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. 96–114, adopted May 3, 1996, and released June 5, 1996. 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 l980 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. 96–15209 Filed 6–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

---

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 96–122; RM–8795]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Riverdale, CA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed on behalf of Happy Nice Valley Broadcasting (''petitioner'') seeking the allotment of FM Channel 252A to Riverdale, California, as that locality's first local aural transmission service. Petitioner is requested to provide additional information to establish Riverdale's status as a community for allotment purposes. Coordinates used for this proposal are 36–20–39 and 119–53–59.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before July 29, 1996, and reply comments on or before August 13, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Happy Nice Valley Broadcasting, Attn: Joe S. Mauk, 365 W. Menlo Avenue, Fresno, CA 93704.

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. 96–122, adopted May 17, 1996, and released June 5, 1996. 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 l980 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. 96–15207 Filed 6–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

---

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 96–121; RM–8806]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Forestville, WI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Lyle Robert Evans d/b/a The Radio Company proposing the allotment of Channel 281A to Forestville, Wisconsin, as that community's first local FM service. Canadian concurrence has been requested for this allotment at coordinates 44–41–37 and 87–27–16. There is a site restriction 2.1 kilometeres (1.3 miles) east of the community.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before July 29, 1996, and reply comments on or before August 13, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Lyle Robert Evans d/b/a The Radio Company, 1296 Marian Lane, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54304.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rule Making,* MM Docket No. 96–121, adopted May 20, 1996, and released June 5, 1996. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission'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 Services, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 857–3800.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of l980 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* contact.

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. 96–15208 Filed 6–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 96- 53; Notice 1]

RIN 2127–AG41

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Rear View Mirrors

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

ACTION: Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: NHTSA has granted a petition for rulemaking from Mr. Dee Norton, who petitioned the Agency to require convex cross view mirrors on the left rear top corner of the cargo box of stepvan and walk-in style delivery and service trucks. NHTSA's analysis of the petition and the backup accident data concludes that this particular solution is only one of many possible accident prevention measures. While it is possible that mirrors can be a cost-effective solution, no performance specifications for these mirrors yet exist. The agency has research underway on this and other means to reduce such deaths and injuries, particularly for children less than five years old and the elderly, who both are over represented in the fatality numbers. The agency believes it is premature to begin rulemaking until we obtain information on the experience of fleets which have installed rear cross-view mirrors and ask other key questions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 15, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments must refer to the docket and notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. It is requested, but not required, that 10 copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For nonlegal issues: Mr. Jere Medlin, Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Mr. Medlin's telephone number is: (202) 366–5276. His facsimile number is (202) 366–4329. For legal issues: Mr. Paul Atelsek, Rulemaking Division, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590. Mr. Atelsek's telephone number is (202) 366–5260, and his FAX number is (202) 366–3820. Please note that written comments should be sent to the Docket Section rather than faxed to the above contact persons.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

By letter dated March 20, 1995, Mr. Dee Norton of Seattle, Washington petitioned the agency to issue an amendment for 49 CFR 571.111, (Standard No. 111) to require convex cross view mirrors on the left rear top corner of the cargo box of stepvan and walk-in style delivery and service trucks. Mr. Norton's petition arose out of a desire to prevent the kind of fatal crash that caused the death of his grandson. C.J. Norton, Mr. Norton's grandson, died on May 18, 1994, when he was struck and backed over by a diaper delivery service truck that was backing from a stall in an apartment complex parking lot. Mr. Norton stated in his petition that the truck was equipped with side-mounted rearview mirrors required by Standard No. 111, but that those mirrors did not provide the driver with a view of the area immediately behind the truck. Mr. Norton stated that, without looking behind the truck, the driver backed up and struck his grandson, not knowing that the child was in the way.

Mr. Norton tried unsuccessfully to get Washington State to enact a law to require delivery vehicles to use rear-mounted cross view mirrors. His state believes that federal law prohibits it from issuing any laws that are different from federal laws on the subject of mirrors. As a consequence, Mr. Norton petitioned NHTSA for changes to Standard No. 111.

