations. At the discretion of the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, between scheduled racing events, traffic may be permitted to resume normal operations.

(2) A succession of not fewer than 5 short whistle or horn blasts from a patrol vessel will be the signal for any and all vessels to take immediate steps to avoid a collision. The display of an orange distress smoke signal from a patrol vessel will be the signal for any and all vessels to stop immediately.

(3) Spectators not in the designated spectator areas, defined in paragraph (a) of the regulated area, are required to maintain clear of the race course area at all times.

(c) *Effective Dates:* This section is effective at 12 p.m. and terminates at 4 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time annually during the second Sunday of June.

Dated: March 14, 1996.

Roger T. Rufe, Jr.,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 96–7303 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

---

33 CFR Part 183

[CGD 95–041]

Propeller Injury Prevention Aboard Rental Boats

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) is to gather current, specific, and accurate information about the injuries involving propeller strikes and rented boats. In a request for comments published May 11, 1995, the Coast Guard solicited comments from all segments of the marine community and other interested persons on various aspects of propeller accident avoidance aboard houseboats and other displacement type recreational vessels. The information received was voluminous, but was too general to be helpful. Consistent with the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative, the Coast Guard is interested in obtaining maximum public involvement before it makes any decision that would impose a new burden on the regulated community. Information gathered in response to this ANPRM will supplement that which the Coast Guard received in response to the request for comments and will be used to determine the appropriate Federal and State roles in reducing propeller-strike incidents, whether governmental intervention is appropriate and, if so, whether it should be directed at the vessels, their manufacturers, their operators or owners, or the companies leasing such vessels. This ANPRM also announces one public meeting at Coast Guard Headquarters at which individuals and interested parties may make oral presentations about the propeller strike avoidance issue. The Coast Guard has also arranged four other opportunities, throughout the country, for those interested in this subject to express their views.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 1, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA/3406)(CGD95–041),

U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the above address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 267–1477.

The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments will become a part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Randolph Doubt, Project Manager, Recreational Boating Product Assurance Division, (202) 267–0984.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to submit written data, views or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses and identify this notice (CGD 95–041). Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period.

Background Information

The Coast Guard published a request for comments on propeller accidents involving houseboats and other displacement type recreational vessels on May 11, 1995 [60 FR 25191]. In a second Federal Register notice published August 9, 1995, the Coast Guard reopened and extended the comment period until November 7, 1995. The Coast Guard received 1,994 responses. More than 1,800 of these were form letters from individuals who support the development of regulations to require the use of propeller guard technology or pump jet propulsion on vessels used in the rental houseboat industry. An additional 69 comments supporting the development of regulations to prevent the incidence of propeller-strike accidents were received from accident victims and their relatives, attorneys, physicians, State law enforcement agencies, manufacturers of devices designed to prevent propeller-strike accidents, and other individuals. Comments opposing regulations were received from 57 boaters, nine houseboat livery operators and marinas, members of 10 associations, committees, or councils, 13 boat and engine manufacturers, and six naval architects or marine consultants.

Solicitation of Views

While available data in the Coast Guard's regulatory docket on this subject does not fully support the costs or burdens that would be imposed by Federal regulation, the number of responses received to the request for comments indicates a great deal of public interest in whether and how the Federal Government should act to prevent propeller-strike accidents.

Persons submitting comments should do as directed under **REQUEST FOR COMMENTS** above, and reply to the following specific questions. Form letters simply citing anecdotal evidence or stating support for, or opposition to regulations, without providing substantive data or arguments do not supply support for regulations.

1. The Coast Guard is making an effort to improve its database of recreational boating accidents resulting in injuries which require medical treatment beyond first aid. Part of that effort consists in trying to determine the extent to which accidents involving propeller strikes by rented boats are a problem. What information is available regarding the incidence of propeller-strike injuries or fatalities involving individuals who rent boats, and what trends, if any, do the data indicate?

