

insulation, coke, pitch and cathode waste.

In the Spring of 1983, the presence of cyanide compounds was detected in the ground water at the Martin Marietta facility. The site was proposed for inclusion on the NPL in October 1984. On June 10, 1986 the Site was placed on the NPL.

In September 1985, MMC and EPA entered into a Consent Order to conduct a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) for the Site. On September 29, 1988, EPA signed a Record of Decision (ROD) that addressed the potential sources of contamination as identified in the RI/FS. The selected remedial action in the ROD included the following components:

- Consolidate on-Site residual cathode waste and fill material into the existing Landfill;
- Cap the existing Landfill in place with a multi-media cap meeting Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) performance criteria;
- Place a soil cover over two Sludge Ponds;
- Plug and abandon nearby production wells and connect users to the City of The Dalles water supply system;
- Collect and treat leachate generated from the Landfill;
- Recover and treat contaminated ground water from a perched zone near the Unloading Area portion of the Site;
- Prepare ground-water quality monitoring and contingency plans to perform additional recovery of ground water in the event that further contamination is detected above health based standards; and
- Implement institutional controls including deed restrictions and fencing, to assure that the remedial action will protect human health and the environment during and after implementation.

An Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) was signed by EPA Region 10 on September 23, 1994. The ESD documented modifications to remedial actions which were anticipated in the ROD, and an addition to the remedial action which was not anticipated in the ROD.

Changes to the ROD which are documented in the ESD include the following:

- The ROD anticipated that the volume of leachate generated from the Landfill would be reduced to a negligible flow within five years. However, since the signing of the ROD, the leachate flow rate has not decreased significantly. As a result, the leachate will have to be treated for a longer term than expected.

- The ROD also required treatment of contaminated ground water in an area known as the Unloading Area. Additional ground-water information which was collected since the ROD, has made it unnecessary to treat the ground water in the Unloading Area.

C. Characterization of Risk

Prior to remediation, the preliminary environmental pathways of concern related to the wastes from the aluminum reduction facility were ground water and on-Site soils.

The remedial action commenced on August 29, 1989 and consisted of the following activities:

- Consolidation and capping of wastes and debris from three former operating units.
- Excavation and consolidation of cathodic wastes into the Landfill, and placement of a multi-layered RCRA performance cap over the Landfill.
- Construction of a Leachate Collection System and Cyanide Destruction Treatment System to collect and transfer any generated leachate from the Landfill for treatment.
- Abandonment of four potable water wells in the vicinity of the Site, and connecting their users to the municipal supply.
- Implementation of institutional controls.
- Implementation of a ground-water monitoring program.

On-Site containment of contaminated soils and debris has reduced exposure and inhibited the source of ground-water contamination. Analytical data based on five years of ground-water monitoring following the remedial action indicate concentrations of contaminants of concern do not exceed ROD cleanup levels.

All pathways by which environmental receptors could potentially be exposed to Site-related contaminants have been eliminated.

Since hazardous substances will remain on Site, operation and maintenance activities will continue, and institutional controls will remain in effect. A long-term ground-water monitoring program has been implemented at the Site. In addition, the Site will continue to be subject to periodic five-year reviews to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.

D. Public Participation

Community input has been sought by EPA Region 10 throughout the cleanup process for the Site. Community relations activities have included public meetings prior to signing of the ROD, several public notices in local

newspapers, and routine publication of progress fact sheets. A copy of the Deletion Docket can be reviewed by the public at the Dalles/Wasco County Library or the EPA Region 10 Superfund Records Center. The Deletion Docket includes this Notice, the ROD, ESD, Remedial Action Construction Report, Preliminary Site Close-Out Report, and Final Site Close-Out Report. EPA Region 10 will also announce the availability of the Deletion Docket for public review in a local newspaper and informational fact sheet.

One of the three criteria for deletion specifies that EPA may delete a site from the NPL if "responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required". EPA, with the concurrence of DEQ, believes that this criterion for deletion has been met. Ground water and soil data from the Site confirm that the ROD cleanup goals have been achieved. It is concluded that there is no significant threat to human health or the environment and, therefore, no further remedial action is necessary. Subsequently, EPA is proposing deletion of this Site from the NPL. Documents supporting this action are available from the docket.

Dated: May 2, 1996.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 96-11756 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Chapter I

[CC Docket No. 96-98, DA 96-700]

Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Increase in Page Limits for Comments and Reply Comments on Proposed Rule

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On April 19, 1996, the Commission adopted and released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to implement provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 that address local competition. In addition to seeking comment on substantive rules, the NPRM established a limit of seventy-five (75) pages for the initial round of comments and thirty-five (35) pages for reply comments. Exhibits, appendices, and affidavits of expert

witnesses are counted towards these page limits. In response to motions filed by GTE Service Corporation and the Consumer Federation of America, the Commission hereby increases the limit for initial comments from 75 to 120 pages and the limit for replies from 35 to 50 pages. In addition, the Commission expands the exclusion from these page limits to include any technical diagrams submitted by commenters in addition to the previously excluded documents. These modifications are intended to permit the development of the best possible record in light of the statutory deadline.

