

2. Add § 3001.103 to subpart G to read as follows:

§ 3001.103 Filing of reports required by 39 U.S.C. 3663(b).

Each report listed in this section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Commission on or before March 15th of each year, and shall cover the most recent full fiscal year. Information contained in these reports that is considered to be commercially sensitive should be identified as such, and will not be publicly disclosed except as required by applicable law. Specific sources cited in this section should be understood to include any successor or substituted source.

(a) The International Cost and Revenue Analysis—PRC and USPS Versions.

(b) The Cost and Revenue Analysis Report—PRC Version. If an unaudited version is provided on March 15, provide an audited version no later than May 15 that describes all adjustments that affect international mail.

(c) The Cost Segments and Components Report—PRC Version. If an unaudited version is provided on March 15, provide an audited version no later than May 15 that describes all adjustments that affect international mail.

(d) Documentation and workpapers for the ICRA, including those related to:

- (1) Terminal dues.
- (2) Air conveyance dues.
- (3) Transit charges.
- (4) Imbalance charges.
- (5) Inward land charges.

(6) Description of cost allocation procedures.

(7) Identification of costs that are exclusive to international mail.

(8) The cost of joint ventures with other postal administrations.

(9) International billing determinants.

(10) The data for Direct Entry separated between inbound and outbound as in the Postal Service's response to Item 1 of order no. 1246.

(11) The attributable costs for ValuePost/Canada developed in accordance with the procedure described in the Postal Service's response to Item 2 of order no. 1251, or any alternative procedure deemed appropriate as a basis for setting the rates for ValuePost/Canada. Costs for ValuePost/Canada should be separated between publications and all other printed matter. Its revenues and volumes should also be separated between publications and all other printed matter.

(e) Handbooks pertaining to the collection of volume and revenue data (MIDAS, SIRVO, SIRVI, Other) if they

were revised or replaced since they were last submitted.

(f) International CRA manual input, A, B, C, and factor reports on a CD-ROM.

(g) A hard copy of the International CRA manual input and the C report.

(h) Cost Segment 3 CRA Worksheets and all supporting files, including the MODS-Based Costing Studies—PRC Version. Include all databases, SAS and other programs, and output worksheets.

(i) Cost Segment 7 CRA worksheets and all supporting files.

(j) The number of weighted tallies by international service separately for clerks and mailhandlers, and for city delivery carriers in-office; clerk and mailhandler tallies should be further separated for mail processing, window service, and all other.

(k) Coefficients of variation for:

(1) IOCS clerk and mailhandler tallies by mail processing, window service, and all other.

(2) IOCS city delivery carriers in-office.

(3) TRACS for purchased transportation by international, air, railroad, and other.

(4) Outbound volume by international service.

(5) Inbound volume by international service.

(l) The percentage of household mail and the percentage of non-household mail for each outbound mail service.

(m) The percentage of single-piece mail and bulk mail for each outbound service.

[FR Doc. 99-30711 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7715-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 126-0190b; FRL-6477-8]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, and Yolo-Solano County Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve revisions to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concern the control of volatile organic

compounds (VOC) from the storage and transfer of gasoline, loading of organic liquids, and fugitive hydrocarbons.

The intended effect of this action is to regulate emissions of VOC in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received, no further activity is contemplated. 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. Any parties interested in commenting should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received by December 27, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Christine Vineyard, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rule revisions and EPA's evaluation report of each rule are available for public inspection at EPA's Region 9 office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rule revisions are also available for inspection at the following locations:

Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), 401 "M" Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, 777 12th Street 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-1908.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 26 Castilian Drive, B-23, Goleta, CA 93301.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003.

Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, 1947 Galileo Ct., Suite 103, Davis, CA 95616.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Vineyard, [AIR-4], Air

Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1197).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document concerns Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Rule 447, Organic Liquid Loading, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Rule 316, Storage & Transfer of Gasoline, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District Rule 70, Storage & Transfer of Gasoline, and Yolo-Solano County Air Pollution Control District Rule 2.23, Fugitive Hydrocarbons. These rules were submitted to EPA on June 23, 1998, March 10, 1998, August 1, 1997, and November 30, 1994, respectively, by the California Air Resources Board. For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action that is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 5, 1999.

