FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 36 and 69

[CC Docket No. 96–45; DA–96–702]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule: Denial of extension of time.

SUMMARY: On May 6, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission (''Commission'') released an Order (''Order'') denying a request to extend the deadline for filing reply comments to its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board, released March 8, 1996 (CC Docket No. 96–45). The Commission denied the request out of concern that further delay in this proceeding might jeopardize the Joint Board's ability to issue a recommended decision within the statutory deadline set forth in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. By not extending the period for filing reply comments, the Commission intends to support the Joint Board in its resolve to announce its recommended decision on or before the statutory deadline of November 8, 1996.

DATES: Reply comments were due on or before May 8, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jon Reel, 202–418–0850, Accounting and Audits Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 8, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board (''NPRM''), 61 FR 10499 (March 14, 1996). The Commission sought comment on all matters discussed in that NPRM. The deadline for comments was April 8, 1996 and the deadline for reply comments was May 3, 1996. On April 1, 1996, the Commission released an Order that extended the comment period until April 12, 1996 and the reply comment period until May 7, 1996 for all interested parties. On April 30, 1996, Information Renaissance and California Technology Assistance Project (petitioners) filed a joint request for a seven day further extension of the reply comment deadline. Petitioners argued that a further extension would permit parties to avail themselves of the original comments that petitioners had put on the World Wide Web in electronic form, and thereby file reply comments based upon a better knowledge of the original comments. Believing that a further extension of time would seriously jeopardize the Joint Board's ability to issue a recommended decision within the statutory deadline set forth in the Act, the Commission found that the public interest would not be served by a further extension of time. Pursuant to the Commission's rules governing motions for the extension of time (47 CFR § 1.46), however, parties have two business days grace after the Commission acts on a timely filed motion for an extension of time. Because the Commission denied petitioner's motion on May 6, 1996, reply comments were due May 8, 1996.

Federal Communications Commission.

Kenneth P. Moran,

Chief, Accounting and Audits Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 96–13667 Filed 5–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 195

[Docket PS–140(e); Notice 6]

RIN 2137–AC34

Areas Unusually Sensitive to Environmental Damage

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

ACTION: Public workshop.

SUMMARY: RSPA invites industry, government agencies, and the public to the fifth workshop on unusually sensitive areas (USAs). The purpose of this workshop is to openly discuss drinking water resources. This workshop is a continuation of the USA workshops held June 15–16, 1995; October 17, 1995; January 18, 1996; and April 10–11, 1996.

DATES: The workshop will be held on June 18–19, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Persons who are unable to attend may submit written comments in duplicate by July 30, 1996. However, persons submitting comments to be considered at the June 18–19 workshop must do so by June 10, 1966. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all material that is relevant to a statement of fact or argument. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held at the U.S. DOT, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Room 6244–48, Washington, DC. Non-federal employee visitors are admitted into the DOT building through the southwest entrance at Seventh and E Streets SW. Persons who want to participate in the workshop should call (202) 366–2392 or e-mail their name, affiliation, and phone number to samesc@rspa.dot.gov before close of business June 10, 1996.

Send written comments in duplicate to the Dockets Unit, Room 8421, RSPA, U.S. DOT, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the heading of this notice.

All comments and docketed materials will be available for inspection and copying in Room 8421 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. each business day. A summary of the workshop will be available from the Dockets Unit about three weeks after the workshop.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Sames, (202) 366–4561, about this document, or the Dockets Unit, (202) 366–5046, for copies of this document or other material in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The pipeline safety laws (49 U.S.C. § 60109) require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations that establish criteria for identifying each hazardous liquid pipeline facility and gathering line, whether otherwise subject to 49 U.S.C. Chapter 601, located in an area that the Secretary, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), describes as unusually sensitive to environmental damage if there is a hazardous liquid pipeline accident.

Consistent with the President's regulatory policy (E.O. 12866), RSPA wants to accomplish this congressional mandate at the least cost to society. Toward this end, RSPA is seeking early public participation in the rulemaking process by holding public workshops at which participants, including RSPA staff, may exchange views on relevant issues. RSPA hopes these workshops will enable government and industry to reach a better understanding of the problem and the potential solutions before proposed rules are issued.

