

elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities." Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

#### *D. Executive Order 13132*

Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government." Under Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This proposed rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

#### *E. Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions. This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co., v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255-66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

#### *F. Unfunded Mandates*

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal

governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

#### *G. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use "voluntary consensus standards" (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

The EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this action. Today's proposed action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 9, 2000.

**Keith Takata,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*  
[FR Doc. 00-12786 Filed 5-22-00; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 64**

[CC Docket No. 94-129; DA 00-1093]

### **Common Carrier Bureau Asks Parties To Refresh Record and Seek Additional Comment on Proposal To Require Resellers To Obtain Carrier Identification Codes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Solicitation of supplemental comments.

**SUMMARY:** In a Further Notice in this proceeding released on December 23, 1998, the Commission sought comment on three proposals to address "soft slamming" and carrier identification problems arising from the shared use of carrier identification codes (CICs) by facilities-based carriers and switchless resellers of their services. The first proposal—requiring resellers to obtain their own CICs—garnered both strong support and opposition among commenters. Supporters view it as a

cost-effective and administratively simple solution to the problems identified by the Commission, whereas opponents raise a number of concerns regarding its potential impact on carriers. In order to focus the record, we invite interested parties to refresh the record and to submit additional comments on a number of specific issues regarding the proposal that resellers obtain their own CICs.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before June 6, 2000 and reply comments on or before June 13, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** See Supplementary Information section for where and how to file comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William J. Scher or Dana Walton-Bradford (202) 418-7400 TTY: (202) 418-0484.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a *Further Notice*, 64 FR 7763 (February 16, 1999), in this proceeding released on December 23, 1998, the Commission sought comment on three proposals to address "soft slamming" and carrier identification problems arising from the shared use of carrier identification codes (CICs) by facilities-based carriers and switchless resellers of their services. The first proposal—requiring resellers to obtain their own CICs—garnered both strong support and opposition among commenters. Supporters view it as a cost-effective and administratively simple solution to the problems identified by the Commission, whereas opponents raise a number of concerns regarding its potential impact on carriers. In order to focus the record, we invite interested parties to refresh the record and to submit additional comments on a number of specific issues regarding the proposal that resellers obtain their own CICs.

First, we seek comment on what it would cost resellers to purchase translations access alone, as distinguished from Feature Group D access, and on whether the Commission should require that this functionality be offered separately. We encourage commenters to provide specific estimates of costs on both a per-LATA and a nationwide basis.

Second, we request information on whether there are functionally-equivalent services that, in conjunction with elimination of the current NANPA requirement that carriers must purchase Feature Group D access to obtain a CIC, would make it possible for switchless resellers to use CICs without also purchasing translations access directly. If so, can and should the Commission require the purchase of such services by

underlying carriers? To what extent are underlying carriers and resellers already taking advantage of any such services, and how are the costs allocated between them? What are the potential drawbacks of such an approach?

Third, we request additional comment on the network, operations support systems, and/or other modifications that underlying carriers and LECs would have to make to accommodate the use of switchless reseller CICs, the likely costs of any such modifications, and the time required to carry them out. We seek comment on whether the Commission should require any such modifications if it adopts the proposed CIC requirement, or whether market incentives are sufficient to encourage carriers to make them of their own accord. Again, we encourage commenters to submit empirical data with their comments, and to provide specific estimates of costs on both a per-LATA and a nationwide basis.

Fourth, we seek additional comment on whether the proposed CIC requirement would be affordable for switchless resellers. We seek comment on whether there are specific measures that would mitigate the financial burden of the proposed CIC requirement on switchless resellers. We also ask commenters to address whether the subject proposal would create additional competitive benefits or disadvantages for resellers, such as giving them greater parity with facilities-based carriers in the timing of customer access to long distance services, or making it more expensive and time-consuming for them to change underlying carriers.

Fifth, we request additional comment on the specific dimensions of soft slamming and the carrier identification problems involving resellers identified in the *Further Notice*. In particular, we request commenters to address—and to submit empirical data, to the greatest extent possible—concerning the percentage of slamming complaints that involve soft slams and the percentage that involve consumers whose preferred carrier freeze protections have been bypassed.

Finally, we seek additional comment on whether this proposal would create a significant threat of CIC exhaustion, and whether modifications to existing Commission policy restricting CIC assignments may be necessary to accommodate the assignment of CICs to resellers.

#### Filing Procedures

This will continue to be a permit-but-disclose proceeding for purposes of the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Pursuant

to § 1.1200 and § 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, interested parties may file supplemental filings on or before June 6, 2000, and replies to supplemental filings on or before June 13, 2000. Rules pertaining to oral and written *ex parte* presentations in permit-but-disclose proceedings are set forth in § 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules. Such filings 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 24121 (May 1, 1998).

Filings submitted through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <<http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>>. 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 or rulemaking number. Parties may also submit electronic filings by Internet e-mail. To receive e-mail filing instructions, commenters should send an e-mail to [ecfs@fcc.gov](mailto:ecfs@fcc.gov), and should include the following words in the body of the message, "get form <your e-mail address.>" A sample form and directions will be sent in reply.

Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing with the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. Parties also must send a paper copy of their filings to Sheryl Todd, Accounting Policy Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 445 Twelfth Street S.W., Room 5-B540, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition, parties filing supplemental filings must send diskette copies to the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 1231 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY-A257, Washington, DC, 20554. This document 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.

