

shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(f) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the document referred to herein upon request to Aerospace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd., ASTA DEFENCE, Private Bag No. 4, Beach Road Lara 3212, Victoria, Australia; or may examine this document at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 11, 1997.

**Michael Gallagher,**

*Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 97-21787 Filed 8-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Customs Service

#### 19 CFR Part 134

RIN 1515-AB61

#### Country of Origin Marking Requirements for Frozen Imported Produce

**AGENCY:** Customs Service, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; additional comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides interested members of the public an additional 60 days to submit written comments on a proposal to amend the Customs Regulations regarding the country of origin marking of imported frozen produce. The proposed amendment would revise the regulations to mandate front panel marking of imported frozen produce.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before October 17, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments (preferably in triplicate) may be addressed to the Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, Franklin Court, 1301 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20229. Comments submitted may be inspected at the Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Suite 4000, Washington, D.C.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Cohen, Special Classification and Marking Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings (202-482-6980).

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Background

On July 23, 1996, Customs published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (61 FR 38119) soliciting comments on a proposal to require that the country of origin of frozen imported produce be marked on the front panel of their retail packages to comply with the statutory requirement that the country of origin marking be in a "conspicuous place." On September 23, 1996, the comment period closed.

Subsequent to the close of the comment period, Customs received a large number of additional comments and other correspondence concerning this matter. In order to afford Customs an appropriate opportunity to consider the points raised in those comments and other correspondence received outside the prescribed comment period, and in order to provide an additional opportunity for the general public to submit comments on this matter which continues to engender significant interest, Customs has decided to reopen this matter for public comment for 60 more days. In order to ensure consideration of the most complete record possible, Customs will, after the close of the new public comment period, give consideration to all comments and other correspondence already received during or after the original comment period as well as all comments received during the new public comment period herein. Accordingly, there is no need to re-submit copies of any comments previously submitted to Customs with respect to this proposed rulemaking.

Dated: August 12, 1997.

**George J. Weise,**

*Commissioner of Customs.*

[FR Doc. 97-21742 Filed 8-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 187

#### 46 CFR Part 67

[CGD 96-060]

#### Vessel Documentation: Combined Builder's Certificate and Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin, Submission of Hull Identification Number (HIN) for Documentation of Recreational Vessels, and Issuance of Temporary Certificates of Documentation

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The National Vessel Documentation Center will hold a public meeting as a follow-up to its November 14, 1996, notice of requests for comments on vessel documentation matters. The meeting will be held to discuss combining the Builder's Certificate and the Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin, requiring a Hull Identification Number for the documentation of recreational vessels, and issuing a Temporary Certificate of Documentation.

**DATES:** The meeting will be on September 17, 1997, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be in room 6200-6204, Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, 400 7th Street SW., Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Dennis M. Nelson, Chief, Recreational Vessel Documentation Branch, National Vessel Documentation Center, 2039 Stonewall Jackson Dr., Falling Waters, WV 25419; telephone 304-271-2400 (800-799-8362); fax 304-271-2405.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 14, 1996, the Coast Guard published a "notice of request for comments" (61 FR 58359) on the following subjects. The notice provides additional background information. After reviewing the comments, we now need your help in answering the following questions:

1. *Hull Identification Number (HIN).* The Coast Guard is considering requiring that recreational vessels be marked with an HIN before being documented and that the HIN appear on the application for documentation. This would align documentation process with the Vessel Identification System. Also, it would deter fraud, aid in law enforcement, and improve the identification of vessels. Should a photo or a rubbing of the HIN accompany the Application for Documentation?

2. *Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin and Builder's Certification.* Currently, the States use the Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin (MCO) for registering and titling vessels and the Coast Guard uses the Builder's Certification (Form CG-1261) for documenting vessels. The Coast Guard is considering combining these two forms to reduce the possibility for fraud, allow boat manufacturers to use only one form for either system, and aid law enforcement by means of a uniform system for identifying vessels. Are there any reasons why this proposal should not be adopted?

3. *Temporary Certificate of Documentation.* For various reasons, a permanent Certificate of Documentation cannot be issued immediately upon application for documentation or re-documentation. This prevents vessel owners from operating their vessels during processing of applications. The delays in processing are due to the need to first get a Satisfaction of Mortgage or a Mortgage Consent, to the seasonal fluctuations in the volume of applications received, and to the limited amount of equipment and staff available to process applications. To enable owners to operate their vessels during the application process, a temporary certificate of documentation could be issued. This would not only reduce down-time for vessels but also assist law enforcement and relieve States from having to issue temporary motorboat registrations. What information should the certificate contain? For how long should it be valid? Who should be authorized to issue it? How can its use be controlled? How much should the issuing person charge?

