

believe that no significant threat to human health or the environment remains because pathways of concern for exposure to contaminants no longer exist. If new information comes available that indicates that there is a significant threat to human health or the environment then EPA or Ecology can require or conduct additional remedial action, if appropriate. Subsequently, EPA is proposing deletion of this site from the NPL. Documents supporting this action are available from the docket.

Dated: June 7, 1999.

**Chuck Clarke,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 99-15274 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 52

[CC Docket No. 99-200; FCC 99-122]

### Numbering Resource Optimization

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document examines a variety of measures intended to increase the efficiency with which telecommunications carriers use telephone numbering resources. The purpose of this effort is two-fold: to slow the rate of number exhaust in this country as evidenced by the ever-increasing rate at which new area codes are assigned; and to prolong the life of the North American Numbering Plan (NANP).

**DATES:** Comments are to be filed on or before July 30, 1999, and reply

comments are due on or before August 30, 1999. Written comments must be submitted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on the proposed information collections on or before August 16, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Secretary, 445 12th Street, SW, Room TW-B204F, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collections 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, and to Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB, 72-17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20503 or via the Internet to fain5\_t@al.eop.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jared Carlson, (202) 418-2320 or email at jcarlson@fcc.gov or Tejal Mehta at (202) 418-2320 or tmehta@fcc.gov. For additional information concerning the information collections contained in this NPRM contact Judy Boley at 202-418-0214, or via the Internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking adopted on May 27, 1999, and released on June 2, 1999. The full text of this Notice is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center. The complete text may also be obtained through the world wide web,

at <http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/CommonCarrier/Orders>, or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

### Paperwork Reduction Act

This NPRM contains either a proposed or modified information collection. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on the information collections contained in this NPRM, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. Public and agency comments are due at the same time as other comments on this NPRM; OMB notification of action is due 60 days from date of publication of this NPRM in the **Federal Register**. Comments should address: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimates; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**OMB Control No.:** None.

**Title:** Numbering Resource Optimization, CC Docket No. 99-200.

**Form No.:** N/A.

**Type of Review:** New collection.

**Respondents:** Business or other for-profit entities.

Proposed number of collections	Estimated time per respondents	Total annual response (hours)	Burden (Annual) (hours)
Verification of Need for Numbers Submissions:			
a. Quarterly Report .....	3000	48	144,000
b. Initial Codes .....	3000	1	3000
c. Growth Codes .....	3000	3	9000

**Frequency of Response:** Quarterly; on occasion.

**Total Annual Burden:** 156,000 hours.

**Estimated Costs Per Respondent:** \$0.

**Needs and Uses:** In CC Docket No. 99-200, the Commission examines a variety of measures intended to increase the efficiency with which telecommunications carriers use numbering resources in order to slow the rate of number exhaust in this country. The Notice examines existing

mechanisms for the administration and allocation of numbering resources, which are governed by industry-developed Central Office Code Guidelines. The Notice proposes certain verification measures designed to prevent carriers from obtaining numbering resources that they do not need in the near term. The Notice tentatively concludes that a more extensive, detailed and uniform reporting mechanism should be

developed that will improve numbering utilization and forecasting on a nationwide basis. The Notice tentatively concludes that carriers should report utilization and forecast data on a quarterly basis and that the Commission should mandate that all users of numbering resources must supply utilization and forecast data to the NANPA. With respect to an applicant's ability to obtain initial codes, the Notice seeks comment on what type of showing

would be appropriate. The Notice seeks comment on whether applicants should be required to make a particular showing regarding the equipment they intend to use to provide service, the state of readiness of their network or switches, or their progress with their business plans, prior to obtaining initial codes, or whether any other type of showing should be required. Applicants for NXX codes currently are required to complete a Months-to-Exhaust Worksheet prior to applying for growth codes. The Notice seeks comment on whether requiring applicants to submit the Months-to-Exhaust Worksheet with an application for growth codes would be an adequate demonstration of need in order to obtain additional numbering resources. Alternatively, the Notice seeks comment on whether carriers should be required to demonstrate that they have achieved a specified level of numbering utilization (or fill rate) in the area in question before they may receive additional numbering resources. All the proposed collections will be used to prevent the premature exhaustion of numbering resources pursuant to the Commissions plenary authority over numbering set forth at 47 U.S.C. Section 251(e).

