

APPENDIX I TO SUBPART A—GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIALS (Mass Basis), REFERENCED TO THE ABSOLUTE GWP FOR THE ADOPTED CARBON CYCLE MODEL CO₂ DECAY RESPONSE AND FUTURE CO₂ ATMOSPHERIC CONCENTRATIONS HELD CONSTANT AT CURRENT LEVELS—Continued

[Only direct effects are considered]

Species (chemical)	Chemical formula	Global warming potential (time horizon)		
		20 years	100 years	500 years
CFC-12	CF ₂ Cl ₂	7900	8500	4200
CFC-13	CClF ₃	8100	11700	13600
CFC-113	C ₂ F ₃ Cl ₃	5000	5000	2300
CFC-114	C ₂ F ₄ Cl ₂	6900	9300	8300
CFC-115	C ₂ F ₅ Cl	6200	9300	13000
H-1301	CF ₃ Br	6200	5600	2200
Carbon Tet	CCl ₄	2000	1400	500
Methyl Chl	CH ₃ CCl ₃	360	110	35
HCFC-22	CF ₂ HCl	4300	1700	520
HCFC-141b	C ₂ FH ₃ Cl ₂	1800	630	200
HCFC-142b	C ₂ F ₂ H ₃ Cl	4200	2000	630
HCFC-123	C ₂ F ₃ HCl ₂	300	93	29
HCFC-124	C ₂ F ₄ HCl	1500	480	150
HCFC-225ca	C ₃ F ₅ HCl ₂	550	170	52
HCFC-225cb	C ₃ F ₅ HCl ₂	1700	530	170

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), February 1995, Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1994, Chapter 13, "Ozone Depleting Potentials, Global Warming Potentials and Future Chlorine/Bromine Loading."

[FR Doc. 95-24938 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR Part 25

[CGD 87-016b]

RIN 2115-AC69

Emergency Position Indicating Radio Beacons for Uninspected Vessels

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This rulemaking was intended to require emergency position indicating radio beacons (EPIRBs) to be carried on certain uninspected passenger vessels and assistance towing vessels. The proposed EPIRB requirements would have applied to vessels operating on the high seas and on the Great Lakes beyond three miles from the coastline. The Coast Guard also proposed requiring visual distress signals on all uninspected vessels not presently required to carry them, when those vessels operate in coastal waters. The Coast Guard has decided to withdraw this project because existing regulations generally fulfill the intended purpose of the underlying statute and the Coast Guard needs to focus its available resources on other regulatory projects.

DATES: This withdrawal is effective on October 6, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Robert Markle, Project Manager, Office of Marine Safety, Security, and Environmental Protection (G-MMS-4), (202) 267-1444.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public Law 100-540, known as the "EPIRB's On Uninspected Vessels Requirements Act" (102 Stat. 2719, October 28, 1988), amended 46 U.S.C. 4102 by revising paragraph (e) to require uninspected commercial vessels operating on the high seas and on the Great Lakes beyond three miles from the coastline to carry the number and type of alerting and locating equipment, including emergency position indicating radio beacons (EPIRBs) as prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation.

On March 10, 1993, the Coast Guard published a Final Rule requiring EPIRBs on certain uninspected vessels, excluding uninspected passenger vessels and assistance towing vessels (58 FR 13364). The preamble of that final rule explained that a Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (SNPRM) would propose new EPIRB regulations and visual distress signal requirements for uninspected vessels not presently required to carry them.

On February 17, 1994, the Coast Guard published an SNPRM titled "Emergency Position Indicating Radio Beacons and Visual Distress Signals for Uninspected Vessels" (59 FR 8100). The SNPRM proposed EPIRB requirements for a limited category of uninspected passenger vessels and assistance towing vessels, and proposed the carriage of visual distress signals for certain

uninspected vessels not currently required to carry them.

The Coast Guard has completed a comprehensive review of its regulations and is withdrawing some proposed regulations resources on the highest priority projects. In reviewing this regulatory project, it was noted that the Coast Guard had required many uninspected vessels to carry EPIRBs under the Final Rule of March 10, 1993, and had therefore largely fulfilled its obligations under P.L. 100-540. The Coast Guard has therefore determined that the best course of action is to withdraw this rulemaking.

Dated: September 26, 1995.