#### Procedural

The meeting will be in the form of an informal workshop open to the public. It is intended to bring together persons knowledgeable about the three issues addressed in this notice to assist the Coast Guard in answering the questions raised.

#### Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meeting, contact Mr. Dennis M. Nelson as soon as possible.

Dated: August 13, 1997.

**Joseph J. Angelo,**

*Director of Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 97-21811 Filed 8-15-97; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[PA 058-4039; FRL-5876-5]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Proposed Disapproval of the NO<sub>x</sub> RACT Determination for Pennsylvania Power Company

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to disapprove a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP). This revision withdraws EPA's previously proposed approval of the nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) reasonably available control technology (RACT) determination submitted by PADEP for Pennsylvania Power Company—New Castle plant (PPNC), located in Lawrence County, Pennsylvania and, instead, proposes to disapprove the SIP revision pertaining to this facility. The intended effect of this action is to propose disapproval of the NO<sub>x</sub> RACT determination submitted by PADEP for PPNC.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 17, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to David L. Arnold, Chief, Ozone/CO and Mobile Sources Section, Mailcode 3AT21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107; Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Quality, P.O. Box 8468, 400 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cynthia H. Stahl, (215) 566-2180, at the EPA Region III office above or via e-mail at [stahl.cynthia@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:stahl.cynthia@epamail.epa.gov). While information may be requested via e-mail, all comments must be submitted in writing to the EPA Region III address above.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On April 19, 1995, PADEP submitted a revision to the Pennsylvania SIP requesting EPA approve RACT determinations it had made for several facilities, including PPNC. Only the RACT determination submitted for PPNC is the subject of this rulemaking action. The revision consists of an operating permit, OP 37-023, for PPNC. The other plan approvals and operating permits submitted on April 19, 1995 are the subject of other rulemaking actions.

On April 9, 1996, EPA published a direct final rule in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 15709). This document stated that EPA was approving, without prior proposal, 21 source-specific RACT determinations made and submitted by PADEP for facilities located in

Pennsylvania. Included among these 21 source-specific RACT determinations was one for PPNC. The document also stated that unless adverse comments were received within 30 days of publication, EPA's RACT determinations for these 21 facilities would become final. The accompanying proposed rulemaking, which appears with every direct final rule, was also published on April 9, 1996 (61 FR 15744).

On May 8, 1996, New York Department of Environmental Conservation submitted a letter stating that it intended to adversely comment on EPA's action to approve PADEP's RACT determination for PPNC. Therefore, on June 11, 1996, EPA published a document withdrawing the final rule approving PADEP's RACT determination for PPNC, among other facilities (61 FR 29483). At the request of the commenters, EPA also extended the comment period twice; the last time until August 2, 1996 (61 FR 29483 and 61 FR 37030).

On June 28, 1996, NYDEC submitted comments to EPA pertaining to PADEP's RACT determination for PPNC. On July 15, 1996 and August 1, 1996, PPNC submitted comments to EPA addressing issues raised by NYDEC. On August 2, 1996, Pennsylvania DEP submitted comments to EPA stating that EPA should proceed with final approval of the PPNC RACT determination. The comments received by EPA are summarized below and, in more detail, in the technical support document (TSD) prepared by EPA in support of this proposed action to disapprove PADEP's SIP revision for PPNC submitted on April 19, 1995. Copies of the TSD are available, upon request, from the EPA Region III office listed in the ADDRESSES section of this document.

This action proposing to disapprove PADEP's April 19, 1995 SIP revision request for PPNC being taken under section 110 of the Clean Air Act.

#### Comments Received on EPA's April 9, 1996 Proposal to Approve PADEP's RACT Determination for PPNC

##### NYDEC Comments:

NYDEC states in its June 28, 1996 comment letter that it disagrees with EPA's proposal to approve PADEP's RACT determination for PPNC. NYDEC states that it believes that the control efficiencies for add-on emission controls are understated in the PADEP technical support document, the costs for add-on controls are overstated, the 15-year cost-recovery period used in the PPNC RACT analysis is too short, and that NO<sub>x</sub> add-on control technology is technically and