

the Escanaba VORTAC 101 radial, extending from the 4.2-mile radius to 7.4 miles east, and within 2.6 miles each side of the Escanaba VORTAC 266 radial extending from the 4.2-mile radius to 7 miles west of the VORTAC.

* * * * *

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on May 6, 1996.

Maureen Woods,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division.

[FR Doc. 96-13421 Filed 5-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 67

[CGD 95-052]

RIN 2115-AF15

Testing of Obstruction Lights and Fog Signals on Offshore Facilities

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of termination and withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This rulemaking project was initiated as part of the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative (PRRI). It was intended to improve the quality of tests performed on obstruction lights and fog signals, while reducing the administrative burden on the public, and minimizing costs borne by the Coast Guard. Comments to the rulemaking raised several substantial issues which require further study. Therefore, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 95-052.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Chad Asplund, Project Manager, Short Range Aids to navigation Division, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, (202) 267-1386.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 10, 1996, the Coast Guard published a notice requesting comments in the Federal Register (61 FR 708). The notice asked (1) whether the flash characteristics of obstruction lights should be changed from a quick-flashing rhythm to a Morse "U"; (2) whether the candlepower requirements on obstruction lighting should be adapted to the new transmissivity tables developed by the Coast Guard; and (3) whether lights and fog signals should be tested independent laboratories rather than by the Coast Guard.

On March 27, 1996, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the Federal Register (61 FR 13472). The Coast Guard proposed a new rule on only one of the three issues investigated in the notice,

specifically, that lights and fog signals would be tested by independent laboratories rather than by the Coast Guard.

The NPRM's approach was in keeping with the goals of the PRRI to make government work better and cost less by finding ways to reduce financial and regulatory burdens on industry while improving governmental efficiency. It proposed to achieve this by (1) consolidating permit applications in headquarters rather than requiring an application to each Coast Guard district; and (2) having independent laboratories test all devices and submit the results to the Coast Guard rather than requiring Coast Guard involvement in the testing of lights or fog signals. In spite of the Coast Guard's intent to reduce burdens, comments indicated that the NPRM, as proposed, was too general to accomplish either the project's goals or the goals of PRRI.

Specifically, comments questioned how independent laboratories would be designated or certified by the Coast Guard, and what standards would be used by the independent laboratories in evaluating lights and fog signals. Comments also expressed concern over the timetable for implementation, with several pointing out that retrofitting all existing structures would impose a high cost on the regulated community without providing any proven reduction in risk.

The Coast Guard has determined that the concerns raised by the comments to this docket require further examination of this area before any rulemaking is undertaken. The Coast Guard seeks to promulgate rules that will improve maritime safety while accomplishing PRRI goals. Because the current rulemaking may do neither, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 95-052 but will continue to investigate the feasibility of implementing these concepts in the future.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

Rudy K. Peschel,

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

[FR Doc. 96-13419 Filed 5-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 141 and 142

[WH-FRL-5511-6]

Drinking Water; National Primary Drinking Water Regulations; Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Requirements

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Announcement of extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is announcing an extension of the public comment period for the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) for the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Regulations (ESWTR) (59 FR 38832, July 29, 1994). The NPDWR consists of a set of regulatory options related to treatment techniques for microbiological pathogens. The NPDWR also includes proposed monitoring, reporting, and public notification requirements for these compounds. The comment period is being extended from May 30, 1996 until August 30, 1996.

DATES: Comments should be postmarked or delivered by hand on or before August 30, 1996. Comments received after this date may not be considered.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to the ESWTR Docket Clerk, Water Docket (MC-4101); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, or hand deliver to the Water Docket, Room 2616, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC.

The proposed rule with supporting documents and all comments received are available for review at the Water Docket at the address above. For access to Docket materials, call (202) 260-3027 between 9 am and 3:30 pm for an appointment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: General information may be obtained from the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, telephone (800) 426-4791; Stig Regli, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4603), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260-7379; or Paul Berger, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (4603), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260-3039.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 29, 1994 EPA proposed two drinking water regulations: the Disinfectant/Disinfection Byproducts (D/DBP) and