

Stephen L. Johnson,
Director, Registration Division, Office of
Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR
part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180
continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.1001 the table to
paragraphs (c) and (e) is amended by
revising the listing for “ α -Alkyl C₁₂-C₁₅-
 ω -hydroxy poly(oxyethylene) sulfate

and its ammonium, calcium,
magnesium, potassium, sodium and
zinc salts; the polyoxyethylene content
averages 3 moles” to read as follows:

§ 180.1001 Exemptions from the requirements of a tolerance.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

Ingredients	Limits	Uses
α -Alkyl (C ₁₀ -C ₁₅)- ω -hydroxy poly(oxyethylene) sulfate and its ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium, and zinc salts; the poly(oxyethylene) con- tent averages 2 moles.	Surfactants, related adjuvants of surfactants.
* *	* * *	* *

* * * * * (e) * * *

Ingredients	Limits	Uses
α -Alkyl (C ₁₀ -C ₁₅)- ω -hydroxy poly(oxyethylene) sulfate and its ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, sodium, and zinc salts; the poly(oxyethylene) con- tent averages 2 moles.	Surfactants, related adjuvants of surfactants.
* *	* * *	* *

[FR Doc. 96-13437 Filed 6-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 0 and 80

[CI Docket 95-55; DA 96-822]

Inspection of Radio Installations on Large Cargo and Small Passenger Ships

AGENCY: Federal Communications
Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of
time.

SUMMARY: The United States Coast
Guard (Coast Guard) has requested an
extension of time to prepare comments
to a *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*
(NPRM) that the Commission adopted
on April 25, 1996. Because the Coast
Guard is responsible for maritime safety
in the United States and the
Commission is coordinating this
proposal with the Coast Guard we are
granting their request. The intended
effect of this extension is to permit the
Coast Guard and other interested parties
additional time to prepare comments.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or
before June 24, 1996, and reply
comments must be filed on or before
July 15, 1996. Written comments by the
public and federal agencies on the
proposed and/or modified information
collections are due by June 24, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications
Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20554. In addition to
filing comments with the Secretary, a
copy of any comments on the
information collections contained
herein should be submitted to Dorothy
Conway, Federal Communications
Commission, Room 234, 1919 M Street,
N.W., Washington, DC 20554, or via the
Internet to dconway@fcc.gov, and to
Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236
NEOB, 725-17th Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20503 or via the
Internet to fain_t@al.eop.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
George R. Dillon of the Compliance and
Information Bureau at (202) 418-1100.
For additional information concerning
the information collections contained in
this NPRM contact Dorothy Conway at
202-418-0217, or via the Internet at
dconway@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April
25, 1996, the Commission adopted a
Notice of Proposed Rule Making, CI

Docket 95-55, FCC 96-194, 61 FR
21151, May 9, 1996, that proposed to
permit the Commission to use private
sector organizations to inspect all U. S.
cargo ships and passenger ships that are
required by statute to have an
inspection. Because the Commission's
primary objective is preserving safety of
life at sea we requested specific
comments on how to ensure that safety
will not be compromised by using
private sector inspectors. Additionally,
we noted that we would coordinate this
proceeding with the U. S. Coast Guard.

1. The U. S. Coast Guard has
requested an extension of time in which
to file comments. The Coast Guard
states that the proposals are substantial
and that the additional time will permit
it to prepare a thorough review of the
proposal. We requested that comments
be filed by May 24, 1996, and reply
comments be filed by June 3, 1996.

2. Because Commission staff are
coordinating this proposal with the
Coast Guard and we have requested
their comments, we believe that an
extension of time is warranted. For good
cause shown, and pursuant to Sections

4(j) and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. 154 (j) and 303 (r), it is ordered that the period of time for filing comments and reply comments in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making, CI Docket 95-55, released on April 26, 1996, is hereby extended. Comments must be filed on or before June 24, 1996. Reply comments must be filed on or before July 15, 1996.

