

result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector in any 1 year. No costs are imposed by this rulemaking since these test rule modifications only make non-significant changes to the reporting schedules for test rules. Therefore, this action is not subject to the requirements of section 202 and 205 of UMRA. The requirements of sections 203 and 204 of UMRA which relate to regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments and to regulatory proposals that contain a significant Federal intergovernmental mandate, respectively, also do not apply to this rule because the rule affects only the private sector, i.e., those companies that test chemicals.

#### E. Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements associated with this rule have been approved by OMB under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, and have

been assigned OMB control number 2070-0033 (EPA ICR No. 1139). EPA has determined that this rule does not change existing recordkeeping or reporting requirements nor does it impose any additional recordkeeping or reporting requirements on the public.

#### F. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under 5 U.S.C. 801 (a)(1)(A), as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, EPA has submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in this **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Parts 766 and 799

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Exports, Hazardous substances,

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 25, 1997.

**Susan H. Wayland,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.*

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

#### PART 766—[AMENDED]

1. In part 766:  
a. The authority citation for part 766 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 2603 and 2607.

b. In § 766.35, by adding an entry in numerical order by "CAS No." to the table in paragraph (b)(4)(i) to read as follows:

#### § 766.35 Reporting requirements.

	*	*	*	*	*
(b)	*	*	*		
(4)	*	*	*		
(i)	*	*	*		

CAS No.	Submitter	Chemical name	Due date	Effective Date
118-75-2	Rhone-Poulenc Inc.	2,3,5,6-tetrachloro-2,5-cyclohexadiene-1,4-dione .....	July 5, 1996.	June 30, 1997

\* \* \* \* \*

#### PART 799—[AMENDED]

2. In part 799:  
a. The authority citation for part 799 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 2603, 2611, 2625.

b. In § 799.5075, by revising paragraphs (c)(1)(ii)(A) and (d) to read as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

#### § 799.5075 Drinking water contaminants subject to testing.

	*	*	*	*	*
(c)	*	*	*		
(1)	*	*	*		
(ii)	*	*	*		

(A) Each subacute test shall be completed and the final report submitted to EPA within 12 months of the date specified in paragraph (d)(1) of this section, except for 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane. The subacute testing for 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane shall be completed and the final report submitted to EPA by February 15, 1996.

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) *Effective date.* (1) This section is effective on December 27, 1993, except for paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), (c)(1)(i)(A), (c)(1)(ii)(A), (c)(1)(ii)(B), (c)(2)(i)(A), and (c)(2)(ii)(A). The effective date for paragraphs (a)(2), (c)(1)(ii)(B), and (c)(2)(ii)(A) is September 29, 1995. The effective date for paragraphs (a)(1), (c)(1)(i)(A), and (c)(2)(i)(A) is February 27, 1996. The effective date for paragraph (c)(1)(ii)(A) is June 30, 1997.

(2) The guidelines and other test methods cited in this section are referenced as they exist on the effective date of the final rule.

[FR Doc. 97-17175 Filed 6-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Coast Guard

##### 46 CFR Part 111

[CGD 97-030]

##### Use of MIL-C-915 Cable on Merchant Vessels

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of policy; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard received several requests that cable meeting the specifications of MIL-C-915 be allowed in the alteration, modification, conversion, or construction of merchant vessels. This document solicits public comments on this issue. In addition, it announces a policy providing a means for requesting the use of the cable until this matter is resolved.

**DATES:** *Effective:* June 30, 1997. Submit comments on or before August 29, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail comments to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G-LRA/3406) (CGD 97-030),

U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001, or deliver them to room 3406 at the same address between 9:30 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202-267-1477.

The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this notice. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, between 9:30 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Laura Hamman, Project Manager, Office of Design and Engineering Standards (G-MSE), 202-267-2206.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Request for Comments**

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to comment on this document. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (CGD 97-030), and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½×11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period. It may change its policy in view of the comments.