Joseph J. Angelo,
Acting Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 95-24920 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 36

[CC Docket No. 80-286; FCC 95-416]

Proposed Six-Month Extension of the Interim Indexed Cap on the Total Level of the Universal Service Fund

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission proposes to extend the duration of the interim indexed cap on the total level of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for an additional six months. The cap was intended to be

effective as an interim measure moderating the growth of the USF during the pendency of a broader rulemaking revising the Part 36 jurisdictional separations rules governing the USF. The Federal Communications Commission proposes to extend the interim cap, which expires January 1, 1996, for an additional six months while that rulemaking is completed.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before October 18, 1995, and reply comments must be filed on or before October 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah A. Dupont, Senior Attorney, 202-418-0873, Accounting and Audits Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking we propose extending the duration of the two-year indexed cap ("interim cap") on the total level of the Universal Service Fund ("USF").¹ The cap was intended to be effective as an interim measure moderating the growth of the USF during the pendency of our broader rulemaking revising the Part 36 jurisdictional separations rules governing the USF.² We propose to extend the interim cap for an additional six months while we complete that rulemaking.

2. We request comment on our proposed extension of the interim cap. We also refer the proposed extension of the interim cap on the Federal-State Joint Board in this proceeding for a recommended decision, as required by Section 410(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.³

3. To continue to moderate the growth of the USF effectively during the entire rulemaking period, the six-month extension must be effective by the January 1, 1996 expiration⁴ of the interim cap. For this reason, and

because we are proposing only to extend the current interim rules for a limited duration, we set a relatively short comment cycle. Comments will be due on October 18, 1995, and reply comments will be due on October 27, 1995.

II. Background

4. The USF rules were adopted in 1984 to promote universally available telephone services at reasonable rates.⁵ The rules allow local exchange carriers ("LECs") with an average unseparated loop cost per working loop⁶ ("average cost per loop") above the assistance threshold to allocate a percentage of these costs to the interstate jurisdiction.⁷ The current rules offer the most assistance to smaller LEC study areas⁸ with higher average cost per loop,⁹ although all study areas with average cost per loop above the assistance threshold receive some assistance.¹⁰

⁵ Amendment of Part 67 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board, Decision and Order, 96 FCC 2d 781, 794, para. 29 (1984).

⁶ The costs included in the unseparated loop costs are enumerated in 47 CFR 36.621(a) (1994). The number of working loops within a LEC study area is defined in 47 CFR 36.611(a)(8) (1994). The average unseparated loop cost per working loop and national average unseparated loop cost per working loop are defined in 47 CFR 36.622 (1994).

⁷ LECs with average cost per loop above 115% of the national average cost per loop can allocate a specified percentage of these costs to the interstate jurisdiction. 47 CFR 36.631 (c), (d) (1994). This allocation is in addition to the interstate allocation allowed under our general jurisdictional separations rules. See 47 CFR 36.154(c) (1994).

⁸ 47 CFR 36.631(c) (allowing LEC study areas with 200,000 or fewer working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 65% or more of their average cost per loop above 115% of the national average cost per loop) with § 36.631(d) (allowing LEC study areas with greater than 200,000 working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 60% or more of their average cost per loop above 200% of the national average cost per loop and 10% to 30% of their average cost per loop above 115% and at or below 200% of the national average cost per loop).

⁹ Compare 47 CFR 36.631(c)(1) (allowing LEC study areas with 200,000 or fewer working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 65% of their average cost per loop above 115% and at or below 150% of the national average cost per loop) with § 36.631(c)(2) (allowing LEC study areas with 200,000 or fewer working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 75% of their average cost per loop above 150% of the national average cost per loop); compare § 36.631(d)(1) (allowing LEC study areas with greater than 200,000 working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 10% of their average cost per loop above 115% and at or below 160% of the national average cost per loop) with § 36.631(d)(4) (allowing LEC study areas with greater than 200,000 working loops to allocate to the interstate jurisdiction 75% of their average cost per loop above 250% of the national average cost per loop).

¹⁰ LECs of any size with average cost per loop above 115% of the national average cost per loop can allocate some portion of these costs to the interstate jurisdiction. 47 CFR 36.631 (c), (d).

