

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

Fokker: Docket 94-NM-249-AD.

Applicability: Model F28 Mark 0100 series airplanes; as listed in Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100-52-045, dated August 25, 1993; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (b) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent the opening and/or separation of the large cargo doors while the airplane is in flight, which could result in rapid decompression and/or structural damage to the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, accomplish either paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this AD, as applicable, in accordance with Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100-52-045, dated August 25, 1993.

(1) For airplanes having serial numbers listed in Part 1 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100-52-045, dated August 25, 1993: Perform an inspection to determine the torque value of the attaching parts of the interlock mechanism of the large cargo doors, in accordance with Part 1 of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin. If the torque value is outside the limits specified in paragraphs 2.C.(1) and 2.C.(2) of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin, prior to further flight, adjust the torque value in accordance with the service bulletin.

(2) For airplanes having serial numbers listed in Part 2 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Fokker Service Bulletin SBF100-52-045, dated August 25, 1993: Remove the spring from the interlock mechanism, and install a new microswitch bracket and new springs in the interlock mechanism, in accordance with Part 2 of the Accomplishment Instructions of the service bulletin.

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on July 13, 1995.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
[FR Doc. 95-17707 Filed 7-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[OR45-1-6762b; FRL-5251-5]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision to the State of Oregon's Air Quality Control Plan Volume 2 (The Federal Clean Air Act State Implementation Plan and other State Regulations), specifically a revision to Section 2.2, Legal Authority, of the State's Implementation Plan (SIP) and a revision to Chapters 468 and 468A of the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS). The SIP revision was submitted to address section 110(a)(2)(E) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (CAA).

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 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 the 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 notice.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by August 18, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Montel Livingston, Environmental Protection Specialist (AT-082), Air Programs Section, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Air Programs Section, 1200 6th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101. The State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, 811 SW., Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204-1390.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rindy Ramos, Air & Radiation Branch (AT-082), EPA, Seattle, Washington 98101, (206) 553-6510.

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

Dated: June 23, 1995.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-17671 Filed 7-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CC Docket No. 91-346; DA 95-1512]

Intelligent Networks

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed Rules; Extension of Time.

SUMMARY: This order provides an extension of time for parties to file comments and reply comments on the Intelligent Networks proceeding so that parties can file more substantive responses.

DATES: *Comment dates:* The dates for filing comments and reply comments are July 19, 1995 and August 2, 1995, respectively.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rose Crellin, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau (202) 418-1571.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission proposed to adopt rules on intelligent networks in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in this docket (58 FR 48623, September 17, 1993). In a subsequent public notice, released June 28, 1995, (not published in the **Federal Register**) the Commission sought comment on a filing by Bell Atlantic, GTE, Pacific Bell, Southwestern Bell, and five other local exchange carriers (LECs), which presented an industry-wide collaborative proposal for an intelligent network (IN) project (IN project). In the IN project, the LECs propose to explore the service creation capabilities of IN platforms owned by LECs and third parties in connection with exchange and exchange access services. The LECs propose laboratory tests and field trials to obtain data regarding the requirements and issues

concerning mediated access in the IN. The proposed IN project would be voluntary and may include LECs, interexchange carriers, enhanced service providers, and other telecommunications providers. At the completion of the 24-month IN project, the LECs propose to deliver a final report to the industry and the Commission. The LECs recommend that the Commission recognize the IN Project as the appropriate way to proceed in the IN proceeding.

In addition, the public notice sought comment on a filing by Ameritech on June 26, 1995, in which Ameritech provided an IN competitive network report to the Common Carrier Bureau in which it states that there has been increased competition and consumer choice in access to and use of intelligent network capabilities.

Thus, Ameritech contends, there is no longer a need for the Commission to mandate IN access as proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Adopted: July 5, 1995

Released: July 5, 1995

By the Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau:

1. On June 30, 1995, NYNEX Telephone Companies (NYNEX) requested an extension of time to file comments and reply comments in the Intelligent Networks (INs) proceeding. Comments are scheduled to be filed by July 12, 1995 and replies by July 19, 1995.¹ NYNEX seeks an extension until July 26, 1995 for comments and August 9, 1995 for replies.

2. NYNEX gives three reasons for its request. First, NYNEX argues that it has had difficulty in obtaining the two filings in the proceedings on which the Commission seeks comment. Second, NYNEX argues that the filings "raise complex substantive matters" that will require additional time for adequate review. Third, NYNEX asserts that additional time will enable more focused and thorough submissions.

3. We do not routinely grant extensions of time.² In this case, however, we are persuaded that because of the complexity of the issues presented by the two filings that additional time will enable commenting parties to develop more substantive responses. In the Public Notice, the Commission sought comment on the collaborative proposal for market trials and laboratory tests for intelligent network services filed by Bell Atlantic, GTE, Pacific Bell, Southwestern Bell

¹ Public Notice, Intelligent Networks Proceeding, CC Docket 91-346, DA 95-1456, released June 28, 1995.

² 47 C.F.R. 1.46(a).

and five other supporting local exchange carriers (LECs). The LECs presented the proposal as the method for the Commission to proceed on INs rather than the mediated access proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in CC Docket No. 91-346 (58 FR 48623, September 17, 1993). The Public Notice also sought comment on the report filed by Ameritech regarding competitively provided INs. Ameritech contends that there has been increased competition and consumer choice in access to and use of IN capabilities since the release of the NPRM. Thus, Ameritech contends that the Commission should not mandate third party access.

4. Because of the complex technology and competitive issues presented by these filings, we conclude that parties should have additional time to develop their responses. Although it is important to provide parties sufficient time to more fully respond to the two filings, we decline to provide the full period requested by NYNEX because it would result in delays in the proceeding. We conclude that an additional week for the comment and reply periods will provide parties with sufficient time to prepare responses. Therefore, we grant all parties an extension of time for the filing of comments from July 12, 1995 to July 19, 1995 and for the filing of reply comments from July 19, 1995 to August 2, 1995.

4. Accordingly, it is ordered that the NYNEX Request for Extension of Time is granted to the extent provided herein, and otherwise is denied.³

Federal Communications Commission.

James D. Schlichting,

Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-17790 Filed 7-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 93-191; RM-8088]

Television Broadcasting Services; Pueblo, CO

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; denial.

SUMMARY: The Commission denies a petition for rule making filed jointly by the University of Southern Colorado

³ This action is taken pursuant to Sections 4(j) and 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(j) and 155(c), and authority delegated thereunder pursuant to Sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. 0.91 and 0.291.