Relevant Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the New Rule.

The Commission is not aware of any other federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the final rulemaking.

List of Subjects

46 CFR Part 515

Exports, Freight, Freight forwarders, Maritime carriers, Non-vessel-operating common carriers, Ocean transportation intermediaries, Licensing requirements, Financial responsibility requirements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

46 CFR Part 545

Antitrust, Exports, Freight forwarders, Maritime carriers, Non-vessel-operating common carriers, Ocean transportation intermediaries, Licensing requirements, Financial responsibility requirements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Federal Maritime Commission amends 46 CFR chapter IV, subchapter B, as set forth below:

PART 515—LICENSING, FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, AND GENERAL DUTIES FOR OCEAN TRANSPORTATION INTERMEDIARIES

1. The authority citation for part 515 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 553, 31 U.S.C. 9701; 46 U.S.C. app. 1702, 1707, 1709, 1710, 1712, 1714, 1716, and 1718; Pub. L. 105–383, 112 Stat. 3411; 21 U.S.C. 862.

2. In § 515.23, revise the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 515.23 Claims against an ocean transportation intermediary.

The Commission or another party may seek payment from the bond, insurance, or other surety that is obtained by an ocean transportation intermediary pursuant to this section. (*See also* § 545.3 of this chapter.)

* * * * *

PART 545—INTERPRETATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF POLICY

1. The authority citation for part 545 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 553; 46 U.S.C. app. 1706, 1707, 1709, 1716, and 1718; Pub. L. 105–383, 112 Stat. 3411; 46 CFR 515.23.

2. Add § 545.3 to read as follows:

§ 545.3 Interpretation of § 515.23(b) of this chapter—Payment pursuant to a claim against an ocean transportation intermediary.

A claimant seeking to settle a claim in accordance with § 515.23(b)(1) of this chapter should promptly provide to the financial responsibility provider all documents and information relating to and supporting its claim for the purpose of evaluating the validity and subject matter of the claim.

By the Commission.

Bryant L. VanBrakle,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–13088 Filed 5–23–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 51 and 54

[CC Docket No. 95–20, FCC 99–387]

Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; Clarification

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Clarification of final rule.

SUMMARY: This document grants in part and denies in part a petition to reconsider the Commission's Computer III Remand Order, stating that the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) should no longer be required to file service-specific Comparably Efficient Interconnection (CEI) plans for information services that are offered on an integrated basis through the regulated entity and obtain approval of those plans prior to initiating or altering their intraLATA information services. This document clarifies that BOCs are obligated to post on their websites a complete copy of all their CEI plans.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 24, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann Stevens, Attorney, Common Carrier Bureau, Policy and Program Planning Division, (202) 418–1580. Further information may also be obtained by calling the Common Carrier Bureau's TTY number: 202–418–0484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order adopted December 9, 1999, and released December 17, 1999. The full text of this Order is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC. The complete text also may be obtained through the World Wide Web, at *http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/CommonCarrier/ Orders/fcc99–387.wp,* or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc. (202) 857–3800, 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Regulatory Flexibility Certification

Bell Atlantic and SBC submitted comments on July 12, 1999 and CIX and BellSouth Corporation filed replies to the comments to the Commission's request for comment on its certification. In this present Order , the Commission promulgates no additional final rules, and our action does not affect the previous analysis.

Synopsis of Order on Reconsideration

1. In this Order, we address a petition for reconsideration or clarification of the Computer III Remand Order, CC Docket No. 95–20, FCC 99–387, filed by Commercial Internet eXchange Association (CIX).

2. The Commission concluded in that order that although the BOCs must continue to comply with their CEI obligations, they should no longer be required to file or obtain pre-approval of CEI plans and plan amendments before initiating or altering their intraLATA information services. Instead, we required the BOCs to ''post on their publicly accessible Internet page, linked to and searchable from the BOCs main Internet page, their CEI plan for any new or altered intraLATA information service offering, and to notify the Common Carrier Bureau upon such posting.

3. CIX filed a petition for reconsideration or clarification of two aspects of two aspects of the Computer III Report and Order, 64 FR 14141 (3/24/99). CIX first asks that the Commission establish that incumbent LECs must disclose in advance and via their web sites the planned deployment of digital subscriber line access multiplexers (DSLAMs) on a wire-center basis, and provide adequate prior notice on the status of line conditioning for a given customer or group of customers. Information on the deployment of broadband telecommunications, CIX continues, should be available to all competing information services providers (ISPs), and should not be used as a means to favor the incumbent's affiliated ISP. CIX also asks that the Commission clarify that the BOCs are obligated to post a complete copy of all their CEI plans on their websites, so that all ISPs have ready information available concerning interconnection with the BOC's ''last mile'' network.