The agency has reviewed the circumstances associated with the petitioner's desired solution, and notes that the agency has been conducting research to investigate the feasibility of equipping motor vehicles with cost-effective countermeasures to assist drivers in more safely carrying out backing, lane change and merging maneuvers including the maneuvers described by the petitioner. The objectives are to determine the performance of one or more feasible countermeasures and to define specifications in performance terms without constraining the solutions to particular devices or technologies.

NHTSA has been conducting and continues to conduct research to determine alternative countermeasures for preventing backing crashes. This research has focused on external auditory alarms (''An Audible Automobile Back-up Pedestrian Warning Device—Development and Evaluation'', DOT-HS–802–083, November 1976) as well as in-vehicle warning systems and mirrors. External alarms have been found to be ineffective deterrents for very young children, who do not understand the sound and may even be attracted to the noise. In-vehicle warning systems that have been studied provide drivers with in-vehicle alarms triggered by the detection of nearby objects detected by the rear facing sensors (typically ultrasonic, radar, or infrared). The agency recently tested six rear object detection systems and found that object detection technology is still in the early stages of its development (''Hardware Evaluation Of Heavy Truck Side And Rear Object Detection Systems'', SAE Paper No. 951010, W. Riley Garrott, Mark A. Flick, and Elizabeth N. Mazzae) . One other system, a unit that costs over $900 and uses microwave radar technology is in voluntary use in some school districts, to detect a moving child in front of a stationary school bus. The agency's tests (''An Evaluation of Electronic Pedestrian Detection Systems For School Buses'', SAE Paper No. 960518, Scott A. Johnston, Elizabeth N. Mazzae, and W. Riley Garrott) show that such systems were intended as a supplement, not a replacement, for cross view mirrors and were designed to work only on stationary vehicles. The agency will continue to evaluate the effectiveness and performance of these types of countermeasures as new technology becomes available.

Used on certain commercial and recreational vehicles, rear video cameras can provide the driver with a view of the blind spot, but the expense of these systems limits their use. Some vehicles use rear mounted convex mirrors to help the driver see objects and pedestrians in the area directly behind the vehicle that is not covered by the currently required mirror systems. However, the small image size in the mirror, the distortion of the image, and the task of using the left side mirror to see the image in the rear mounted mirror may make it difficult for drivers to reliably detect objects and small pedestrians, especially at night and in adverse weather. The agency is initiating a research program to collect data on the extent of obstructed view areas behind commercial and passenger vehicles and to determine the extent to which low cost mirror systems can improve the driver's view in that area. It may take two years to complete this research, data collection, and analysis. Also, the agency has requested information from some commercial fleet owners to gain insight on the extent of

the backing problem and to learn of the experiences that some have had with rear-mounted convex mirrors. As the agency learns more about the extent of this safety problem and potential solutions, it will be in a better position to consider whether rulemaking to mandate performance-oriented requirements for preventing backup crashes is appropriate.

Additionally, for the past two years the agency has enlisted the assistance of the U. S. Consumer Product Safety Commission and its National Electronic Injury Surveillance System to gather data on the involvement of children with motor vehicles in nonhighway injuries and fatalities. This effort is not yet completed. When it is completed in 1997, the Agency may be able to estimate the size of the safety problem better than it can today.

The agency finds that the State of Washington has misinterpreted how federal preemption affects the ability of the state to act. It is true that under 49 U.S.C. 30103(b), no State may enact or continue in effect a standard covering the same aspect of performance as an FMVSS unless it is identical to the FMVSS. However, there is no federal requirement addressing the visibility of the area directly and immediately behind the vehicle in question. Thus, NHTSA does not concur with the State of Washington's conclusion that the preemption clause prohibits Washington, or any other state, from requiring the use of rear-mounted cross view mirrors on any motor vehicle. While it is true that nonidentical state standards would become preempted if NHTSA did adopt a performance requirement for cross view mirrors, NHTSA would certainly consider the existing state laws in doing so.

