(''900 MHz B/ILT Pool''), in order to facilitate flexible use. In particular, the Commission proposes to permit any use of the B/ILT channels in the 900 MHz band that is consistent with the band's fixed and mobile allocations. In addition, the Commission proposes to license the remaining spectrum using a geographic area licensing scheme, and to adopt service rules, including licensing, technical and operational rules for the new geographic licensees.

3. On April 4, 2005, the United Telecom Council, the National Association of Manufacturers and MRFAC, the Association of American Railroads, the American Petroleum Institute, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the Enterprise Wireless Alliance jointly filed a request for an extension of time to submit comments. They contend that the current comment period does not provide commenters with a sufficient length of time to provide thorough and meaningful responses. They also state that they are conducting discussions with other interested parties in an effort to reach consensus that would allow a consistent filing position in this matter for most of the 900 MHz user communities, and believe that this effort will not be complete before the comment filing deadline. On April 12, 2005, Nextel Communications, Inc. filed an opposition to the comment period extension request, arguing that any delay would adversely impact the Commission's 800 MHz rebanding effort, 69 FR 67823, November 22, 2004, and would delay Nextel's opportunity to obtain, through the auction process, any unused 900 MHz B/ILT spectrum.

Ordering Clauses

4. Pursuant to sections 4(i) and 4(j) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i) and 154(j), and §§ 0.131, 0.331, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 0.131, 0.331, and 1.46, the deadline for filing comments in response to the *NPRM*, published at 70 FR 13143, March 18, 2005, in this proceeding, is extended to May 18, 2005, and the deadline for filing reply comments is extended to June 2, 2005.

Federal Communications Commission.

Katherine M. Harris,

Deputy Chief, Mobility Division.

[FR Doc. 05–8682 Filed 5–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–05–21051]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS); Small Business Impacts of Motor Vehicle Safety

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

ACTION: Notice of regulatory review; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) seeks comments on the economic impact of its regulations on small entities. As required by Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, we are attempting to identify rules that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We also request comments on ways to make these regulations easier to read and understand. The focus of this notice is rules that specifically relate to passenger cars, multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, buses, trailers, incomplete vehicles, motorcycles, and motor vehicle equipment.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 5, 2005.

ADDRESSES: You should mention the docket number of this document in your comments and submit your comments in writing to: Docket Management System, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. You may call Docket Management at: (202) 366–9324. You may visit the Docket from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nita Kavalauskas, Office of Regulatory Analysis, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Budget, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366–2584. Facsimile (fax): (202) 366–2559.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act

A. Background and Purpose

Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–354), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), requires agencies to conduct periodic reviews of final rules that have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities. The purpose of the reviews is to determine whether such rules should be continued without change, or should be amended or rescinded, consistent with the objectives of applicable statutes, to minimize any significant economic impact of the rules on a substantial number of such small entities.

B. Review Schedule

The Department of Transportation (DOT) published its Semiannual Regulatory Agenda on November 22, 1999, listing in Appendix D (64 FR 64684) those regulations that each operating administration will review under section 610 during the next 12 months. Appendix D also contains DOT's 10-year review plan for all of its existing regulations.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA, ''we'') has divided its rules into 10 groups by subject area. Each group will be reviewed once every 10 years, undergoing a two-stage process—an Analysis Year and a Review Year. For purposes of these reviews, a year will coincide with the fall-to-fall publication schedule of the Semiannual Regulatory Agenda. Thus, Year 1 (1998) began in the fall of 1998 and ended in the fall of 1999; Year 2 (1999) began in the fall of 1999 and ended in the fall of 2000; and so on.

During the Analysis Year, we will request public comment on and analyze each of the rules in a given year's group to determine whether any rule has a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities and, thus, requires review in accordance with section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. In each fall's Regulatory Agenda, we will publish the results of the analyses we completed during the previous year. For rules that have subparts, or other discrete sections of rules that do have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities, we will announce that we will be conducting a formal section 610 review during the following 12 months.