To date, RSPA has held four public workshops on unusually sensitive areas (USAs). Participants at the workshops have included representatives from the hazardous liquid pipeline industry; the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, and Commerce; EPA;

non-government agencies; and the public.

The first workshop was held on June 15 and 16, 1995, and focused on criteria being considered to determine USAs (60 FR 27948; May 26, 1995). A second workshop held on October 17, 1995, focused on developing a process that could be used to determine if an area is a USA (60 FR 44824; August 29, 1995). The third workshop on January 18, 1996, focused on guiding principles for determining USAs (61 FR 342; January 4, 1996).

Participants at the fourth workshop held April 10–11, 1996, (61 FR 13144; March 26, 1996) discussed the criteria, components, and parameters of the following ten terms that have been used when describing USAs: Significant, Threat of significant contamination, Contamination, Ecological, Drinking water resources, Recreational areas, Economic areas, Cultural areas, Readily available, and Uniform. Participants also discussed the scope and objectives of the additional USA workshops.

Additional information and the results of the four workshops can be obtained from the RSPA Docket Unit at (202) 366–5046. Please reference Docket PS–140, PS–140(a), PS–140(b), and PS–140(c), when requesting the information.

API Technical Meeting

On May 9–10, 1996, the American Petroleum Institute (API) held a meeting of technical experts to discuss drinking water resources. RSPA and EPA attended this meeting and provided a draft discussion point paper on drinking water resources that RSPA intends to discuss at its public workshop on drinking water resources. The draft discussed possible areas of primary concern (also known as USA candidates) and possible filtering criteria that could be used in determining which drinking water resources are unusually sensitive to damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release. The unedited notes from the API meeting and all materials presented at that meeting can be obtained from the Dockets Unit at the above address. Please reference Docket PS–140(d) when requesting the information.

The following discusses the areas of primary concern and filtering criteria for drinking water resources that are currently being considered. This draft will be discussed in detail at the June 18 and 19 workshop. This draft is not final and RSPA invites comments on these primary concerns, filtering criteria, and issues. This draft and any additional information that is submitted to the docket before June 10 will be considered at the June 18–19 workshop.

Drinking Water Resource Areas of Primary Concern

Drinking water resource areas of primary concern (USA candidates) are a subset of the drinking water surface intakes and groundwater based drinking water supplies. Drinking water USA candidates being considered include:

A. Public Water System (PWS): provides piped water for human consumption to at least 15 service connections or serves an average of at least 25 people for at least 60 days each year. These systems include the sources of the water supplies—i.e., surface or ground, PWSs can be community, nontransient noncommunity, or transient noncommunity systems.

1. *Community Water System (CWS):* a PWS that provides water to the same population year round.

2. *Nontransient Noncommunity Water System (NTNCWS):* a PWS that regularly serves at least 25 of the same people at least six months of the year. [Examples of these systems include schools, factories, and hospitals that have their own water supplies.]

3. *Transient Noncommunity Water System (TNCWS):* a PWS that caters to transitory customers in nonresidential areas (e.g., campgrounds motels, and gas stations).

B. Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA): the surface and subsurface area surrounding a well or well field that supplies a public water system through which contaminants are likely to pass and eventually reach the water well or well field.

C. Sole Source Aquifer (SSA): areas designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under the Sole Source Aquifer program as the ''sole or principal'' source of drinking water for an area.

Drinking Water Resource Filtering Criteria

Filtering criteria are intended to assist RSPA in determining which areas of primary concern are truly unusually sensitive to damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release. Drinking water resource filtering criteria would be applied to the drinking water resource areas of primary concern to determine which of the USA candidates are USAs. RSPA is considering the following filtering criteria and has listed issues under each:

Filter Criteria #1: If the public water system is a Transient Noncommunity Water System (TNCWS), the water intakes shall not be designated as USAs.

Filter Criteria #1 Issue: The readily available data source that would be used to make this determination on a nationwide basis is the Federal Reporting Data System (FRDS), that is being replaced by the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS). There are concerns about the quality of this database and whether it can be used to confidently identify TNCWSs.