II. Discussion

4. The Commission has reviewed the initial request made by CIX in its petition—that we clarify our network information disclosure rules to require incumbent local exchange carriers to provide information regarding DSLAMs and line conditioning to ISPs. CIX essentially asks the Commission to clarify that section 251(c)(5) of the Communications Act and the rules implementing that section require disclosure of such information. We decline to do so. The Commission did not raise this issue in the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in these dockets. Thus, the CIX request for clarification with regard to information on deployment of DSLAMs and line conditioning is beyond the scope of this proceeding. Accordingly, we deny that request for clarification on reconsideration.

5. CIX next requests that the Commission clarify that the BOCs are obligated to post on their websites a complete copy of all their CEI plans—rather than merely a copy of ''new or altered'' plans. We grant this request. It was not our intention in the Computer III Report and Order to exclude from the CEI posting requirement the BOCs' existing plans. As CIX notes in its petition, it is important for all CEI plans to be available on the BOCs' websites, including those previously filed plans. Otherwise, it would be difficult for the ISPs to get information regarding plans filed with the Commission under the prior CEI regime. Moreover, we do not believe that requiring the BOCs to post all their plans and plan amendments—both old and new—is unduly burdensome, especially given the benefit of having all these plans in one, easily accessible place. Accordingly, we clarify that the BOCs must post all their existing and new CEI plans and plan amendments on their Internet websites and notify the Common Carrier Bureau at the time of the posting.

III. Ordering Clause

6. The petition for reconsideration and clarification filed by the Commercial Internet eXchange Association IS GRANTED IN PART and IS DENIED IN PART, to the extent discussed above.

Federal Communications Commission
Magalie Roman Salas,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00–13039 Filed 5–23–00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 575

[Docket No. 00–7364]

RIN 2127–AG96

Consumer Information Regulations: Uniform Tire Quality Grading Test Procedures

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the treadwear testing procedures under the Uniform Tire Quality Grading Standards (UTQGS). To ensure the consistency of the treadwear grades from one year to the next, the agency monitors the changing roughness of the test course, periodically calculates a base course wear rate (BCWR), and uses it to adjust the measured wear rates of tires driven over the course. To monitor the test course, the agency uses special tires designated as course monitoring tires (CMTs).

The agency is amending the UTQGS to change the computation of the BCWR used in calculating the treadwear grade of passenger car tires. These amendments establish a direct comparison of the wear rates of CMTs used as the control standard with the wear rates of the candidate tires, *i.e.,* the tires being tested for the purposes of grading. This direct comparison will result in more consistent treadwear ratings by compensating for any changes or variations in CMT characteristics. NHTSA will measure the wear rate of CMTs 4 times per year and use the average wear rate from the last 4 quarterly CMT tests as a basis for the BCWR. NHTSA is further requiring that CMTs used to determine wear rate be not more than 1 year old at the commencement of the test and that the CMTs used in the test must be used within 2 months after removal from storage.

DATES: Effective date: The amendments in this final rule are effective July 24, 2000.

Petitions for reconsideration of this final rule must be received by NHTSA not later than July 10, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Petitions for reconsideration should be submitted to the Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For technical issues: Mr. Sanjay Patel, Safety Standards Engineer, Office of Planning and Consumer Programs, Office of Safety Performance Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590; telephone (202) 366–0307.

For legal issues: Mr. Stephen P. Wood, Assistant Chief Counsel for Rulemaking, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590; telephone (202) 366–2992.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

1. Current Provisions.

Section 30123(e) of title 49, United States Code (U.S.C.) requires the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe a uniform system for grading motor vehicle tires to assist consumers in making informed choices when purchasing tires. In response to that congressional mandate, NHTSA established the Uniform Tire Quality Grading Standards (UTQGS) in 49 CFR 575.104.

The UTQGS require tire manufacturers and tire brand name owners to grade their tires with respect to the tires' relative performance with respect to treadwear, traction, and temperature resistance. Treadwear grades are shown by numbers, such as 100, 160, and 200, with the higher numbers indicating greater treadwear performance. The traction grades are indicated by AA, A, B, and C, with AA representing the highest performance characteristics and C the lowest. The temperature resistance grades are indicated by the letters A, B, and C, with A representing the best performance and C indicating the minimum level of performance necessary to comply with Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The UTQGS provide that treadwear grades are developed first by running the tires being graded, called ''candidate tires,'' over a selected 400-mile segment of public highway outside San Angelo, Texas. After an 800-mile ''break-in'' run, the candidate tires are driven over the test course for a total of 6,400 miles in test convoys composed of 4 passenger cars and/or light trucks. Each driver remains in the same position within the convoy. The vehicles are regularly rotated among the 4 positions in the convoy as are the positions of the tires on the test vehicles so that each candidate tire gets equal time with each driver, each vehicle, and each wheel position.