

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