

the field are supported with parts (inactive), or no longer in production or supported with replacement parts (obsolete).

The status listing of Active, Inactive, or Obsolete status is included in the NIOSH certified equipment list (CEL). In accordance with received comments, NIOSH is requesting the manufacturers to provide this production status information as soon as it becomes available, to update the CEL. NIOSH intends to address the reporting of production status information in an Administrative/Quality Assurance module to be proposed in the near future.

VII. Priority of Quality Assurance/Administrative Modules

Based on the comments received, NIOSH intends to propose three Administrative/Quality Assurance modules. The intended subjects for these modules are:

A. Corrections and Existing Policies

1. Discussion of Comments Received

One commenter recommended that NIOSH publish technical amendments to 42 CFR part 84 prior to any other modules. Specifically, this commenter requested clarification of the 200 mg. filter loading levels for particulate filters used in pairs.

One commenter suggested that air purifying respirators with end of service life indicators (ESLI) should be certified for polyisocyanate catalyzed paints. Several commenters stated that workers were improperly protected because the adequate NIOSH-certified (supplied-air) respirators were not conducive to use. Estimates of 50,000 auto body shops with over 100,000 workers, with additional unnumbered workers such as law enforcement personnel and first response teams with accidental release of chemical agents and chemical warfare agents were given.

Air-purifying respirators can be certified with ESLI's in accordance with requirements published in the **Federal Register** on July 19, 1984 (49 FR 29270). That notice provided for the approval of air purifying respirators with either effective passive or active ESLI for use against gases and vapors with adequate warning properties or for use against gases and vapors with inadequate warning properties whenever there is a regulatory standard already permitting the use of air purifying respirators.

Two commenters suggested a module to address self contained self rescuers (SCSR) that are used in the mining industry. Both commenters urged development of a duration testing

protocol using a metabolic simulator to replace human subject testing.

2. Conclusions

There are typographical errors in 42 CFR 84 to be corrected. There are also a number of existing program policies that have been developed since 1972 that are not included in the regulations. Policies affecting areas such as ESLI for air purifying respirators and service life plans for SCSR, need to be codified in the regulations as a single source for the respirator approval requirements.

NIOSH will publish a module to make corrections and incorporate all existing certification program policies into 42 CFR 84.

B. Upgrade of Quality Assurance Requirements and Fee Schedule

1. Discussion of Comments Received

As discussed previously in VI.B., no commenter opposed the use of private sector quality auditors in the certification program. Commenters also generally endorsed the use of ISO-9000 or similar quality assurance requirements. NIOSH acceptance of audits conducted by private sector auditors was also generally recommended by commenters.

As discussed previously in VI.C., the majority of commenters supported fees that reflect the costs of the certification program.

As discussed previously in VI.F., a number of commenters supported use of the NIOSH CEL to notify respirator users of the production status of approved respirators.

2. Conclusions

NIOSH intends to publish a module to address the use of independent quality auditors, respirator production status information and updated fees.

C. Use of Independent Testing Laboratories in the Certification Program and Restructured Fee Schedule

1. Discussion of Comments Received

As discussed previously in VI.A., a number of commenters expressed reservations about the ability of NIOSH to use private sector testing laboratories in the certification program. Several concerns, such as the availability of test procedures and the accreditation method, were presented.

As discussed previously in VI.C., some of the comments on fee revision recommended substantial changes to the fees structure. These recommendations included concepts such as: retention of the fees in the certification program; annual maintenance fees; and fees for complaint investigations.

2. Conclusions

NIOSH intends to publish a module to address the use of independent testing laboratories and a restructured fee schedule.

VIII. Continued Comments

As stated previously, NIOSH is requesting additional comments and information on content for the modules identified and prioritized in this notice. Comments for the need to prioritize other module topics are also welcomed. NIOSH will periodically review the information in the docket to assist in determining if a priority reassessment is needed. Comments should be mailed to the NIOSH Docket Office, Robert A. Taft Laboratories, M/S C34, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45226, telephone (513) 533-8450, fax (513) 533-8285. Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to: DMM2@CDC.GOV. E-mail attachments should be formatted as WordPerfect 4.2, 5.0, 5.1/5.2, 6.0/6.1, or ASCII files.

Dated: October 8, 1997.

Linda Rosenstock,

Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

[FR Doc. 97-27224 Filed 10-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163-19-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 97-210, RM-9166]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Soldiers Grove, WI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Lyle Robert Evans d/b/a Rural Radio Company proposing the allotment of Channel 290A to Soldiers Grove, Wisconsin, as that community's first local FM broadcast service. There is a site restriction 11.8 kilometers (7.3 miles) northeast of the community at coordinates 43-28-16 and 90-40-21. **DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 24, 1997, and reply comments on or before December 9, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Lyle Robert Evans, d/b/a Rural Radio Company,

1296, Marian Lane, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54304.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 97-210, adopted September 24, 1997, and released October 3, 1997. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC. 20036, (202) 857-3800, facsimile (202) 857-3805.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 97-27513 Filed 10-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No.97-209, RM-9152]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Coarsegold, CA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed on behalf of Thomas L. Whitlock d.b.a. West Coast Wireless, seeking the allotment of FM Channel 233A to Coarsegold, California, as that

community's first local aural transmission service. Coordinates for this proposal are 37-18-51 and 119-42-20.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before November 24, 1997, and reply comments on or before December 9, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: James A. Koerner, Esq., Baraff, Koerner & Olender, P.C., Three Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 640, Bethesda, MD 20814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Joyner, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 97-209, adopted September 24, 1997, and released October 3, 1997. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, (202) 857-3800.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, See 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 97-27512 Filed 10-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 97-136, RM-9083 and RM-9136]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Ironton, Malden and Salem, MO

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; Order to Show Cause.

SUMMARY: In response to a counterproposal filed by B.B.C., Inc. and Dockins Communications, Inc., we have issued an Order to Show Cause to the Ultra-Sonic Broadcast Stations, Inc., licensee of Station KMMC, Channel 240A, Salem, Missouri. This document affords Station KMMC an opportunity to object to the proposed channel change but it does not afford an additional opportunity to comment on the merits of the proposal set forth in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making and Order to Show Cause or the proposal advanced in the counterproposal. See 62 FR 29090, May 29, 1997.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before November 24, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order to Show Cause, MM Docket No. 97-136, adopted September 24, 1997, and released October 3, 1997. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC. 20036, (202) 857-3800.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.