(Sec. 305, 307, 313(a), 601, 606, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1343, 1348, 1354(a), 1421, 1426); 49 U.S.C. 106(g) (Revised, Pub. L. 97-449, January 12, 1983).)

Note.—This amendment merely makes a minor revision to the minimum standards and procedures used for the approval, installation, operation, and maintenance of non-FAA Microwave Landing System facilities. There is only one non-FAA facility and six airborne receivers operating with the old standard and they will only need inexpensive reprogramming; further, manufacturers are aware of this standard and are already in compliance. Consequently, there is only a minor cost impact as a result of this amendment. Accordingly, it has been determined that this final rule is not major under Executive Order 12291 or signficant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). For these reasons and because there are no cost savings associated with this revision, I certify that, under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In addition, the FAA has determined that the expected impact of this final rule is so minimal that it does not require an evaluation.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 14, 1984.

Michael J. Fenello,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 84-10447 Filed 4-18-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 13

[Docket C-2402]

Georgia-Pacific Corp.; Prohibited Trade Practices, and Affirmative Corrective Actions

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Vacating Order.

SUMMARY: On April 3, 1984, the Federal Trade Commission terminated the order issued against Georgia-Pacific Corp. on May 16, 1973 (38 FR 16992).

DATES: Consent Order issued May 16, 1973. Vacating Order issued April 3, 1984.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: FTC/CC, Selig Merber, Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 634-4642.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Matter of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, a corporation. Codification appearing at 38 FR 16992 is deleted.

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 13

Wood and paper products, Trade practices.

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U.S.C. 46. Interprets or applies Sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 45)

In the matter of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, a corporation; Docket No. C-2402 Order Reopening and Terminating Order.

Issued May 16, 1973.

On December 8, 1983, respondent Georgia-Pacific Corporation ("Georgia-Pacific") filed a "Request To Reopen And Vacate Consent Order" ("Request"), pursuant to Section 5(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45(b) and § 2.51 of the Commission's Rules of Practice. The Request asks the Commission to reopen the consent order issued on May 16, 1973 ("the Order"), and vacate it in its entirety. Georgia-Pacific's Request was on the public record for thirty days and no comments were received.

After reviewing respondent's Request, the Commission has concluded that the public interest warrants reopening and terminating the Order. The action we take today is consistent with our recent determinations in *Occidental Petroleum Corp.*, Docket No. 2492, March 9, 1983, and in *The Southland Corp.*, Docket No. 8915, October 25, 1983.

Accordingly, it is ordered that this matter be, and it hereby is, reopened and that the Commission's order issued on May 16, 1973, shall be of no further force and effect as of the effective date of this order.

By the Commission. Commissioner Bailey voted in the negative.

Issued: April 3, 1984.

Benjamin I. Berman,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 84-10582 Filed 4-18-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 167

[CGD 81-080]

Ports and Waterways Safety, Offshore Traffic Separation Schemes; Galveston Bay: Correction

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a final rule relating to a Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS) published on August 11, 1983 (48 FR 36453). The definition of Traffic Separation Scheme contained in the rule at § 167.5(a) of title 33 Code of Federal Regulations included explanatory matter that is technically incorrect. Therefore the second sentence of the definition is being deleted.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 19, 1984.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Christopher Young, Project Manager, Office of Navigation, Room 1606, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 2nd Street SW, Washington, DC 20593, (202) 245-0108.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The provisions of 33 CFR 167.5 define significant terms associated with offshore Traffic Separation Schemes (TSSs) established under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA) (33 U.S.C. 1223). The definitions are derived from those developed by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) which adopts TSSs for applicability of Rule 10 of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (72 COLREGS). Since the TSS in the approach to Galveston Bay was the first to be established under both IMO and PWSA procedures, it was intended that the new Part 167 would contain definitions which were effectively the same as those used by IMO. This intent was accomplished; however the definition of Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS) was over-inclusive. The correction will limit the definition to more clearly reflect that the TSS under the PWSA and under the IMO are identical for navigation purposes.

