Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 96–7621 Filed 3–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 96–52; RM–8755]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Princeville, HI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed on behalf of John Moore dba Moore Broadcasting Company, one of two mutually-exclusive applicants for Channel 255C1 at Princeville, Hawaii, proposing the allotment of Channel 260C1 to Princeville, to resolve the mutual exclusivity while providing a second local FM service to that community. If the channel is allotted with cut-off protection, petitioner also seeks to amend its pending application for Channel 255C1 at Princeville to reflect operation on Channel 260C1. Coordinates used for Channel 260C1 at Princeville are 22–00–00 and 159–22–50.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 13, 1996, and reply comments on or before May 28, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: Cary S. Tepper, Esq., Booth, Freret & Imlay, P.C., 1233 - 20th Street, NW., Suite 204, Washington, DC 20554.

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. 96–52, adopted March 6, 1996, and released March 21, 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. 96–7620 Filed 3–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 96–51; RM–8764]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Wellington, CO

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed by Victor A. Michael, Jr., requesting the allotment of FM Channel 232C3 to the incorporated community of Wellington, Colorado, as its first local aural tramsission service. Coordinates used for this proposal are 40–53–57 and 105–01–53.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 13, 1996, and reply comments on or before May 28, 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: Victor A. Michael, Jr., 7901 Stoneridge Drive, Cheyenne, WY 82001.

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. 96–51, adopted March 6, 1996, and released March 21, 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. 96–7618 Filed 3–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 96–53; RM–8767]

Television Broadcasting Services; Marinette, WI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Douglas A. Maszka d/b/a Tri-City Television Company proposing the allotment of UHF Television Channel 25+ to Marinette, Wisconsin. There is a site restriction 18.6 kilometers (11.6 miles) north of the community at coordinates 45–15–54 and 87–36–51. The proposed allotment of Channel 25+ will require a plus offset. Canadian concurrence will be requested for this allotment.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 13, 1996, and reply comments on or before May 28, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Douglsa A. Maszka, d/b/a Tri-City Television Company, 600 Vroman Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54303.

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. 96–53, adopted March 6, 1996, and released March 21, 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

Television broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 96–7619 Filed 3–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

Denial of Petition for Rulemaking; Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies Mr. John Chevedden's petition for rulemaking to require only amber bulbs be sold in the aftermarket for replacement of the front amber turn signal bulbs. NHTSA's analysis of the petition concludes that this action would have a negligible effect on reducing crashes or fatalities, and would have significant cost effects for the redesign of turn signal and stop lamps.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard Van Iderstine, Office of Safety Performance Standards, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Van Iderstine's telephone number is: (202) 366–5275. His facsimile number is (202) 366–4329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By letter dated November 14, 1995, Mr. John Chevedden of Redondo Beach, California, petitioned the agency to issue a rule that would ''require only amber light bulbs to be sold in the aftermarket for replacement of factory amber front turn signal bulbs.'' Mr. Chevedden stated that this is necessary ''to prevent the aftermarket from nullifying the requirement (since 1963) that front turn signal lamps be amber.'' He states that the use of clear bulbs on vehicles with clear lenses on front turn signal lamps nullifies the amber requirement.

While it is true that front turn signal lamps are required to be amber on new motor vehicles at the time of their delivery to the first user, the requirement may be met by either an amber bulb behind a clear lens, or a clear bulb behind an amber lens. In service, the correct maintenance of that safety equipment is the responsibility of vehicle owners. The installation of incorrect bulbs or replacement lenses represents the failure of the owner to fulfill that responsibility. The responsibility for inspection of and enforcement for properly operating safety equipment belongs to the states, and in the petitioner's case, existing laws in most states require that front turn signal lamps emit amber light.

The clear bulbs, about which the petitioner is concerned, that may be used to replace burned-out amber bulbs in front turn signal lamps with clear lenses, are also used for all existing backup, stop, and rear red turn signal lamps, as well as for other purposes. These bulbs would be banned under the Mr. Chevedden's petition. Ultimately, this would necessitate that new bulbs be designed and marketed that are not interchangeable between lamp functions. This would have cost impacts on new and replacement bulbs as well as on the design of new signal lamps. This also could have significant adverse consequences to safety, because of the inability of vehicle owners to obtain clear replacement bulbs for the ones that will burn out on the 150 million vehicles already in the fleet. Thus, the fleet could have fewer and fewer functional lamps over time, leading to increases in accidents.

Mr. Chevedden did not provide any support for his petition, such as the argument that accidents are occurring as a result of the use of clear turn signal bulbs in lamps with clear lenses. In the absence such support and in light of the adverse consequences that the agency foresees for his solution, the agency sees no basis for rulemaking.

In accordance with 49 CFR part 552, this completes the agency's technical review of the petition. The agency has concluded that there is no reasonable possibility that the amendment requested by the petitioner would be issued at the conclusion of a rulemaking proceeding. After considering all relevant factors, including the need to allocate and prioritize limited agency resources to best accomplish the agency's safety mission, the agency has decided to deny the petition.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30103, 30162; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: March 25, 1996.

Barry Felrice,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96–7706 Filed 3–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

49 CFR Part 571

Denial of Petition for Rulemaking; Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition from the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) for rulemaking to incorporate the latest version of SAE Standard J594—*Reflex Reflectors,* into Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108. NHTSA's analysis of the petition concludes that there is minimal benefit to the public in updating the reference to this SAE standard. While incorporation would make reflex reflector requirements more readily available to lighting and vehicle design engineers as a current reference, it would require considerable expenditures of agency resources to implement it and all the other SAE standards whose references in FMVSS No. 108 are not the most recent. The agency's commitment of its resources to identify its safety priorities precludes