

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 94-NM-55-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This action withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that proposed a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes. That action would have required replacement of certain feel and limitation computers (FLC) with modified FLC's. Since the issuance of the NPRM, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has issued other rulemaking that requires actions equivalent to and beyond those proposed. Accordingly, the proposed rule is withdrawn.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Groves, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (206) 227-1503; fax (206) 227-1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to add a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Airbus Model A300-600 series airplanes, was published in the Federal Register as a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on May 18, 1994 (59 FR 25844). The proposed rule would have required the replacement of certain feel and limitation computers (FLC) with modified FLC's, in accordance with instructions contained in Airbus Service Bulletin A300-27-6025, dated September 15, 1993. That action was prompted by reports that the elevator control on several in-service airplanes operated with stiffness. The proposed actions were intended to prevent stiff operation of the elevator control and undetected loss of the rudder travel limitation function, which may adversely affect the controllability of the airplane.

Actions That Occurred Since the NPRM Was Issued

Since the issuance of that NPRM, the FAA has issued AD 96-09-02, amendment 39-9576 (61 FR 18665, April 29, 1996). That AD requires the installation of modified FLC's on Airbus

Model A300-600 series airplanes, as well as other Airbus models. Like the NPRM, that AD was prompted by reports indicating that the elevator control operated with stiffness. The actions required by that AD are intended to prevent stiff operation of the elevator control and undetected loss of rudder travel limitation function, which could adversely affect the controllability of the airplane.

FAA's Conclusions

The requirements of AD 96-09-02 address the same unsafe condition that would have been addressed by the NPRM issued as Docket 94-NM-55-AD. That AD also incorporates and implements the same actions that were proposed by the NPRM, as well as additional actions found necessary to address the unsafe condition comprehensively. In light of this, the issuance of a final action for this NPRM is unnecessary. Accordingly, the proposed rule is hereby withdrawn.

Withdrawal of this NPRM constitutes only such action, and does not preclude the agency from issuing another notice in the future, nor does it commit the agency to any course of action in the future.

Regulatory Impact

Since this action only withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking, it is neither a proposed nor a final rule and therefore, is not covered under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Withdrawal

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket 94-NM-55-AD, published in the Federal Register on May 18, 1994 (59 FR 25844), is withdrawn.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 23, 1996.

John J. Hickey,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-13611 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**Copyright Office****37 CFR Ch. II**

[Docket No. 96-2]

Eligibility for the Cable Compulsory License

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Office of the Library of Congress is extending the period for filing reply comments in its rulemaking proceeding considering the eligibility of open video systems for the cable compulsory license.

DATES: Initial comments are due on or before July 5, 1996. Reply comments are due on or before September 13, 1996.

ADDRESSES: If delivered BY MAIL, fifteen copies of written comments should be addressed to the Office of the Copyright General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, DC 20024. If delivered BY HAND, fifteen copies of written comments should be brought to: Office of the Copyright General Counsel, James Madison Memorial Building, Room LM-407, First and Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20540.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marilyn J. Kretsinger, Acting General Counsel, or William Roberts, Senior Attorney for Compulsory Licenses. Telephone (202) 707-8380. Telefax (202) 707-8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 6, 1996, the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress published a notice of inquiry to consider the eligibility of open video systems ("OVS") for the cable compulsory license, 17 U.S.C. 111. See 61 FR 20197 (May 6, 1996). Initial comments are due July 5, 1996, and reply comments are due August 5, 1996. It has recently come to the attention of the Office that the Federal Communications Commission will be completing a rulemaking proceeding regarding OVS in early August. Because the Commission's adoption of rules may have a bearing on the copyright inquiry, the Office is extending the period for filing reply comments in this proceeding to September 13, 1996, to allow interested parties to submit comments in light of the Commission's final OVS rules.

Dated: May 24, 1996.

Marybeth Peters,

Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 96-13664 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-31-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**47 CFR Parts 36 and 69**

[CC Docket No. 96-45; DA-96-702]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Proposed rule: Denial of extension of time.