Filter Criteria #2: For CWS and NTNCWS that obtain their water supply primarily from surface water sources, and do not have an adequate alternative source of water, the water intakes shall be designated as USAs.

Filter Criteria #2 Issues:

A. A definition is needed for an adequate alternative source of water. The intent is that, in the event of a spill which threatens to shut down a water intake, there would be surface water intakes in a different surface water body that are not in the threat zone, or there would be groundwater sources that could be utilized during the threat period, or there would be other drinking water systems that could temporarily provide drinking water to the shut-down system.

B. There are no readily available national databases on which this filtering criteria could be applied.

Filter Criteria #3: For CWS and NTNCWS that obtain their water supply primarily from groundwater sources, where the source aquifer is identified as a Class I or Class IIa (as identified in Pettyjohn et al., 1991; EPA Document: EPA/600/2–91/043, August 1991; see Attachment A), and that do not have an adequate alternative source of water, the WHPAs for such systems shall be designated as USAs.

Filter Criteria #3 Issues:

A. Determination of the source aquifer is a complex problem, and no national database is available. Furthermore, for some CWS and NTNCWS, the depth of the wells or source aquifer is not known.

B. Seven states do not have Wellhead Protection Programs. Where WHPAs are not adequately delineated, WHPA (criteria, threshold, methods, etc.) will be generated.

C. A definition is needed for an adequate alternative source of water for groundwater systems.

D. The classification system discussed in Filter Criteria #3 (above) has data coverage for the conterminous United States. Data for Alaska, Hawaii, and all other U.S. possessions must be identified.

Filter Criteria #4: For CWS and NTNCWS that obtain their water supply primarily from groundwater sources, where the source aquifer is identified as

a Class IIb, Class IIc or Class U (as identified in Pettyjohn et al., 1991; EPA Document: EPA/600/2–91/043, August 1991; see Attachment A), the public water systems that rely on these aquifers shall not be designated as USAs.

Filter Criteria #5: For CWS and NTNCWS that obtain their water supply primarily from ground water sources, where the source aquifer is identified as a Class I or Class IIa (as identified in Pettyjohn et al., 1991; EPA Document: EPA/600/2–91/043, August 1991; see Attachment A), and the aquifer is designated as a sole source aquifer, an area twice the WHPA shall be designated as an USA.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 23, 1966.

Richard B. Felder,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

Attachment A

Recommended Data Source: EPA Report 600/2–91/043. Regional Assessment of Aquifer Vulnerability and Sensitivity in the Conterminous United States. Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. 319pp.

The following information was obtained from pages 6–8 of the above report:

CLASS I AQUIFERS (Surficial or shallow, permeable units; highly vulnerable to contamination).

Unconsolidated Aquifers (Class Ia): Class la aquifers consist of surficial, unconsolidated, and permeable alluvial, terrace, outwash, beach, dune and other similar deposits. These units generally contain layers of sand and gravel that, commonly, are interbedded to some degree with silt and clay. Not all deposits mapped as Class la are important water-bearing units, but they are likely to be both permeable and vulnerable. The only natural protection of aquifers of this class is the thickness of the unsaturated zone and the presence of fine-grained material.

Soluble and Fractured Bedrock Aquifers (Class Ib): Lithologies in this class include limestone, dolomite, and locally, evaporitic units that contain documented karst features or solution channels, regardless of size. Generally these systems have a wide range in permeability * * * Also included in this class are sedimentary strata, and metamorphic and igneous (intrusive and extrusive) rocks that are significantly faulted, fractured, or jointed. In all cases groundwater movement is largely controlled by secondary openings. Well yields range widely, but the important feature is the potential for rapid vertical and lateral ground water movement along preferred pathways, which result in a high degree of vulnerability.

Semiconsolidated Aquifers (Class Ic): Semiconsolidated systems generally contain poorly to moderately indurated sand and gravel that is interbedded with clay and silt. This group is intermediate to the unconsolidated and consolidated end members. These systems are common in the Tertiary age rocks that are exposed throughout the Gulf and Atlantic coastal states. Semiconsolidated conditions also arise from the presence of intercalated clay and caliche within primarily unconsolidated to poorly consolidated units, such as occurs in parts of the High Plains Aquifer.

