FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Mohamed Serageldin, Emission Standards Division (MD–13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541–2379.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulated Entities. The regulated category and entities affected by this action include:

Category	Examples of regulated entities
Industry	Facilities that build, repair, repaint, convert, or alter ships. The term ship means any marine or fresh-water vessel, including self-propelled vessels, those propelled by other craft (barges), and navigational aids (buoys). **Note:** An offshore oil and gas drilling platform is not considered a ship for purposes of this regulation.
Federal Govt ...	Federal Agencies which undertake shipbuilding or repair operations (see above) such as the Navy and Coast guards.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be regulated by this action. This table lists the types of entities that EPA is now aware could potentially be regulated by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be regulated. To determine whether your facility is regulated by this action, you should carefully examine the applicability criteria in § 63.782 of the regulation. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the preceding **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

If no significant and timely adverse comments are received, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule, and the direct final rule in the final rules section of this Federal Register will automatically go into effect on the date specified in that rule. If significant and timely adverse comments are received, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be considered prior to promulgation of the final rule. Because the EPA will not institute a second comment period on this proposed rule, any parties interested in commenting should do so during this comment period.

For further supplemental information, the detailed rationale, and the rule provisions, see the information provided in the direct final rule in the final rules section of this Federal Register.

Administrative Requirements

A. Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements of the previously promulgated NESHAP were submitted to and approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). A copy of this Information Collection Request (ICR) document (OMB control number 1414.02) may be obtained from Sandy Farmer, Information Policy Branch (PM–223Y); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M Street, SW; Washington, DC 20460 or by calling (202) 260–2740.

Today's changes to the NESHAP should have no impact on the information collection burden estimates made previously. The changes to the implementation plan submittal date and the compliance date do not impose new requirements. Consequently, the ICR has not been revised.

B. Executive Order 12866 Review

Under Executive Order 12866, the EPA must determine whether the proposed regulatory action is ''significant'' and therefore, subject to OMB review and the requirements of the executive order. The Order defines ''significant'' regulatory action as one that is likely to lead to a rule that may:

(1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety in State, local, or tribal governments or communities;

(2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

(3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or

(4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

The Shipbuilding NESHAP promulgated on December 15, 1995 was not considered ''significant'' under Executive Order 12866 and a regulatory impact analysis (RIA) was not prepared. Today's proposed revisions do not add any additional control or recordkeeping requirements. Therefore, this action is not considered to affect the decision whether this rule is significant.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires the identification of potentially adverse impacts of Federal regulations upon small business entities. The Act specifically requires the completion of a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis in those instances where small business impacts are possible. Because this rulemaking imposes no adverse economic impacts, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis has not been prepared.

D. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, the EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of $100 million or more. Under Section 205, the EPA must select the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires the EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

The EPA has determined that the action promulgated today does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. Therefore, the requirements of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act do not apply to this action.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 63

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 7, 1996.

Carol M. Browner,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–15440 Filed 6–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 36 and 69

[CC Docket 96–45; DA–96–936]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The purpose of the notice is to inform the general public of a meeting that will be held by the Federal-State Joint Board on universal service.

DATES: The Federal-State Joint Board in CC Docket 96–45 will hold an Open Meeting on Wednesday, June 19, 1996 at 9:00 a.m.

ADDRESSES: in Room 856 at 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irene Flannery, Accounting and Audits Division, Common Carrier Bureau, at (202) 418–0844.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: At the meeting, the Federal-State Joint Board will hear from two panels of experts addressing universal service issues set forth in Section 254 of the Telecommunications Act. In addition, the Federal-State Joint Board will consider whether to extend the two-year indexed cap on the rate at which the Universal Service Fund may grow.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–15339 Filed 6–12–96; 4:23 pm]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 571 and 581

[Docket No. 96–65; Notice 1]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards Bumper Standard

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

ACTION: Notice of public meetings; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This document announces public meetings to be held in Palm Desert, California, and Washington, DC, at which NHTSA will seek information on the appropriate classification and safety regulations for golf carts and other small, light-weight vehicles that are capable of being driven on the public roads. This document also invites written comments on these subjects.

