

longer qualifying for bidding credits under this section, the licensee must seek Commission approval and reimburse the government for the amount of the bidding credit as a condition of the approval of such assignment, transfer or other ownership change.

(2) If during the term of the initial license grant (see § 24.15), a licensee that utilizes a bidding credit under this section seeks to assign or transfer control of its license to an entity meeting the eligibility standards for lower bidding credits or seeks to make any other change in ownership that would result in the licensee qualifying for a lower bidding credit under this section, the licensee must seek Commission approval and reimburse the government for the difference between the amount of the bidding credit obtained by the licensee and the bidding credit for which the assignee, transferee or licensee is eligible under this section as a condition of the approval of such assignment, transfer or other ownership change.

10. Section 24.720 is amended by revising paragraphs (l)(11)(ii) and (n)(3) and adding paragraph (n)(4) to read as follows:

§ 24.720 Definitions.

* * * * *

(l) * * *

(11) * * *

(ii) For purposes of § 24.713(a)(2) and paragraph (b)(2) of this section, an entity controlled by *members of minority groups* is not considered an *affiliate* of an applicant (or licensee) that qualify as a *business owned by members of minority groups and/or women* if affiliation would arise solely from control of such entity by members of the applicant's (or licensee's) control group who are *members of minority groups*. For purposes of this paragraph (l)(11)(ii), the term minority-controlled entity shall mean, in the case of a corporation, an entity in which 50.1 percent of the voting interests is owned by *members of minority groups* or, in the case of a partnership, all of the general partners are *members of minority groups* or *entities controlled by members of minority groups*; and, in all cases, one in which *members of minority groups* have both *de jure* and *de facto* control of the entity.

* * * * *

(n) * * *

* * * * *

(3) For purposes of assessing compliance with the minimum equity requirements of § 24.709(b) (5) and (6), where such equity interests are not held

directly in the applicant, interests held by *qualifying investors* shall be determined by successive multiplication of the ownership percentages for each link in the vertical ownership chain.

(4) For purposes of assessing compliance with the minimum equity requirements of § 24.713(b) (5) and (6), where such equity interests are not held directly in the applicant, interests held by *qualifying investors* and *qualifying minority and/or women investors* shall be determined by successive multiplication of the ownership percentages for each link in the vertical ownership chain.

[FR Doc. 95-16130 Filed 6-29-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket Nos. 91-221 and 87-8; 94-149 and 91-140; and 94-150, 92-51 and 87-154; DA 95-1373]

Mass Media Ownership Rules

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Commission granted an extension of time to file reply comments in the above three proceedings in response to a request filed by the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council to extend the filing dates for two of the three proceedings. The three related rulemaking items involve ownership of television stations, minority and female ownership of mass media facilities, and attribution of ownership interests.

The Commission had already granted an extension of the original deadline for filing comments in the three proceedings from April 17, 1995, to May 17, 1995, and had extended the original deadline for filing reply comments from May 17, 1995, to June 19, 1995. 60 Fed. Reg. 19566 (April 19, 1995). Petitioners requested an additional two-week extension of time to file reply comments in the proceedings dealing with minority and female ownership and attribution. The Commission determined that a three-week extension was warranted for all three proceedings because of the possible relevance of the issues addressed by the Supreme Court in *Adarand Construction v. Pena*, No. 93-1841 (June 12, 1995).

DATES: Reply comments are now due on July 10, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jane Hinckley Halprin or Mania Baghdadi at (202) 776-1653, or Robert Kieschnick at (202) 739-0764.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Order Granting Extension of Time for Filing Reply Comments

Adopted: June 16, 1995; Released: June 16, 1995

By the Chief, Mass Media Bureau:

1. On December 15, 1994, the Commission adopted three related rulemaking items regarding ownership of television stations, minority and female ownership of the mass media, and attribution of ownership interests. *Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making* in MM Docket Nos. 91-221 and 87-8, 10 FCC Rcd 3524 (1995) 60 FR 6490, February 2, 1995 (*TV Ownership Further Notice*); *Notice of Proposed Rule Making* in MM Docket Nos. 94-149 and 91-140, 10 FCC Rcd 2788 (1995) 60 FR 6068, February 1, 1995 (*Minority/Female Ownership Notice*); *Notice of Proposed Rule Making* in MM Docket Nos. 94-150, 92-51, and 87-154, 10 FCC Rcd 3606 (1995) 60 FR 6483, February 2, 1995 (*Attribution Notice*). Comments in all three proceedings were initially due on April 17, 1995, and reply comments were initially due on May 17, 1995. By *Order* released April 7, 1995 60 FR 19566, April 19, 1995, the time for filing comments in the three proceedings was extended to May 17, 1995, and the time for filing reply comments was extended to June 19, 1995. In addition, in an *Order* released on June 15, 1995, we extended the time for filing reply comments in response to the *TV Ownership Further Notice* to June 30, 1995.

