upon passing an examination for that route. Upon completion of 3 months of experience in that route, he or she may have the restricted endorsement removed.

23. In § 10.482, revise paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 10.482 Assistance towing.

(a) This section contains the requirements to qualify for an endorsement authorizing an applicant to engage in assistance towing. The endorsement applies to all licenses except those for master and mate (pilot) of towing vessels and those for master or mate authorizing service on inspected vessels over 200 gross tons. Holders of any of these licenses may engage in assistance towing within the scope of the licenses and without the endorsement.

* * * * *

§ 10.701 [Amended]

24. In § 10.701(a), remove the words ''operator of uninspected towing vessels'' and add, in their place, the words ''master or mate (pilot) of towing vessels''.

§ 10.703 [Amended]

25. In § 10.703(a), remove the words ''operator of uninspected towing vessels'' and add, in their place, the words ''master or mate (pilot) of towing vessels''.

§ 10.901 [Amended]

26. In § 10.901(b)(1), remove the words ''uninspected towing vessels'' and add, in their place, the words ''master or mate (pilot) of towing vessels''.

27. In § 10.903, revise paragraphs (a)(18) and (b)(4) to read as follows:

§ 10.903 Licenses requiring examinations.

(a) * * *

(18)(i) Apprentice mate (steersman) of towing vessels;

(ii) Mate (pilot) of towing vessels, vessel assist;

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(4) Master or mate (pilot) of towing vessels (endorsed for the same route).

28. In § 10.910, revise paragraphs 10 through 12 in Table 10.910–1 to read as follows:

§ 10.910 Subjects for deck licenses.

* * * * *

10. Apprentice mate, towing vessels, Oceans (domestic trade) and Near-coastal routes.

11. Apprentice mate (steersman), towing vessels, Great lakes and inland routes.

12. Steersman, towing vessels, Western rivers.

* * * * *

PART 15—MANNING REQUIREMENTS

29. Revise the authority citation for part 15 to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 2101, 2103, 3306, 3703, 8101, 8102, 8104, 8105, 8301, 8304, 8502, 8503, 8701, 8702, 8901, 8902, 8903, 8904, 8905(b), 9102; 50 U.S.C. 198; and 49 CFR 1.45 and 1.46.

§ 15.301 [Amended]

30. In § 15.301, remove paragraph (b)(6); and redesignate paragraphs (b)(7) through (10) as paragraphs (b)(6) through (9).

31. Revise section § 15.610 and its heading to read as follows:

§ 15.610 Masters and mates (pilots) of towing vessels.

Every towing vessel at least 8 meters (at least 26 feet) in length measured from end to end over the deck (excluding sheer), except a vessel described by the next sentence, must be under the direction and control of a person licensed as master or mate (pilot) of towing vessels or as master or mate of appropriate gross tonnage holding an endorsement of his or her license for towing vessels. This does not apply to any vessel engaged in assistance towing, or to any towing vessel of less than 200 gross tons engaged in the offshore mineral and oil industry if the vessel has sites or equipment of that industry as its place of departure or ultimate destination.

§ 15.705 [Amended]

32. In § 15.705(d), remove the words ''individual operating an uninspected towing vessel'' and add, in their place, the words ''master or mate (pilot) operating a towing vessel''; and remove the words ''individuals serving as operators of uninspected towing vessels'' and add, in their place, the words ''masters or mates (pilots) serving as operators of towing vessels''.

33. In § 15.805, add paragraph (a)(5) to read as follows:

§ 15.805 Master.

(a) * * *

(5) Every towing vessel of 8 meters (at least 26 feet) or more in length.

* * * * *

34. In § 15.810, redesignate paragraphs (d) and (e) as (e) and (f); and add a new paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 15.810 Mates.

* * * * *

(d) Each person in charge of the navigation or maneuvering of a towing vessel of 8 meters (at least 26 feet) or more in length shall hold either a license authorizing service as mate of towing vessels—or, on inland routes, as pilot of towing vessels—or a license as master of appropriate gross tonnage according to the routes, endorsed for towing vessels.

* * * * *

35. Revise § 15.910 and its heading to read as follows:

§ 15.910 Towing vessels.

No person may serve as master or mate (pilot) of any towing vessel of 8 meters (at least 26 feet) or more in length unless he or she holds a license explicitly authorizing such service.

Dated: October 17, 1997.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Acting Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 97–28409 Filed 10–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 97–68; RM–8999]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Hayfield, VA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; denial of petition.

