Total Annual Cost to Respondents: $10,750. The photocopying and stationery costs associated with this recordkeeping requirement are estimated to be $2 per system. 5,375 systems x $2 = $10,750.

Needs and Uses: Section 76.207 requires every cable television system to keep and permit public inspection of a complete record (political file) of all requests for cablecast time made by or on behalf of candidates for public office, together with an appropriate notation showing the disposition made by the system of such requests, and the charges made, if any, if the request is granted. The disposition includes the schedule of time purchased, when the spots actually aired, the rates charged, and the classes of time purchased. Also, when free time is provided for use by or on behalf of candidates, a record of the free time provided is to be placed in the political file. The data are used by the public in order to assess the amount of money expended and time allotted to a political candidate to ensure that equal access was afforded to other legally qualified candidates for public office.

OMB Approval Number: 3060–0595.

Title: FCC Form 1210 Updating Maximum Permitted Rates for Regulated Services and Equipment.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business and other for-profit entities; State, local and tribal governments.

Number of Respondents: 6,000 (4,000 filings and 2,000 LFA reviews)

Estimated Time Per Response: 2-15 hours.

Total Annual Burden to Respondents: 54,000 hours, calculated as follows: We estimate that approximately 4,000 FCC Form 1210s will be filed in the next year, approximately 50% with the Commission and 50% with LFAs. The average burden for cable operators to complete FCC Form 1210 is estimated to be 15 hours. The average burden for local franchise authorities to review Form 1210 filings is estimated to be 10 hours per filing. Cable operators are estimated to use in-house staff to complete approximately 50% of the filings. When using outside assistance to complete to other 50%, we estimate operators undergo a burden of 2 hours per filing to coordinate information with the outside assistance. 2,000 (50% of 4,000) filings completed with in-house staff x 15 hours per filing = 30,000 hours. 2,000 (50% of 4,000) filings coordinated with outside assistance x 2 hours per filing = 4,000 hours. 2,000 filings reviewed by LFAs at an average burden of 10 hours per filing = 2,000 x 10 hours per filing = 20,000 hours.

Total Annual Cost to all Respondents: $3,008,000 calculated as follows: Printing, photocopying and postage costs incurred by respondents are estimated to be $2 per filing. 4,000 annual filings x $2 per filing = $8,000. We estimate cable operators that use legal and accounting contractors will pay for services at an average rate of $100/hour. 2,000 filings x 15 hours per filing x $100/hour = $3,000,000.

Needs and Uses: FCC Form 1210 is used by cable operators to file for adjustments in maximum permitted rates for regulated services to reflect external costs. Regulated cable operators submit this form to local franchising authorities or the Commission (in situations where the FCC has assumed jurisdiction). It is also filed with the Commission when responding to a complaint filed with the Commission concerning cable programming service rates and associated equipment. The filings are used by the Commission and local franchising authorities (''LFAs'') to adjudicate permitted rates for regulated cable services and equipment, for the addition of new programming tiers and to account for the addition and deletion of channels, and for the allowance for pass throughs of external costs and costs due to inflation.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–3774 Filed 2–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 97–231; FCC 98–17]

Application by BellSouth Corporation, et al. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Memorandum Opinion and Order (Order) in CC Docket No. 97–231 concludes that BellSouth Corporation, *et al.* (BellSouth) has not satisfied the requirements of section 271(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act). The Commission therefore denies, pursuant to section 271(d)(3), BellSouth's application to provide in-region interLATA services in Louisiana. The Order declines to grant BellSouth authority to provide in-region, interLATA services in Louisiana.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Kinney, Attorney, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau, (202) 418–1580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order adopted February 3, 1998, and released February 4, 1998. The full text of this Order is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 1919 M St., NW., Room 239, Washington, D.C. The complete text also may be obtained through the World Wide Web, at http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Common Carrier/Orders/fcc98–17.wp, or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 1231 20th St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

SYNOPSIS OF ORDER:

1. On November 6, 1997, BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc. (collectively, BellSouth) filed an application for authorization under section 271 of the Act, to provide in-region interLATA services in the State of Louisiana. The Commission recently considered BellSouth's application for entry into the long distance market in South Carolina. Because BellSouth's Louisiana application is materially indistinguishable with respect to two of the checklist items that BellSouth failed to meet in its South Carolina application, the Commission denies BellSouth's application to provide interLATA services in Louisiana.

2. In this Order, the Commission concludes that BellSouth has not demonstrated that it has fully implemented the competitive checklist in section 271(c)(2)(B). In particular, the Commission finds that BellSouth has not met its burden of showing that it meets the competitive checklist with respect to: (1) access to its operations support systems, and (2) resale of contract service arrangements. The Commission therefore denies, pursuant to section 271(d)(3), BellSouth's application to provide in-region interLATA services in Louisiana.

3. *Compliance with the Competitive Checklist in Section 271(c)(2)(B).* For the reasons set forth below, the Commission concludes that BellSouth has not yet demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that it has fully implemented the competitive checklist.