5. In 1993, in response to pronounced and erratic growth in the total level of the USF, we stated our intention to reappraise the USF high-cost assistance mechanisms to determine whether changes were needed to better serve our underlying public policy goals.¹¹ The completion of the eight-year USF phase-in period and "numerous regulatory, technological, and market changes in the telecommunications industry" also supported a reevaluation of the high-cost assistance mechanisms at that time.¹² We intended to address possible changes in the Part 36 USF rules through a notice of proposed rulemaking.¹³ An indexed cap on the total level of the USF was imposed for the purpose of moderating growth in the USF for the anticipated duration of that rulemaking period.¹⁴ The interim cap expires on January 1, 1996.¹⁵

6. In order to focus the issues in advance of the proposed rulemaking,¹⁶ we requested comments on several policy questions relating to the goals and effects of high-cost assistance.¹⁷ We also requested comment on two broad alternative approaches to the high-cost assistance mechanisms of Part 36.¹⁸ Under the first approach, assistance would be based on actual reported costs, as is the case under our present rules.¹⁹ Under the second, proxy factors reasonably correlated with either the need for assistance or with costs would be used to determine assistance.²⁰

7. On July 13, 1995, we issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Notice of Inquiry ("Notice") proposing revisions to our USF rules. The Notice requested comments by September 12 and reply comments by October 12.²¹ The Notice invited comment on three proposals for revising our USF rules.²² The first proposal presented three specific alternative modifications to the existing rules that would continue to

¹¹ Amendment of Part 36 of The Commission's Rules And Establishment of a Joint Board, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC Rec 7114, 7114-15, paras. 2, 11-15 (1993) (Interim Notice). 58 FR 48815, September 20, 1993.

¹² Interim Order, *supra* note 1, at 305, para. 15.

¹³ *Id.* at 303, paras. 1-2.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 303, para. 1.

¹⁵ 47 CFR 36.601(c).

¹⁶ Amendment of Part 36 of The Commission's Rules And Establishment of a Joint Board, Notice of Inquiry, 9 FCC Rec 7404, 7406 n.5 (1994) 59 FR 46606, September 9, 1994.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 7406, para. 2.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.* at 7414-15, para. 26.

²⁰ *Id.* at 7426-27, paras. 61-64.

²¹ Amendment of Part 36 of The Commission's Rules And Establishment of a Joint Board, CC Docket No. 80-286, FCC 95-282, 36, para. 91 (released July 13, 1995), 60 FR 46803, September 8, 1995.

²² *Id.* at 10, para. 17.

¹ 47 CFR 36.601(c) (1994). Under the interim cap, growth in the total level of the USF is indexed to growth in the total number of working loops. *Id.*; see also Amendment of Part 36 of The Commission's Rules And Establishment of a Joint Board, Report and Order, 9 FCC Rcd 303, 305, para. 20 (1993) (Interim Order). A working loop is "[a] revenue producing pair of wires, or its equivalent, between a customer's station and the central office from which the station is served." 47 CFR Part 36, Appendix-Glossary (1994).

² Interim Order, *supra* note 1, at 303, paras. 1-2.

³ 47 U.S.C. 410(c).

⁴ 47 CFR 36.601(c).

base high-cost assistance on actual costs reported by LECs.²³ Under the second proposal, assistance would be distributed on the basis of factors related to the cost of providing service rather than on the basis of actual reported costs.²⁴ The third proposal suggested the distribution of assistance among the States, with State utility commissions deciding the allocation of assistance among the carriers serving the State under distribution plans developed under Commission guidelines and reviewed by the Commission.²⁵ In addition to the three proposals, comment was solicited on the use of credits, or customer vouchers, directing assistance to LECs selected by the customer.²⁶ Finally, the Notice invited comment on the abolition, revision, or combination with USF assistance of dial equipment minute ("DEM") weighting, which currently allows LEC study areas with fewer than 50,000 loops to allocate part of their local switching costs to the interstate jurisdiction.²⁷

8. On August 31, we granted requests from interested parties, including the Alaska Public Utilities Commission, for an extension of time for the filing of comments and reply comments, because we were persuaded that an extension would serve the public interest.²⁸ We noted that an extension would encourage more detailed analysis by interested parties of the complex issues presented in the Notice for their consideration.²⁹ The new deadlines for filing comments are October 10 and November 9, 1995.³⁰

III. Discussion

9. We proposed the interim cap for the purpose of moderating growth in the total level of the USF for the duration of an intended rulemaking that would address possible permanent changes to the USF rules.³¹ In imposing the interim cap, we noted that previous changes to the jurisdictional separations rules involved lengthy phase-in periods to ease the transition for affected carriers.³² Since the intended rulemaking could

result in new USF rules retargeting assistance, we concluded that the interim cap would facilitate our ability to implement the new rules in a timely manner.³³

10. We note that the Commission had limited the duration of the interim cap to two years in the belief that two years would be sufficient for the completion of the rulemaking.³⁴ We specifically stated that should rulemaking conclude prior to the expiration of the cap, the new rules would replace the interim cap.³⁵ The issues addressed in this rulemaking are complex, however, and despite diligent effort by the Commission staff and interested parties, it is now clear that their resolution will take more time than the anticipated two years.

