United States paid in connection with the Site through April 20, 2001. In addition, IPL is entitled to protection from contribution actions or claims as provided by sections 113(f) and 122(h)(4) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9613(f) and 9622(h)(4), for response costs incurred by any person in the Site through April 20, 2001.

For thirty (30) days after the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement. The Agency will consider all comments received and may modify or withdraw its consent to the settlement if comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at EPA's Region 5 Office at 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, and at the Indianapolis Public Library in Indianapolis, Indiana.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 14, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The proposed settlement is available for public inspection at EPA's Record Center, 7th floor, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604. A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Mark Geall, Associate Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA, Mail Code C–14J, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604, telephone (312) 353–9538. Comments should reference the M Metal site, Indianapolis, Indiana, and EPA Docket No. V–W–01–C–649, and should be addressed to Mark Geall, Associate Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA, Mail code C–14J, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Geall, Associate Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA, Mail Code C–14J, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604, telephone (312) 353–9538.

Authority: The Comprehensive environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9601, *et seq.*

Dated: July 19, 2001.

Douglas E. Ballotti,

Acting Director, Superfund Division.

[FR Doc. 01–20505 Filed 8–14–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 98–67; DA 01–1706]

Common Carrier Bureau Seeks Comment on Requests for Waiver of Video Relay Service Requirements

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On July 16, 2001 the Commission released a document seeking comment on waiver requests filed by Hamilton Telephone Company (Hamilton) and Sprint Communications (Sprint). Both Hamilton and Sprint requested temporary waiver of certain mandatory minimum requirements for providing Video Relay Services (VRS).

DATES: Comments due September 14, 2001. Reply comments due October 1, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, The Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Suite 6A207, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Slipakoff of the Common Carrier Bureau, Network Services Division: by phone at (202) 418–7705; by fax at (202) 418–2345; by TTY at (202) 418–0484 or; by email at *pslipako@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the March 6, 2000 *Improved TRS Order*, 65 FR 38432 (June 21, 2000), the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) amended the TRS rules to expand the kinds of relay services available to consumers and to improve the quality of TRS. The order changed many of the definitions and standards for traditional TRS and added speech-to-speech (STS) and Spanish relay requirements. It also permitted recovery of the costs of both intrastate and interstate VRS through the interstate TRS fund but did not require the provision of VRS. In addition, the *Improved TRS Order* required that all relay service, whether mandatory or voluntary, funded by intrastate and interstate TRS funds must comply with the minimum service quality standards; it also modified the rules to accommodate STS and VRS services.

Hamilton's filing includes a request for clarification of the scope of the VRS rules and for a two year waiver of certain provisions contained in the *Improved TRS Order*. Specifically, Hamilton seeks clarification that VRS need not include STS or Spanish relay service under our current rules. This request will be addressed in a separate Commission level proceeding.

Hamilton's request for a temporary waiver seeks exemption of portions of section 64.604 of the Commission's rules as they apply to VRS providers. Specifically, Hamilton seeks temporary waiver of the following requirements: (1) The types of calls that must be handled; (2) emergency call handling; (3) speed of answer; (4) equal access to interexchange carriers; and (5) pay-per-call services. On June 4, 2001, Sprint filed a similar request for waiver. Sprint seeks a temporary two year waiver of the same sections identified in Hamilton's waiver request, except for section 64.604(a)(3) which pertains to the types of calls that must be handled. Sprint also seeks waiver of any Commission rules that ''may require providers of VRS to ensure that users are able to utilize American Sign Language to communicate with Spanish speaking individuals.''

Hamilton and Sprint's waiver requests will be available for review and copying during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 418–0270. They may also be viewed at *https://haifoss.fcc.gov/cgi-bin/ws.exe/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.hts*, by typing 98–67 in the proceeding box and 4/06/2001 and 6/04/2001, respectively in the date box. Copies of these documents may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc. (ITS), 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, telephone 202–857–3800, facsimile 202–857–3805, TTY 202–293–8810.

Federal Communications Commission.

Dorothy Attwood,

Chief, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 01–20487 Filed 8–14–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreement(s) Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement(s) under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties can review or obtain copies of agreements at the Washington, DC offices of the Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Room 940. Interested parties may submit comments on an agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within 10 days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**.

Agreement No.: 011741–002.

Title: U.S. Pacific Coast-Oceania Agreement.

Parties:
P&O Nedlloyd Limited/P&O Nedlloyd B.V.
Australia-New Zealand Direct Line
Hamburg-Sud KG
Fesco Ocean Management Limited (''Fesco'')
Synopsis: The proposed amendment authorizes all of the parties except Fesco to share and distribute certain cost savings realized under the agreement.