The definition for "Traffic Separation Scheme" as given in the IMO publication *Ships' Routing* and IMO Resolution A.378(X) is as follows: "A routing measure aimed at the separation of opposing streams of traffic by appropriate means and by the establishment of traffic lanes".

The definition for "Traffic Separation Scheme" as given in 33 CFR 167.5(a) is identical to the above IMO wording, but the following was also added: "The elements of a TSS include traffic lanes, a separation zone or line, and in many cases, precautionary areas". This last sentence does not conform to the IMO definition.

Under the IMO guidelines, a precautionary area is one type of routing measure and a TSS is another type of routing measure, both of which may be contained within a routing system. Although a precautionary area is normally associated with the termination of a TSS, it is not technically an element of a TSS. In § 167.5(b) and in IMO Guidelines, "precautionary area" is separately defined.

A possible confusion resulting from the definition in 33 CFR 167.5(a) is the application of COLREGS Rule 10 to the TSSs. Rule 10 is made applicable to TSSs promulgated in Part 167 by reference in § 167.10. COLREGS Rule 10(g) instructs vessels, so far as practicable, to "avoid anchoring in a traffic separation scheme or in areas near its terminations." Although precautionary areas typically are described near entry and exit points of lanes, a precautionary area does not, in and of itself, lie within the Rule 10 proscription.

In order to correct the definition and ensure that a TSS as established in Part 167 is interpreted by mariners in the same way as an IMO-adopted TSS, the second sentence of § 167.5(a) of Title 33 CFR is deleted. This action will have no impact on persons to whom the TSS rules apply.

Accordingly, the Coast Guard is correcting Section 167.5(a) of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations (FR Doc. 83–21920), appearing on page 48 FR 36453, August 11, 1983, by removing "The elements of a TSS include traffic lanes, a separation zone or line and, in many cases, precautionary areas."

(92 Stat. 1473; 33 U.S.C. 1223; 49 (CFR 1.46 (N))

Dated: April 9, 1984.

H. H. Kothe,

Acting U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Navigation.

[FR Doc. 84–10541 Filed 4–18–84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

38 CFR Part 17

Unauthorized Medical Services

AGENCY: Veterans Administration.

ACTION: Final regulations.

SUMMARY: The Veterans Administration is amending its medical regulations (38 CFR Part 17), to define the point in time when an emergency ends, for the purpose of approval of claims by veterans for payment and reimbursement of the expenses of emergency hospital care and medical services not previously authorized.

DATES: This regulation is effective March 28, 1984.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph F. Fleckenstein, (202) 389–3785.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Existing regulations specify the criteria for approval of claims by certain veterans for payment and reimbursement of the expenses of hospital care and medical services not previously authorized. One of the prerequisites is that the veterans must have received the care and services in a medical emergency of such nature that delay would have been hazardous to life or health. However, there is no termination point defined for the emergency. The new regulation accomplishes this. This action will correct an inequity which grants a greater benefit to veterans who file claims for payment or reimbursement for the expenses of non-VA hospital care or medical services not previously authorized than for veterans who request and receive prior authorization for such care. In the latter cases, the termination point for VA payment of costs of the emergency hospital care is already clearly defined.

On Page 26627 of the Federal Register of June 9, 1983, the proposed regulation was published for Title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, § 17.80a. Interested persons were given 30 days to submit comments, suggestions or recommendations. One comment was received concerning the decision by a VA physician on the termination point of the emergency. Concern was expressed that a veteran might have to pay for some portion of a hospital bill, since a VA physician decides on when the emergency terminated and this opinion could be different from that of the treating physician. The VA will obtain all available medical documentation and evidence from a treating facility to assist the physician in making a decision based on sound medical judgment. Only when such evidence indicates that a medical emergency has terminated, will veterans be required to pay for charges beyond that date.