Laura Yoshii,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99-30610 Filed 11-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 61

[CC Docket Nos. 94-1 and 96-262; FCC 99-345]

Prescription of Local Exchange Carrier Price Cap Productivity Offset ("X-Factor")

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document seeks comment on the represcription of the productivity offset, or "X-factor," in the local exchange carrier price cap formula. The X-factor of 6.5 percent prescribed by the Commission in the 1997 *Price Cap Performance Review Order* was reversed and remanded to the agency by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Therefore, the Commission seeks comment on the retroactive prescription of the X-factor for the period affected by the court's remand, from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000, and on the prospective prescription, from July 1, 2000 forward. The Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("FNPRM") identifies three studies on which the historical component of the X-factor prescription may be based: the 1997 staff total factor productivity ("TFP") study relied upon

in the 1997 order; a new 1999 staff TFP study; or a staff Imputed X study. This document also seeks comment on whether a consumer productivity dividend ("CPD") should be included in the X-factor.

DATES: Comments are due on or before December 30, 1999, and reply comments are due on or before January 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Aaron Goldschmidt, (202) 418-1520.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1997, the Commission represcribed the amount by which it annually adjusts price caps for incumbent local exchange carriers subject to the price cap rules ("price cap LECs"). *Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers*, 62 FR 31939, June 11, 1997 ("1997 Price Cap Review Order"). The revised price cap adjustment required price cap LECs to reduce inflation-adjusted prices for interstate access services by an "X-factor" of 6.5 percent annually. Pursuant to petitions for review of the Commission's order, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reversed and remanded the Commission's decision. *USTA v. FCC*, 188 F.3d 521 (D.C. Cir. 1999). The court has stayed issuance of its mandate until April 1, 2000, to allow time for the Commission to conduct this proceeding. *USTA v. FCC*, Nos. 97-1469 *et al.*, (D.C. Cir. June 21, 1999).

In this Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("FNPRM") we seek comment on how we should represcribe an X-factor. More specifically, we seek comment on prescribing two separate X-factors to address retroactively the period affected by the court remand (July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000), and prospectively the period from July 1, 2000 forward, or a single X-factor to cover the combined period. Specifically, we seek comment on three possible bases for setting the historical component of the X-factor: (1) by relying on the results of the 1997 staff TFP study used in the 1997 order; (2) by relying on the results of a new 1999 staff TFP study that makes several adjustments to the 1997 staff study; or (3) by relying on the results of a new staff Imputed X study that determines the X-factor that would have produced a competitive level of capital compensation in the interstate jurisdiction during the period between price cap performance reviews.

Further, we seek comment on resetting, on a forward-looking basis, price cap LEC prices to a level that is

consistent with any X-factor prescription in order to rebalance the sharing of benefits of price caps between LECs and their customers. This FNPRM is limited to issues surrounding the setting of the X-factor, and does not include any broader changes to our method of price cap regulation.

In a separate but related proceeding, the Commission is seeking comment on a proposal submitted by the Coalition for Affordable Local and Long Distance Services ("CALLS"). See *Access Charge Reform, Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers, Low-Volume Long Distance Users, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, 64 FR 50527, September 16, 1999. The CALLS proposal would purportedly eliminate the necessity of retrospectively adjusting the X-factor in response to the court's remand. Instead, it would keep the X-factor at 6.5 percent, but would target X-factor reductions to the traffic-sensitive price cap basket. Once local switching rates reached a certain level, all price cap indices would be frozen. Adoption of the CALLS proposal would also eliminate the need to prescribe an X-factor on a going-forward basis. We seek comment in this proceeding on the prescription of the X-factor because, in the event that the CALLS proposal is not adopted, or not all price cap LECs become signatories to the proposal, the Commission must be prepared to prescribe a new X-factor before April 1, 2000.

Option 1: The 1997 Staff TFP Study

We seek comment on whether we should use only the results from the 1997 staff TFP study in setting the historical component of the X-factor for the remand period. We seek comment on whether, in addressing the court's remand, we are precluded from revising the X-factor using any other methodology, or from supplementing the data in the 1997 staff TFP study.

The court did not find fault with the 1997 staff TFP study, and did not ask us to revisit it. Instead, the court limited its critique of TFP to our selection of a value at the upper end of the reasonableness range, and with the upward adjustment to the reasonable range.

In their responses to a 1998 request to refresh the record in our *Access Charge Reform* proceeding, both USTA and AT&T used the methodology in the 1997 staff TFP study to extend the calculation of the X-factor through 1997. USTA has also calculated an X-factor for 1998. We seek comment on the legal and logical arguments supporting consideration of data that have become available after the