Covered Aquifers (Class Id): This class consists of any Class I aquifer that is overlain by less than 50 feet of low permeability, unconsolidated material, such as glacial till, lacustrian, and loess deposits.

CLASS II AQUIFERS (Consolidated bedrock aquifers; moderately vulnerable).

Higher Yield Bedrock Aquifers (Class IIa): These aquifers generally consist of fairly permeable sandstone or conglomerate that contain lesser amounts of interbedded fine grained clastics (shale, siltstone, mudstone) and occasionally carbonate units. In general, well yields must exceed 50 gpm to be included in this class. Locally fracturing may contribute to the dominant primary porosity and permeability of these systems.

Lower Yield Bedrock Aquifers (Class IIb): In most cases, these aquifers consist of sedimentary or crystalline rocks. Most commonly, lower yield systems consist of the same classic rock types present in the higher yield systems, but in the former case grain size is generally smaller and the degree of cementation or induration is greater, both of which lead to a lower permeability. In many existing and ancient mountain regions, such as the Appalachians (Blue Ridge and Piedmont), the core consists of crystalline rocks that are fractured to some degree. Well yields are commonly less than 50 gpm, although they may be larger in valleys than on interstream divides.

Covered Bedrock Aquifers (Class IIc): This group consists of Class IIa and IIb aquifers that are overlain by less than 50 feet of unconsolidated material of loq permeability, such as glacial till, lacustrian, or loess deposits. It is assumed that most Class V wells are relatively shallow and, therefore, 50 feet or less of fine grained cover could reduce but not necessarily eliminate the vulnerability of underlying Class II systems.

CLASS III (Consolidated or unconsolidated aquifers that are overlain by more than 50 feet of low permeability material; low vulnerability).

Aquifers of this type are the least vulnerable of all the classes because they are naturally protected by a thick layer of fine grained material, such as glacial till or shale. Examples include parts of the Northern Great Plains where the Pierre Shale of Cretaceous age crops out over thousands of square miles and is hundreds of feet thick. In many of the glaciated states, till forms an effective cover over bedrock or buried outwash aquifers, and elsewhere alternating layers of shale, siltstone, and fine grained sandstone insulate and protect the deeper major water bearing zones * * *

CLASS U (Undifferentiated aquifers): This classification is used where several lithologic and hydrologic conditions are present within a mappable area. Units are assigned to this class because of constraints of mapping scale, the presenece of undelineated members within a formation or group, or the presence of nonuniformly occurring features, such as fracturing. This class is intended to convey a wider range of vulnerability than is usually contained within any other single class.

SUBCLASS V (Variable covered aquifers): The modifier ''v'', such as Class IIa–v, is used to describe areas where an undetermined or highly variable thickness of low permeability sediments overlie the major water bearing zone. To provide the largest amount of information, the underlying aquifer was mapped as if the cover were absent, and the ''v'' designation was added to the classification. The ''v'' indicates that a variable thickness of low permeability material covers the aquifer and, since the thickness of the cover, to a large degree, controls vulnerability, this aspect is undefined.

[FR Doc. 96–13530 Filed 5–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 96–51, Notice 01]

RIN 2127–AG16

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards Door Locks and Door Retention Components

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

ACTION: Grant of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice grants a petition for rulemaking submitted by Independent Mobility Systems, Inc. (IMS), to exclude wheelchair ramps from the Federal motor vehicle safety standard that establishes performance requirements for door locks and door retention components. Since side doors equipped with wheelchair lifts are excluded from the standard, the petitioner requests that the standard be amended to also exclude side doors equipped with wheelchair ramps.

NHTSA believes that the amendment suggested by IMS merits further research and study. To that extent, therefore, the agency grants IMS' petition. The granting of this petition, however, does not necessarily mean that a rule will be issued.

The determination of whether to issue a rule will be made in the course of the rulemaking proceeding in accordance with statutory criteria.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *For technical issues:* Mr. Maurice Hicks, Light Duty Vehicle Division, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; telephone (202) 366–6345; facsimile (202) 366–4329.

For legal issues: Walter Myers, Office of the Chief Counsel, National Highway