11. In view of the progress in the rulemaking process to date, we believe that an additional six months should be sufficient to complete it. Given the scope of the proposals presently under consideration for amending the jurisdictional separations rules,³⁶ we conclude that the extension of the interim cap for the purpose of continuing to moderate the growth of the USF for the remainder of the rulemaking period is prudent. We propose extending the interim cap for an additional six months while we complete the rulemaking. We seek comment on this proposed extension of the interim rules. We also invite interested parties to propose longer or shorter extensions, with accompanying justifications for the length of time proposed.

IV. Procedural Matters

A. *Ex Parte*

12. This is a non-restricted notice and comment rulemaking proceeding. "Ex parte" presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided they are disclosed as provided in the Commission's rules.³⁷

B. *Regulatory Flexibility*

13. We certify that the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 does not apply to this rulemaking proceeding because if the proposals in this proceeding are adopted, there will not be a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities, as defined by Section 601(3) of the

Regulatory Flexibility Act.³⁸ Because of the nature of local exchange and access service, the Commission has concluded that LECs, including small LECs, are dominant in their fields of operation and therefore are not "small entities" as defined by that act.³⁹ The Secretary shall send a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, including the certification, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in accordance with Section 603(a) of that act.⁴⁰

C. *Comment Dates*

14. We invite comment on the proposals and tentative conclusions set forth above. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules,⁴¹ interested parties may file comments on or before October 18, 1995, and reply comments on or before October 27, 1995. To file formally in this proceeding, you must file an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If you want each Commissioner to receive a personal copy of your comments, you must file an original plus nine copies. You should send comments and reply comments to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. Parties should send one copy of any documents filed in this docket to the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service (ITS), 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037. We also ask that parties send a copy of their comments to each member of the Federal State Joint Board and its staff, as indicated in the attached service list. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Room 239, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

V. *Ordering Clauses*

15. Accordingly, it is ordered that, pursuant to Sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 154(j), and 403, notice is hereby given of proposed interim amendments to Part 36, Subpart F of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. Part 36, Subpart F, as described in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

16. It is further ordered, pursuant to Section 410(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C.

²³ *Id.* at 17, paras. 37-38, at 22, para. 47, at 23-24, para. 51.

²⁴ *Id.* at 25-31, paras. 56-75.

²⁵ *Id.* at 32, paras. 76-77.

²⁶ *Id.* at 10, para. 17.

²⁷ *Id.* at 7-9, paras. 9-12.

²⁸ Amendment of Part 36 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board, Order, CC Docket No. 80-286, DA 95-1876, 2 para. 4 (released September 1, 1995).

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.* at 2, para. 5.

³¹ Interim Notice, *supra* note 11, at 7114, paras. 1-2.

³² Interim Order, *supra* note 1, at 305, paras. 17-18.

³³ *Id.* at 305, paras. 16-18.

³⁴ Interim Notice, *supra* note 11, at 7114, para. 4.

³⁵ *Id.* at 7114 n. 2; Interim Order, *supra* note 1 at 306, para. 24.

³⁶ See *supra* para. 7.

³⁷ See generally 47 CFR 1.1202, 1.1203, 1.1206(a) (1994).

³⁸ 5 U.S.C. 601(3).

³⁹ See MTS and WATS Market Structure, 93 FCC 2d 241, 338-39 (1983).

⁴⁰ 5 U.S.C. 603(a).

⁴¹ 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419 (1994).