#### **Synopsis of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking**

1. In 1947, AT&T adopted the current nationwide numbering scheme, under which the ten-digit telephone number serves not only as a network "address," but also conveys information to the network as to how phone calls should be routed and billed. A principal benefit of this system was that it permitted automated routing of long-distance phone calls, obviating the need for operators to assist in routing. Under the allocation system that developed to support this system, numbering resources are allocated to local telephone exchange carriers on the basis of physical geography, rather than on the basis of end-user demand for those numbers. That is, typically a large block of numbers is allocated to a carrier for use in a geographic area, even though there may not be end-users assigned to each individual number available in the area. This system worked smoothly so long as only one entity (the local exchange carrier) offered only one type of service (wireline telephony) to customers.

2. New services using the same numbering system, particularly cellular telephones, began to enter the telecommunications marketplace with increasing frequency beginning in the late 1980's. More recently, the Telecommunications Act of 1996

opened the market for competitive local wireline service, again giving rise to more players entering the market. In addition, many customers are obtaining additional telephone lines to support additional services such as Internet, data, and facsimile services. Because of the relatively recent explosion of market entry and customer demand for new services, as well as the assignment of telephone numbers to multiple service providers in large blocks on a geographic basis, we have witnessed an incredible increase in demand for numbering resources.

3. Although we are only just beginning to see the benefits of competition in the marketplace for local wireline telephone service, the coincident costs in the form of the rapid exhaust of area codes are already all too apparent. The effect on consumers having to undergo, in some cases, multiple area code changes in relatively short time frames is an unacceptable byproduct of burgeoning competition in the telecommunications marketplace. To illustrate the pace of area code exhaust, consider California, which, at the end of 1992, had thirteen area codes in use. The California Public Utilities Commission projects that by the end of 2002, it will have 41 area codes. When the task of splitting the 323 area code from the 213 area code in the Los Angeles area was completed in April 1999, rather than lasting for ten or even five years, the new area code was immediately declared to be in jeopardy of exhausting its numbering resources.

4. The goal of this proceeding is to address the underlying drivers of area code exhaust so that consumers are spared the enormous costs and inconveniences associated with the rapid pace of implementation of new area codes. In addition, clearly, implementing new area codes is not a solution that can continue indefinitely. As of the end of 1998, it was estimated that nearly one-third of the total number of geographic area codes assignable to the United States had been put into service. By some projections, the NANP could exhaust within ten years. Because the estimated cost of expanding the NANP is enormous, and the time to effect such an expansion is estimated to be on the order of ten years, the need to extend the life of the current NANP through effective conservation and efficient utilization of numbering resources is apparent and immediate.

5. This Commission, with input from industry groups, advisory bodies, state public utility commissions and the public, has already begun to examine various numbering conservation and optimization methods. Continuing in

these efforts, we issue this Notice to seek public comment on how best to create national standards for numbering resource optimization. In doing so, we seek to: (1) minimize the negative impact on consumers; (2) ensure sufficient access to numbering resources for all service providers that need them to enter into or to compete in telecommunications markets; (3) avoid, or at least delay, exhaust of the NANP and the need to expand the NANP; (4) impose the least societal cost possible, in a competitively neutral manner, while obtaining the highest benefit; (5) ensure that no class of carrier or consumer is unduly favored or disfavored by our optimization efforts; and (6) minimize the incentives for carriers to build and carry excessively large inventories of numbers.

#### **Executive Summary**

6. In this Notice, we consider and seek comment on a variety of administrative and technical measures that would promote more efficient allocation and use of NANP resources. In Section III, we seek specific comment on the relative costs and benefits, both financial and societal, of implementing each measure. We also ask that commenters weigh the cost of extending the life of the current NANP through various numbering resource optimization strategies against the projected cost of expansion of the NANP.

7. In Section IV, we examine the existing mechanisms for the administration and allocation of numbering resources, which are governed by industry-developed CO Code Guidelines. We find that the guidelines have not been effective in constraining the ability of carriers to obtain and carry excessively large inventories of numbering resources for which they have no immediate need. We seek comment on whether the guidelines should be modified or replaced, wholly or in part, by enforceable federal rules. Within the section, we outline proposals for a uniform set of numbering status definitions. We also seek comment on measures that would tie the allocation of new numbering resources to a showing of need by the carrier, increase carrier accountability for number utilization through enhanced data reporting and audit requirements, and speed the return of unused numbering resources. We specifically seek comment on the possibility of requiring carriers to meet number utilization thresholds before they can obtain additional numbering resources. These measures would not require

implementation of new systems or technologies, and we believe that they could be implemented in a relatively short time period at minimal cost.

