

tend to ensure that dairy farmers would continue to have their milk priced under the order and thereby receive the benefits that accrue from such pricing.

Interested parties are invited to submit comments on the probable regulatory and informational impact of this proposed rule on small entities. Also, parties may suggest modifications of this proposal for the purpose of tailoring their applicability to small businesses.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, the suspension of the following provisions of the order regulating the handling of milk in the Southwest Plains marketing area is being considered for the months of September 1, 1998, through August 31, 1999:

In § 1106.6, the words "during the month".

In § 1106.7(b)(1), beginning with the words "of February through August" and continuing to the end of the paragraph.

In § 1106.13, paragraph (d)(1) in its entirety.

All persons who want to submit written data, views or arguments about the proposed suspension should send two copies of their views to the USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Order Formulation Branch, Room 2971, South Building, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, DC 20090-6456, by the 7th day after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The period for filing comments is limited to 7 days because a longer period would not provide the time needed to complete the required procedures before the requested suspension is to be effective.

All written submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection in the Dairy Programs during regular business hours (7 CFR 1.27(b)).

Statement of Consideration

The proposed rule would suspend a portion of the supply plant shipping standard and the touch-base requirement of the Southwest Plains order for the period of September 1998 through August 1999. The proposed suspension would allow a supply plant that has been associated with the Southwest Plains order during the months of September 1997 through January 1998 to qualify as a pool plant without shipping any milk to a pool distributing plant during the months of September 1998 through August 1999. Without the suspension, a supply plant would be required to ship 50 percent of its producer receipts to pool distributing plants during the months of September

through January and 20 percent of its producer receipts to pool distributing plants during the months of February through August to qualify as a pool plant under the order.

The proposed rule would also suspend the requirement that producers "touch-base" at a pool plant with at least one day's production during the month before their milk is eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. By suspending the touch-base provision, producer milk would not be required to be delivered to pool plants before going to unregulated manufacturing plants.

According to Kraft's letter requesting the suspension, supplemental milk supplies will not be needed to meet the fluid needs of distributing plants. Kraft anticipates that there will be an adequate supply of direct-ship producer milk located in the general area of distributing plants available to meet the Class I needs of the market. The handler notes that the supply plant shipping provision and the touch-base requirement have been suspended since 1993 and 1992, respectively.

Kraft states there is no need to require producers located some distance from pool distributing plants to touch-base when their milk can more economically be diverted directly to manufacturing plants in the production area. Thus, the handler contends the proposed suspension is necessary to prevent the uneconomical and inefficient movement of milk and to ensure producers historically associated with the Order 106 will continue to have their milk pooled under the order.

Accordingly, it may be appropriate to suspend the aforesaid provisions from September 1, 1998 through August 31, 1999.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1106

Milk marketing orders.

The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 1106 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601-674.

Dated: August 6, 1998.

Richard M. McKee,

Deputy Administrator, Dairy Programs.

[FR Doc. 98-21579 Filed 8-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-97-131]

RIN 2115-AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Acushnet River, MA.

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of withdrawal of proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard has withdrawn the notice of proposed rulemaking governing the New Bedford Fairhaven (Rt-6) Bridge, mile 0.0, over the Acushnet River between New Bedford and Fairhaven, Massachusetts. In light of comments received, the Coast Guard reconsidered the proposed changes to the operating regulations and determined that the changes were too restrictive for the waterway users. It is expected that this action will better meet the present needs of navigation.

DATES: The NPRM is withdrawn effective August 12, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Documents as indicated in this preamble are available for inspection or copying at 408 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (617) 223-8364.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John W. McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, (617) 223-8364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Route 6 Bridge presently opens on the hour from 6 a.m. to 10 a.m., a quarter past the hour from 11:15 a.m. to 6:15 p.m., and at all other times on call. The draw also opens at any time for vessels with a draft exceeding 15 feet and for vessels owned or operated by the U.S. Government, state or local authorities. Each opening of the draw should not exceed 15 minutes except for vessels with drafts exceeding 15 feet or in extraordinary circumstances.

