(*13*) At the completion of short-term dredging projects, at least annually for ongoing projects, and at any other time or interval requested by the District Engineer or Regional Administrator, permittees shall prepare and submit to the District Engineer and Regional Administrator a report that includes complete records of all dredging, transport and disposal activities, such as navigation logs, disposal coordinates, scow certification checklists, and other information required by permit conditions. Electronic data submittals may be required to conform to a format specified by the agencies. Permittees shall include a report indicating whether any dredged material was dredged outside the areas authorized for dredging or was dredged deeper than authorized for dredging by their permits.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 99–10729 Filed 4–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99–116, RM–9536]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Angel Fire, Chama, Taos, NM

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Alpine Broadcasting Limited Partnership seeking the substitution of Channel 256C for Channel 260C at Taos, NM, the modification of Station KHYF's construction permit to specify the alternate Class C channel, the substitution of Channel 260C2 for Channel 256C2 at Angel Fire, NM, the modification of Station KKIT's license to specify the alternate Class C2 channel, the substitution of Channel 221A for Channel 255A at Chama, NM, and the modification of the new station's construction permit (BPH–961115MM) to specify the alternate Class A channel. Channel 256C can be allotted to Taos in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements with a site restriction of 60.3 kilometers (37.4 miles) northwest, at coordinates 36–47–33 NL; 106–02–49 WL, to accommodate petitioner's desired transmitter site. Channel 260C2 can be allotted to Angel Fire at Station KKIT's licensed transmitter site, at coordinates 36–22–33; 105–14–12. Channel 221A can be allotted to Chama at the transmitter site specified in the outstanding construction permit, at coordinates 36–54–11; 106–34–35.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before June 1, 1999, and reply comments on or before June 16, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW–A325, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Richard A. Helmick, Cohn and Marks, 1920 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 (Counsel to petitioner).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie K. Shapiro, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making and Order to Show Cause, MM Docket No. 99–116, adopted March 31, 1999, and released April 9, 1999. 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, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 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. 99–10750 Filed 4–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 99–114, RM–8902]

Television Broadcasting Services; Lake Havasu City, AZ and Laughlin, NV

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed on behalf of Mojave Broadcasting Company (formerly Meridian Communications Company), permittee of television Station KMCC, Channel 34+, Lake Havasu City, Arizona, requesting the reallotment of NTSC Channel 34+ from Lake Havasu City to Laughlin, Nevada, as that community's first local television transmission service and the modification of its authorization accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of Section 1.420(i) of the Commmission's Rules. Additionally, Mojave's request also seeks the reallotment of its DTV Channel 32 from Lake Havasu City, Arizona, to Laughlin, Nevada. Coordinates used for NTSC Channel 34+, as well as DTV Channel 32 at Laughlin, Nevada, are 35–01–57 NL and 114–21–56 WL. As Laughlin, Nevada, is located within 320 kilometers (199 miles) of the United States-Mexico border, the Commission must obtain concurrence of the Mexican government to this proposal.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 31, 1999, and reply comments on or before June 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: Richard E. Wiley and James R. Bayes, Esqs., Wiley, Rein & Fielding, 1776 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006.

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. 99–114, adopted March 31, 1999, and released April 9, 1999. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Information Center (Room CY–A257), 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service,

Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, (202) 857–3800.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 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

Television broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

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

[FR Doc. 99–10752 Filed 4–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–98–4167; Notice 1]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems

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

ACTION: Denial of petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition for rulemaking requesting that NHTSA amend Standard 213, ''Child Restraint Systems,'' to delete the head excursion requirement for rear-facing convertible restraints. Petitioners believe that infants should be rear-facing until at least 1 year of age, and that the head excursion limit in Standard 213 makes it unnecessarily difficult for manufacturers to recommend their restraints be used rear-facing for children of at least that age. NHTSA is denying the petition because the head excursion limit serves a safety need and there are unknown safety consequences to the petitioners' requested action. Second, more and more manufacturers are able to meet the head excursion requirement and certify rear-facing restraints for children older than 1 year in age. Further, the petitioners did not provide—and NHTSA has not identified—any data which indicate that injuries could have been prevented by the requested amendment.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For nonlegal issues: Mike Huntley, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, Special Vehicle and Systems Division (telephone 202–366–0029).

