D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Suite 140, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis:

The Commission has determined that Section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), does not apply to these rules because they do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The definition of a ''small entity'' in Section 3 of the Small Business Act excludes any business that is dominant in its field of operation. Although some of the LECs that will be affected are very small, such LECs do not qualify as ''small entities'' because each has a monopoly on ubiquitous access to the subscribers in their service area. The Commission has also found all exchange carriers to be dominant in its competitive carrier proceeding. See Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Competitive Common Carrier Services and Facilities Authorization Therefore, CC Docket No. 79–252, First Report and Order, 85 FCC 2d 1, 23–24 (1980), 45 FR 76148, November 18, 1980. To the extent that small telephone companies will be affected by these rules, the Commission certified that these rules would not have a significant effect on a substantial number of ''small entities.''

Summary of Report and Order

In its Docket 91–35 Reconsideration Order, the Commission ordered LECs to offer, pursuant to interstate tariffs, services that would block international direct-dialed sequences (011+ and 10XXX–011+), but did not require LECs to make that service available to customers other than aggregators. See Policies and Rules Concerning Operator Service Access and Pay Telephone Compensation, CC Docket No. 91–35, Order on Reconsideration, 7 FCC Rcd 4355 (1992) (Docket 91–35 Reconsideration Order), 57 FR 34253, August 4, 1992. The Commission also required the LECs to offer two tariffed screening services, originating line screening (OLS) and billed number screening (BNS). These services enable operator service providers (OSPs) to determine whether there are billing restrictions on lines to which a caller may seek to bill a call. The Commission, however, did not expressly require that those screening services be federally tariffed. In its Order on Further Reconsideration and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in this docket, 8 FCC Rcd 2863 (1993) (Further Reconsideration/Further NPRM), 58 FR 21435, April 21, 1993, the Commission subsequently affirmed the requirement that LECs offer OLS and BNS services and tentatively found that Bell Atlantic's federally tariffed line information data base (LIDB) service fulfills its obligation to provide a BNS service. The Further Reconsideration/ Further NPRM requested further comment on three major issues: (1) whether the Commission should require the LECs to extend their international blocking services to non-aggregator business subscribers and to residential subscribers; (2) whether the Commission should affirm its tentative conclusion that BNS and OLS services should be tariffed at the federal level; and (3) whether proposed standards regarding availability to all customers, unbundling, and rate levels should be applied to OLS and BNS services provided by the LECs. In light of the rapid growth in the availability of, and complaints about, international information services since comments were last filed in this proceeding, the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau (Bureau) issued a Public Notice in March 1995 requesting further comment on whether international blocking for residential consumers would be useful in preventing losses to international pay-per-call services, particularly dial-a-porn services. Public Notice, Request for Additional Comments on the Costs and Benefits of International Blocking for Residential Customers, CC Docket No. 91–35, 10 FCC Rcd 4549 (Com.Car.Bur. 1995) (Public Notice), 60 FR 16651, March 31, 1995. Specifically, the Bureau asked LECs to comment on the costs they would incur to provide international call blocking service to residential customers and to show the extent to which those costs could be reduced by not providing blocking in areas in which it would not be technically feasible or economically reasonable to do so.

In this Order, the Commission required LECs to provide international blocking services to business customers, where technically feasible and economically reasonable. The Commission did not, however, require LECs to provide such blocking for residential consumers at this time. Also, the Commission required LECs to tariff, at the federal level, BNS and OLS screening services that allow aggregators to ensure that the proper screening codes are associated with their telephone lines. The OLS service must deliver a code that discretely identifies private payphones and such other codes as are necessary to identify other categories of aggregator locations. The Commission emphasized again that it is important for LECs to use uniform codes for the OLS services that they provide. The Commission required the LECs to unbundle their OLS ''confirmation services,'' unless they can show that bundling would not place aggregators at a competitive disadvantage or that it is not technically feasible or would be economically unreasonable to unbundle OLS service. The Commission also required that LECs unbundle the BNS service they provide to aggregators under federal tariff and make that service available to both aggregators and non-aggregators. Finally, the Commission specified a rate structure for OLS and BNS services provided to aggregators.

Ordering Clauses

Accordingly, it is ordered, pursuant to authority contained in Sections 1, 4, 201–205, 218, 220, and 226 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 154, 201–205, 218, 220, and 226, that the policies and requirements set forth herein ARE adopted.

It is further ordered That this Order will be effective June 27, 1996.

It is further ordered That, pursuant to Section 203 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. 203, each of the LECs SHALL FILE revisions to their federal tariffs, reflecting the requirements of this Order to provide international blocking service for non-aggregator business customers and Billed Number Screening (BNS) service within 60 days after the effective date of this Order.

It is further ordered That, pursuant to Section 203 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 203, each of the LECs shall file tariff revisions, reflecting the requirements of this Order to federally tariff Originating Line Screening (OLS) service, no later than December 1, 1996.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–13300 Filed 5–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

49 CFR Parts 37 and 38

[Docket No. 49658]

RIN 2105–AC13

Transportation for Individuals With Disabilities; Correction

AGENCY: Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of the Secretary.