4. *Operations Support Systems.* With respect to the first checklist item addressed, the Commission concludes,

as it did in its Order denying BellSouth's South Carolina application, that BellSouth has failed to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that it provides nondiscriminatory access to all of the operations support systems (OSS) functions provided to competing carriers, as required by the competitive checklist. BellSouth has deployed the same operations support systems throughout its nine-state region, and, in its application, BellSouth relies on data from its entire region to support its assertion that it is in compliance with the requirements of section 271. The Commission reviewed BellSouth's OSS in when it reviewed BellSouth's South Carolina application and found that its OSS were deficient. The Commission uses the determinations it made about BellSouth's operations support systems in its *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, 63 FR 78 (January 2, 1998), as a starting point. In this Order, the Commission reviews the new information BellSouth has provided and finds that BellSouth has not remedied the deficiencies in its OSS that the Commission identified in its *BellSouth South Carolina Order*.

5. In this Order, the Commission finds that BellSouth fails to offer nondiscriminatory access to its OSS functions for the pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning of resale services. Based on the evidence in the record, the Commission made the following conclusions. First, the Commission concludes that, as in its South Carolina application, BellSouth has failed to demonstrate that it is offering competing carriers the ability to order services for resale on a nondiscriminatory basis, *i.e.*, within substantially the same time and manner as BellSouth provides the service to itself. Second, the Commission finds that, as in its South Carolina application, BellSouth has failed to demonstrate that a competing carrier is able to provide service to its customers, using BellSouth's resold service, in substantially the same time and manner that BellSouth provides service to its own retail customers. Third, the Commission concludes that, as in its South Carolina application, BellSouth's pre-ordering system does not provide competing carriers with equivalent access to operational support systems for pre-ordering.

6. *Resale of Contract Service Arrangements*. The Commission also addresses the checklist item that requires incumbent LECs to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail, and not to prohibit, or to impose unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations on, the resale of such telecommunications service. As in its *BellSouth South Carolina Order*, the Commission concludes that BellSouth does not meet this checklist item because it refuses to offer contract service arrangements, which are contractual agreements made between a carrier and a specific, typically high-volume, customer, at a wholesale discount.

7. In this Order, the Commission affirms its conclusion in the *BellSouth South Carolina Order* that neither incumbent LECs nor states may create a general exemption from the requirement that incumbent LECs offer their promotional or discounted offerings, including contract service arrangements, at a wholesale discount. The Commission concludes that BellSouth's argument that contract service arrangements should not be further discounted because they have already been discounted from the tariff rate has been previously considered and rejected by the Commission. Finally, the Commission concludes that BellSouth's refusal to offer contract service arrangements at a wholesale discount is not a local pricing matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the state commission.

8. *Compliance with Section 271(c)(1)(A)*. The Commission also concludes that the Act excludes only cellular providers, not Personal Communications Services (PCS) providers, from being considered ''facilities-based competitors'' for purposes of satisfying section 271(c)(1)(A). Thus, the Commission finds that section 271 does not preclude the Commission from considering, in future applications, the presence of a PCS provider in a particular state as a ''facilities-based competitor.'' The Commission does not address, however, whether the specific PCS carriers on which BellSouth relies in its Louisiana application satisfy section 271(c)(1)(A).

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–3772 Filed 2–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collection(s) Approved by Office of Management and Budget

February 10, 1998.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the following public information collection(s) pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 USC 3501–3520. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Questions concerning the OMB control numbers and expiration dates should be directed to Jerry Cowden, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–0447.

Federal Communications Commission

OMB Control No.: 3060–0291.

Expiration Date:

Title: 90.477 Interconnected systems.

Form Number: Not applicable.

Estimated annual burden: 1,000 hours; 1 hour per response; 1,000 respondents.

Description: This section allows private land mobile radio licensees to use common point telephone interconnection with telephone service costs distributed on a non-profit cost sharing basis. Records of such arrangements must be placed in the licensee's station records and made available to participants in the sharing arrangement and the Commission upon request.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0224.

Expiration Date:

Title: 90.151 Requests for waiver.

Form Number: Not applicable.

Estimated Annual Burden: 120 hours; 2 hours per respondent; 60 respondents.

Description: The Commission has the responsibility to establish and administer rules for the orderly and efficient use of the radio spectrum. Circumstances do arise, however, where general rules cannot properly address the needs of the public, and waiver of those rules is desirable. In order to enable the Commission to make an informed decision on the desirability of such waivers, applicants are required to submit information justifying why a waiver is needed.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0226.

Expiration Date:

Title: 90.135(d) & (e) Modification of license.

Form Number: Not applicable.

Estimated Annual Burden: 276 hours; 0.167 hour per respondent; 1,656 respondents.

Description: These rule paragraphs require licensees who have changed their name, address, number and location of station control points,