Dated: May 18, 2000.

Irene M. Flannery,

Chief, Accounting Policy Division.

[FR Doc. 00-12981 Filed 5-22-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AF90

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Rule To List the Mississippi Gopher Frog Distinct Population Segment of Dusky Gopher Frog as Endangered

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** We, the Fish and Wildlife Service, propose to list the Mississippi gopher frog distinct population segment of the dusky gopher frog (*Rana capito sevosa*) as an endangered species under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). Historically, the Mississippi gopher frog occurred in at least nine counties or parishes across Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, ranging from east of the Mississippi River in Louisiana to the Mobile River delta in Alabama. Today, it is known from only one site in Harrison County, Mississippi. This last surviving population is threatened by habitat destruction and degradation from a proposed housing development on property within 200 meters (m) (656 feet (ft)) of its only remaining breeding pond; the construction and expansion of two highways in the vicinity of the pond; and a proposed reservoir. These actions pose threats to the terrestrial habitat of adult frogs and their ability to offset mortality rates with reproduction and recruitment. This proposed rule, if made final, would extend the Act's protection to the Mississippi gopher frog distinct population segment.

**DATES:** Send your comments to reach us on or before July 24, 2000. We will not consider comments received after the above date in making our decision on the proposed rule. We must receive requests for public hearings by July 7, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments and materials concerning this proposal to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mississippi Field Office, 6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213. Comments and materials received will be available

for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Linda LaClaire at the above address, telephone 601/965-4900, or facsimile 601/965-4340.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The gopher frog (*Rana capito*) is a member of the large cosmopolitan family, Ranidae ("true frogs"). The genus *Rana* is the only North American representative of this family. We define the Mississippi gopher frog distinct population segment as those populations of gopher frogs in the lower coastal plain ranging from the Mississippi River in Louisiana to the Mobile River delta of Alabama. Goin and Netting (1940) described frogs from this geographic range as a distinct species of gopher frog, *Rana sevosa*. The taxonomic history of gopher frogs is complex (summary in Altig and Lohoefer 1983). Subsequent to the original description by Goin and Netting, frogs of this population segment were considered subspecies of *Rana capito* (gopher frog) (*R. c. sevosa*) (Wright and Wright 1942) and later subspecies of *R. areolata* (crayfish frog) (*R. a. sevosa*) (Viosca 1949). In 1991, Collins challenged the taxonomic arrangement that lumped crayfish frogs and gopher frogs together as one species and recommended their separation based on biogeographical grounds. This arrangement was followed by Conant and Collins (1991), who again recognized the name *R. c. sevosa*. Wright and Wright (1942) first used the common name of "dusky gopher frog" for this subspecies, and it has been used in subsequent publications. The range of the subspecies, as presently described, also extends to the Gulf Coast of western Florida and adjacent Alabama (Conant and Collins 1991).

Young (1997) conducted the first comprehensive biochemical analysis of the relationships between gopher frogs and crayfish frogs and among subspecies of gopher frogs. She used allozyme electrophoresis (an assay (examination) of gene products) to examine allelic (genetic) differences between and among populations. Allozyme data have been used extensively to investigate the evolution of genetic relationships among related species. Young found strong support for the species designations *R. areolata* (crayfish frogs) and *R. capito* (gopher frogs). Gopher and crayfish frogs varied from each other by fixed differences at four loci (specific locations on a gene).

In addition, she found that populations of gopher frogs from Harrison County, Mississippi, were genetically distinct from other populations of gopher frogs east of the Mobile River drainage in Alabama. Young analyzed tissue from gopher frogs across the range of the species including populations in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina. Although Mississippi gopher frogs showed a fixed difference at only a single locus (site for a specific gene on a chromosome) from all other gopher frogs, this difference is considered by many taxonomists to be significant enough to warrant elevation of the frog to its own species (B. Crother, Southern Louisiana University, pers. comm. 1999). No other specific taxonomic divisions could be determined among the remaining populations of gopher frogs sampled. Since Harrison County is within the range of the original specimens used to describe *R. sevosa*, Young recommended the resurrection of *R. sevosa* as a distinct species. A manuscript summarizing her findings has been submitted for publication (Young and Crother, unpublished manuscript). If her recommendations are accepted by the herpetological scientific community, we will reflect this taxonomic change in subsequent publications in the **Federal Register**. Researchers have recommended "Mississippi gopher frog" as the common name for this population segment to distinguish it from the other populations of gopher frogs further east (R. Seigel, pers. comm. 1998).

The Mississippi gopher frog has a stubby appearance due to its short, plump body, comparatively large head, and relatively short legs (Conant and Collins 1991). The coloration of its back is dark and varies in individual frogs. It ranges from an almost uniform black to a pattern of reddish brown or dark brown spots on a ground color of gray or brown (Goin and Netting 1940). Warts densely cover the back. The belly is thickly covered with dark spots and dusky markings from chin to mid-body (Goin and Netting 1940, Conant and Collins 1991). Males are distinguished from females by their smaller size, enlarged thumbs, and paired vocal sacs on either side of the throat (Godley 1992). Richter and Seigel (1998b) reported a mean snout-vent length of 67.7 millimeters (mm) (2.7 inches (in)) for males and 79.3 mm (3.2 in) for females in the extant population. Mississippi gopher frog tadpoles are presently indistinguishable from those of leopard frogs and other gopher frogs