2. On June 16, 1995, the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council (Petitioner) filed a request for an additional two-week extension of time to file reply comments in response to the *Attribution Notice* and the *Minority/Female Ownership Notice*. Petitioner contends additional time is needed to analyze the effect of the Commission's minority ownership policies of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Adarand Construction v. Pena*, No. 93-1841 (June 12, 1995).

3. As set forth in Section 1.46 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR § 1.46, it is our policy that extensions of time for filing comments in rulemaking proceedings shall not be routinely granted. The initial comment period in all three proceedings was longer than usual, and one 30-day extension of time for all three proceedings has already been granted. However, because of the possible relevance of the issues addressed in *Adarand* to the highly

complex rulemakings that are the subject of the instant request, we believe a further extension of the reply comment deadline for the *Minority/Female Ownership Notice* and the *Attribution Notice* is warranted. Because there may be benefit to a concurrent schedule for the three proceedings, we also, on our own motion, extend the reply comment deadline for the *TV Ownership Further Notice*.

4. Accordingly, it is ordered that the Motion for Extension of Time filed in MM Docket Nos. 94-150, 92-51, 87-154, 94-149 and 91-140 by the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council IS granted to the extent detailed above.

5. It is further ordered that the time for filing reply comments in the three above-captioned proceedings is extended to July 10, 1995.

6. This action is taken pursuant to authority found in Sections 4(i) and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i) and 303(r), and Sections 0.204(b), 0.283, and 1.45 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.204(b), 0.283, and 1.45.

Federal Communications Commission.

Roy J. Stewart,

Chief, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-16072 Filed 6-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 95-87, RM-8644]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Hatfield, AR

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed by John Harle, requesting the allotment of FM Channel 281C2 to Hatfield, Arkansas, as that community's first local aural transmission service. Coordinates used for this proposal are 34-31-04 and 94-23-46.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before August 18, 1995, and reply comments on or before September 18, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: John Harle, 951 Redan, Houston, TX 77009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Joyner, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, MM Docket No. 95-87, adopted June 8, 1995, and released June 27, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, See 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-16117 Filed 6-29-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 572

[Docket No. 74-14; Notice 96]

RIN 2127-AF41

Anthropomorphic Test Dummy; Occupant Crash Protection

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document proposes modifications to the Hybrid III test dummy, which is specified by the agency for use in compliance testing under Standard No. 208, Occupant crash protection. The agency is proposing minor modifications to the femurs and ankles to improve biofidelity, and is considering

specifying use of a neck shield. The changes would have practically no effect on Standard No. 208 test results, but would make the compliance test dummy more useful to vehicle manufacturers in the more severe impact conditions of some research and vehicle development programs. This rulemaking results from petitions submitted by Ford, Toyota, Honda and Nissan.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 29, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket and notice number of this notice and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. (Docket Room hours are 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m., Monday through Friday.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stanley Backaitis, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-4912. Fax: (202) 366-4329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Standard No. 208, *Occupant Crash Protection*, currently permits the use of either the Hybrid III test dummy or the older Hybrid II dummy in compliance testing. Effective September 1, 1997, however, the Standard will specify the use of only a single dummy, the Hybrid III dummy.

NHTSA adopted the Hybrid III dummy as an alternative to the older dummy in a final rule published in the **Federal Register** (51 FR 26688) on July 25, 1986. That rulemaking resulted from a petition submitted by General Motors (GM). The specifications for the Hybrid III dummy appear in subpart E of 49 CFR part 572.

The Hybrid III dummy is the most human like test dummy currently available and represents a number of advances over the earlier dummy. Among other things, the Hybrid III dummy has a more humanlike seated posture, head, neck, chest, and lumbar spine designs that meet biofidelic impact response requirements, and the capability of monitoring almost four times as many injury-indicating parameters as compared with the Hybrid II dummy. NHTSA decided to specify exclusive use of the Hybrid III dummy in a final rule published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 59189) on November 8, 1993.

The Hybrid III dummy has seen widespread use in recent years. A number of manufacturers have used that dummy for Standard No. 208 certification purposes. Moreover, many manufacturers use this advanced