Lewisburg Dump Superfund Site, which was the subject of FR Doc. 96–3581 is corrected as follows:

On page 6556, in the third column, in Part 300, Appendix B—[Amended], paragraph 2, ''Table 2'' is corrected to read ''Table 1.''

Dated: March 6, 1996.

Phyllis P. Harris,

Acting Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 96–6241 Filed 3–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Part 10

RIN 3067–AC41

Environmental Considerations/ Categorical Exclusions

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Correction of final rule.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the final rule published on Monday, February 5, 1996 (61 FR 4227). The rule relates to environmental considerations and exclusions from environmental impact statements or assessments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 5, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rick Shivar, Office of Policy and Regional Operations, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, or telephone (202) 646–3610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency published a final rule on February 5, 1996 that clarified the statutory exclusions and revised the categorical exclusions that normally would not require an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment. As published the final rule omitted the statutory reference to section 402 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in revising 44 CFR 10.8(c)(1).

Accordingly, the final rule published as FR Doc. 96–2087 on February 5, 1996 61 FR 4227, is corrected as follows:

On page 4230, in the third column, § 10.8(c)(1) is corrected to read as follows:

§ 10.8   Determination of requirement for environmental review.

*   *   *   *   *

(c) * * *

(1) Action taken or assistance provided under sections 402, 403, 407, or 502 of the Stafford Act; and

*   *   *   *   *

Dated: March 7, 1996.

Harvey G. Ryland,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 96–6081 Filed 3–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 0

[FCC 96–92]

Delegated Authority to Process Mutually Exclusive ITFS Applications

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On February 8, 1996, President Clinton signed into law the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Telecom Act).[1] Section 403(c) of the Telecom Act authorizes the Commission to delegate to the staff the authority to process and grant from among mutually exclusive applications for Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) facilities. By this Order, we exercise this option and delegate such authority to the staff.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul R. Gordon, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, Legal Branch, (202) 418–2130.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order, FCC 96–92, adopted March 7, 1996 and released March 8, 1996. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 239), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Synopsis of Order

1. *Statutory Authority to Delegate.* Mutually exclusive applications for new ITFS facilities currently are resolved by the full Commission in a paper hearing by means of a point accumulation system. After calculating each applicant's score based on information submitted with the application, the

[1] Public Law No. 104–104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).

Commission determines which applicant is the most qualified to serve the public interest. Because this is considered a comparative hearing, the processing staff has been statutorily barred from granting or denying any of the applications. Pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (''APA''), the Commission itself must preside in the taking of evidence in a comparative hearing, or it may delegate this function to either (1) one or more members of the Commission, or (2) one or more administrative law judges.[2] However, the APA adds that these limitations do not supersede agency delegation authority that is designated under statute.[3]

2. Section 403(c) of the Telecom Act authorizes such a delegation with regard to the processing of ITFS applications, expressly superseding the APA's restrictions. It replaces the last sentence of Section 5(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 with the following:

Except for cases involving the authorization of service in the instructional television fixed service, or as otherwise provided in this Act, nothing in this paragraph shall authorize the Commission to provide for the conduct, by any person or persons other than persons referred to in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 556(b) of title 5, United States Code [the APA], of any hearing to which such section applies.[4]

3. *Exercise of the Commission's Delegation Authority.* We believe that delegation to the staff of ITFS processing authority will speed the processing of ITFS applications, complementing recent rule changes designed to increase ITFS processing efficiency. Moreover, the Commission has conducted a substantial number of hearings for ITFS facilities over the past several years and has developed a large body of case law addressing a variety of issues. Educational applicants, their wireless cable lessees, and Commission staff have become familiar with the many legal and technical issues involved in applying for ITFS facilities. Thus, we believe that delegation will serve the public interest by increasing processing efficiency and allowing more rapid authorization and initiation of service to the public.

Administrative Matters. Because this action involves rules of agency organization and procedure, the notice

[2] 5 U.S.C. 556(b)(2) and (3).

[3] 47 U.S.C. 556(b) (''this subchapter does not supersede the conduct of specified classes of proceedings, in whole or in part, by or before boards or other employees specially provided for or designated under statute'').

[4] To be codified at 47 U.S.C. 155(c)(1).