For legal issues: Deirdre Fujita, Office of the Chief Counsel (202–366–2992). Both can be reached at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Petitioners' Request

On March 1, 1997, Stephanie Trombello and Deborah Stewart, Executive Director and Technical Consultant, respectively, of SafetyBeltSafe U.S.A., Inglewood, California, petitioned NHTSA to amend Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 213, ''Child Restraint Systems'' (49 CFR 571.213), concerning certain labeling and occupant excursion requirements in the standard. Petitioners believe that infants should be rear-facing until at least 1 year of age, and that the head excursion limit in Standard 213 makes it unnecessarily difficult for manufacturers of convertible [1] child restraint systems to recommend that their restraints be used rear-facing until the child is at least that age.

Standard 213 specifies performance requirements that a child restraint must meet when tested with dummies representing the range of children for which that child restraint is recommended. Under Standard 213's requirements, child restraints recommended for use by children weighing over 22 lb are tested with a test dummy representing a 3-year-old child. So tested, they must meet all performance requirements of the standard, including limits on how far they allow the rear-facing dummy's head to extend beyond and above the top of the child restraint in a 30-mph dynamic test. (This document refers to these limits as the head excursion limits.) The head excursion limits are set forth in S5.1.3.2 of Standard 213, as follows:

> S5.1.3.2. *Rear-facing child restraint systems.* In the case of each rear-facing child restraint system, all portions of the test dummy's torso shall be retained within the system and neither of the target points on either side of the dummy's head and on the transverse axis passing through the center of mass of the dummy's head and perpendicular to the head's midsagittal plane, shall pass through the transverse orthogonal planes whose intersection contains the forward-most and top-most points on the child restraint system surfaces.

The petitioners request that Standard 213 be amended to exclude convertible child restraints from the head excursion limit when the restraint is tested rear-facing with the 33 lb dummy. Petitioners state that, but for the head excursion limit,

> (S)ome currently available convertible safety seats have performed well in crash tests with the 33-pound dummy in the rear-facing position. (However, we) understand that the reason the manufacturers have hesitated to change their instructions to encourage rear-facing use for heavier babies is that the child's head could ramp up and over the top edge of the car seat in a head-on collision.

Petitioners believe that injuries will be prevented if NHTSA amends the standard as they request. Twenty-two (22) lb is the weight of a 50th percentile 12-month-old. Petitioners state that many babies reach 22 lb at six months of age or even earlier. They believe that current labeling on convertible child restraints results in parents of ''heavy'' infants turning the child forward when the child is less than 1 year.

Petitioners believe that the head excursion limit is unnecessary because a heavy one-year-old is much shorter than the 33 lb (3-year-old) dummy. They suggest that in lieu of the head excursion requirement, parents can be instructed, by way of a label, to limit use of the rear-facing child restraint based on the child's height. They suggest a statement such as ''This safety seat may be used in the rear-facing position until the child weighs 30 pounds if the child's head is below the top edge (or within __ inches of the top edge) of the seat.''

II. Evaluation of Petition

NHTSA is denying the petition for the reasons set forth below.

1. Rear-Facing Restraints Certified Above 22 Lb

Infants should be transported rear-facing until the child's skeletal and muscular structure can develop to where they can more safely withstand crash forces in a forward-facing position, which typically occurs at around age 1. Transporting infants rear-facing spreads crash forces evenly across the infant's back and shoulders, the strongest part of the child's body.

[1] A convertible restraint is used to restrain children from birth to about 40 lb. When restraining an infant, the restraint is positioned so that it faces the rear of a vehicle. When restraining a toddler, the restraint is positioned so that it faces the front of a vehicle.