Public Participation

ATF requests comments from all interested parties. Comments received on or before the closing date will be carefully considered. Comments received after that date will be given the same consideration if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except as to comments received on or before the closing date.

ATF will not recognize any comment as confidential. Comments may be disclosed to the public. Any material which a commenter considers to be confidential or inappropriate for disclosure to the public should not be included in the comment. The name of the person submitting a comment is not exempt from disclosure. During the comment period, any person may request an opportunity to present oral testimony at a public hearing. However, the Director reserves the right to determine, in light of all circumstances, whether a public hearing will be held.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document is Mary Lou Blake, Wine, Beer, and Spirits Regulations Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

List of Subject in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practices and procedures, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, and Wine.

Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 9, American Viticultural Areas, is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 9—AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for Part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

* * * * *

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

Par. 2. Section 9.84(c) is revised to read as follows:

§ 9.84 Paso Robles.

* * * * *

(c) *Boundaries.* The Paso Robles viticultural area is located within San Luis Obispo County, California. From the point of beginning where the county lines of San Luis Obispo, Kings and Kern Counties converge, the county line also being the township line between T.24S. and T.25S., in R.16E.:

(1) Then in a westerly direction along this county line for 42 miles to the range line between R.9E. and R.10E.;

(2) Then in a southerly direction for 12 miles along the range line to the southwest of corner of T.26S. and R.10E.;

(3) Then in a southeasterly direction, approximately 5.5 miles to a point of intersection of the Dover Canyon Jeep Trail and Dover Canyon Road;

(4) Then in an easterly direction along Dover Canyon Road, approximately 1.5 miles, to the western border line of Rancho Paso de Robles;

(5) Then, following the border of the Paso Robles land grant, beginning in an easterly direction, to a point where it intersects the range line between R.11E. and R.12E.;

(6) Then southeasterly for approximately 16.5 miles to the point of intersection of the township line between T.29S. and T.30S. and the range line between R.12E. and R.13E.;

(7) Then in an easterly direction for approximately 6 miles to the range line between R.13E. and R.14E.;

(8) Then in a northerly direction for approximately 6 miles to the township line between T.28S. and T.29S.;

(9) Then in an easterly direction for approximately 18 miles to the range line between R.16E. and R.17E.;

(10) Then in a northerly direction for approximately 24 miles to the point of beginning.

Dated: December 29, 1995.

Daniel R. Black,

Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 96–298 Filed 1–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 67

[CGD 95–052]

RIN 2115–AF15

Conformance of Lights on Artificial Islands and Fixes Structures, and Other Facilities to IALA Standards

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: In keeping with the National Performance Review, the Coast Guard is reviewing its requirements for lights on artificial islands and fixed structures (such as oil rigs) and other facilities to bring them into conformance with the International Association of Lighthouse Authorities (IALA) standards. Also, the Coast Guard is reviewing its approval procedures and considering requiring manufacturers to have lighting equipment and fog signal emitters tested by independent laboratories. Adopting the IALA standards may enhance maritime safety by conforming to lighting standards which are easier for the mariner to understand. After consideration of the comments received, the Coast Guard may initiate a rulemaking project.

DATES: Comments are requested by February 9, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G–LRA/3406) (CGD 95–052), U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593–001, or may be delivered to room 3406 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (202) 267–1477.

The Executive Secretary maintains the public docket for this request for comments. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room 3406, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG Chad Asplund, Short Range Aids to Navigation Division, Telephone: (202) 267–1386.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to participate in this request for comments by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (CGD 95–052) and the specific section of this notice to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit two copies of all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclosed stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes.

Background and Purpose

In keeping with the National Performance Review, the Coast Guard is reviewing its standards for lighting equipment presently required on artificial islands, fixed structures, and other facilities. The Coast Guard is considering bringing the lighting standards into conformance with the International Association of Lighthouse Authorities (IALA) standards. In 1982, the United States, along with most of the world's other maritime nations, became a party to the agreement that established the IALA Maritime Buoyage

System (MBS). In 1985, the United States began harmonizing the United States Aids to Navigation System (USATONS) with the MBS.

If the standards of IALA are adopted, the current candlepower for these lights would be revised to an ''area specific'' standard. These lights would still have to be visible for 90 percent of the nights of the year. The Coast Guard is also considering standardizing the approval procedures for optical and audio equipment for fog signal emitters.

