

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The notice of proposed rulemaking is withdrawn and the docket is closed.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

the proposed rule, pending further study of how best to implement this policy without creating an undue administrative burden for both the contractor and the Government.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The FAR Secretariat, Room 4035, GS Building, Washington, DC 20405, (202) 501-4755, for information pertaining to status or publication schedules. For clarification of content, contact Ms. Linda Nelson at (202) 501-1900. Please cite FAR case 97-010, withdrawal.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 31

Government procurement.

Dated: August 7, 1998.

Edward C. Loeb,

Director, Federal Acquisition Policy Division.

[FR Doc. 98-21631 Filed 8-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-EP-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

49 CFR Parts 375 and 377

[Docket No. FHWA-97-2979]

RIN 2125-AE30

Transportation of Household Goods; Consumer Protection Regulations

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Extension and reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is extending and reopening this rulemaking's comment period for an additional 60 day period of time. This is in response to one petition received by the FHWA requesting an extension of the comment period closing date. The petitioner based her request upon her belief that the FHWA provided too brief an opportunity to enable individual consumers, as opposed to industry lobbyists, to become aware of the rulemaking, to digest the NPRM's contents and to respond to the opportunity with comments. This NPRM is required, in part, by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, because most of the information collection burdens formerly imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission have never received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval.

DATES: Comments to the NPRM should be received no later than October 13, 1998. The FHWA will consider late comments to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Signed, written comments should refer to the docket number

appearing at the top of this document and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas Vining, Chief, Licensing and Insurance Division (HIA-30), Office of Motor Carrier Information Analysis, (202) 358-7055, Mr. Michael Falk, Motor Carrier Law Division, Office of the Chief Counsel (HCC-20), (202) 366-1384, or Mr. David Miller, Office of Motor Carrier Research and Standards (HCS-10), (202) 366-1790, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

Internet users may access all comments received by the U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, by using the universal resource locator (URL): <http://dms.dot.gov>. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. Please follow the instructions on-line for more information and help.

You may download an electronic copy of this document using a personal computer, modem, and suitable communications software from the Federal Register Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512-1661. Internet users may reach the Federal Register's home page at URL: <http://www.nara.gov/fedreg> and at the Government Printing Office's databases at URL: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs.

Background

On May 15, 1998, (63 FR 27126), the FHWA published an NPRM requesting comments to a proposed rule. The proposed rule would regulate motor carriers transporting household goods by requiring these motor carriers to provide certain services to protect consumers.

Many customers of household goods carriers, particularly those customers who move at their own expense and are infrequent users of transportation services, are unsophisticated and less able to protect themselves than commercial shippers. In order to ensure these consumers are protected, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) had prescribed regulations governing

the transportation of household goods. These regulations were codified at 49 CFR part 1056.

Following the termination of the ICC, the responsibility for the household goods regulations was delegated to the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to the ICCTA, Pub. L. 104-88, 109 Stat. 803, effective January 1, 1996. The Surface Transportation Board (STB) and the FHWA transferred these regulations from 49 CFR chapter X, Part 1056 to 49 CFR chapter III, Part 375 on October 21, 1996. See 61 FR 54706. On December 27, 1996 (61 FR 68162), the Secretary of Transportation delegated to the Federal Highway Administrator the responsibilities to carry out certain functions and exercise the authority vested in the Secretary under the ICCTA, including 49 U.S.C. 14104, Household goods carrier operations.

Enactment of the ICCTA requires deletion from the regulations of all references to the former ICC and repealed sections of the Interstate Commerce Act, revision of the regulations to codify the transfer to the FHWA of oversight responsibilities for the household goods moving industry, and other editorial corrections.

The FHWA also must seek and obtain OMB approval for the information the FHWA proposes motor carriers and individual shippers must collect, disseminate, and disclose in 49 CFR part 375. "Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public." 5 CFR part 1320, implements the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13 (May 22, 1995)). Part 1320 requires the FHWA to obtain OMB approval before the FHWA requires the public to collect, disseminate, and disclose the information proposed in 49 CFR part 375. The NPRM's 60-day comment period is serving as the 60-day period required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), 1320.11, and 1320.12.

On July 3, 1998, the FHWA received a petition from Barbara R. Kueppers, Esquire, to extend the comment period for an additional 60-day period. She stated the original 60-day period allotted too brief an opportunity "to enable individual consumers, as opposed to industry lobbyists, to be aware of the rulemaking, to digest the contents of the proposed rules and to respond with meaningful comments."

For the reason in the above paragraph, the FHWA finds good cause to extend this NPRM comment period closing date until October 13, 1998, to provide individual consumers and others additional time to digest the NPRM's contents and to respond with salient comments.