3. To file formally in this proceeding, you must file an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If you want each Commissioner to receive a personal copy of your comments, you should file an original and nine copies. You should send your comments and reply comments to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

4. You may also file informal comments by electronic mail. You should address informal comments to gdillon@fcc.gov. You must put the docket number of this proceeding on the subject line (see the caption at the beginning of this Notice). You must also include your full name and Postal Service mailing address in the text of the message. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the Reference Center of the Federal Communications Commission (Room 239), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

Federal Communications Commission.

Beverly G. Baker,

Chief, Compliance and Information Bureau.

[FR Doc. 96-13835 Filed 6-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

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 the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) petition to incorporate the latest version of SAE J592 Clearance, Side Marker, and Identification Lamps, and SAE J593 Backup Lamps, 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 these SAE standards. While incorporation would make them more readily available to lighting and vehicle design engineers as a reference, this is a minimal benefit compared to the expenditures of Agency resources to implement it and other SAE standards whose references in FMVSS No. 108 are not the most recent. The Agency's commitment of its resources to its safety priorities precludes granting this petition. However, the agency has compiled a reference document of materials incorporated into FMVSS No. 108 to improve the availability of these materials. This document is available upon request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard L. Van Iderstine, Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Van Iderstine's telephone number is: (202) 366-5280. His facsimile number is (202) 366-4329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By letter dated February 15, 1996, William A. McKinney, Chairman of the Lighting Coordinating Committee of the Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc. (Petitioner) petitioned the agency to incorporate the latest version of SAE J592 Clearance, Side Marker, and Identification Lamps, and SAE J593 Backup Lamps, into 49 CFR 571.108 (Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 108, Lamps, reflective devices and associated equipment.)

The Petitioner claimed the changes in SAE J592 DEC94 Clearance, Side Marker, and Identification Lamps provide significant improvements as follows:

a. Photometric performance requirements are based on zones, including 60% minimum requirement for individual test points, and are consistent with the required format used for most signal and marking lamps regulated by FMVSS 108, and a 0.5 degree radius tolerance area for maximum readings is also additionally specified to allow for inconsequential light streaks,

b. Additional explanations and guidelines for installation are provided,

c. The format and content is consistent with the current SAE formatting requirements, and

d. Information on SAE publications referenced in the document is incorporated.

The petitioner claimed the changes in SAE J593 OCT95 Backup provide the following:

a. A definition of point of visibility,
b. Photometric performance requirements based on zones, including

60% minimum requirement for individual test points, thus allowing the deletion of FMVSS 108, Figure 2, Minimum Luminous Intensity Requirements for Backup Lamps,

c. A specific maximum requirement of 500 cd for a one (1) backup lamp system, whereas the current FMVSS 108, Table 2 footnote leaves the maximum requirement subject to interpretation,

d. Specific requirements for limiting and measuring the currently specified "incidental red, amber, or white light * * *"

e. Additional explanations and guidelines for photometry and installation,

f. Revised format with content that is consistent with the current SAE formatting requirements, and

g. Information on SAE publications referenced in the document.

Petitioner further claimed that these revisions make new versions easier to apply, as well as easier to find because they are located in current SAE Handbooks. Petitioner also claimed that the changes would not adversely affect the costs of any lighting. No claims about safety or performance were made.

The agency has reviewed what would be required to implement the Petitioner's desired solution. It has found that the tests and many requirements of the new documents are from other SAE standards newer than those referenced in FMVSS No. 108, making an update only partially of value to any particular user.

Thus, the advantage claimed by Petitioner by referencing standards in current SAE Handbooks appears to be very small because this action would update only the two referenced documents, and none of the subreferenced documents. Additionally, because NHTSA reference to SAE standards is not always absolute, in that parts of standards are referenced or exceptions are made to specific requirements in SAE standards where different or more stringent performance is necessary for safety purposes, the value of having the latest version of an SAE document is lessened. Thus, without a careful reading of FMVSS No. 108, a reader of the newest referenced documents could be misled as to the pertinent requirements, just as can occur with the currently referenced versions.

Additionally, it is unlikely these two documents, or any version of a referenced industry standard would be wholly usable for more than just a short period of time and probably would be out of print within no more than five years because of SAE's 5-year schedule