DATES: Comments on all sections of the NPRM other than Dialing Parity, Number Administration, Public Notice of Technical Changes, and Access to Rights of Way, must be submitted on or before May 16, 1996. Reply Comments must be filed on or before May 30, 1996. Comments on the remaining sections must be submitted on or before May 20, 1996. Reply comments for these sections must be submitted on or before June 3, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments and reply comments should be sent to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222, Washington, D.C. 20554, with a copy to Janice Myles of the Common Carrier Bureau, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544, Washington, D.C. 20554. A copy of Comments and Reply Comments on Dialing Parity, Number Administration, Public Notice of Technical Changes, and Access to Rights of Way should be submitted to Gloria Shambley of the Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Parties should also file one copy of any documents filed in this docket with the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 239, Washington, D.C. 20554. Parties are also asked to submit comments and reply comments on diskette. Such diskette submissions would be in addition to and not a substitute for the formal filing requirements addressed above. Parties submitting diskettes should submit them to Janice Myles of the Common Carrier Bureau, 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collections contained

herein should be remitted to Dorothy Conway, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 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:

Kalpak Gude at (202) 418-1580, Common Carrier Bureau, Policy and Program Planning Division.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Adopted: May 7, 1996

Released: May 7, 1996

By the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau:

1. On April 19, 1996, the Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Notice) in CC Docket No. 96-98 to implement the local competition provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 96-182, 61 FR 18311 (April 25, 1996). The NPRM provided that comments were to be no longer than seventy-five (75) pages and that reply comments were to be no longer than thirty-five (35) pages, including exhibits, appendices, and affidavits of expert witnesses. Empirical economic studies and copies of relevant state orders were not to be counted against these page limits. The NPRM required parties to file comments by May 16, 1996 and reply comments by May 30, 1996. The NPRM established separate comment and reply dates for issues regarding Dialing Parity, Number Administration, Notice of Technical Changes, and Access to Rights of Way. Nothing in this order alters or affects filing procedures regarding those issues.

2. On May 1, 1996, GTE Service Corporation (GTE) and the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) filed motions for extension of time. GTE Motion for Extension of Time and for Waiver of Page Limits (filed May 1, 1996); CFA Request for Extension of Time (filed May 1, 1996). GTE argued that, in light of the number of issues to be addressed, the inclusion of appendices in the page limits, the 35 page limit for replies, and the 14 day time period for replies, will preclude development of the most helpful and informative record. Among other things, GTE emphasized the difficulty of reviewing the record and filing reply comments within 14 days. GTE urged the Commission to modify the comment filing procedures to provide that: (1) Exhibits, appendices, and affidavits not

be counted against the page limits; (2) the page limit for replies be 50 pages; and (3) the date for filing reply comments be increased from 14 to 21 days after the comment due date, i.e., June 6, 1996.

3. CFA argued that this proceeding and the universal service proceeding are inextricably linked, and that the limited comment periods in this proceeding would have a disproportionate negative effect on the ability of public interest groups to file comments. *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board, CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 96-93, 61 FR 10499 (March 14, 1996). CFA argued that large telecommunications companies with substantial resources would have less difficulty participating in both proceedings, while public interest groups may be forced to either file comments which are less than complete or not file comments at all. CFA asserted that this would result in an incomplete record. CFA requested the Commission to extend the time to file comments until June 13, 1996 and the time for reply comments until July 3, 1996.

4. In light of concerns expressed by the parties, and in the interest of building the best record possible under the existing circumstances, the page limitations are modified as follows: (1) Comments must be no longer than one hundred twenty (120) pages and reply comments no longer than fifty (50) pages; (2) in addition to empirical economic studies and copies of relevant state orders, technical diagrams will not count against these page limitations; and (3) an additional 4 copies of comments and reply comments must be sent to Janice Myles of the Common Carrier Bureau, 1919 M Street, NW., Room 544, Washington, DC 20554. We decline to adopt GTE's request that exhibits, appendices and affidavits be excluded from the page limit since we believe that this could easily be tantamount to removing the page limitations altogether. In lieu of this, we are increasing the page limit for comments substantially, from 75 to 120 pages. We are also increasing the page limit for replies to 50 pages as requested by GTE.

5. We deny the GTE and CFA requests for extension of the dates for filing comments and/or replies. Although the current pleading schedule is relatively compressed given the scope of the issues involved, we do not believe that we can extend the filing dates without compromising the Commission's ability to meet the implementation schedule mandated by Congress.

6. In order to facilitate development of the best possible record within existing constraints, we stress the need for interested parties to present their positions fully in their initial comments. We emphasize that the purpose of reply comments is to permit parties to respond to the original comments. 47 CFR § 1.415(c).