The section 610 review will determine whether a specific rule should be revised or revoked to lessen its impact on small entities. We will consider: (1) The continued need for the rule; (2) the nature of complaints or comments received from the public; (3) the complexity of the rule; (4) the extent to which the rule overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other federal rules or with state or local government rules; and (5) the length of time since the rule has been evaluated or the degree to which technology, economic conditions,

or other factors have changed in the area affected by the rule. At the end of the Review Year, we will publish the results of our review. The following table shows the 10-year analysis and review schedule:

NHTSA SECTION 610 REVIEW PLAN

Year	Regulations to be reviewed	Analysis year	Review year
1	49 CFR parts 501 through 526 and 571.213	1998	1999
2	49 CFR 571.131, 571.217, 571.220, 571.221, and 571.222	1999	2000
3	49 CFR 571.101 through 571.110 and 571.135	2000	2001
4	49 CFR parts 529 through 579, except part 571	2001	2002
5	49 CFR 571.111 through 571.129 and parts 580 through 588	2002	2003
6	49 CFR 571.201 through 571.212	2003	2004
7	49 CFR 571.214 through 571.219, except 571.217	2004	2005
8	49 CFR parts 591 through 594	2005	2006
9	49 CFR 571.223 through 571.404, part 500 and new parts and subparts under 49 CFR	2006	2007
10	23 CFR parts 1200 and 1300 and new parts and subparts under 23 CFR	2007	2008

C. Regulations Under Analysis

During Year 7 (2004), the Analysis Year, we will conduct a preliminary assessment of the following sections of 49 CFR part 571:

Section	Title
571.214	Side impact protection.
571.216	Roof crush resistance.
571.218	Motorcycle helmets.
571.219	Windshield zone intrusion.

We are seeking comments on whether any requirements in Parts 571.214, 571.216, 571.218, and 571.219 have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. ''Small entities'' include small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations under 50,000. Business entities are generally defined as small businesses by Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code, for the purposes of receiving Small Business Administration (SBA) assistance. Size standards established by SBA in 13 CFR 121.201 are expressed either in number of employees or annual receipts in millions of dollars, unless otherwise specified. The number of employees or annual receipts indicates the maximum allowed for a concern and its affiliates to be considered small. If your business or organization is a small entity and if any of the requirements in Parts 571.214, 571.216, 571.218, and 571.219 have a significant economic impact on your business or organization, please submit a comment to explain how and to what degree these rules affect you, the extent of the economic impact on your business or organization, and why you believe the economic impact is significant.

If the agency determines that there is a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, it will ask for comment in a subsequent notice during the Review Year on how these impacts could be reduced without reducing safety.

II. Plain Language

A. Background and Purpose

Executive Order 12866 and the President's memorandum of June 1, 1998, require each agency to write all rules in plain language. Application of the principles of plain language includes consideration of the following questions:

- Have we organized the material to suit the public's needs?
- Are the requirements in the rule clearly stated?
- Does the rule contain technical language or jargon that is not clear?
- Would a different format (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing) make the rule easier to understand?
- Would more (but shorter) sections be better?
- Could we improve clarity by adding tables, lists, or diagrams?
- What else could we do to make the rule easier to understand?

If you have any responses to these questions, please include them in your comments on this document.

B. Review Schedule

In conjunction with our section 610 reviews, we will be performing plain language reviews over a ten-year period on a schedule consistent with the section 610 review schedule. We will review part 571 to determine if these regulations can be reorganized and/or rewritten to make them easier to read, understand, and use. We encourage interested persons to submit draft regulatory language that clearly and simply communicates regulatory requirements, and other recommendations, such as for putting information in tables that may make the regulations easier to use.

Comments

How Do I Prepare and Submit Comments?

Your comments must be written and in English. To ensure that your comments are correctly filed in the Docket, please include the docket number of this document in your comments.

Your comments must not be more than 15 pages long. (49 CFR 553.21.) We established this limit to encourage you to write your primary comments in a concise fashion. However, you may attach necessary additional documents to your comments. There is no limit on the length of the attachments.

Please submit two copies of your comments, including the attachments, to Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES.**

Comments may also be submitted to the docket electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov*. Click on ''Help & Information'' or ''Help/Info'' to obtain instructions for filing your comments electronically.

How Can I Be Sure That My Comments Were Received?

If you wish Docket Management to notify you upon its receipt of your comments, enclose a self-addressed, stamped postcard in the envelope containing your comments. Upon receiving your comments, Docket Management will return the postcard by mail.

How Do I Submit Confidential Business Information?