ACTION: Correction to final regulations.

SUMMARY: On May 21, 1996, the Department of Transportation published final rules amending its Americans with Disabilities Act in several respects (61 FR 25409). This document corrects certain editorial errors in that document. The corrections do not affect the substance of the amendments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert C. Ashby, Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulation and Enforcement, Department of Transportation, 400 7th Street, SW, Room 10424, Washington, DC, 20590. (202) 366–9306 (voice); (202) 755–7687 (TDD); or Richard Wong, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Transit Administration, same street address, Room 9316. (202) 366–4011.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department is making editorial corrections to its May 21, 1996, final rule (61 FR 25409), amending 49 CFR parts 37 and 38, which implement the Americans with Disabilities Act for transportation services. The amendments concern such subjects as advance reservations for paratransit service, updates to paratransit plans, requirements for independent private schools, and other subjects.

Need for Correction

As published, the document contains errors which may prove to be misleading and are in need of correction. First, In the preamble, the last sentence of the first paragraph under the heading ''Visitor Eligibility,'' beginning ''The Department will further amend * * *'' (61 FR 25414, first column) is incorrect, and should be disregarded. The rule does not contain such an amendment,

In four instances, the amendatory language for certain provisions of the rule left notice of proposed rulemaking language (e.g., ''proposes to amend'' rather than ''amends'' or ''revises'') in place. This document corrects these errors. Finally, the amendment to § 37.135(c)(1) contained an potentially misleading citation to §§ 37.137–139, which could cause confusion about the applicability of the requirement of §§ 37.137(c) for continuing public participation in transit authorities' paratransit programs. The citation is corrected to fix this problem.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication on May 21, 1996, of the final regulations amending 49 CFR Parts 37 and 38, which were the subject of FR Doc. 96–11935, is corrected as follows:

1. On page 25415, in the third column, amendatory instruction 1, relating to the authority citation for 49 CFR Part 37, is corrected to read as follows:

1. The authority citation for 49 CFR Part 37 continues to read as follows:

2. On page 25415, in the third column, amendatory instruction 2, relating to the authority citation for 49 CFR Part 38, is corrected to read as follows:

2. The authority citation for 49 CFR Part 38 is revised to read as follows:

3. On page 25415, in the third column, amendatory instruction 3, relating to the revision of § 37,27(b), is corrected to read as follows:

3. In part 37, § 37.27(b) is revised to read as follows:

4. On page 25416, in the second column, in the amendment to § 37.135(c)(1), the citation in the final sentence of the paragraph to ''§§ 37.137–37.139'' is corrected to read ''§§ 37.137 (a) and (b), 37.138 and 37.139''.

5. On page 25416, in the third column, amendatory instruction 12, relating to Appendix D to Part 37, is corrected to read as follows:

12. In Part 37, Appendix D, the paragraph entitled ''Section 37.13 Effective Date for Certain Vehicle Lift Specifications'' is amended by replacing the words ''new 30″ by 48″'' with the words ''Part 38''.

Rasheed J. Tahir,

Legal Assistant.

[FR Doc. 96–13252 Filed 5–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 501

Organization and Delegation of Powers and Duties

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule delegates to NHTSA's Chief Counsel the authority to issue authoritative interpretations of the statutes administered by NHTSA and the regulations issued by the agency.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 28, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Womack, Senior Assistant Chief Counsel, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Room 5219, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Womack's telephone number is: (202) 366–9511.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule revises the regulations on the organization of and delegation of powers and duties within the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

Since the creation of the agency, NHTSA's Chief Counsel has issued written interpretations of the statutes the agency administers and the regulations it issues. These interpretations, in the form of letters responding to questions from the motor vehicle industry and members of the public, have been available to the public in the agency's technical reference library in Washington. With the development of new technology, the agency is now able to make them available through the Internet on the World Wide Web. (The website is www.nhtsa.dot.gov. At that site, select ''NHTSA's Library.'' On the ''NHTSA Library'' page, select ''NHTSA's Interpretation Letters.'')

In preparing to implement this new service, NHTSA noted that although the industry and the public have consistently recognized the implicit authority of the Chief Counsel to issue such interpretations, there was no formal delegation of that authority from the Administrator to the Chief Counsel. Therefore, in connection with the broadening of public access to these interpretations, and in order to eliminate any possible misunderstanding or doubt, NHTSA is amending 49 CFR 501.8(d) to formally delegate the authority to interpret applicable statutes and regulations to the Chief Counsel.

This action should be construed as a confirmation of a preexisting implicit delegation, and does not invalidate in any way the interpretations that have previously been issued by the Office of Chief Counsel. However, interested persons should recognize that all interpretations are necessarily based on the facts presented in individual cases and the law that exists at the time the interpretation is issued. Since the agency's statutes and regulations change from year to year, past interpretations may no longer be applicable under current law.

As matters relating to agency management, the amendments made by this document are not covered by the notice and comment or the effective date requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. These amendments relate solely to changes in the scope of the delegation of authority from the NHTSA Administrator to the Chief Counsel and have no substantive effect. Notice and the opportunity for comment are, therefore, not required, and these