DATES: The public meeting in Palm Desert, California, will be held on Thursday, July 18, 1996, at 1:00 p.m. The public meeting in Washington, DC, will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, July 25, 1996. An agenda for each meeting will be made based on the number of persons wishing to make oral presentations and will be available on the day of the meeting. Those wishing to make oral presentations at each meeting should contact Z. Taylor Vinson, at the address or telephone number listed below, by the close of business July 11, 1996.

ADDRESSES: *Public Meetings:* The first public meeting will be held at the City of Palm Desert Council Chambers, 73510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, California. The second public meeting will be held at DOT headquarters, Nassif Building, Room 6200, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. *Written Comments:* Written comments may be submitted at any time before or after the meetings, but not later than August 8, 1996. They should be sent to the Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, ATTN: Docket No. 96–65; Notice 1.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Z. Taylor Vinson, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA, Room 5219, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone 202–366–5263).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

As discussed below in more detail, vehicles such as golf carts have not been regulated by NHTSA because they were not being used on the public roads. Even where a vehicle is being used on the roads, NHTSA has not regulated it if it was configured differently from passenger cars or light trucks, and if it had a top speed of 20 mph or less. However, the agency has become aware that the use and design of some of these vehicles are evolving in previously unanticipated ways. Although golf carts have traditionally been limited in their operations to golf courses, a number of states have taken legislative actions that permit the use of golf carts on the public roads at speeds up to 25 mph. In addition, there appears to be a growing interest worldwide in small vehicles of somewhat unusual configurations that are capable of exceeding 20 mph, and that are intended for on-road use as city or commuter cars. While some new golf cart-like vehicles do not really resemble very small passenger cars, neither do they resemble the traditional golf cart.

The agency therefore deems it timely to review its historical position in light of this evolving situation. To aid it in its review, NHTSA has decided to hold two public meetings to receive the comments of local elected and law enforcement officials, manufacturers, individual citizens who use these vehicles, public interest groups, and other interested persons on safety and regulatory issues affecting golf carts and other light-weight limited-speed vehicles.

II. Legal Considerations

A. Federal Law

Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 grants NHTSA regulatory authority over ''motor vehicles.'' All ''motor vehicles'' are subject to the Federal motor vehicle safety standards promulgated by NHTSA pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30111, and to the notification and remedy provisions of 49 U.S.C. 30118–30121. A ''motor vehicle'' is a vehicle ''manufactured primarily for use on the public streets, roads, and highways'' (Sec. 30102(a)(6)). The agency's interpretations of this term have centered around the meaning of the word ''primarily.'' The agency has generally interpreted the term to mean that a significant portion of a vehicle's use must be on the public roads in order for the vehicle to be considered to be a motor vehicle.

NHTSA's principal interpretation of Sec. 30102(a)(6) dates from 1969, and addressed the status of mini-bikes. NHTSA said that the capability of a vehicle to be operated on the public roads would be an important criterion in determining whether it was a ''motor vehicle'', but that test would not be reached if there is clear evidence as a practical matter that the vehicle was not being used on the public roads. In NHTSA's view, ''in the case of self-propelled riding mowers, golf carts, and many other similar self-propelled vehicles, such clear evidence exists.'' Thus, the agency declined to regulate golf carts.

Without such clear evidence, NHTSA said that it would initially defer to the manufacturer's judgment that a vehicle was not a ''motor vehicle'' unless ''a substantial portion of the consuming public'' was operating the vehicle on the public roads. In borderline cases, NHTSA set forth criteria it would employ in determining whether a particular vehicle is a ''motor vehicle.'' Noting the comparative rarity of mini-bike use on public streets, and that the registration of mini-bikes for use on public streets was precluded by laws of most jurisdictions unless they were equipped with Standard No. 108-type lighting devices, NHTSA said it would not consider mini-bikes to be ''motor vehicles'' if their manufacturers:

(1) Do not equip them with devices and accessories that render them lawful for use and registration for use on public highways under state and local laws;

(2) Do not otherwise participate or assist in making the vehicles lawful for operation on public roads (as by