2. To what extent are data available to indicate whether the type of propulsion (e.g., outboard motor, inboard engine or inboard-outboard engine) contributes to the incidence of propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats?

3. In two fatal accidents during the last several years, one on Lake Shasta and one on Lake Havasu, the victim was in the water and was struck by the propeller when a rental houseboat was put in reverse and backed into them. Several other houseboat accidents have resulted in injuries. The Coast Guard is interested in determining whether accidents involving propeller strikes and rented houseboats occur nationwide, or are limited to a few States or bodies of water. If the latter is the case, do any particular hazardous local conditions contribute to the likelihood of such accidents? If so, the Coast Guard is interested in determining the nature and location of those conditions.

4. To what extent are data available on the relationship between the consumption of alcohol or the use of controlled substances and propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats?

5. Some States have laws requiring boat operators to complete a boating safety course.

a. To what extent do available data indicate whether boater behavior patterns, a lack of boating education, or a lack of boating law enforcement contribute to the incidence of propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats?

b. Do data indicate whether mandatory boating education for individuals renting boats with propellers significantly contribute to a reduction in the number of propeller-strike accidents?

c. If so, do data indicate what type of boating education would be the most effective?

d. What other vessel operator-oriented requirements might reduce the incidence of propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats?

e. What economic or other burdens would be imposed on companies leasing recreational boats if either the Federal or State Government was to require education of individuals renting propeller-driven boats?

6. The two fatal accidents mentioned above occurred when individuals were in the water astern of the vessels and the vessels were put in reverse. While limited operator visibility astern may have contributed to the accidents, the transom is also the usual location for swim platforms and boarding ladders for swimmers. Do available data indicate whether vessel design features contribute to the incidence of propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats? If so, what vessel design features might reduce the incidence of propeller-strike accidents involving rental boats?

7. Are there any proven technologies that would help reduce the risk of propeller-strike accidents involving rented boats? What technologies are unacceptable, and for what reasons?

8. The two fatal accidents mentioned above involved rental houseboats. If the Coast Guard developed regulations in this area, how should it define the term, ''houseboat?'' Are there any other vessel types the Coast Guard should consider regulating? If so, what vessels, if any, should be excepted from such regulations?

9. What, if any, types of information should be displayed on boats and/or motors leased, rented or chartered for noncommercial use for the purpose of alerting operators or passengers to the dangers of a propeller strike?

10. What are the economic and other impacts on companies renting boats or other entities if the Coast Guard were to require companies to retrofit such vessels with devices or methods of propulsion designed to reduce the

incidence of propeller-strike accidents? In considering regulations, the Coast Guard must assess the potential adverse impacts on small business entities. To what extent are small entities engaged in leasing recreational boats?

11. a. How many companies are currently leasing propeller-driven boats for bareboat charters by the recreational boating public? How many vessels are involved and on which bodies of water?

b. How many companies are currently offering propeller-driven uninspected boats for charter by the recreational boating public? How many vessels are involved and on which bodies of water?

12. What adverse impacts might result from a regulation requiring livery companies to verbally brief individuals renting propeller-driven boats about the dangers of propeller-strike accidents, and requiring individuals chartering such vessels to acknowledge receiving the information?

13. Under current Federal statutes (46 U.S.C. 4306), the States do not have the authority to establish carriage requirements for associated equipment, such as a mechanical means for preventing propeller strikes, on vessels operated on waters where both the Coast Guard and the State have jurisdiction. However, a State may impose more stringent requirements on vessels such as rental boats on waters subject to the State's exclusive jurisdiction, so long as such a requirement is not imposed upon vessel manufacturers. What is the proper role for the States in reducing propeller-strike accidents involving rented boats? If the Coast Guard allowed the States to regulate the equipment carried, or the use of rental boats, how would interstate commerce be affected?