8. In Section V, we consider and seek comment on some specific numbering resource optimization solutions that could be implemented in addition to, or in combination with, stricter administrative standards for the administration and allocation of numbering resources. These methods include rate center consolidation, mandatory ten-digit dialing, and number pooling. We consider the likely costs and potential number optimization benefits of each of these solutions. We also seek comment on a host of issues related to the way in which number pooling might be implemented and administered, if we were to make carrier participation mandatory at some level.

9. In light of the potential costs of these numbering resource optimization solutions, we seek comment on whether the magnitude of the number exhaust problem justifies requiring carriers to participate in one or more of these solutions on a mandatory basis, either at the federal level or through delegation of authority to the states. In the alternative, we consider whether optimal use of numbering resources could be accomplished without the need for such mandates, provided that carriers achieved sufficiently high levels of efficiency in their usage of numbers. Under this approach, we would require carriers to meet specific number utilization thresholds, but would leave to each carrier the choice of what numbering optimization method or methods to use to achieve that threshold.

10. In Section VI, we consider whether establishing a pricing mechanism for numbering resources would improve the efficiency of number allocation and use. Although it is probably not feasible in the short-term to replace our existing numbering resource allocation mechanism with a market-based approach, we believe it is important to consider using market-based mechanisms to allocate numbers as a possible long-term alternative to regulatory mandates. We seek comment on whether moving to a market-based system of allocating numbering resources is feasible, and how the transition to such a system could be implemented.

11. In Section VII, we consider area code relief methodologies, including splits, overlays, and boundary realignments, as numbering optimization strategies. We recognize that our consideration of both short-term and long-term numbering resource

optimization measures in this Notice does not eliminate the need for states to continue to implement area code relief in those area codes that are approaching depletion. We seek comment on what action the Commission can take to assist states in implementing area code relief in a manner that is consistent with the objectives of this proceeding.

## Procedural Matters

### A. Ex Parte Presentations

12. This matter shall be treated as a "permit-but-disclose" proceeding in accordance with the Commission's ex parte rules. Persons making oral ex parte presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentations must contain summaries of the substance of the presentations and not merely a listing of the subjects discussed. More than a one or two sentence description of the views and arguments presented is generally required.

### B. Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

13. The following is a summary of the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) created for the Notice. Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), See 5 U.S.C. section 603. The RFA, See 5 U.S.C. section 601 *et seq.*, was amended by the Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996, Public Law 104-121, 110 Stat. 847 (1996) (CWAAA). Title II of the CWAAA is the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA). The Commission has prepared the following IRFA of the possible significant economic impact on small entities of the policies and rules in this Notice. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. These comments must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines as comments on the rest of the Notice, and should have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the IRFA. The Commission shall send a copy of this Notice, including the IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

14. *Need for and Objectives of the Proposed Rules.* The Commission is issuing this Notice to seek public comment on how best to create national standards for numbering resource optimization. In doing so, we seek to: (1) ensure sufficient access to numbering resources for all service providers that need them to enter into or to compete in telecommunications markets; (2) avoid, or at least delay, exhaust of the NANP and the need to expand the NANP; (3) minimize the negative impact

on consumers; (4) impose the least cost possible, in a competitively neutral manner, while obtaining the highest benefit; (5) ensure that no class of carrier or consumer is unduly favored or disfavored by our numbering resource optimization efforts; and (6) minimize the incentives for building and carrying excessively large inventories of numbers.

15. *Legal Basis.* The proposed action is authorized under sections 1, 4(i) and (j), 201, 208, and 251 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. 47 U.S.C. sections 151, 154(i), 154(j), 201, and 251(e).

16. *Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities That May Be Affected by this Notice.* The RFA requires that an initial regulatory flexibility analysis be prepared for notice-and-comment rulemaking proceedings, unless the agency certifies that "the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities." 5 U.S.C. section 605(b). The RFA generally defines "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction." *Id.* section 601(6). In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act. *Id.* section 601(3) (incorporating by reference the definition of "small business concern" in Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. section 632). A small business concern is one which: (1) is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the Small Business Administration (SBA). Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. section 632.

