

safeguards the Commission has put into place to protect against anticompetitive practices by the BOCs. The Commission described how the ONA model had evolved, and the forms of network unbundling it encompasses today and is likely to cover in the future. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking also outlined the other safeguards that are designed to work in concert with ONA to protect against anticompetitive practices by the BOCs. Parties were asked to comment on the specific issue identified by the court: Whether these nonstructural safeguards are sufficient for the BOCs to be granted full structural relief.

6. The Commission also asked parties to comment on broader issues regarding the relative merits of structural and nonstructural safeguards. The Commission noted that, although there is evidence to suggest that nonstructural safeguards have been effective, various parties have argued that structural separation should be reimposed on the BOCs. In order to provide it with information to make an informed decision, the Commission asked commenters to provide specific evidence as to the relative costs and benefits of structural separation and nonstructural safeguards.

7. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking also sought comment on the protection against discrimination necessary to allow ESPs and BOCs to compete effectively without creating unnecessary burdens, whether certain types of enhanced services may require greater protection than others, and whether structural separation or additional nonstructural safeguards are needed for specific enhanced services. Parties were asked to identify any specific unbundled network services that BOCs do not currently provide which meet the criteria established in *Computer III* for service unbundling. To the extent that parties propose a reimposition of structural separation, the Commission asked that they identify the benefits that they believe will accrue for the provision of enhanced services to consumers from such action, and articulate why these benefits cannot be achieved under a regime of nonstructural safeguards.

8. Finally, the Commission recognized that a return to some form of structural separation requirements at this time would impose certain transition costs on the BOCs, and could result in service disruption and customer confusion. The Commission therefore asked parties to identify transitional expenses that would be borne by customers of BOC enhanced services, and to indicate whether a return to structural separation requirements would result in

disruptions of service or confusion among customers. To the extent that parties believe structural separation is appropriate, the Commission asked them to describe particular scenarios and timetables under which BOCs would be required to move from the existing partially integrated CEI plan regime, and to identify the specific costs and benefits of those scenarios.

Ordering Clauses

1. Accordingly, *it is ordered* That, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1, 4, and 201-205 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 154, and 201-205, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is hereby adopted.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 64

Communications common carriers, Computer technology.

Federal Communications Commission.
William F. Caton,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-5491 Filed 3-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 95-29, RM-8596]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Iron Mountain, MI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Superior Media Group, Inc., proposing the allotment of Channel 294A to Iron Mountain, Michigan, as that community's third local FM service. The channel can be allotted to Iron Mountain without a site restriction at coordinates 45-49-12 and 88-04-06. Canadian concurrence will be requested for this allotment.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before April 24, 1995, and reply comments on or before May 9, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: Matthew H. McCormick, Reddy, Begley, Martin & McCormick, 1001 22nd Street, NW, Suite 350, Washington, D. C. 20037.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Notice of*

Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 95-29, adopted February 21, 1995, and released March 2, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Services, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037, (202) 857-3800.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-5492 Filed 3-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

48 CFR Parts 45, 52

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Government Property

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of cancellation and rescheduling of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The public meetings originally scheduled for March 9, and 10, 1995, as part of the continuing initiative to rewrite the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 45, Government Property, have been canceled and rescheduled for April 6, 1995, and April 7, 1995.

DATES: Public Meetings: The public meetings will be conducted at the address shown below from 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., local time, on April 6, 1995; and from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., local time, on April 7, 1995.

Statements: Statements from interested parties for presentation at the