SUMMARY: The Commission denies the petition for rule making filed by Vixon Valley Broadcasting proposing the allotment of Channel 263A to Hayfield, Virginia. See 62 FR 9409, March 3, 1997. The proposal is denied because Hayfield was found not to be a community for allotment purposes. With this action, this proceeding is terminated.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MM Docket No. 97–68, adopted September 24, 1997, and released October 17, 1997. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC 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 contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

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. 97–28357 Filed 10–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 96–41, Notice 02]

RIN AG–38

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment

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

ACTION: Request for comments; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document reopens the comment period for a request for comments published December 13, 1996, regarding the potential value of several auxiliary signal lamps in addition to those required by Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108. One of the commenters provided NHTSA with a field study of the effectiveness of an ''advance brake warning system'' (ABWS), one of the auxiliary signal lamps on which comments were requested. NHTSA believes that this field study is a significant piece of evidence in reaching any decision about the merits of ABWS. However, this study only became available just before the comment period closed. Accordingly, the only commenters that addressed this field study were the two commenters who filed late comments, as well as the commenter that provided the field study.

The purpose of this document is to make the public aware of the field study and to invite comments and analysis of the field study. To facilitate such comments and analysis from the public, NHTSA is noting some questions and issues the agency has identified in its review and analysis of the field study. The comment period is reopened for an additional 30 days.

DATES: Comments must be received by NHTSA no later than November 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to Docket No. 96–41, Notice 2, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590 (Docket hours are 9:30 am to 4:00 pm Monday through Friday).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical issues: Richard Van Iderstine, Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, NPS–21, telephone (202) 366–5280, FAX (202) 366–4329.

For legal issues: Taylor Vinson, Office of Chief Counsel, NCC–20, telephone (202) 366-5263, FAX (202) 366–3820.

Both may be reached by mail at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Comments should be sent to the Docket Section at the address given above, not sent or FAXed to these people.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 13, 1996, at 61 FR 65510, NHTSA published a request for comments on whether NHTSA should permit several types of auxiliary signal lamps in addition to those required by Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108, *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment* (49 CFR 571.108). The agency noted in this request for comments that these lighting ideas had been submitted without any data showing that the concepts would produce real safety benefits on the public roads.

One of the signal lamp ideas on which the agency sought public comment was an Advance Brake Warning System (ABWS). At present, vehicles' stop lamps are activated when the driver applies the brakes. ABWS lights the stop lamps sooner in hard braking than in normal braking, with the intent of giving following drivers earlier warning. ABWS does this by activating the stop lamps when a driver rapidly removes his or her foot from the accelerator pedal, on the assumption that these rapid removals indicate an intention to apply the brakes.

The 90-day comment period in which the public was invited to respond to this request for comments closed on March 13, 1997. NHTSA has received 27 comments in response to this request for comments. In one of those comments, Baran Advanced Technology Ltd. (Baran), one of the companies seeking to market ABWS in the United States, provided NHTSA with a field study conducted in Israel of the crash experience of vehicles equipped with ABWS. Baran's comment is available to the public from NHTSA's public docket and has been filed as 96–041–N01–014. This field study differentiates ABWS from the other signal lamp ideas discussed in the request for comments, for which there are still no studies or other data suggesting their effectiveness.

This field study became available only during the last week of the 90-day comment period. Because of this, only three of the 27 comments addressed this Israeli field study—the commenter that submitted the study and two organizations that filed comments well after the comment closing date. Because this field study is important in evaluating the merits of ABWS, the agency wants to make the public aware of this field study and ask for public review and comment on the study to help NHTSA assess the merits of ABWS.

NHTSA has reviewed and analyzed the Israeli field study. The agency would like to summarize its understanding of the study and identify some areas in which public comment and additional information might be helpful. The field study of ABWS involved 764 Israeli government vehicles tracked over a two-year period. Half the vehicles were equipped with ABWS, the other half were not. The control group (those vehicles that did not have ABWS) were matched to the ABWS-equipped vehicles. That is, each vehicle in the control group was the same make, model, and model year as a vehicle in the ABWS group.

These 764 vehicles were in a total of 881 crashes, 78 of which were crashes in which the government vehicle was struck from the rear. Of these 78 rear-end crashes, 37 occurred in the vehicle fleet equipped with ABWS, while 41 crashes occurred in the control group. After adjusting for the distance driven by three particular vehicles, the study's authors concluded that the rear-end crash involvement rate of the ABWS equipped vehicles was 17.6 percent less than that of the control vehicles. In addition, these 78 crashes were then sorted into ''relevant,'' defined in the report as ''crashes in which the government vehicle was struck from behind while braking or immediately after braking,'' and ''irrelevant,'' defined in the report as ''crashes in which the government vehicle was already stopped for a while, or the driver reported that (s)he decelerated or braked gradually rather than abruptly, and/or the driver of the striking vehicle testified that he failed to pay attention to the stopping or stopped vehicle ahead.'' Of the 78 rear-end crashes, 26 were classified as ''relevant'' and the other 52 were deemed ''irrelevant.'' The study concluded that the crash involvement rate of the ABWS-equipped vehicles in relevant rear end crashes was 64 percent less than that of the control group.