17. In this IRFA, we consider the potential impact of this Notice on all users of telephone numbering resources. The small entities possibly affected by the proposed rules, if adopted, include wireline, wireless, and other entities, as described below. The SBA has defined a small business for Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) categories 4,812 (Radiotelephone Communications) and 4,813 (Telephone Communications, Except Radiotelephone) to be small entities having no more than 1,500 employees. 13 CFR section 121.201. In the FRFA to the *Universal Service Order*, we described and estimated in detail the number of small entities that would be affected by the new universal service rules. 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 9227-9243 (1997). Although some affected incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) may have 1,500 or fewer employees, we do not believe that such

entities should be considered small entities within the meaning of the RFA because they are either dominant in their field of operations or are not independently owned and operated, and therefore by definition not "small entities" or "small business concerns" under the RFA. Accordingly, our use of the terms "small entities" and "small businesses" does not encompass small ILECs. Out of an abundance of caution, however, for regulatory flexibility analysis purposes, we will separately consider small ILECs within this analysis and use the term "small ILECs" to refer to any ILECs that arguably might be defined by the SBA as "small business concerns." See 13 CFR section 121.201, SIC code 4813. Since the time of the Local Competition decision, 11 FCC Rcd 15499, 16144-45 (1996), 61 FR 45476 (Aug. 29, 1996), the Commission has consistently addressed in its regulatory flexibility analyses the impact of its rules on such ILECs.

18. The most reliable source of information regarding the total numbers of certain common carrier and related providers nationwide, as well as the numbers of commercial wireless entities, appears to be data the Commission publishes annually in its *Carrier Locator: Interstate Service Providers Report (Locator)*. FCC, Carrier Locator: Interstate Service Providers at 1-2. This report lists 3,604 companies that provided interstate telecommunications service as of December 31, 1997 and was compiled using information from Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) Fund Worksheets filed by carriers (Jan. 1999). These carriers include, *inter alia*, local exchange carriers, competitive local exchange carriers, interexchange carriers, competitive access providers, satellite service providers, wireless telephony providers, operator service providers, pay telephone operators, providers of telephone toll service, providers of telephone exchange service, and resellers.

19. *Local Service Providers*. There are two principle providers of local telephone service; ILECs and competing local service providers. Neither the Commission nor the SBA has developed a definition for small providers of local exchange services (LECs). The closest applicable definition under the SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. According to data set forth in the *FCC Statistics of Communications Common Carriers (SOCC)*, 34 ILECs have more than 1,500 employees. We do not have data specifying the number of these carriers

that are either dominant in their field of operations or are not independently owned and operated, and thus are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of ILECs that would qualify as small business concerns under the SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that fewer than 1,376 ILECs are small entities that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.

20. *Competitive Local Service Providers*. This category includes competitive access providers (CAPs), competitive local exchange providers (CLECs), shared tenant service providers, local resellers, and other local service providers. The closest applicable definition under the SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. According to the most recent *Locator* data, 145 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of competitive local service. We estimate that there are fewer than 145 small entity competitive local service providers that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.

21. *Providers of Toll Service*. The toll industry includes providers of interexchange services (IXCs), satellite service providers and other toll service providers, primarily resellers. The closest applicable definition under the SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. According to the most recent *Locator* data, 164 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of toll services. We estimate that there are fewer than 164 small entity toll providers that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.

22. In addition, an alternative SBA standard may apply to satellite service providers. The applicable definition of small entity generally is the definition under the SBA rules applicable to Communications Services, Not Elsewhere Classified (NEC). This definition provides that a small entity is expressed as one with \$11.0 million or less in annual receipts. According to the Census Bureau, there were a total of 848 communications services providers, NEC, in operation in 1992, and a total of 775 had annual receipts of less than \$9,999 million. The Census report does not provide more precise data.

23. *Resellers*. This category includes toll resellers, operator service providers, pre-paid calling card providers, and other toll service providers. The closest applicable SBA definition for a reseller is a telephone communications company other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. According to the

most recent *Locator* data, 405 carriers reported that they were engaged in the resale of telephone service. We estimate that there are fewer than 405 small entity resellers that may be affected by the proposed rules, if adopted.

24. *Wireless Telephony and Paging and Messaging*. Wireless telephony includes cellular, personal communications service (PCS) or specialized mobile radio (SMR) service providers. The closest applicable SBA definition for a reseller is a telephone communications company other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. According to the most recent *Locator* data, 732 carriers reported that they were engaged in the provision of wireless telephony and 137 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of paging and messaging service. We estimate that fewer than 732 carriers are engaged in the provision of wireless telephony and fewer than 137 companies are engaged in the provision of paging and messaging service.