An editorial change was made in the title and in the first sentence of the regulation which clearly reflects that the limitation applies to both payment and reimbursement of claims and not just one or the other. This was clearly explained in the summary of the preamble. The final regulation is adopted as set forth below.

The Administrator has determined that this amendment to VA regulations is considered nonmajor under the criteria of Executive Order 12291 on Federal Regulation. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs certifies that this amendment will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), these regulations are exempt from the initial and final regulatory analyses requirements of sections 603 and 604. The reason for this certification is that this change will directly effect only the entitlement of individual veterans to these benefits.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program numbers are 64.009 and 64.011.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 17

Alcoholism, Claims, Dental health, Drug abuse, Foreign relations, Government contracts, Grants programs—health, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Medical devices, Medical research, Mental health programs, Nursing homes, Philippines, Veterans.

Approved: March 28, 1984.

By direction of the Administrator:

Everett Alvarez, Jr.,

Deputy Administrator.

PART 17—[AMENDED]

38 CFR Part 17, *Medical*, is amended by adding a new § 17.80a to read as follows:

§ 17.80a Limitations on payment or reimbursement of the costs of emergency hospital care and medical services not previously authorized.

Claims for payment or reimbursement of the costs of emergency hospital care or medical services not previously authorized will not be approved for any period beyond the date on which the medical emergency ended. For the purpose of payment or reimbursement of the expense of emergency hospital care or medical services not previously authorized, an emergency shall be deemed to have ended at that point when a VA physician has determined that, based on sound medical judgment, a veteran:

(a) Who received emergency hospital care could have been transferred from the non-VA facility to a VA medical center for continuation of treatment for the disability, or

(b) Who received emergency medical services, could have reported to a VA medical center for continuation of treatment for the disability.

From that point on, no additional care in a non-VA facility will be approved for payment by the VA. (38 U.S.C. 210(c)(1))

[FR Doc. 84–10515 Filed 4–18–84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–M

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 10

International Express Mail Service to Ireland

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Final action on International Express Mail Service to Ireland.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to agreement with the postal administration of Ireland, the Postal Service intends to begin

International Express Mail Service with Ireland at postage rates indicated in the tables below. Service is scheduled to begin on May 19, 1984.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 19, 1984.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leon W. Perlinn, (202) 245-4414.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By a notice published in the **Federal Register** on March 15, 1984 [49 FR 9752], the Postal Service announced that it was proposing to begin International Express Mail Service to Ireland. Comments were invited on published rate tables, which are proposed amendments to the International Mail Manual [incorporated by reference in Code of the Federal Regulations, 39 CFR 10.1], and which are to become effective on the date service begins. No comments were received.

Accordingly, the Postal Service states that it intends to begin International Express Mail Service with Ireland on May 19, 1984, at the rates indicated in the tables below.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 10.

Foreign relations, Postal Service.

IRELAND—INTERNATIONAL EXPRESS MAIL

Custom designed service [1,2] Up to and including Pounds	Rate	On demand Service [2] Up to and including Pounds	Rate
1	$27.00	1	$19.00
2	29.90	2	21.90
3	32.80	3	24.80
4	35.70	4	27.70
5	38.60	5	30.60
6	41.50	6	33.50
7	44.40	7	36.40
8	47.30	8	39.30
9	50.20	9	42.20
10	53.10	10	45.10
11	56.00	11	48.00
12	58.90	12	50.90
13	61.80	13	53.80
14	64.70	14	56.70
15	67.60	15	59.60
16	70.50	16	62.50
17	73.40	17	65.40
18	76.30	18	68.30
19	79.20	19	71.20
20	82.10	20	74.10
21	85.00	21	77.00
22	87.90	22	79.90
23	90.80	23	82.80
24	93.70	24	85.70
25	96.60	25	88.60
26	99.50	26	91.50
27	102.40	27	94.40
28	105.30	28	97.30
29	108.20	29	100.20
30	111.10	30	103.10
31	114.00	31	106.00
32	116.90	32	108.90
33	119.80	33	111.80
34	122.70	34	114.70
35	125.60	35	117.60
36	128.50	36	120.50
37	131.40	37	123.40
38	134.30	38	126.30
39	137.20	39	129.20
40	140.10	40	132.10
41	143.00	41	135.00
42	145.90	42	137.90
43	148.80	43	140.80
44	151.70	44	143.70

[1] Rates in this table are applicable to each piece of International Custom Designed Express Mail shipped under a Service Agreement providing for tender by the customer at a designated Post Office.