7. Accordingly, it is ordered that the motion for extension of time and for waiver of page limits filed by GTE Service Corporation is granted to the extent indicated above and otherwise denied.

8. It is further ordered that the request for extension of time filed by the Consumer Federation of America is denied.

Federal Communications Commission.

Regina M. Keeney,

Chief, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 96-11965 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Chapters 1 and 2

[FAR Case 96-308]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Implementation of Commercially Available Off-the-Shelf Item Acquisition Provisions of the Federal Acquisition Reform Act

AGENCIES: Department of Defense, General Services Administration, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council is soliciting comments regarding the implementation of section 4203 of the Federal Acquisition Reform Act (Pub. L. 104-106) (the Act) with respect to Commercially Available Off-the-Shelf Item Acquisitions. The Act requires the FAR to list provisions of law that are inapplicable to contracts for the acquisition of commercially available off-the-shelf items. Certain laws have already been determined to be inapplicable to all commercial items as a result of the implementation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (see FAR 12.503). The additional provisions of law that could be

determined inapplicable to commercially available off-the-shelf items are listed under

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION below.

DATES: Comments should be submitted to the address shown below by June 28, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit comments to the FAR Secretariat, General Services Administration, 18th and F Sts. NW, Washington, DC 20405. Please cite FAR Case 96-308.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: FAR Secretariat, (202) 501-4755.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 15 U.S.C. 637(d) (2) and (3), Utilization of Small Business Concerns (see 52.219-8); 15 U.S.C. 637(d)(4), Small Business Subcontracting Plan (see 52.219-9); 15 U.S.C. 637(a)(14), Limitation on Subcontracting (see 52.219-14); 19 U.S.C. 1202, Tariff Act of 1930 (see 52.225-10); 19 U.S.C. 1309, Supplies for Certain Vessels and Aircraft (see 52.225-10); 19 U.S.C. 2701, *et seq.*, Authority to Grant Duty Free Treatment (see 52.225-10); 29 U.S.C. 793, Affirmative Action for Handicapped Workers (see 52.222-36); 38 U.S.C. 4212, Affirmative Action for Special Disabled Vietnam Era Veterans (see 52.222-35); 38 U.S.C. 4212(d)(1), Employment Reports on Special disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era (see 52.222-37); 41 U.S.C. 10, Buy American Act—Supplies (see 52.225-3); 41 U.S.C. 253d, Validation of Proprietary Data Restrictions (see 52.227-14); 41 U.S.C. 253g and 10 U.S.C. 2482, Prohibition on Limiting Subcontractor Direct Sales to the United States (see 52.203-6); 41 U.S.C. 254(b) and 10 U.S.C. 2306a, Truth in Negotiations Act (see 15.804); 41 U.S.C. 254d(c) and 10 U.S.C. 2513(c), Examination of Records of Contractor (see 52.215-2); 41 U.S.C. 418a, Rights in Technical Data (see 52.227-14); 41 U.S.C. 442, Cost Accounting Standards (see FAR Appendix B, 48 CFR Chapter 99); 41 U.S.C. 423(e)(3), Administrative Actions (see 3.104); 46 U.S.C. 1241(b), Transportation in American Vessels of Government Personnel and Certain Cargo (see 52.247-64); 49 U.S.C. 40118, Fly American Provisions (see 52.247-63); For purposes of this notice, a “commercially available off-the-shelf item” means—

(1) a commercial item as defined in FAR 2.101;

(2) an item sold in substantial quantities in the commercial marketplace; and

(3) an item is offered to the Government, without modification, in the same form in which it is sold in the

commercial marketplace. This does not include bulk cargo, as defined in 46 U.S.C. App. 1702, such as agricultural and petroleum products. The FAR Council is requesting any interested parties to provide advance comments on:

(1) the definition of “commercially available off-the-shelf item” cited above.

(2) whether the above cited list of statutory provisions that could be determined inapplicable to commercial off-the-shelf items is complete.

(3) whether the specific provisions of law should be determined to be inapplicable. Comments received will be considered in the development of proposed or interim rules. In addition, a 60-day public comment period will be provided once proposed and/or interim FAR rules are drafted. Noted that agency specific statutory provisions will be addressed in separate Federal Register notices.

Dated: May 7, 1996.

Edward C. Loeb,

Director, Federal Acquisition Policy Division.

[FR Doc. 96-11862 Filed 5-10-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-EP-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 537

[Docket No. 96-38, Notice 01]

RIN 2127-AG00

Automotive Fuel Economy; Semi- Annual Reports

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

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes various revisions to the required form and contents of the semi-annual reports which automobile manufacturers are statutorily required to submit under the Federal automotive fuel economy program. It is intended that these revisions will reduce the paperwork burdens imposed on manufacturers without inhibiting the agency's ability to comply with its statutory requirements. NHTSA undertakes this action as part of its effort to implement the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative to make regulations easier to understand and apply.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket and notice number set forth above and be submitted to: Docket