Thus, it is possible for the petitioner and others to seek solutions at the state level, and those solutions can have greater immediate effect than any Federal action. Because States regulate vehicles-in-use and the actions of drivers, a solution at the State level of adding rear-mounted cross view mirrors to delivery service vehicles and restrictions on how delivery service operations are conducted, would affect all existing subject vehicles in states that chose to implement such regulations. A Federal rule only would affect new trucks once implemented and could take more than twenty-five years (ref. ''Updated Vehicle Survivability and Travel Mileage Schedules'', DOT-HS–808–339, November ,1995) before the full benefits would be realized because of the slow rate of fleet replacement. This study showed that 12% of light trucks were still in use 25 years later.

II. Questions on Which Comment is Requested

A. For Fleet Users of Rear Cross-View Mirrors

1. Have your vehicles' accident rates in backing incidents decreased since you equipped your fleet with rear cross view mirrors? Please provide any available data on your backing crash rates.

2. What percentage of your backing incidents occur off the public roadway?

3. Under what conditions, if any, are these mirrors difficult to use or perhaps even unusable?

a. Dark days?

b. Rainy days?

c. Shadows behind the vehicle?

d. At night with the backup lamps?

e. Other adverse conditions; please describe.

4. What comments, if any, have your drivers made regarding their use of rear cross view mirrors? Are they generally in favor of them? Please explain.

5. To what extent do your drivers rely on cross view mirrors while backing? Should the driver directly inspect the area behind the truck before entering the vehicle and backing?

6. What depth of field (behind the vehicle) can these mirrors provide? Does this need to be increased to allow adequate reaction time when backing?

7. Would a depth of field of six feet be practicable and economically feasible on such mirrors?

8. Is image distortion a problem on existing rear cross-view mirrors?

9. Are reductions in insurance premiums available for vehicles equipped with rear cross view mirrors? How far do any such reductions go in offsetting the cost of the mirror and its installation?

(The next three questions are for fleet operators that have installed rear cross-view mirrors.)

10. Why did your fleet install rear cross-view mirrors?

11. What specific mirrors were used and on what specific vehicles were these mirrors installed?

12. What were the costs of the mirrors and their installation?

B. General

1. NHTSA must analyze both the safety benefits associated with new or added regulations and their costs. The agency therefore requests cost estimates for rear cross-view mirrors expressed as the increase in the cost of a new truck (say a full-size commercial van, a step-van, high cube van, or straight truck) with such a mirror installed. Are these costs significantly different for the installation of the mirrors on existing vehicles?

2. Do these mirrors present any practical problems, such as:

a. Are there any trucks up to 26,000 pounds GVWR that cannot accommodate such mirrors?

b. Are there loading dock interference problems?

c. Are there significant driver training changes?

d. Are there mirror vibration problems or maintenance problems?

e. Are some designs of rear cross-view mirrors vastly superior in performance to others?

f. Are depth of field or other parameters on these mirrors in need of improvement?

g. Are there any alternatives to these mirrors that are as inexpensive as the mirrors desired by the petitioner?

III. Procedures for Filing Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on this request for comment. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted. Comments must not exceed 15 pages in length. (49 CFR 553.21). Necessary attachments may be appended to these submissions without regard to the 15-page limit. This limitation is intended to encourage commenters to detail their primary arguments in a concise fashion.

If a commenter wishes to submit certain information under a claim of confidentiality, three copies of the complete submission, including purportedly confidential business information, should be submitted to the Chief Counsel, NHTSA, at the street address given above, and seven copies from which the purportedly confidential information has been deleted should be submitted to the Docket Section. A request for confidentiality should be accompanied by a cover letter setting forth the information specified in the agency's confidential business information regulation. (49 CFR Part 512).

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above for the proposal will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Comments received after the comment due date will be considered as suggestions for any future rulemaking action. Comments on the request for comment will be available for inspection in the docket. The NHTSA will continue to file relevant information as it becomes available in the docket after the closing

date, and it is recommended that interested persons continue to examine the docket for new material.