##### **Discussion**

The Coast Guard has received comments questioning its policy prohibition the use of cable constructed to the specifications of MIL-C-915 (Cable and Board for Shipboard Use (including Amendment 2)) (MIL-C-915 cable) for alterations, modifications, conversions, and new construction of merchant vessels. That policy is set out in a note following paragraph (a) of 46 CFR 111.60-1. Paragraph (a) was amended by the final rule published in the **Federal Register** on May 1, 1997 (62 FR 23908). The note to paragraph (a) was added by an interim rule published in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 1996 (61 FR 28280) and remained unchanged in the final rule. Section 111.60-1(a) and its note now read as follows:

##### **§ 111.60-1 Cable construction and testing.**

(a) Each marine shipboard cable must meet all the construction and identification requirements of either IEEE Std 45, IEC 92-3, MIL-C-24640A, or MIL-C-24643A and the respective flammability tests contained therein and be of copper stranded type.

Note to paragraph (a): MIL-C-915 cable is acceptable only for repairs and replacements in kind. MIL-C-915 cable is no longer acceptable for alterations, modifications, conversions, or new construction. (See § 110.01-3 of this chapter).

\* \* \* \* \*

The note to paragraph (a) limits the use of MIL-C-915 cable to repairs and replacements in kind and prohibits its use for alterations, modifications, conversions, and new construction.

The requests stated that MIL-C-915 cable meets the requirements of Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) Std 45 (Recommended Practice for Electric Installations on Shipboard, 1983), as listed in paragraph (a). Therefore, the cable should be allowed for all uses, including alterations, modifications, conversions, and new construction.

The Coast Guard limited the use of the cable based on a decision by the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) to restrict the use of the cable on Navy vessels. However, NAVSEA's decision was not based on a question of whether or not the cable meets IEEE Std 45 and whether or not it is suitable for use on merchant vessels.

The Coast Guard is soliciting comments on the use of MIL-C-915 cable.

##### **Policy**

In light of the fact that MIL-C-915 cable meets the requirements of IEEE Std 45, the Coast Guard will accept requests to use MIL-C-915 cable in alterations, modifications, conversions, and new construction under the equivalency provision in 46 CFR 110.20-1. This policy will remain in effect until this matter is resolved and notice of the action taken is published in the **Federal Register**. If the Coast Guard determines that the note to § 111.60-1(a) should be removed or amended, a rulemaking will be initiated to allow the public an opportunity to comment on that determination.

Dated: June 19, 1997.

**Howard L. Hime,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-16525 Filed 6-27-97; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-14-M**

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 15**

[DA 97-1280]

#### **Spread Spectrum Frequency Hopping Regulations Request**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action will permit Amtech's waiver request to be treated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding subject to the "permit-but-disclose" requirements under § 1.1206(b) of the rules.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 20, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anthony Serafini at (202) 418-2456.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Released: June 20, 1997

#### **Office of Engineering and Technology Declares Amtech Systems Corporation Waiver Request of Part 15 Spread Spectrum Frequency Hopping Regulations A "Permit-But-Disclose" Proceeding for Ex Parte Purposes**

On April 3, 1996, Amtech Systems Corporation filed a Request for Waiver to provide for authorization of a modulated backscatter tag reader under the part 15 Spread Spectrum Frequency Hopping Regulations. We issued a public notice inviting comments from interested parties.<sup>1</sup> Eight parties responded in support of Amtech's request. One party opposed the request. On June 13, 1997, Amtech filed a letter seeking to have its pending waiver request treated on a "permit-but-disclose" basis for purpose of the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

In the course of examining the filings in this proceeding, OET has concluded that the public interest would be served by modifying the applicable *ex parte* procedures in this case to permit a fuller exchange on the complex issues under consideration in this proceeding. Therefore, in accordance with § 1.1200(a) of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR § 1.1200(a), as revised, this proceeding will be treated, for *ex parte* purposes, as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding and subject to the "permit-but-disclose" requirements under § 1.1206(b) of the rules, 47 CFR § 1.1206(b), as revised.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Public Notice released April 19, 1996, DA 96-609.

<sup>2</sup> See Amendment of 47 CFR § 1.1200 *et seq.* Concerning Ex Parte Presentations in Commission Proceedings, Report and Order in GC Docket No. 95-21, 62 FR 15852 (April 3, 1997).