On April 20, 1998, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking entitled Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Acushnet River, Massachusetts, in the **Federal Register** 63 FR 19435. Interested persons were invited to comment on the notice of proposed rulemaking on or before June 19, 1998. The proposed changes to the operating rules published in the notice of proposed rulemaking would have required the bridge to open on signal on the hour from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m., except that from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, the

bridge need not open, except for inbound commercial fishing vessels on the hour. The bridge would be required to open on signal at any time for vessels with a draft of 15 feet or greater.

The Coast Guard received twenty (23) comment letters in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking and a petition signed by 76 recreational boaters. All the comment letters and the petition opposed the proposed changes to the operating rules for the bridge. Comment letters were received from commercial operators, public officials, commercial facilities, recreational vessel owners, and marinas located upstream of the bridge. The petition was from recreational boaters located at several marinas upstream of the bridge. The comment letters and the petition objected to any limitation of the operating hours for both commercial and recreational vessels at any time. They indicated that the marine operators have enough restrictions with the existing hourly openings and further limitations on their ability to transit to their facilities would cause an undue economic hardship on their operations.

The marinas located upstream of the bridge indicated a potential loss of business could result since many of their customers likely would seek other locations rather than deal with the hourly openings and the proposed two additional closed periods Monday through Friday. The commercial operators indicated that any restrictions to commercial vessels would be totally unacceptable and would place a hardship on the main economic interests of the New Bedford area.

In light of the strong opposition to the notice of proposed rulemaking, the Coast Guard reconsidered changing the operating regulations for the bridge and determined that the proposed rule is too restrictive for the waterway users.

The Coast Guard no longer believes that this proposed rule achieves the requirement of balancing the navigational rights of waterway users and the needs of land based transportation.

The notice of proposed rulemaking is withdrawn and the docket is closed.

Dated: July 10, 1998.

James D. Garrison,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting

Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 98-21596 Filed 8-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[MN59-01-7284b; FRL-6139-3]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Minnesota; Municipal Waste Combustor State Plan Submittal

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to approve the Minnesota State Plan submittal for implementing the Emission Guidelines for Large Municipal Waste Combustors (MWCs). The State's plan submittal was made pursuant to requirements found in the Clean Air Act (CAA). The State's plan was submitted to EPA on April 28, 1998 in accordance with the requirements for adoption and submittal of State plans for designated facilities in 40 CFR part 60, subpart B. It establishes performance standards for existing large MWCs and provides for the implementation and enforcement of those standards. The EPA finds that Minnesota's Plan for existing large MWCs adequately addresses all of the Federal requirements applicable to such plans. In the final rules of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving this action as a direct final without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. 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 EPA 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 EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received by September 11, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), EPA, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information, see the Direct Final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the request and the EPA's analysis are available for inspection at the following

address: (Please telephone Douglas Aburano at (312) 353-6960 before visiting the Region 5 office.) EPA, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590.

Dated: July 23, 1998.

Robert Springer,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region V.

[FR Doc. 98-21676 Filed 8-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

General Services Administration

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

48 CFR Part 31

[FAR Case 97-010]

RIN 9000-AH71

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Taxes Associated With Divested Segments

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DoD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Civilian Agency Acquisition Council and the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council have decided to withdraw the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** at 62 FR 49903, September 23, 1997 (FAR Case 97-010, Taxes Associated with Divested Segments).

When a contractor discontinues operations through the sale or other transfer of ownership of a segment, the contractor may be assessed state and local taxes on the gain resulting from that sale or transfer. Since the Government does not share in the gain resulting from the segment sale or transfer, the Government should not share in any tax increases resulting from the segment sale or transfer. The rule proposed revisions to Federal Acquisition Regulation 31.205-41, Taxes, to add increased taxes resulting from a contractor's sale or other transfer of ownership of a segment to the list of unallowable costs.

The respondents expressed concern that the rule would place a significant administrative burden on contractors by requiring them to compute state and local taxes twice: once to determine the actual taxes and again to assess the taxes that would have been paid had the segment not been sold. The DoD, GSA, and NASA have decided to withdraw