25. The SBA has developed a definition of small entities for cable and other pay television services, which includes all such companies generating \$11 million or less in revenue annually. This definition includes cable systems operators, closed circuit television services, direct broadcast satellite services, multipoint distribution systems, satellite master antenna systems and subscription television services. According to the Census Bureau data from 1992, there were 1,788 total cable and other pay television services and 1,423 had less than \$11 million in revenue.

26. The Commission has developed its own definition of a small cable system operator for the purposes of rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving fewer than 400,000 subscribers nationwide. Based on our most recent information, we estimate that there were 1,439 cable operators that qualified as small cable system operators at the end of 1995. Paul Kagan Associates, Inc., *Cable TV Investor*, Feb. 29, 1996 (based on figures for Dec. 30, 1995). 47 U.S.C. section 543(m)(2). 47 CFR section 76.1403(b). Since then, some of those companies may have grown to serve over 400,000 subscribers, and others may have been involved in transactions that caused them to be combined with other cable operators. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 1,439 small entity cable system operators.

27. The Communications Act also contains a definition of a small cable system operator, which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer

than 1 percent of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed \$250,000,000." The Commission has determined that there are 66,000,000 subscribers in the United States. Therefore, we found that an operator serving fewer than 660,000 subscribers shall be deemed a small operator, if its annual revenues, when combined with the total annual revenues of all of its affiliates, do not exceed \$250 million in the aggregate. Based on available data, we find that the number of cable operators serving 660,000 subscribers or less totals 1,450. We do not request nor do we collect information concerning whether cable system operators are affiliated with entities whose gross annual revenues exceed \$250,000,000, and thus are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of cable system operators that would qualify as small cable operators under the definition in the Communications Act.

**28. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements.** The Notice seeks comment on whether all NXX codeholders should be required to report the status of all telephone numbers within the NXX blocks assigned to them. In the alternative, the Notice seeks comment on whether utilization data reporting on a more aggregated basis (or some more aggregated set of telephone number status categories) would provide sufficient data to accurately track number utilization. The Notice proposes that any utilization reporting obligation that the Commission adopts would be in addition to the demand forecasting requirement that the COCUS currently places on carriers. The Notice seeks comment on whether any modifications should be made to improve the quality and accuracy of carriers' demand forecasts. Alternatively, the Notice seeks comment on several alternative data collection options, including the forecast and utilization reporting process in the current Thousand Block Pooling Guidelines, and the Line Number Use Survey (LINUS) data

collection model designed by NANPA staff as a replacement for COCUS. The Notice also seeks comment on other industry proposals for a number utilization and forecasting mechanism to replace COCUS. Finally, it seeks comment on whether to supplement the need verification measures and data collection program with a comprehensive audit program that verifies carrier compliance with federal rules and industry numbering guidelines.

**29. Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Significant Alternatives Considered.** The rules we propose in this Notice are designed to ensure sufficient access to numbering resources for all service providers that need them. The Notice seeks public comment on how best to create national standards for numbering resource optimization in order to: (1) ensure sufficient access to numbering resources for all service providers that need them to enter into or to compete in telecommunications markets; (2) avoid, or at least delay, exhaust of the NANP and the need to expand the NANP; (3) minimize the negative impact on consumers; (4) impose the least cost possible, in a competitively neutral manner, while obtaining the highest benefit; (5) ensure that no class of carrier or consumer is unduly favored or disfavored by our optimization efforts; and (6) minimize the incentives for carriers to build and carry excessively large inventories of numbers. We seek comment on our tentative conclusions and proposals, and on additional actions we might take in this regard to relieve burdens on users of telephone numbering resources.

**30. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules.** None.

#### *C. Comment Filing Procedures*

31. Interested parties may file comments on or before July 30, 1999 and reply comments on or before August 30, 1999. Parties must file an original and four copies of each filing. All filings must be sent to the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445

Twelfth Street, SW, Room TW-B204F, Washington, DC 20554. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. See *Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, 63 FR 24,121 (1998). Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <<http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket number, CC Docket 99-200 or rulemaking number, RM No. 9258.

32. Written comments by the public on the proposed information collections are due by July 30, 1999. Written comments must be submitted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on the proposed information collections on or before August 16, 1999. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collections 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](mailto:jboley@fcc.gov) and to Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503 or via the Internet to [fain\\_t@al.eop.gov](mailto:fain_t@al.eop.gov).

33. Parties should also file one copy of any documents filed in this docket with the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554.

#### **List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 52**

Communications common carriers, Telecommunications, Telephone. Federal Communications Commission. **Magalie Roman Salas,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-15334 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P