

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

43 CFR Part 3800

[WO-300-1990-00]

RIN 1004-AD22

Mining Claims Under the General Mining Laws; Surface Management; Correction

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is correcting the address for hand delivery of comments and information related to public hearings to be held on its recently published proposed rule to revise regulations governing mining operations involving metallic minerals on public lands. This action will ensure that the public has the correct location for hand delivery of comments and the correct dates and times for the public hearings.

ADDRESSES: The correct address for hand delivery of comments on the proposed rule is: Bureau of Land Management Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, Nevada 89520.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Schwartz, Regulatory Affairs Group, Bureau of Land Management, (202) 452-5198.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 9, 1999, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a proposed rule to revise its regulations governing mining operations involving metallic and some other minerals on public lands administered by BLM. See 64 FR 6422. The proposed rule announced the addresses for submitting comments and the dates and times of the public hearings. In the first column on page 6422, the address for hand delivery of comments was incorrect. The correct address appears in the **ADDRESSES** section above.

In the third column on page 6422 and the first column on page 6423, we gave the dates and times of the public hearings. The date of the Elko, Nevada public hearing was incorrect. The hearing will be held on Thursday, March 25, 1999.

We did not give the times of the Ontario, California; Eugene, Oregon; and Spokane, Washington public hearings because the information was not available at the time of publication of the proposed rule. The times of the hearings are as follows:

Ontario, California—1 p.m. and 6 p.m.

Eugene, Oregon—1 p.m. and 7 p.m.
Spokane, Washington—1 p.m. and 7 p.m.

Dated: February 24, 1999.

Michael Schwartz,

Group Manager, Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 99-4994 Filed 2-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 1

[WT Docket No. 96-86; DA 99-331]

The Development of Operational, Technical and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Agency Communication Requirements Through the Year 2010

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension for filing comments.

SUMMARY: This document extends the time to file replies to oppositions to petitions for reconsideration and replies to comments concerning the Commission's combined *First Report and Order* and *Third Notice of Proposed Rule Making* ("First Report or Third Notice" as applicable) adopted on August 6, 1998.

DATES: Replies to oppositions to petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report* are due on or before February 23, 1999, and reply comments regarding the *Third Notice* are due on or before February 25, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, Publications Branch, Room TW-A325, The Portals II, 445 12th ST., SW, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Daronco or Michael Pollak, at the Public Safety & Private Wireless Division, (202) 418-0680.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The full text of the *Order* is as follows:

1. On August 6, 1998, the Commission adopted a combined *First Report and Order (First Report)* and *Third Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Third Notice)* in this proceeding. See 63 FR 58685 (Nov. 2, 1998). Petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report* were filed and oppositions to these petitions were filed on February 5, 1999. The current deadline for filing replies to these oppositions is February 16, 1999. See 64 FR 3298 (Jan. 21, 1999). Comments were also filed regarding the *Third Notice* and the current deadline for filing reply

comments is February 18, 1999. See 64 FR 1003 (Jan. 7, 1999).

2. On February 8, 1999, the Commission received a *Motion for Extension of Time* filed by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc. (APCO). APCO requests seven (7) day extensions of time both for filing replies to oppositions to petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report*, and for filing reply comments regarding the *Third Notice*. APCO states these short extensions would afford interested parties adequate time to prepare full and complete comments because most parties are simultaneously participating in both the "reconsideration" and "Third NPRM" elements of this proceeding. Specifically, APCO contends that the proximity of the two related deadlines, combined with the upcoming Federal holiday on February 15, 1999, will limit the ability of public safety agencies and organizations to provide adequate and timely submissions in both aspects of this critical proceeding. APCO adds while a 30-day period was allotted for reply comments regarding the *Third Notice*, many parties have been occupied during that period with preparing oppositions to the petitions for reconsideration.

3. It is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time are not routinely granted. Upon review, however, we agree that an extension will afford parties the necessary time to coordinate and file comments that will facilitate the compilation of a more complete record in this proceeding. We believe that seven-day extensions of time, both for filing replies to oppositions to petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report* and reply comments regarding the *Third Notice*, should provide an adequate opportunity for all parties to prepare and file responsive and complete pleadings in this proceeding without causing undue delay to the Commission's consideration of this proceeding.

4. Accordingly, it is ordered that the *Motion for Extension of Time* filed by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc., on February 8, 1999, is granted. Parties shall file replies to oppositions to petitions for reconsideration of the *First Report* no later than February 23, 1999, and reply comments regarding the *Third Notice* no later than February 25, 1999.

5. This action is taken pursuant to the authority provided in Section 1.46 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR 1.46 and under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the

Commission's Rules, 47 CFR 0.131, 0.331.

