

are all applicable to the matters on which comments was sought in Docket 20019 and Docket 20023, and they will accordingly be terminated without the adoption of further rules.

4. These considerations are also largely applicable to the matters on which comment was sought in Docket 20022. Here, however, those commenting have made an effort to persuade use that there are additional matters warranting the adoption of new Federal rules. Specifically, it is urged that the failure of local franchise agreements to provide procedures that assure continued service to the public when a franchise agreement is not renewed or is terminated for cause will deprive the public of access to television and specifically cable television service in a manner inconsistent with federal policies and objectives. Additionally, it is urged that the lack of any legitimate renewal expectancy will inhibit capital investment and cause other disruptions and interruptions of service. Suggestions as to what action should be taken with respect to these issues range from the establishment of better means of communication between the Commission and franchise authorities to a federal requirement that no franchise be terminated or not renewed except following a full public proceeding affording due process. Many parties, including most of the cable television interests represented, suggested that there be established in each franchise a predetermined formula for fair compensation in the case of franchise non-renewal or cancellation.

5. The comments submitted make a persuasive case that the issues of how cable television franchise renewals should be treated and what provision should be made for franchise termination are matters of considerable importance and complexity. We are not persuaded, however, that matters of overriding federal interest are involved. First, it is not clear that there is a single national solution available to resolve the problem. And second, we do not perceive that a federal response to this problem is necessary. We recognize that there may well be difficulties when these situations arise at the local level. We have no evidence, however, that these difficulties will not be resolvable at the local level, that there will be significant losses of service to subscribers, or that the possibility of appeal to the Commission for resolution of these problems would not exacerbate rather than assist in resolving them. In sum, we believe that the policy decision made when the franchise standards of § 76.31(a) were deleted is equally

applicable to this proposal and that this proceeding should also be terminated without the adoption of further rules.

Accordingly, it is ordered, that the proceedings in Dockets 20019, 20022, and 20023 are terminated.

Federal Communications Commission.

William J. Tricarico,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc 79-31473 Filed 10-10-79 8 45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Research and Special Programs Administration

#### 49 CFR Parts 110 through 189

#### Public Meeting on Polyethylene Packagings

**AGENCY:** Materials Transportation Bureau, Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** A second public meeting will be held to solicit comments and hold a discussion on the feasibility of establishing standards for polyethylene used in packagings for hazardous materials.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on November 13, 1979, at 9:15 a.m. Written comments should be received no later than January 12, 1980.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in Room 2230, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. Written comments should be submitted to Dockets Branch, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590. It is requested that five copies be submitted.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mario Gigliotti, Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590, (202) 755-4906.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On July 24, 1979, the Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB) held a public meeting to solicit views and comments on the standards that should be considered by the MTB relative to the use of polyethylene packagings for hazardous materials. While most participants agreed that the meeting was constructive and beneficial, it was decided that a second meeting should be held to pursue the subject in further detail. The MTB wishes to emphasize that its principal interest in this matter is the development of appropriate

regulations pertaining to the use of polyethylene packagings, not the design specifications for the manufacture of such packagings.

Alan I. Roberts,

Associate Director for Hazardous Materials Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc 79-31345 Filed 10-10-79; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

## 49 CFR Parts 172 and 173

[Docket No. HM-159; Notice No. 79-12]

### Forbidden Materials

**AGENCY:** Materials Transportation Bureau, Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Extension of time to file comments.

**SUMMARY:** On July 26, 1979, the Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB) published a notice of proposed rulemaking under Docket HM-159, Notice 79-12 [44 FR 43861] which proposes to add the names of certain materials to the Hazardous Materials Table, § 172.101, that the MTB considers to be too hazardous to be permitted in commercial transportation. In addition, the notice proposes certain changes to §§ 173.21 and 173.51 pertaining to forbidden materials and their packaging.

**DATE:** The time for filing comments is extended from October 18, 1979, to November 19, 1979.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Delmer F. Billings, Standards Division, Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590, (202) 426-2075.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Two petitioners, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association (CSMA) and the Chemical Manufacturers Association, have requested an extension of the comment period on Docket HM-159, Notice 79-12, in order to properly evaluate the proposed rules. The petitioners stated that the response deadline of October 18, 1979, was too constructive due to the fact that this comment period deadline on Docket HM-159 is shared with comment period deadlines on Dockets HM-126A and HM-171. CSMA also stated that the schedules of task force members of the Association are such that a circulation of comments to be submitted to the docket would be difficult to accomplish in a timely manner. The MTB considers this request to be reasonable and, therefore, an extension of the comment period is justified.

**AUTHORITY:** 49 U.S.C. 1803, 1804, 1808; 49 CFR 1.53, App. A. to Part 1, and paragraph [a][4] of App. A. Part 106.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on October 2, 1979.

**Alan I. Roberts,**

*Associate Director for Hazardous Materials  
Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 79-31346 Filed 10-10-79; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-60-M**