

EVALUATION OF ANKYLOSIS OR LIMITATION OF MOTION OF SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DIGITS OF THE HAND—Continued

	Rating	
	Major	Minor
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5217 Four digits of one hand, unfavorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any three fingers	60	50
Index, long, ring, and little fingers	50	40
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5218 Three digits of one hand, unfavorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any two fingers	50	40
Index, long, and ring; index, long, and little; or index, ring, and little fingers	40	30
Long, ring, and little fingers	30	20
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5219 Two digits of one hand, unfavorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any finger	40	30
Index and long; index and ring; or index and little fingers	30	20
Long and ring; long and little; or ring and little fingers	20	20
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		

II. Multiple Digits: Favorable Ankylosis

5220 Five digits of one hand, favorable ankylosis of	50	40
5221 Four digits of one hand, favorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any three fingers	50	40
Index, long, ring, and little fingers	40	30
5222 Three digits of one hand, favorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any two fingers	40	30
Index, long, and ring; index, long, and little; or index, ring, and little fingers	30	20
Long, ring and little fingers	20	20

EVALUATION OF ANKYLOSIS OR LIMITATION OF MOTION OF SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DIGITS OF THE HAND—Continued

	Rating	
	Major	Minor
5223 Two digits of one hand, favorable ankylosis of:		
Thumb and any finger	30	20
Index and long; index and ring; or index and little fingers	20	20
Long and ring; long and little; or ring and little fingers	10	10
III. Ankylosis of Individual Digits		
5224 Thumb, ankylosis of:		
Unfavorable	20	20
Favorable	10	10
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5225 Index finger, ankylosis of:		
Unfavorable or favorable	10	10
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5226 Long finger, ankylosis of:		
Unfavorable or favorable	10	10
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		
5227 Ring or little finger, ankylosis of:		
Unfavorable or favorable	0	0
Note: Also consider whether evaluation as amputation is warranted.		

IV. Limitation of motion of individual digits

5228 Thumb, limitation of motion:		
With a gap of more than two inches (5.1 cm.) between the thumb pad and the fingers, with the thumb attempting to oppose the fingers	20	20
With a gap of one to two inches (2.5 to 5.1 cm.) between the thumb pad and the fingers, with the thumb attempting to oppose the fingers	10	10

EVALUATION OF ANKYLOSIS OR LIMITATION OF MOTION OF SINGLE OR MULTIPLE DIGITS OF THE HAND—Continued

	Rating	
	Major	Minor
With a gap of less than one inch (2.5 cm.) between the thumb pad and the fingers, with the thumb attempting to oppose the fingers	0	0
5229 Index or long finger, limitation of motion:		
With a gap of one inch (2.5 cm.) or more between the fingertip and the proximal transverse crease of the palm, with the finger flexed to the extent possible, or; with extension limited by more than 30 degrees	10	10
With a gap of less than one inch (2.5 cm.) between the fingertip and the proximal transverse crease of the palm, with the finger flexed to the extent possible, and; extension is limited by no more than 30 degrees	0	0
5230 Ring or little finger, limitation of motion:		
Any limitation of motion	0	0

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 01-27426 Filed 11-1-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 89, 90, 91, 94, 1048, 1051, 1065, and 1068

[AMS-FRL-7096-9]

RIN 2060-A111

Control of Emissions from Nonroad Large Spark Ignition Engines and Recreational Engines (Marine and Land-based); Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency published in the **Federal Register** of October 5, 2001 a document

concerning new emission standards for large spark-ignition engines, recreational vehicles using spark-ignition engines, and recreational marine diesel engines. This document corrects two items in the preamble to that document.

DATES: *Comments:* Send written comments on this proposed rule by December 19, 2001.

Hearings: Hearings were held in the Washington, DC, area on October 24 and in Denver, CO, on October 30.

