

significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (Air).

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration on the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

1. The authority citation for Part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9E, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 10, 1997, and effective September 16, 1997, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.

* * * * *

ASO KY E5 Hartford, KY [New]

Ohio County Airport
(lat. 37°27'30" N, long. 86°50'59" W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth within a 6.4-mile radius of Ohio County Airport.

* * * * *

Issued in College Park, Georgia, on June 18, 1998.

John R. Schroeter,

*Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division,
Southern Region.*

[FR Doc. 98–16958 Filed 6–25–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[OR–2–0001; FRL–6116–4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the Section 111(d) State Plan submitted by Oregon on May 14, 1997. The State Plan was submitted by Oregon to satisfy certain Federal Clean Air Act requirements. In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's Plan submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates that it will not receive any significant, material, and adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no significant, material, and adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If the 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.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by July 27, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Catherine Woo, Environmental Protection Specialist, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the day of the visit.

Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 10, Office of Air Quality, 1200
6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101.

The State of Oregon, Department of
Environmental Quality, 811 SW Sixth
Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Catherine Woo, Office of Air Quality
(OAQ–107), EPA, 1200 6th Avenue,
Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553–1814.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: June 8, 1998.

Chuck Findley,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 98–17120 Filed 6–25–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR 197

[USCG–1998–3786]

RIN 2115–AF64

Commercial Diving Operations

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard requests comments on the type and scope of needed revisions to the commercial diving operations regulations. The regulations are over 20 years old and do not include current safety and technology standards and industry practices. At this early stage of the rulemaking process we need information on current safety practices, diving technology, and industry standards to help us identify the scope of any necessary regulatory revisions.

DATES: Comments must reach the Docket Management Facility on or before September 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: You may mail comments to the Docket Management Facility [USCG–1998–3786], U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001, or deliver them to room PL–401, located on the Plaza Level of the Nassif Building at the same address, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments, and documents indicated in this preamble, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL–401, located on the Plaza Level of the Nassif Building at the same address, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also access this docket on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

A copy of the Association of Diving Contractors' (ADC) proposed changes to the Coast Guard commercial diving regulations and of its Consensus Standards are available in the public docket at the above address or on the Internet at <http://dms.dot.gov>, or you may obtain a copy by contacting the project manager at the number in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on this advance notice of rulemaking, contact Lieutenant Diane Kalina, Project Manager, Vessel and

Facility Operating Standards Division, Coast Guard, telephone 202-267-1181. For questions on viewing, or submitting material to the docket, contact Carol Kelley, Coast Guard Dockets Team Leader, or Paulette Twine, Chief, Documentary Services Division, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this advance notice [USCG-1998-3786] and the specific section or question in this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you want acknowledgment of receipt of your comments, you should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period when developing its proposed changes to the regulations.

The Coast Guard plans no public meetings. You may request a public meeting by submitting a comment requesting one to the address under **ADDRESSES**. The request should include the reasons why a meeting would be beneficial. If the Coast Guard determines that a meeting should be held, we will announce the time and place in a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

Purpose

The Coast Guard needs your comments and information on the issues contained in this advance notice to help us define the scope of any necessary revisions to the commercial diving operations regulations in 46 CFR 197, Subpart B. The regulations are over 20 years old and do not include current safety and technology standards and industry practices. At this early stage of the rulemaking process we need information on current safety practices, diving technology, and industry standards to help us identify necessary regulatory revisions.

Background

The existing commercial diving regulations were published in 1977 and only minor changes have been made to them since then. In 1994, the Association of Diving Contractors

(ADC), a diving industry trade organization, submitted proposed regulatory changes to the Coast Guard and requested that the Coast Guard revise its regulations accordingly. A copy of their proposed changes is available in the public docket. ADC's proposal was reviewed by over 140 General Members (operating companies) of ADC; their Technical and their Safety, Medical and Education Committees; and their Board of Directors. ADC also suggested that we adopt their Consensus Standards, possibly through incorporation by reference. A copy of the Consensus Standards is also available in the public docket. The Coast Guard will consider ADC's proposed changes when developing its proposed revisions to the commercial diving operations regulations, but would like to receive your comments on the ADC proposal. A copy of ADC's proposal is also available by contacting the Coast Guard point of contact under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Preliminary Regulatory Assessment

This rulemaking is not likely to be classified as a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to be significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). A draft regulatory evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation would be prepared to support any future Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

The Coast Guard is not yet able to prepare a benefit-cost analysis assessing the impact of potential changes to the commercial diving operations regulations because specific changes have not been identified. However, the Coast Guard would like your comments on the cost estimate provided by ADC. According to a 1995 estimate by ADC, their proposed regulatory changes would likely not cost more than \$300,000 to implement on an industry-wide basis. ADC also estimates that annualized costs would be minimal. We would like your comments on whether or not ADC's cost estimate is reasonable given the scope of ADC's recommendations.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act [5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*], the Coast Guard must consider whether a potential rulemaking would have significant economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities. "Small entities" include small businesses, not-

for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000.