Agreement No.: 201126.
Title: Oakland/Hanjin/Total Terminals Agreement.
Parties:
Port of Oakland
Hanjin Shipping Company, Ltd.
Total Terminals International, LLC
Synopsis: The proposed agreement provides for the assumption of certain of Hanjin's financial responsibilities at Berths 55–56 (Oakland). The agreement runs through December 31, 2004.

Dated: August 10, 2001.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–20557 Filed 8–14–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 96–20]

Port Restrictions and Requirements in the United States/Japan Trade

AGENCY: Federal Maritime Commission.

ACTION: Requirement for reporting revised.

SUMMARY: The Federal Maritime Commission is revising its requirement that certain ocean common carriers in the U.S.-Japan trade report on the status of efforts to reform conditions unfavorable to shipping in the U.S.-Japan trade. Areas for reporting include effects of recent changes in Japanese laws and ordinances; continued application of the ''prior consultation'' system for pre-approving carriers' service changes in Japan; and entry of new entities into Japan's harbor services market.

DATES: Reports due by November 7, 2001, 90 days from the date of service of this Order and every 180 days thereafter.

ADDRESSES: Reports and requests for publicly available information should be addressed to: Bryant L. VanBrakle, Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Washington, DC 20573; (202) 523–5725.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David R. Miles, Acting General Counsel, Federal Maritime Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., Washington, DC 20573; (202) 523–5740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

1997 Final Rule

Following an extensive investigation, the Commission on February 26, 1997 issued a final rule in this docket finding unfavorable conditions facing U.S. ocean shipping interests in Japanese ports and imposed sanctions in the form of $100,000 per voyage fees on three Japanese ocean common carriers entering United States ports. The rule took effect on September 4, 1997, but was suspended by the Commission on November 13, 1997, after the signing of comprehensive government-to-government and industry-government accords to substantially reform Japanese port practices. At that time, accrued fees of $1.5 million were paid by the Japanese carriers.

The February 1997 final rule identified a number of conditions unfavorable to shipping warranting action under section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, 46 U.S.C. app. sec. 876:

- Ocean common carriers in the Japan-U.S. trades could not make operational changes, major or minor, without the permission of the Japan Harbor Transportation Association (''JHTA''), an association of Japanese waterfront employers operating with the permission of, and under the regulatory authority and ministerial guidance of, the Japanese Ministry of Transportation (''MOT'').[1]
- JHTA had absolute and unappealable discretion to withhold permission for proposed operational changes by refusing to accept such proposals for ''prior consultation,'' a mandatory process of negotiations and pre-approvals involving carriers, JHTA, and waterfront unions.
- There were no written criteria for JHTA's decisions whether to permit or disallow carrier requests for operational changes under prior consultation, nor were there written explanations given for the decisions.
- JHTA threatened to use, and did use, its prior consultation authority to punish its detractors and to disrupt their business operations.
- JHTA used its prior consultation authority to extract fees and impose operational restrictions, such as limits on Sunday work.
- JHTA used its prior consultation authority to allocate work among its members, by barring carriers and consortia from freely choosing stevedores and terminal operators and by compelling carriers to hire additional, unneeded stevedores or contractors.
- MOT administered a licensing standard which blocked new entrants from the stevedoring industry in Japan, protected JHTA's dominant position, and ensured that the stevedoring market remained entirely Japanese.
- Because of the restrictive licensing requirements, U.S. carriers could not perform stevedoring or terminal operating services for themselves or for third parties in Japan, as Japanese carriers do in the United States.

On November 10, 1997, U.S. and Japanese officials and relevant industry groups (*i.e.*, JHTA, the Japan Shipowners' Port Council (''JSPC'') and the Japan Foreign Steamship Association (''JFSA'')) came to terms on a number of points for remedying conditions in Japanese ports, including:

- A reaffirmation by the Government of Japan (''GOJ'') that it would approve foreign shipping companies' applications for licenses for port transportation business operations;
- An agreement to simplify the prior consultation system, increase its transparency, and provide for dispute settlement procedures which would include a role for MOT or an MOT-chaired committee;
- A commitment by the GOJ and carrier groups to establish and implement an alternative to the prior consultation system under which carriers intending to implement operational changes would confer with their terminal operators (who, in turn, would consult with labor unions, directly or through a collective bargaining agent as may be required by applicable collective bargaining agreements);
- Commitments that prior consultation would not be used as a means to approve carriers' business plans and strategies, allocate business among port transportation business operators, restrict competition or infringe on carriers' freedom to select port transport business operators; and
- A commitment by the GOJ that it would use its authority to prevent the unjustifiable denial of essential services, ensure the smooth operation of the port

[1] As part of a reorganization, the functions formerly performed by the Ministry of Transport were transferred to the new Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (''MLIT'') at the beginning of 2001.