

40 CFR Part 52

[MA-26-1-6173b; A-1-FRL-5123-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; RACT for Nichols and Stone Company

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Massachusetts. This revision establishes and requires reasonably available control technology (RACT) for Nichols & Stone Company in Gardner, MA. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received by February 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Linda M. Murphy, Director, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, JFK Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, 10th floor, Boston, MA; and Division of Air Quality Control, Department of Environmental Protection, One Winter Street, 8th Floor, Boston, MA 02108.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: September 18, 1994.

John P. DeVillars,

Regional Administrator, Region I.

[FR Doc. 95-293 Filed 1-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 52

[AL 38-1-6571b; FRL-5123-9]

Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of Redesignation of the Leeds Area of Jefferson County, AL, to Attainment for Lead

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Alabama for the purpose of redesignating the Leeds area to attainment for lead. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do at this time.

DATES: To be considered, comments must be received by February 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to: Kimberly Bingham, Regulatory Planning and Development Section, Air Programs Branch, Air, Pesticides & Toxics Management Division, Region 4 Environmental Protection Agency, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

Copies of the material submitted by the state of Alabama may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (Air Docket 6102), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 Air Programs Branch, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365.

Alabama Department of Environmental Management, Office of General Counsel, 1751 Cong. W. L. Dickinson Drive, Montgomery, Alabama 36130.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kimberly Bingham, Regulatory Planning

and Development Section, Air Programs Branch, Air Pesticides & Toxics Management Division, Region 4 Environmental Protection Agency, 345 Courtland Street, NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30365. The telephone number is (404) 347-2864.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information see the direct final rule which is published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: December 7, 1994.

Patrick M. Tobin,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-285 Filed 1-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

40 CFR Part 52

[MD3-2-5624b, MD10-2-6169b, MD24-2-5968b, MD25-1-6146b, MD28-1-6147b; FRL-5123-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; VOC RACT Catch-ups and Stage I Vapor Recovery

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Maryland. These revisions establish statewide applicability for Maryland's category-specific volatile organic compound (VOC) reasonably available control technology (RACT) regulations, lower the applicability threshold for VOC RACT regulations, and correct deficiencies in Maryland's Stage I Vapor Recovery rule. These revisions were submitted to comply with the RACT "Catch-up" and "Fix-up" provisions of the Clean Air Act (the Act). The intended effect of this action is to propose approval of revisions to Maryland's category-specific VOC RACT regulations, including Stage I. This action is being taken in accordance with the SIP submittal and revision provisions of the Act.

In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public

comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by February 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Thomas J. Maslany, Director, Air Radiation, and Toxics Division (3AT00), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107 and the Maryland Department of the Environment, 2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, 21224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria A. Pino, (215) 597-9337.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final action of the same title, pertaining to revisions to Maryland's category-specific VOC RACT regulations, including Stage I, which is located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: October 19, 1994.

Peter H. Kostmayer,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 95-287 Filed 1-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 61 and 69

[CC Docket No. 91-213, FCC No. 94-325]

Transport Rate Structure and Pricing

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: On December 22, 1994, the Commission released a Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking inviting comments from interested parties on proposals to stimulate the resale and

sharing of network facilities by common carriers through the use of "split billing." Split billing is a billing arrangement that enables multiple customers to share or resell entrance facilities and direct-trunked transport facilities. Implementing procedures for common carriers to provide split billing will enable smaller customers to better obtain the benefits of, and contribute to, the Commission's goal of more efficient use of network facilities by allowing pricing to reflect costs, by permitting a rate structure which is conducive to competition, and by encouraging the development of full and fair competition.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 1, 1995; reply comments must be received on or before February 16, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554; one copy shall also be filed with the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc. (ITS, Inc.), 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 857-3800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Debra Sabourin, Common Carrier Bureau, (202) 418-1530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Summary of Transport Rate Structure and Pricing

On December 22, 1994, the Commission released a Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in its Transport Rate Structure and Pricing proceeding, CC Docket No. 91-213, FCC No. 94-325. In this Order, the Commission tentatively concludes that it is in the public interest to require local exchange carriers (LECs) to offer split billing for their transport service, and that it is also in the public interest to require these carriers to include in their tariffs procedures for offering transport split billing. Split billing is a billing arrangement that enables multiple customers to share or resell entrance facilities and direct-trunked transport facilities.

Proposed rule. Through LEC split billing and shared network arrangements, customers can reap the maximum benefit from the restructured transport rates. LEC split billing would help smaller interexchange carriers (IXCs) reduce their access costs by enabling them to resell the services of other IXCs or by utilizing network sharing arrangements with other carriers to transmit and terminate interstate calls. It could also solve the practical billing problems that have arisen regarding Feature Group A and B access

services. Finally, split billing could permit more efficient deployment and use of transport facilities, a primary goal of the transport restructure. The Commission therefore tentatively concludes that split billing for transport service is in the public interest. It further tentatively concludes that it should require the LECs to include in their tariffs procedures for offering transport split billing. The Commission seeks comment on these conclusions.

Implementation. As the record on this issue indicates, the parties strongly disagree on how best to implement split billing. Although the industry's Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) has made progress, it has not yet been able to reach final closure on an access charge split billing prototype after 11 months of consideration. The Commission therefore seeks comment on how best to implement the proposed split billing requirement.

First, the Commission seeks comment on a proposal offered by CompTel in the transport tariff review proceeding. CompTel urges the Commission to adopt the following affirmative steps to make resale and sharing feasible: (1) require the LECs to permit switched and special access facilities to be combined at the customer POP, LEC serving wire centers, or any other designated hubbing locations; (2) require the LECs to permit multiple carriers of record for DS3 and DS1 entrance and interoffice facilities; (3) require the LECs to offer "split billing" for multiplexing equipment located at a hub; and (4) require the LECs to permit the IXC to specify (i) the type and grade of switched access service as well as the code at the terminating hub, and (ii) the customer premises location associated with special access channels. The Commission seeks comment on whether it should adopt any of these proposed requirements.

Second, the Commission seeks comment on whether a split billing charge levied on multiple customers of record using a single high-capacity facility should be set to recover the cost of unused as well as used capacity. For example, should a LEC be allowed to charge an end-user customer for its use of a high-capacity facility at a rate computed by dividing total flat charges for the entrance and interoffice facilities by the number of end-users whose traffic is carried over that facility, with a pro rata allocation of the costs of unused capacity in that rate? Commenters should address the issue of which entity would be responsible for determining the allocation, the service design and capability and the circuit facility assignment under such an