Federal Communications Commission.

Herbert W. Zeiler,

Deputy Chief, Public Safety & Private Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

[FR Doc. 99-4687 Filed 2-26-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-5119; Notice 01]

RIN No. 2127-AH57

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems; Air Brake Systems

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

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: NHTSA is considering whether to grant a petition to amend Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 105, Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems, and FMVSS No. 121, Air Brake Systems, to require that school buses be equipped with a parking brake warning system that activates when the school bus engine is turned off, the transmission is in neutral, and the parking brake has not been applied. The petition was submitted by Schmitt and Sons School Buses, a school bus operator that is concerned about the possibility of school bus roll away crashes due to the driver not applying the parking brake. The petitioner cited several instances in which this has occurred. This request for comments notice seeks to obtain information to help the agency determine the magnitude of the problem and the potential effectiveness of the proposed warning system.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 30, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments must refer to the docket and notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comments be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For non-legal issues: Mr. Jeff Woods, Office

of Safety Performance Standards (NPS-22), NHTSA, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC, 20590. Mr. Woods' telephone number is (202) 366-6206; facsimile (202) 366-4329.

For legal issues: Ms. Dorothy Nakama, Rulemaking Division, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC, 20590. Ms. Nakama's telephone number is (202) 366-2992 and her facsimile number is (202) 366-3820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

A petition was submitted to NHTSA on June 23, 1998, by Schmitt and Sons School Buses, a school bus operator. The petition cited several crashes in Minnesota involving school buses in which the parking brake was not set and the bus rolled into another vehicle. In one instance, it was reported that an empty school bus rolled into another school bus that was unloading students during a practice emergency exit drill, and as a result, several students were injured.

The petitioner believes that a warning system should be incorporated on school buses to provide a warning buzzer and/or light to indicate to the driver that the parking brake has not been applied when the engine has been turned off and the transmission has been placed in the "neutral" position. The petitioner contacted Blue Bird Body Company, a school bus manufacturer, to determine if such a system could be made available. A copy of the response letter from the manufacturer was enclosed with the petition. Blue Bird indicated that the warning system concept appears to have merit. However, the manufacturer cited several concerns with the concept. The primary concern was that incorporation of the warning system on some (newer) vehicles would result in inconsistencies in the fleet, whereby some vehicles would prompt the driver to apply the parking brake and other vehicles would not. Blue Bird suggested that if a driver became used to being prompted to applying the parking brake in a vehicle equipped with the warning system, then that driver may forget to apply the parking brake when operating a vehicle not equipped with the warning system.

Other concerns cited by Blue Bird included the proliferation of warning devices, which could result in driver dependence and/or confusion, issues on integrating this system with other warning devices and systems, and the need to deactivate the system after some preset time to prevent battery drain.

Blue Bird stated that if such a warning system were to be implemented, then it

would recommend unilaterally applying it to all medium and heavy vehicles to avoid the situation of some vehicle types being equipped with the warning system and others not being equipped with the warning system. In Blue Bird's view, implementation of the warning system would also need to be accompanied by an extensive publicity and driver training program to familiarize drivers with the new system.

Blue Bird stated that because of these concerns, it would not make such a warning system available as standard equipment or as optional equipment. Blue Bird suggested that the school bus operator petition NHTSA to require such a system on all medium and heavy vehicles, so that appropriate research, study, and public comment could be addressed prior to such a system being introduced. The school bus operator, Schmitt & Sons School Buses, subsequently petitioned NHTSA to require such a warning system on a nationwide basis.

NHTSA decided to publish this request for comments prior to making a determination on whether to grant or deny the petition. If NHTSA determines that the petition should be granted, based on indications that there is a significant safety need, then it would begin the rulemaking process to propose amendments to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSSs), in this case, FMVSS No. 105, Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems, and FMVSS No. 121, Air Brake Systems. The rulemaking process, if it proceeds, will provide ample opportunity for concerned parties to further comment on all aspects of any proposed changes to the FMVSSs.

Parking Brake Requirements

FMVSS No. 105, Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems, requires each vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 10,000 lbs. (4536 kg) or less and each school bus with a GVWR greater than 10,000 lbs. to be equipped with a friction-type parking brake system, with a solely mechanical means to retain engagement (S5.2).

The standard requires the parking brake for a passenger car or a school bus with a GVWR of 10,000 lbs. or less to hold the vehicle on a 30 percent grade (up to the limit of traction on the braked wheels).

As an option, the standard permits a passenger car or school bus with a GVWR of 10,000 lbs. or less, equipped with a transmission that includes a parking mechanism, to use the parking mechanism in meeting the 30 percent grade holding requirement for the vehicle, if the parking mechanism must