

6. Revise A010.4.3 and 4.5 to mandate the use of a ZIP Code or ZIP+4 code in the return address on certain mail. (The standard for required use of a return address was not changed by these proposals.)

7. Add A010.5.3 to clarify the meaning and appropriate use of the terms "post office box," "P.O. Box," "PO Box," "POB," "P.O.B.," and similar combinations.

8. Change A010.5.1 to prohibit dual addresses in both the delivery and return addresses on Express Mail and Priority Mail; on registered, certified, restricted delivery, and special delivery mail; and on any mail claimed at a bulk or presort rate.

Miscellaneous organizational and technical revisions were also proposed for clarity and consistency as well.

Over the total comment period, the Postal Service received 53 written responses from printers, mailer associations, publishers, a consultant, and other customers, all offering hundreds of individual comments on the several aspects of the proposed rule. Of the total responses, 47 opposed all or part of the proposed rule, and 6 mixed support for some aspects of the proposal with opposition to others. The public meeting was attended by 48 industry representatives, of whom 20 offered oral comments for the record. In addition, 22 representatives submitted written comments, including 13 of those who gave oral comments. Neither the oral nor the written comments raised issues not already exposed in the written comments described earlier.

The Postal Service concluded that, despite the merit of some elements of the proposed rule, the broad, general opposition expressed by commenters to the proposal argued strongly for its reconsideration. Moreover, the advent of classification reform was an opportunity, seen both by the Postal Service and the commenters, to enact more fundamental changes and thus render moot some issues in the proposed rule.

Therefore, in view of the comments received and the events that have occurred since the proposed rule was published, the Postal Service has determined to withdraw its proposal at this time. The Postal Service does so, however, with the caveat that elements of the proposed rule are likely to be republished at a later date for comment, separately or in combination, as part of

classification reform rulemaking or otherwise.

Stanley F. Mires,
Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 95-17472 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[KS-5-1-6958b; FRL-5250-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Kansas. The revision includes the creation of a class II operating permit program and revisions and additions to existing SIP rules. The approval of the class II permitting program authorizes Kansas to issue Federally enforceable state operating permits addressing both criteria pollutants (regulated under section 110 of the Clean Air Act) and hazardous air pollutants (regulated under section 112 of the Act). In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this 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 document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by August 16, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Wayne A. Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne A. Kaiser at (913) 551-7603.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final

rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: June 21, 1995.

Dennis Grams,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-17215 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Parts 261, 271 and 302

[SWH-FRL-5259-3]

Extension of Comment Period for the Proposed Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste/Dye and Pigment Industries

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) again is extending the comment period for the proposed listing determination on a number of wastes generated during the production of dyes and pigments, which appeared in the **Federal Register** on December 22, 1994 (see 59 FR 66072-66114). The public comment period for this proposed rule was to end on July 19, 1995. The purpose of this document is to extend the comment period an additional 90 days beyond that, to end on October 17, 1995. This extension of the comment period is provided in response to a request by a trade association representing the affected industry, due to outstanding confidential business information (CBI) issues.

DATES: EPA will accept public comments on this proposed listing determination until October 17, 1995. Comments postmarked after the close of the comment period will be stamped "late".

ADDRESSES: The public must send an original and two copies of their comments to EPA RCRA Docket Number F-94-DPLP-FFFFF, Room 2616, U.S. EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC. The docket is open from 9 am to 4 pm, Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. The public must make an appointment to review docket materials by calling (202) 260-9327. The public may copy material from any regulatory docket at no cost for the first 100 pages, and at \$0.15 per page for additional copies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical information concerning this notice, please contact Wanda Levine, Office of Solid Waste (5304), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,

401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460, (202) 260-7458.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposed rule was issued under Section 3001(b) of RCRA. EPA proposed to list certain wastes generated during the production of dyes and pigments because these wastes may pose a substantial present or potential risk to human health or the environment when improperly managed. See 59 FR 66072-114 (December 22, 1994) for a more detailed explanation of the proposed rule.

These proposed hazardous waste listings were based in part upon data claimed as confidential by certain dye and pigment manufacturers. Although EPA intends to publish these data or information derived from these data claimed as confidential (to the extent relevant to the proposed listing), the Agency is unable to do so at the present time, pending a decision on current CBI litigation. EPA is pursuing avenues to allow publication of the information, and intends to supplement the public record prior to issuance of a final listing. In addition, the Ecological and Toxicological Association of Dyes and Organic Pigments Manufacturers (ETAD) requested an additional extension of the comment period for the same reason, *i.e.*, that the CBI issues have not been resolved yet.

Therefore, for these reasons, EPA is extending the comment period to provide sufficient time for the public to comment if and when additional data are published.

Dated: July 11, 1995.

Loretta Marzetti,

Acting Director, Office of Solid Waste.

[FR Doc. 95-17475 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 95-104, RM-8656]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Johannesburg, CA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed on behalf of Jacqueline Lago requesting the allotment of Channel 265A to Johannesburg, California, as that community's second local FM service. Coordinates used for Channel 265A at Johannesburg are 35-22-24 and

117-38-06. Johannesburg is located within 320 kilometers (199 miles) of the United States-Mexico border, and therefore, the Commission must obtain concurrence of the Mexican government to this proposal.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before September 1, 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's counsel, as follows: Denise B. Moline, Esq., 6800 Fleetwood Road, Suite 100, P.O. Box 539, McLean, VA 22101.

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. 95-104, adopted June 29, 1995, and released July 11, 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. 95-17377 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

Denial of Petition for Rulemaking; Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition from Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. for rulemaking to permit an alternative performance requirement (allowing permissible moisture presence) for certain types of headlamps after completion of the humidity test. The humidity test of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108, Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment, was shortened in duration in 1991 to accommodate another petition from Koito; thus, this petition is somewhat repetitive. The requirement of no visible moisture inside the headlamp has existed for replaceable bulb headlamps since their inception in 1983. The claim by Koito that the requirement is not a performance standard but a design standard is without merit. Koito's proposed supplementary corrosion test for headlamps with visible moisture present after a humidity test does not seem to support its claim of no long-term photometric degradation in these headlamps passing the test.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jere Medlin, Office of Rulemaking, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Medlin's telephone number is: (202) 366-5276; FAX (202) 366-4329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 19, 1995, Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Koito) petitioned for a change to the humidity test performance requirements for replaceable bulb, integral beam, and some types of combination headlighting systems. The present humidity performance requirement originated in 1983 and requires that no evidence of delamination or moisture, fogging or condensation be present to the eye (without magnification) upon completion of the humidity test sequence. Koito proposed an alternative requirement for those headlamps that cannot pass this requirement. Koito did not provide any test data to substantiate its claim that there is no long-term performance degradation in photometric