[2] Pickup is available under a Service Agreement for an added charge of $5.60 for each pickup stop, regardless of the number of pieces picked up. Domestic and International Express Mail picked up together under the same Service Agreement incurs only one pickup charge.

A transmittal letter making these changes in the pages of the International Mail Manual will be published in the **Federal Register** as provided in 39 CFR 10.3 and will be transmitted to subscribers automatically.

(39 U.S.C. 401, 404, 407)

W. Allen Sanders,

Associate General Counsel, Office of General Law and Administration.

[FR Doc. 84-10591 Filed 4-18-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[AL-002; A-4-FRL 2567-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Set II VOC Regulations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is today approving Alabama's Set II volatile organic compound (VOC) regulations. This approval is given because the State has modified their tire manufacturing regulations as specified in EPA's May 19, 1982, proposal (47 FR 21555).

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective April 19, 1984.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the materials submitted by the State may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Public Information Reference Unit, Library Systems Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460

Air Management Branch, EPA, Region IV, 345 Courtland Street NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Library, Office of the Federal Register, 1100 L Street, NW., Room 8401, Washington, D.C. 20005

Alabama Department of Environmental Management, 645 S. McDonough Street, Montgomery, Alabama 36130.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Douglas Cook, Air Management Branch, EPA Region IV, at the above address, telephone 404/881-2864 (FTS: 257-2864).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The State of Alabama held a public hearing on August 21 and November 17, 1980, to consider adopting VOC regulations based on EPA's second set of Control Techniques Guidelines. On January 27, 1981, the Alabama Air Pollution Control Commission adopted regulations covering the Set II source categories for inclusion in Chapter 6 (Control of Organic Emissions) of the State's Air Pollution Control Rules and Regulations. EPA proposed to approve the regulations with the understanding that the State would change the averaging time for Rubber Tire Manufacturing (Section 6.17) to a maximum of 30 days (see 47 FR 21555 for expanded discussion).

On May 4, 1983, following an August 16, 1982, public hearing, the Alabama Environmental Management Commission adopted the required change in Section 6.17. The change was submitted to EPA on May 5, 1983. The Alabama Set II VOC regulations are fully approvable. A problem exists, however, in the interpretation of a portion of pre-existing regulations that allow certain exemptions; this portion applies to both Set I and Set II regulations.

First, it appears that the State regulations in Sections 6.1.1.(a) and 1.2.1, can be erroneously applied so as to exempt any "emission point" or "line" (i.e., "any * * * article, machine, equipment, device or contrivance which * * * may emit any air contaminant") that does not emit more than 100 tons per year (TPY) or VOC. For example, under the State interpretation of "source" in Section 6.1.1(a), a 1000 TPY plant could exempt all those emissions from control simply because no single "emission point" emitted more than 100 TPY. In contrast, well-established EPA legal interpretation has been that Federally approvable VOC regulations must apply to any "stationary source" with the term "stationary source" understood to include all "emission points" located within any contiguous property owned or operated by the same person or entity. In other words, applicability determinations should be based on the total emissions from all "emission points" or "lines" at the plant. To remove any doubt, EPA is clarifying that, for purposes of the Federally-approved SIP, EPA interprets the "100 TPY" exemption as applying only when the plant-wide total of emissions is less thant 100 TPY. Further, EPA possesses the authority to enforce the SIP on that basis. Consequently, individual points within a plant are subject to reasonably available control technology (RACT) irrespective of size if the plant-wide