Those persons desiring to be notified upon receipt of their comments in the rule's docket should enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard in the envelope with their comments. Upon receiving the comments, the docket supervisor will return the postcard by mail.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, and 30166; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: June 12, 1996.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96–15325 Filed 6–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018–AD20

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Special Rule for the Conservation of the Northern Spotted Owl on Non-Federal Lands

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The Service issued a Draft Environmental Alternatives Analysis (EAA) (February 23, 1996, 61 FR 6964) for the proposed special rule for the conservation of the northern spotted owl on non-Federal lands in California and Washington, which is currently out for public comment. The proposed special rule was published in the Federal Register on February 17, 1995 (60 FR 9484). The comment period for both documents was scheduled to end on June 3, 1996. The intent of this document is to extend the comment period to June 27, 1996.

The Service is briefly extending the comment period in order to accept the comments of The Resources Agency of California, and invites other interested parties who have not yet submitted comments to do so.

DATES: The comment period for written comments is extended until June 27, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments and materials concerning this Draft Environmental Alternatives Analysis and the proposed rule should be sent to Mr. Michael J. Spear, Regional Director, Region 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 911 NE. 11th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232–4181. The complete file for this proposed rule will be available for public inspection, by appointment during normal business hours, at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Technical Support for Forest Resources, 333 SW. 1st Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, Oregon 97204, (503/326–6218).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Curt Smitch, Assistant Regional Director, Region 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 3704 Griffin Lane SE., Suite 102, Olympia, Washington 98501, (206/534–9330); or Ron Crete, Office of Technical Support for Forest Resources, 333 SW. 1st Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232–4181, (503/326–6218).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Service has prepared a draft document called an Environmental Alternatives Analysis (EAA) that describes and analyzes the potential environmental effects of the proposed special rule and six alternatives for the conservation of the northern spotted owl on non-Federal lands in Washington and California. Each alternative would revise to varying degrees the Federal prohibitions and exceptions regarding the incidental take of spotted owls on non-Federal lands in California and Washington. The proposed rule, analyzed in the Draft EAA as Alternative 3, was published in the Federal Register on February 17, 1995 (60 FR, No. 33, Page 9484).

The Service's Draft EAA, including all maps, tables, charts, and graphs, remains available on the Internet's World Wide Web at http://www.r1.fws.gov/4deaa/welcome.html.

Dated: June 10, 1996.

H. Dale Hall,

Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.

[FR Doc. 96–15123 Filed 6–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Parts 217 and 227

[Docket No.950830222–6103–02; I.D. 011696D]

RIN 0648–AH89

Sea Turtle Conservation; Revisions to Sea Turtle Conservation Requirements; Restrictions to Shrimp Trawling Activities; Reopening of Comment Period

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period; notice of availability.

SUMMARY: On April 24, 1996, NMFS published a proposed rule to amend the regulations protecting sea turtles to enhance their effectiveness in reducing sea turtle mortality resulting from shrimp trawling in the Atlantic and Gulf Areas in the southeastern United States. In response to several requests for an extension of the comment period, NMFS is reopening the comment period through July 15 to provide further opportunity to submit comments on the proposed rule and to review additional analyses, including the preliminary report scheduled to be submitted to NMFS by June 28, 1996, by the sea turtle expert working group.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be submitted on or before July 15, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this proposed rule and requests for a copy of the sea turtle expert working group report should be addressed to the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles A. Oravetz, 813–570–5312, or Therese A. Conant, 301–713–1401.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 24, 1996, NMFS published a proposed rule (61 FR 18102) to amend the regulations at 50 CFR 227.72(e) protecting sea turtles to enhance their effectiveness in reducing sea turtle mortality resulting from shrimp trawling in the Atlantic and Gulf Areas in the southeastern United States. The background and rationale for the proposed amendments were contained in the preamble of the proposed rule and are not repeated here. The comment period for the proposed rule closed on June 10, 1996. However, NMFS is reopening the comment period through July 15 to provide further opportunity to submit comments on the proposed rule and to review additional analyses, including the preliminary report scheduled to be submitted to NMFS by June 28, 1996, by the sea turtle expert working group. The formation of this group of scientists to analyze existing databases to determine sea turtle population abundance, population trends, and sustainable take levels was a requirement of the November 14, 1994, biological opinion. The report will be made available for public review and distributed upon request when it is submitted to NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**).