Some commercial diving companies subject to our regulations may be small entities. Because we have not yet proposed specific revisions and because the number of affected small entities has not been identified, we cannot accurately estimate the potential impact on small entities at this time. As part of the required 5 U.S.C. 610 review of regulations affecting small entities, we are requesting information at this early stage about the aspects of this rulemaking which may affect small entities, so we can evaluate and minimize the impact of proposed changes on small entities.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 [Pub. L. 104-21], the Coast Guard wants to assist small entities to understand this advance notice so they can better evaluate the potential effects of any future rulemaking on them and participate in the rulemaking process. If you believe that your small business, organization, or agency may be affected by this rulemaking, please explain how you could be affected, and tell us what flexibility or compliance alternatives the Coast Guard should consider to minimize the burden on you while promoting commercial diving safety. If you have questions concerning this advance notice, you may call the Coast Guard point of contact designated in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. We also maintain a small business regulatory assistance Web Page at <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/reg/ reghome.htm> that has current information on small entity issues and proposed Coast Guard regulations. To help small entities become more involved in this rulemaking, the Coast Guard will mail copies of this advance notice to Small Business Development Center (SBDC) State Directors nationwide for distribution to local SBDC offices and interested small businesses.

Collection of Information

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act [44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*], the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reviews each proposed rule that contains a collection of information requirement to determine whether the practical value of the information is worth the burden imposed by its collection. As defined in 5 CFR 1320.3(c), "collection of

information" includes reporting, record-keeping, monitoring, posting, labeling, and other, similar actions. The Coast Guard will review the existing information collection requirements in 46 CFR 197.480 through 46 CFR 197.488 to either validate existing burdens or to reduce or eliminate burdens that are no longer necessary.

Questions

We request your comments and any data or information that would answer the following questions, as well as comments on any other part of the current regulations that should be revised. In responding to a question, please explain your reasons for each answer so that we can carefully weigh the consequences and impacts of any future requirements we may propose. In addition, please provide relevant data (accident data would be particularly useful), if possible, that will support the need for a revision to the commercial diving operations regulations.

1. Based on your review of the ADC submission to the Coast Guard, which revisions should the Coast Guard include in its proposed rule, not include in a proposed rule, or revise and include in a proposed rule? Why?

2. Should the Coast Guard adopt the ADC Consensus Standards or any other written industry standards? If so, which ones and why?

3. Is ADC's cost estimate of \$300,000.00 for implementing their proposed regulatory changes reasonable? If not, please explain why and, if possible, provide your own cost estimate.

4. What definitions in the existing regulations should be updated or deleted? Please explain. Are there other terms that the Coast Guard should define in the regulations? Please explain.

5. Should dynamically positioned vessels (vessels with an installed system that automatically maintains the position of the vessel within a specified tolerance by controlling onboard thrusters to counter the forces of the wind, waves and currents) and remotely operated vehicles be addressed in the regulations? If so, what particular issues should the Coast Guard propose to regulate?

6. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning diving in contaminated waters? If yes, how should it be addressed?

7. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning one atmosphere observation bells, suits or submersibles? If yes, how should it be addressed?

8. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning bell bounce (a

diving procedure whereby a diving bell is used to transport divers under atmospheric pressure to a work site, and subsequently to transport the divers back to the surface in a decompression status)? If yes, how should it be addressed?

9. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning saturation diving in more detail? If yes, how should it be addressed?

10. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning requirements for back-up equipment at the dive site? If yes, how should it be addressed?

11. Should the Coast Guard propose regulations concerning minimum training requirements for divers? If yes, how should it be addressed?

12. If you think the regulations should include minimum training requirements, please answer the following questions:

a. What courses or information should the training include?

b. What should be the minimum number of hours required for training?

c. What would be the benefits of establishing minimum training requirements?

d. Should training organizations or providers meet certification requirements? If so, what organization should certify the training organizations or providers?

13. Should diving supervisors be licensed by the Coast Guard to ensure compliance with federal regulations? Please explain the reason for your choice and, if your answer is "yes", provide examples, if possible, of situations in which a licensed diving supervisor would have improved a situation.

14. If you are a small entity as defined under "Small Entities" and believe you will be affected by potential changes to the commercial diving regulations, please explain what flexibility or compliance options the Coast Guard should consider and how these options would minimize the burden on small entities, while promoting commercial diving safety.

Dated: June 19, 1998.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Acting Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 98-17069 Filed 6-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 980608151-8151-01; I.D.122497B]

RIN 0648-AK43

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Golden Crab Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Gear and Vessel Management Measures

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues this proposed rule to implement a regulatory amendment prepared by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) in accordance with framework procedures for adjusting management measures of the Fishery Management Plan for the Golden Crab Fishery of the South Atlantic Region (FMP). For the golden crab fishery in the South Atlantic exclusive economic zone (EEZ), the regulatory amendment would revise the vessel size limitations applicable when a vessel permit is transferred to another vessel and would extend through January 31, 1999, the authorized use of wire cable for a mainline attached to a golden crab trap. In addition, NMFS proposes to remove from the regulations the eligibility criteria and procedures for obtaining initial commercial vessel permits in the South Atlantic golden crab fishery. Such criteria and procedures are no longer applicable. The intended effects of this proposed rule are to allow for additional evaluation of cable used as mainlines for traps, to provide greater flexibility for fishermen to fish with vessels of different lengths without adversely affecting the FMP's cap on fishing effort, and to simplify the regulations.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 13, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed rule must be sent to Peter Eldridge, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive N., St. Petersburg, FL 33702.

Requests for copies of the framework regulatory amendment, which includes an environmental assessment, a regulatory impact review (RIR), and a social impact assessment/fishery impact statement, should be sent to the South