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 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. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

H. 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 action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

I. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by March 27, 2000. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: January 5, 2000.

A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations*, is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42.U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart L—Georgia

2. In § 52.570(c), the table is amended by revising the entry for 391–3–20 to read as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

EPA-APPROVED GEORGIA REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* *	*	* *	*	*
391–3–20	Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance.	November 12, 1998	March 27, 2000.	
* *	*	* *	*	*

[FR Doc. 00–1834 Filed 1–25–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 21 and 74

[MM Docket 97–217, DA 00–99]

MDS and ITFS Two-Way Transmissions

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petitions for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: This item gives notice of the filing of petitions for reconsideration and sets out the dates for oppositions and replies to those oppositions.

DATES: Oppositions to the petitions for reconsideration are due February 10, 2000. Replies to oppositions are due February 22, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dave Roberts (202) 418–1600, Video Services Division, Mass Media Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received six petitions for further reconsideration of its *Report and Order on Reconsideration,* MM Docket, 97–217, 64 FR 63727. The petitions were filed by: Wireless Cable Association International, *et al.*; the Catholic Television Network; BellSouth; the Archdiocese of Los Angeles; IPWireless, Inc.; and the National ITFS Association. In the *Report and Order on Reconsideration*, the Commission made changes to the rules adopted in previous order which enabled licensees in the Multipoint Distribution Service (''MDS'') and Instructional Television Fixed Service (''ITFS'') to engage in fixed two-way transmissions. The petitioners seek further changes. The full text of the petitions for further reconsideration are available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Room, Room CY–A257, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc. (''ITS''), Portals II, 445 12th Street,

SW Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554.

List of Subjects

47 CFR Part 21

Communications common carriers, Communications equipment, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Television.

47 CFR Part 74

Communications equipment, Education, Reporting and Recordkeeping requirements, Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–1797 Filed 1–25–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 68

[CC Docket No. 88–57; FCC 99–405]

Review of the Commission's Rules Concerning Connection of Simple Inside Wiring to the Telephone Network and Petition for Modification of the Commission's Rules Filed by the Electronic Industries Association

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends Commission rules regarding the establishment of quality standards for inside wiring, to promote the availability of quality telecommunications facilities that will not frustrate consumer access to existing and advanced telecommunications services. The Commission also affirms the gold or gold equivalent standard for connectors, and decline to designate schools and hospitals as multiunit structures, establish requirements compelling notification of building owners and tenants with respect to additional network protectors, and establish a standard time period for carrier responses to customer requests for inside wiring information.

DATES: Effective July 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Paladini, Attorney, 202/418–2332, Fax 202/418–2345, TTY 202/418–2224, *vpaladin@fcc.gov,* Common Carrier Bureau.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Third Report and Order (Third R&O) in CC Docket No. 88– 57; FCC 99–405, adopted December 21, 1999, and released January 10, 2000. The complete text of this Third R&O is available for inspection and copying during the weekday hours of 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the FCC Reference Center, Room CY–A257, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554, or copies may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., 445 12th Street, SW., Suite CY–B400, Washington, D.C. 20554, phone (202) 314–3070.

Synopsis of the Third Report and Order

1. In the Review of §§ 68.104 and 68.213 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Connection of Simple Inside Wiring to the Telephone Network and Petition for Modification of § 68.213 of the Commission's Rules filed by the Electronic Industries Association, Order on Reconsideration, Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 88–57, RM–5643, 12 FCC Rcd 11897, (1997), 62 FR 36476, the Commission included a Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking requesting comment on proposed modifications to the demarcation point rule, BICSI's proposed enhanced wire quality standards, and the gold or gold equivalent standard.

2. In this Order, we adopt material standards for copper, twisted pair wire used in new, simple inside wiring installations. We introduce this standard into our regulations to identify a ''standard industry practice.'' This action will benefit consumers and small businesses using legacy voice telecommunications services as well as those seeking to access broadband services. We envision that consumers may enforce this rule by prosecuting claims against builders and contractors that have utilized inferior wiring in new construction. For example, an aggrieved consumer or building owner, beset by problems caused by poor quality inside wire, may make a civil claim against a builder or contractor for breach of implied warranty of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. We also anticipate that telecommunications wiring standards will be adopted by building industry organizations, and reflected in local building codes.

3. Poor-quality, non-twisted pair inside wiring can cause network harm in the form of ''cross-talk,'' resulting in a loss of privacy, interference with digital transmission, and disruption of telephone conversations. The presence of inferior wiring may not be immediately apparent to homeowners and homebuyers, since the potential for future problems may be difficult to detect. Once a problem is discovered, homeowners often must rewire the affected premises to rectify the problem, at a cost substantially higher than the cost of initially installing quality inside wiring.

4. A primary cause of this troublesome situation is that the simple inside wiring market does not function correctly because homebuyers are shut out of the inside wire selection process. Building contractors and developers generally select telecommunications wire long before the homebuyer has entered the picture, and that this situation allows builders to prioritize lower cost over quality when purchasing wire to be used for simple inside wiring. When homeowners become aware of the problem, such as when they attempt to install an additional line or experience audible cross-talk, it is often too late to seek reparations from the builder or contractor. Thus, since the ''purchasing entity,'' in this case the builder or contractor, is not held accountable for the problems caused by its least-cost-based decision, market forces will not protect the consumer's interest in quality inside wiring. Thus, we establish a wire quality standard to correct this market malfunction.

5. We find that it is in the public interest to adopt inside wiring quality standards in order to protect consumers and the PSTN from such harm. Thus, we amend § 68.213(c) of the Commission's rules to adopt enhanced wire quality standards for simple inside wiring. Specifically, we require that copper inside wiring installed July 24, 2000, shall be, at a minimum, solid, 24 gauge or thicker, twisted pairs, marked to indicate compliance with the electrical specifications for Category 3, as defined in the ANSI/EIA/TIA Building Wiring Standards. Inside wiring material exceeding the minimum requirements specified in § 68.213(c) as amended by this Order may be used and should be marked to indicate those characteristics. We note that the inside wiring requirements that we adopt in this Order apply only to copper conductor specifically installed for use as simple inside wiring for telecommunications service. We define the scope of this regulation specifically to avoid precluding the development and use of other transmission media that may be able to function in place of twisted pair copper inside wiring.

6. We emphasize that the inside wiring quality standards we adopt in this do not imply that inferior materials may be used instead of copper. Under § 68.108 of our rules, carriers are afforded certain self-help privileges