410(c), that the issues relating to interim amendments to Part 36, Subpart F of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. Part 36, Subpart F, as described in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, shall be and hereby are referred to the Federal State Joint Board established in this proceeding for a recommended decision.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 36

Communications common carriers; Reporting and recordkeeping requirements; Telephone; Uniform System of Accounts.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

Federal-State Joint Board Service List

The Honorable Sharon L. Nelson, Chairman; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission; Chandler Plaza Building; 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive, S.W.; Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

The Honorable Cheryl L. Parrino, Chair; Wisconsin Public Service Commission; Post Office Box 7854; Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

The Honorable Stephen O. Hewlett, Commissioner; Tennessee Public Service Commission; 460 James Robertson Parkway; Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder, Chairman; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; State Capitol Building; Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070

The Honorable Reed E. Hundt, Chairman; Federal Communications Commission; 1919 M Street, N.W.—Room 814; Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Andrew C. Barrett, Commissioner; Federal Communications Commission; 1919 M Street, N.W.—Room 826, Stop 0105; Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Susan Ness, Commissioner; Federal Communications Commission; 1919 M Street, N.W.—Room 832; Washington, D.C. 20554

Deborah A. Dupont, FCC Joint Board Staff Chair; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting & Audits Div.; 2000 L Street, N.W.—Room 257; Washington, D.C. 20036

Teresa Pitts, State Joint Board Staff Chair; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission; 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive, S.W.; Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

Charles Bolles; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; State Capitol Building; Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070

Elton Calder; Georgia Public Service Commission; 162 State Office Building; 244 Washington Street, S.W.; Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Ronald Choura; Michigan Public Service Commission; 6545 Mercantile Way; Lansing, Michigan 48910

Rowland Curry; Texas Public Utility Commission; 7800 Shoal Creek Blvd.—Suite 400N; Austin, Texas 78757

Ann Dean; Maryland Public Service Commission; 6 St. Paul Centre; Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dean Evans; California Public Utilities Commission; 505 Van Ness Avenue—Room 4004; San Francisco, California 94102

William Howden; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting & Audits Div.; 2000 L Street, N.W.—Room 812; Washington, D.C. 20036

George Johnson; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting & Audits Div.; 2000 L Street, N.W.—Room 257; Washington, D.C. 20036

Chris Klein; Tennessee Public Service Commission; 460 James Robertson Parkway; Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

Robert Loube; Public Service Commission of District of Columbia; 450 Fifth Street, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20001

Sam Loudenslager; Arkansas Public Service Commission; 1000 Center Street; Post Office Box C-400; Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Rafi Mohammed; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting and Audits Div.; 2000 L Street—Room 812; Washington, D.C. 20036

Paul Pederson; Missouri Public Service Commission; Post Office Box 360; Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

James Bradford Ramsay; National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners; 1102 ICC Building; Constitution Avenue & 12th Street, N.W.; Post Office Box 684; Washington, D.C. 20044

Jonathan Reel; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting and Audits Div.; 2000 L Street, N.W.—Room 257; Washington, D.C. 20036

Jeff Richter; Wisconsin Public Service Commission; Post Office Box 7854; Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

Gary Seigel; Federal Communications Commission; Common Carrier Bureau—Accounting & Audits Div.; 2000 L Street, N.W.—Room 812; Washington, D.C. 20036

Joel B. Shifman; Maine Public Utilities Commission; State House Station # 18; Augusta, Maine 04333

Fred Sistarenik; New York Public Service Commission; 3 Empire State Plaza; Albany, New York 12223

Mary Steele; North Carolina Utilities Commission; Box 29510; Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0510

[FR Doc. 95-25036 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 61

[CC Docket No. 94-1; FCC 95-406]

Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Further notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: On March 30, 1995, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a First Report and Order in this docket, revising its price cap regulations applicable to local exchange carriers (LECs). In that Order, the Commission also stated that it would consider adopting further rule revisions in the near future.

In this Further Notice, the Commission seeks comment on revising its rules governing calculation of the "X-Factor" in the price cap index (PCI) formula, and revising the rules governing sharing obligations. The Commission also seeks comment on revising the rules governing the price cap common line formula, and the rules governing treatment of exogenous costs. In a previous further notice of proposed rulemaking, the Commission sought comment on how the price cap rules should be adjusted as the competition faced by local exchange carriers (LECs) develops in the future. The intended effect of this action is to revise the price cap rules to strengthen the existing incentives for LECs to become efficient and innovative.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 27, 1995. Reply Comments must be submitted on or before December 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Tariff Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Room 518, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Spaeth or C. Anthony Bush, Tariff Division, Common Carrier Bureau, (202) 418-1530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Fourth Further Notice adopted September 27, 1995, and released September 27, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours