

would simplify the process of providing requested information. This simplification would significantly reduce the time licensees, including small broadcast television station licensees, need to locate information requested by the public. The *NPRM* specifically asks for cost information associated with the requirement that broadcasters, especially small broadcasters, provide public interest information in a standardized format.

By definition, the standardized disclosure form would ask questions about defined categories of programming. Accordingly, the *NPRM* seeks comment on what categories should be included on the form. While categories should be defined, the Commission believes it is not necessary to define what type of programming would fall within any category, leaving it to the broadcasters' discretion to determine which programs belong under which categories. The *NPRM* also seeks comment on the Commission's tentative view only to require that licensees certify on the standardized form compliance with the minimum requirements for closed captioning and video description.

The *NPRM* invites further comment on whether licensees should provide a narrative description on the standardized form of the actions taken, in the normal course of business, to assess a community's programming needs and interests. This requirement would be much less burdensome than the Commission's former ascertainment requirements, which included detailed methodologies for ascertaining the problems, needs and interests of the public within the station's service area. Finally, the *NPRM* seeks comment on whether a licensee's activities in its community, including supporting and organizing community events and promoting and organizing awareness campaigns, should be considered in assessing whether a licensee has served the public interest under the Communications Act and whether they should be listed on an attachment to the standardized form. The alternative to this requirement would be to leave the rule as is. Based on our experience and the comments to the *NOI*, we believe that it serves an important public interest to make the information available in a clear and easy to understand format.

The *NPRM* also requests comment on the Commission's tentative conclusion to require licensees each quarter to place a paper copy of the standardized form in their public inspection files and to make their public inspection files, including the standardized forms,

available on the Internet until final action has been taken on the station's next renewal license. As an alternative to posting the information on each station's website, the Commission has proposed allowing licensees to make the public inspection file available on state broadcasters associations' websites. The Commission has asked for cost information on creating new websites as well as using a licensee's state broadcasters association's website. The *NPRM* seeks comment on whether television broadcasters should be encouraged or required to make websites on which they post the proposed form and public file accessible to persons with disabilities and proposes not to require licensees to file the proposed form with the Commission. One alternative that the Commission considered was a requirement to mandate this type of interaction with the public. As the *NPRM* states, however, the Commission is disinclined to mandate interaction with the public through Internet websites, but encourages broadcasters to use their websites to conduct discussions with members of the public. The Commission is seeking comment on these proposed alternatives so as to minimize the effect of the proposed rules on small businesses.

#### **Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules**

None.

#### **Ordering Clauses**

32. This *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* is issued pursuant to the authority contained in Sections 4(i), 303, 307, 309, and 336 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 303, 307, 309, and 336, and Sections 1.412, 1.413, and 1.415 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.412, 1.413, and 1.415.

33. The Commission's Consumer Information Bureau, Reference Information Center, *shall send* a copy of this *NPRM*, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

#### **List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Television broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Magalie Roman Salas,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-26785 Filed 10-18-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712-01-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

### **Fish and Wildlife Service**

#### **50 CFR Part 17**

**RIN 1018-AG32**

#### **Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Extending of Comment Period on Proposed Determination of Critical Habitat for the California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*).**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) gives notice of the extension of the comment period on the proposed rule to designate critical habitat for the California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). The extension of the comment period will be for 30 additional days. The extension of the comment period will allow all interested parties to submit written comments on the proposal. We are seeking comments or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested parties concerning the proposed rule. Comments already submitted on the proposed rule need not be resubmitted as they will be fully considered in the final determination.

**DATES:** The comment period for this proposal now closes on November 20, 2000. Any comments received by the closing date will be considered in the final decision on this proposal.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments and materials concerning this proposal should be sent to the Field Supervisor, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2605, Sacramento, California 95825. Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments and materials concerning this proposal by any one of several methods.

1. You may submit written comments and information to the Field Supervisor, Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W-2605, Sacramento, California 95825.

2. You may also send comments by electronic mail (e-mail) to fw1crfch@fws.gov. See the Public Comments Solicited section below for

file format and other information about electronic filing.

3. You may hand-deliver comments to our Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W. 2605, Sacramento, California 95825.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Curt McCasland or Stephanie Brady, at the above address, phone 916-414-6600, facsimile 916-414-6710.

For information about Monterey, Los Angeles, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Ventura counties, contact Diane Noda, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2394 Portola Road, Suite B, Ventura, California 93003 (telephone 805/644-1766; facsimile 805/644-3958).

For information about areas in the San Gabriel Mountains of Los Angeles County or Riverside and San Diego counties, contact Ken Berg, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad, California 92008 (telephone 760/431-9440; facsimile 760/431-9624).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Comments from the public regarding the accuracy of this proposed rule are sought, especially regarding:

(1) The reasons why any habitat should or should not be determined to be critical habitat for California red-legged frogs as provided by section 4 of the Act, including whether the benefits of designation will outweigh any benefits of exclusion;

(2) Specific information on the distribution of California red-legged frogs, the amount and distribution of the species' habitat, and what habitat is essential to the conservation of the species, and why;

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

(4) Any foreseeable economic or other impacts resulting from the proposed designation of critical habitat, including, in particular, any impacts on small entities or families; and

(5) Economic and other values associated with designating critical habitat for California red-legged frogs, such as those derived from nonconsumptive uses (e.g., hiking, camping, bird-watching, enhanced watershed protection, improved air quality, increased soil retention, "existence values", and reductions in administrative costs).

## Background

On September 11, 2000, the Service published a proposed rule to designate

critical habitat for the California Red-legged frog in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 54892). The original comment period closed on October 11, 2000. The comment period now closes on November 20, 2000. Written comments should be submitted to the Service (see **ADDRESSES** section).

Approximately 2,175,000 hectares (5,373,650 acres) of land fall within the boundaries of the proposed critical habitat designation. Specifically, aquatic and upland areas where suitable breeding and nonbreeding habitat is interspersed throughout the landscape and is interconnected by unfragmented dispersal habitat are areas proposed as critical habitat. Proposed critical habitat is located in Alameda, Butte, Calaveras, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, Mariposa, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Plumas, Riverside, San Benito, San Diego, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Tehama, Tuolumne, Ventura, and Yuba counties, California. Critical habitat receives protection from destruction or adverse modification through required consultation under section 7 of the Act with regard to actions carried out, funded, or authorized by a Federal agency. Section 4 of the Act requires us to consider economic and other relevant impacts when specifying any particular area as critical habitat.

The comment period on this proposal now closes on November 20, 2000. Written comments should be submitted to the Service office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section.

**Author:** The primary authors of this notice are Curt McCasland and Stephanie Brady (see **ADDRESSES** section).

**Authority:** The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: October 12, 2000.

**Elizabeth H. Stevens,**

*Acting Manager.*

[FR Doc. 00-26704 Filed 10-18-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AG17

### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reopening of Comment Period and Notice of Availability of Draft Economic Analysis on Proposed Critical Habitat Determination for the Peninsular Bighorn Sheep. Notice of Availability of Peninsular Bighorn Sheep Distribution Map

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of comment period and notice of availability of draft economic analysis and notice of availability of Peninsular bighorn sheep distribution map.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces the availability of a draft economic analysis for the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Peninsular bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*). We also provide notice of the reopening of the comment period for the proposal to designate critical habitat for the Peninsular bighorn sheep to allow all interested parties to submit written comments on the proposed rule and on the draft economic analysis. Comments previously submitted need not be resubmitted as they will be incorporated into the public record as a part of this reopening and will be fully considered in the final rule. We also provide notice of the availability of distribution map for the Peninsular bighorn sheep.

**DATES:** The original comment period on the critical habitat proposal closed on August 31, 2000. The comment period is again reopened and we will accept comments until November 20, 2000. Comments must be received by the closing date. Any comments that are received after the closing date may not be considered in the final decision on this proposal.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the draft economic analysis are available on the Internet at "http://pacific.fws.gov/crithab/pbsh" or by writing to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad, California, 92008. Written comments should be sent to the Field Supervisor. You may also send comments by electronic mail (e-mail) to [fw1pbsh@fws.gov](mailto:fw1pbsh@fws.gov). Please submit comments in ASCII file format and avoid the use of special characters and