SUMMARY: On May 6, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission") released an Order ("Order") denying a request to extend the deadline for filing reply comments to its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board, released March 8, 1996 (CC Docket No. 96-45). The Commission denied the request out of concern that further delay in this proceeding might jeopardize the Joint Board's ability to issue a recommended decision within the statutory deadline set forth in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. By not extending the period for filing reply comments, the Commission intends to support the Joint Board in its resolve to announce its recommended decision on or before the statutory deadline of November 8, 1996.

DATES: Reply comments were due on or before May 8, 1996.**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20554.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jon Reel, 202-418-0850, Accounting and Audits Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 8, 1996, the Federal Communications Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board ("NPRM"), 61 FR 10499 (March 14, 1996). The Commission sought comment on all matters discussed in that NPRM. The deadline for comments was April 8, 1996 and the deadline for reply comments was May 3, 1996. On April 1, 1996, the Commission released an Order that extended the comment period until April 12, 1996 and the reply comment period until May 7, 1996 for all interested parties. On April 30, 1996, Information Renaissance and California Technology Assistance Project (petitioners) filed a joint request for a seven day further extension of the reply comment deadline. Petitioners argued that a further extension would permit

parties to avail themselves of the original comments that petitioners had put on the World Wide Web in electronic form, and thereby file reply comments based upon a better knowledge of the original comments. Believing that a further extension of time would seriously jeopardize the Joint Board's ability to issue a recommended decision within the statutory deadline set forth in the Act, the Commission found that the public interest would not be served by a further extension of time. Pursuant to the Commission's rules governing motions for the extension of time (47 CFR § 1.46), however, parties have two business days grace after the Commission acts on a timely filed motion for an extension of time. Because the Commission denied petitioner's motion on May 6, 1996, reply comments were due May 8, 1996.

Federal Communications Commission.
Kenneth P. Moran,*Chief, Accounting and Audits Division,
Common Carrier Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 96-13667 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Research and Special Programs Administration****49 CFR Part 195**

[Docket PS-140(e); Notice 6]

RIN 2137-AC34

Areas Unusually Sensitive to Environmental Damage**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.**ACTION:** Public workshop.

SUMMARY: RSPA invites industry, government agencies, and the public to the fifth workshop on unusually sensitive areas (USAs). The purpose of this workshop is to openly discuss drinking water resources. This workshop is a continuation of the USA workshops held June 15-16, 1995; October 17, 1995; January 18, 1996; and April 10-11, 1996.

DATES: The workshop will be held on June 18-19, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Persons who are unable to attend may submit written comments in duplicate by July 30, 1996. However, persons submitting comments to be considered at the June 18-19 workshop must do so by June 10, 1996. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all material that is relevant to a statement of fact or

argument. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held at the U.S. DOT, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Room 6244-48, Washington, DC. Non-federal employee visitors are admitted into the DOT building through the southwest entrance at Seventh and E Streets SW. Persons who want to participate in the workshop should call (202) 366-2392 or e-mail their name, affiliation, and phone number to samesc@rspa.dot.gov before close of business June 10, 1996.

Send written comments in duplicate to the Dockets Unit, Room 8421, RSPA, U.S. DOT, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. Identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the heading of this notice.

All comments and docketed materials will be available for inspection and copying in Room 8421 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. each business day. A summary of the workshop will be available from the Dockets Unit about three weeks after the workshop.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christina Sames, (202) 366-4561, about this document, or the Dockets Unit, (202) 366-5046, for copies of this document or other material in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The pipeline safety laws (49 U.S.C. § 60109) require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations that establish criteria for identifying each hazardous liquid pipeline facility and gathering line, whether otherwise subject to 49 U.S.C. Chapter 601, located in an area that the Secretary, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), describes as unusually sensitive to environmental damage if there is a hazardous liquid pipeline accident.

Consistent with the President's regulatory policy (E.O. 12866), RSPA wants to accomplish this congressional mandate at the least cost to society. Toward this end, RSPA is seeking early public participation in the rulemaking process by holding public workshops at which participants, including RSPA staff, may exchange views on relevant issues. RSPA hopes these workshops will enable government and industry to reach a better understanding of the problem and the potential solutions before proposed rules are issued.

To date, RSPA has held four public workshops on unusually sensitive areas (USAs). Participants at the workshops have included representatives from the hazardous liquid pipeline industry; the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, and Commerce; EPA;