ADDRESSES: You may send written comments in paper form to Margaret Borushko, U.S. EPA, National Vehicle and Fuels Emission Laboratory, 2000 Traverwood, Ann Arbor, MI 48105. We must receive them by the date indicated under **DATES** above. You may also submit comments via e-mail to "nranprm@epa.gov." In your correspondence, refer to Docket A-2000-01.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret Borushko, U.S. EPA, National Vehicle and Fuels Emission Laboratory, 2000 Traverwood, Ann Arbor, MI 48105; Telephone (734) 214-4334; FAX: (734) 214-4816; e-mail: borushko.margaret@epa.gov. EPA hearings and comments hotline: 734-214-4370.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA published a document in the **Federal Register** of October 5, 2001 (66 FR 51098). That document proposed new emission standards for large spark-ignition engines, recreational vehicles using spark-ignition engines, and recreational marine diesel engines. On page 51172, in the first column, the information about the public hearing in Denver, Colorado should state that the hearing will occur on October 30, 2001. This is consistent with the information published in the original document under **DATES**.

Also, on page 51131, column 3, in the second paragraph under b., the CO emission standard that applies to field-testing procedures should be 5.0 g/kW-hr (3.8 g/hp-hr). This is consistent with the proposed regulations at § 1048.101(c).

Readers should also note a new telephone number that will serve as a hotline for updated information related to public hearings and comment period. People should call 734-214-4370 before traveling to ensure that there is no change in plans for the hearings.

Dated: October 24, 2001.

Robert Brenner,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 01-27466 Filed 11-1-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 20

[CC Docket No. 94-102; FCC 01-293]

Wireless E911 Service, Petition of City of Richardson, TX

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document responds to a petition for clarification and/or declaratory ruling by amending the Commission's rules to clarify what constitutes a valid Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) request for Enhanced 911 (E911) service so as to trigger a wireless carrier's obligation to implement E911 within the six-month period following the date of the request. If challenged by the wireless carrier, the request will be deemed valid if the PSAP making the request demonstrates E911-readiness as provided in the amended rule. This action is taken to ensure the continuing clarity of E911 obligations and thus avoid the possibility of confusion leading to delays in critically important emergency services. The decision is adopted to respond to the petition for clarification and/or declaratory ruling filed by the City of Richardson, Texas.

DATES: This document contains revised information collection requirements that have not been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Commission will publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing the effective date of this amendment. Public comment on the information collections are due January 2, 2002.

ADDRESSES: A copy of any comments on the information collection contained herein should be submitted to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-C804, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554, or via the Internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jane Phillips, 202-418-1310. For further information concerning the information collection contained in this document, contact Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, 202-418-0214, or via the Internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order in CC Docket No. 94-102, FCC No. 01-293, adopted October 2, 2001, and released October 17, 2001. The complete text of this Order is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Courtyard Level, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC, and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554. Copies of the full text of this decision may also be found at the Commission's Internet site at www.fcc.gov.

Synopsis of the Order

1. The Commission responds to a petition for clarification and/or declaratory ruling filed by the city of Richardson, Texas. The Commission amends its rules to clarify what constitutes a valid Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) request so as to trigger a wireless carrier's obligation to provide enhanced 911 (E911) service to that PSAP. Specifically, the Order finds that a wireless carrier must implement E911 within the six-month period following the date of the PSAP's request and that, if challenged by the wireless carrier, the request will be deemed valid if the PSAP making the request demonstrates that: (1) A mechanism is in place by which the PSAP will recover its costs of the facilities and equipment necessary to receive and utilize the E911 data elements; (2) the PSAP has ordered the equipment necessary to receive and utilize the E911 data and the equipment will be installed and capable of receiving and utilizing that data no later than six months following its request; and (3) the PSAP has made a timely request to the appropriate local exchange carrier (LEC) for the necessary trunking and other facilities to enable the E911 data to be transmitted to the PSAP. In the alternative, a PSAP may demonstrate that a funding mechanism is in place, that it is E911-capable using a Non-call Associated Signaling (NCAS) technology, and that it has made a timely request to the appropriate LEC to upgrade the Automatic Location Identification (ALI) database.

2. The Commission established periods for public comment and replies to those comments upon receiving the Richardson petition. (See the document at 66 FR 19781, April 17, 2001, and a second document at 66 FR 36989, July 16, 2001.) Both representatives of PSAPs and of wireless carriers have participated in the record established during the comment periods, and these