If you wish to submit any information under a claim of confidentiality, you should submit three copies of your

complete submission, including the information you claim to be confidential business information, to the Chief Counsel, NHTSA, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. In addition, you should submit two copies, from which you have deleted the claimed confidential business information, to Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES.** When you send a comment containing information claimed to be confidential business information, you should include a cover letter setting forth the information specified in our confidential business information regulation. (49 CFR part 512.)

Will the Agency Consider Late Comments?

We will consider all comments that Docket Management receives before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above under DATES. To the extent possible, we will also consider comments that Docket Management receives after that date.

How Can I Read the Comments Submitted by Other People?

You may read the comments received by Docket Management at the address given above under **ADDRESSES.** The hours of the Docket are indicated above in the same location.

You may also see the comments on the Internet. To read the comments on the Internet, take the following steps:

(1) Go to the Docket Management System (DMS) Web page of the Department of Transportation (*http://dms.dot.gov/*).

(2) On that page, click on ''search.''

(3) On the next page (*http://dms.dot.gov/search/*), type in the four-digit docket number shown at the beginning of this document. Example: If the docket number were ''NHTSA–1998–1234,'' you would type ''1234.'' After typing the docket number, click on ''search.''

(4) On the next page, which contains docket summary information for the docket you selected, click on the desired comments. You may download the comments. However, since the comments are imaged documents, instead of word processing documents, the ''pdf'' versions of the documents are word searchable.

Please note that even after the comment closing date, we will continue to file relevant information in the Docket as it becomes available. Further, some people may submit late comments. Accordingly, we recommend that you periodically check the Docket for new material.

Joseph Carra,

Associate Administrator for National Center for Statistics and Analysis.

[FR Doc. 05–8827 Filed 5–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018–AI15

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Roswell Springsnail, Koster's Springsnail, Pecos Assiminea, and Noel's Amphipod as Endangered With Critical Habitat

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Revised proposed rule; reopening of public comment period, notice of availability of draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment, updated legal descriptions for critical habitat units.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of the draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment for the proposal to designate critical habitat for the Roswell springsnail (*Pyrgulopsis roswellensis*), Koster's springsnail (*Juturnia kosteri*), Pecos assiminea (*Assiminea pecos*), and Noel's amphipod (*Gammarus desperatus*) (four invertebrates) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). We are also reopening the public comment period for the proposal to list the four invertebrates as endangered with critical habitat to allow all interested parties an opportunity to comment on and request changes to the proposed listing and critical habitat designation, as well as the associated draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment. In addition, we are proposing updated legal descriptions for critical habitat units using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) coordinates. We invite all interested parties to submit comments on this proposal within the 30-day comment period.

DATES: Comments must be submitted directly to the Service (see **ADDRESSES** section) on or before June 3, 2005.

ADDRESSES: If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments and materials by any one of several methods:

1. You may submit written comments and information to the Susan MacMullin, Field Supervisor, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, 2105 Osuna Road NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87113.

2. You may hand-deliver written comments and information to our New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, at the above address, or fax your comments to 505–346–2542.

3. You may send your comments by electronic mail (e-mail) to ''*R2FWE_AL@fws.gov*.'' For directions on how to submit electronic filing of comments, see the ''Public Comments Solicited'' section below.

You may obtain copies of the draft economic analysis and draft environmental assessment by mail by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. You may also view these documents in person, review comments and materials received, and review supporting documentation used in preparation of the proposed rule, by appointment, during normal business hours, at the New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office at the address provided above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan MacMullin, Field Supervisor, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office (telephone 505–761–2525, facsimile 505–346–2542).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Comments Solicited

We intend any final action resulting from this proposal to be as accurate and as effective as possible. Therefore, we solicit comments or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested party concerning this proposed rule. We particularly seek comments concerning:

(1) The reasons why any habitat should or should not be determined to be critical habitat as provided by section 4 of the Act, including whether the benefits of designation will outweigh any threats to the species resulting from designation;

(2) Specific information on the amount and distribution of the four invertebrates' habitat, and which habitat is essential to the conservation of the species and why;

(3) Land use designations and current or planned activities in the subject area and their possible impacts on the species or proposed critical habitat;

(4) Whether our approach to listing or critical habitat designation could be improved or modified in any way to provide for greater public participation