Presently, under 33 CFR part 67, all artificial islands and structures erected on or over the seabed and subsoil of the outer continental shelf (OCS) are marked as private aids to navigation. The obstruction lights prescribed are either a white or red, quick-flashing, all-around light, depending on structure classification and background lighting. Multiple obstruction lights are required to flash in unison.

The IALA standards define a quick-flashing, white light as a north cardinal mark. The present private aid system may be misleading to the mariner accustomed to the IALA system. The mariner accustomed to using a white, quick-flashing light as a cardinal mark might mistake a structure which is not a cardinal mark for a cardinal mark. To conform with IALA, each structure would retain the red or white light, but display a Morse code ''U'' (..-) rather than the quick flashing light.

Current regulations in 33 CFR part 67, subpart 67.05 require that lights be of sufficient candlepower so as to be visible for a prescribed distance, corresponding to the structure's class, 90 percent of the nights of the year. Certain geographic regions have environmental conditions that preclude lights from meeting the above standard. The new standards might divide the country into separate regions to allow for differences in transmissivity and its effects on the range of visibility. For example, one region might include the First, Ninth, and Eleventh Coast Guard Districts, while the other region might include the remaining districts.

The existing procedure in 33 CFR 67.05–10 that regulates lighting equipment states that manufacturers of lights must have their equipment approved by the District Commander and a permit must be issued before the equipment can be distributed. This procedure might be changed to require an independent laboratory to conduct the test. If so, the manufacturer would then forward the results to Commandant (G-NSR), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 2nd Street SW., Washington, D.C., 20593, for review.

Cost Information

The Coast Guard is seeking additional information on the cost that could be associated with this project. Presently, the Coast Guard is consulting with Automatic Power Incorporated, Tideland Signal Corporation, and Sea Nav Corporation in an effort to estimate the economic impact that this project could have on manufacturers and users. The Coast Guard specifically requests comments from laboratories which conduct tests of lighting systems and fog signal emitters covered by part 67 regarding the costs of approvals.

Solicitation of Views

The Coast Guard solicits comments from all segments of the marine community and other interested persons on these suggestions and recommended alternatives related to obstruction lighting on artificial islands, fixed structures, and other facilities. The Coast Guard is particularly interested in receiving information, views, data, and reasons on the following questions and areas of concern:

1. Should these lights be changed to conform to IALA standards?

Should the lights be charged to Morse ''U'' in accordance with IALA standards, or with another configuration?

2. Should Class ''C'' structures be required to conform to IALA?

3. Should fog signal and light inspection procedures be changed?

Should the equipment approval procedures be changed to require testing by independent laboratories with results then forwarded to the Coast Guard?

Would such a change increase or decrease costs and compliance time?

4. What other factors should be considered in light of this proposed change?

Is there any other information that you feel may be helpful in implementing this change with less impact on the affected persons?

Dated: January 3, 1996.

J.A. Creech,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Chief, Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services.

[FR Doc. 96–354 Filed 1–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

---

33 CFR Part 117

[CGD05–95–081]

RIN 2115–AE47

Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Anacostia River, Washington, DC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: At the request of the Consolidated Rail Corporation (CONRAIL), the Coast Guard is proposing to change the regulations that govern the operation of the railroad bridge across the Anacostia River, mile 3.4, at Washington, DC. This proposal would change the current schedule by extending the winter seasonal restrictions and reducing the hours of operation during the boating season.

These changes to the drawbridge regulations are intended to relieve the bridge owner of the burden of having a bridgetender staff the bridge during periods of non-use, while still providing for the reasonable needs of navigation.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 9, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Commander (ob), Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704–5004, or may be delivered to Room 109 at the same address between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is (804) 398–6222. Comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection at Room 109, Fifth Coast Guard District.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann B. Deaton, Bridge Administrator, Fifth Coast Guard District, at (804) 398–6222.

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 rulemaking (CGD05–95–081) and the specific section of this proposal to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. The Coast Guard requests that all comments and attachments be submitted in an unbound format suitable for copying and electronic filing. If not practical, a second copy of any bound material is requested. Persons wanting acknowledgement of receipt of comments should enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

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

The Coast Guard plans no public hearing. Persons may request a public hearing by writing to the Commander (ob) at the address under **ADDRESSES**. The request should include reasons why