Open Meetings

A subcommittee of the National Boating Safety Advisory Council, and the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators are studying the propeller injury prevention issue. The Coast Guard invites interested parties and the public to make brief oral presentations about the propeller injury prevention issue during the following meetings or events:

From 5 to 7 p.m., Monday, April 22, 1996 at the National Water Safety Congress Professional Development Seminar at the Boardwalk Resort in Panama City, FL, (April 23–25, 1996).

From 3 to 5 p.m., Monday April 29, 1996 at the National Boating Safety Advisory Council Meeting at the Parc Fifty-Five Hotel in San Francisco, CA (April 27–29, 1996).

From 8:30 to 10:30 a.m., Wednesday May 1, 1996 at the Northeastern States Boating Law Administrators Conference in the Camden Room at the Samoset Resort in Rockland, ME (April 29–30, 1996).

From 1 to 4 p.m., Monday, May 6, 1996 in Room 2415 of Coast Guard Headquarters in Washington, DC.

From 10 a.m. to 12 p.m., Sunday, May 19, 1996 at the Southern States Boating Law Administrator Conference at the Royal Sonesta Hotel in New Orleans, LA (May 18–22, 1996).

Those wishing to give an oral presentation should submit their name, address, and organization represented (if any) at least seven days prior to the particular meeting or event, to COMMANDANT (G–NAB–6), room 1505, U.S. Coat Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–0001, Attn: Mr. Jay Doubt. Individuals wishing to give an oral presentation who fail to notify the Coast Guard within seven days of a particular meeting or event will be allowed to do so if time permits.

Those giving oral presentations are reminded of the necessity to also furnish written comments, if those comments are intended for inclusion in the regulatory docket.

The Coast Guard will consider all relevant comments in determining what action may be necessary to address propeller accidents involving rented propeller-driven vessels.

Dated: March 15, 1996.

Rudy K. Peschel,

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

[FR Doc. 96–7304 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[FRL–5446–8]

Proposed Requirements for Control Technology Determinations for Major Sources in Accordance With Clean Air Act (Act) Section 112(g)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of reopening of comment period; notice of availability of draft rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is reopening the comment period for the proposed rule implementing section 112(g) of the Act and is announcing the availability of a revised draft of the proposal. Section 112(g) establishes requirements for owners or operators who intend to construct, reconstruct, or modify a major source of hazardous air pollutants (HAP). When no emission standard has been promulgated under section 112(d) of the Act, determinations concerning such sources must be made on a case-by-case basis. Today's notice announces the availability of a revised draft of the proposed rule which implements section 112(g)(2)(B) of the Act with respect to constructed or reconstructed major sources, and requests comment on the revised draft. The EPA does not intend at this time to issue a rule implementing the provisions of section 112(g) which concern modifications.

DATES: The revised draft of the proposed rule will be available in the public docket and on the EPA electronic bulletin board on the date this document is signed. Comments concerning this document or the revised draft rule must be received by EPA on or before April 25, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The revised draft rule and other information pertaining to the proposed rule are contained in Docket Number A–91–64. The docket is available for public inspection and copying from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the EPA's Air Docket Section, Waterside Mall, Room M1500, EPA, 401 M Street, Southwest, Washington, DC 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying. The draft rule is also available on the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) electronic bulletin board, the Technology Transfer Network (TTN), under Clean Air Act, Title III, Recently Signed Rules. For information on how to access the TTN, please call (919) 541–5384 between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

Comments concerning this notice or the revised draft rule should be submitted (in duplicate if possible) to: Central Docket Section (6102), EPA, Attn: Air Docket No. A–91–64, Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Gerri Pomerantz, telephone (919) 541–2371, or Ms. Kathy Kaufman, telephone (919) 541–0102, Information Transfer and Program Integration Division (MD–12), OAQPS, EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC, 27711.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The information in this notice is organized as follows:

I. Background and Major Differences between the Proposed Rule and Draft Final Rule
II. Definition of ''Construct a Major Source''
III. Review of Applications for a maximum achievable control technology (MACT) Determination
IV. Extensions of Compliance Date for Subsequent Emission Standards