BOC in order to satisfy section 271(c)(1)(A).

3. According to SBC, its ''implemented agreement with Brooks Fiber (Brooks) satisfies all the requirements of [section 271(c)(1)(A)].'' The Commission concludes, however, that Brooks' provision of local exchange service on a test basis to the homes of four of its employees does not qualify Brooks as a ''competing provider[ ] of telephone exchange service . . . to residential . . . subscribers,'' as required by section 271(c)(1)(A). Nor is the Commission persuaded that Brooks is a competing provider of telephone exchange service to residential and business subscribers merely because it has an effective tariff in place for the provision of both business and residential service in Oklahoma, or because it may have engaged in certain types of limited media advertising. Brooks represents, and SBC has not disputed, that Brooks ''is not now offering residential service in Oklahoma, nor has it ever offered residential service in Oklahoma,'' and that it ''is not accepting any request in Oklahoma for residential service.'' As a result, the Commission concludes that SBC has not demonstrated on this record that it is providing access and interconnection to an unaffiliated, facilities-based competing provider of telephone exchange service to residential and business subscribers, as required by section 271(c)(1)(A) of the Act.

4. The Commission further concludes that, under the circumstances presented in this application, SBC may not obtain authorization to provide in-region interLATA services in Oklahoma pursuant to section 271(c)(1)(B) at this time. Section 271(c)(1)(B) of the Act allows a BOC to seek entry without satisfying section 271(c)(1)(A) if ''no such provider has requested the access and interconnection described in [section 271(c)(1)(A)]'' and the BOC's statement of generally available terms and conditions has been approved or permitted to take effect by the applicable state regulatory commission. All parties appear to agree that, if SBC has received a ''request'' that is referred to in section 271(c)(1)(B), which is hereinafter referred to as a ''qualifying request,'' the statute bars SBC from proceeding under Track B. The Commission agrees with this analysis and concludes that, in order to decide whether SBC's application may proceed under Track B, the Commission must determine whether SBC has received a ''qualifying request''. The Commission concludes that a qualifying request under section 271(c)(1)(B) is a request for negotiation to obtain access and interconnection that, if implemented, would satisfy the requirements of section 271(c)(1)(A). The Commission further concludes that the request for access and interconnection must be from an unaffiliated competing provider that seeks to provide the type of telephone exchange service described in section 271(c)(1)(A). Such a request need not be made by an operational competing provider, as some BOCs suggest. Rather, the qualifying request may be submitted by a potential provider of telephone exchange service to residential and business subscribers.

5. The Commission reaches this conclusion for several reasons. As a matter of statutory interpretation, the Commission finds that this reading, by giving full effect to the meaning of the term ''request'' in section 271(c)(1)(B), is the one most consistent with the statutory design. In addition, as a matter of policy, the Commission finds that this interpretation will best further Congress' goal of introducing competition in the local exchange market by giving BOCs an incentive to cooperate with potential competitors in providing them the facilities they need to fulfill their requests for access and interconnection. Moreover, the Commission finds this interpretation to be particularly sound in contrast to the extreme positions set forth by SBC and its potential competitors.

6. Under SBC's interpretation of section 271(c)(1)(B), only operational facilities-based competing providers may submit qualifying requests that preclude a BOC from proceeding under Track B. Adoption of this interpretation of a qualifying request would create an incentive for a BOC to delay the provision of facilities in order to prevent any new entrants from becoming operational and, thereby, preserve the BOC's ability to seek in-region interLATA entry under Track B. As the Department of Justice observes, this reading of section 271(c)(1)(B) would effectively ''reward the BOC that failed to cooperate in implementing an agreement for access and interconnection and thereby prevented its competitor from becoming operational.'' Opponents of SBC's application offer a radically different—and, in the Commission's view, equally unreasonable—interpretation of when a qualifying request has been made. These parties claim that any request for access and interconnection submitted by a potential new entrant to a BOC is a qualifying request and precludes the BOC from proceeding under Track B. The Commission concludes, however, that this statutory reading could create an incentive for potential competitors to ''game'' the negotiation process by submitting an interconnection request that would foreclose Track B but, if implemented, would not satisfy the requirements of section 271(c)(1)(A). Such a result would effectively give a BOC's potential competitors in local telecommunications markets the power to deny the BOC entry into the in-region interLATA market.

7. On the basis of the record in this proceeding, the Commission finds that SBC has received at least several qualifying requests for access and interconnection that, if implemented, will satisfy the requirements of section 271(c)(1)(A). The Commission therefore concludes that SBC, at this time, may not pursue in-region interLATA entry in Oklahoma under section 271(c)(1)(B).

8. Because SBC has failed to meet the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) or section 271(c)(1)(B), the Commission finds it unnecessary to address SBC's compliance with the competitive checklist requirements set forth in section 271(c)(2)(B). Nonetheless, the Commission recognizes that even if SBC had satisfied the requirements of section 271(c)(1)(A) or 271(c)(1)(B), it would still be required to demonstrate compliance with each and every item of the competitive checklist, including access to physical collocation, cost-based unbundled loops, and reliable OSS functions before it may gain in-region interLATA entry. The Commission leaves it to future applications to define the scope of these and other checklist requirements.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–17267 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 92–237; DA 97–1352]

North American Numbering Council; Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On July 1, 1997, the Commission released a public notice announcing the next meeting of the North American Numbering Council and the Agenda for that meeting. The intended effect of this action is to make the public aware of the NANC's next meeting and its Agenda.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeannie A. Grimes, Paralegal Specialist, assisting the NANC at (202) 418–2313, or via the internet at jgrimes@fcc.gov. The mailing address is: Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 2000 M Street, NW, Suite 235, Washington, DC 20054. The fax number is: (202) 418–2345. The TTY number is: (202) 418–0484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Released: July 1, 1997. The next meeting of the North American Numbering Council (NANC) will be held on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, at 8:30 A.M. EST at the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, DC. This meeting will be open to members of the general public. The FCC will attempt to accommodate as many people as possible. Admittance, however will be limited to the seating available. The public may submit written statements to the NANC, which must be received two business days before the meeting. In addition, oral statements at the meeting by parties or entities not represented on the NANC will be permitted to the extent time permits. Such statements will be limited to five minutes in length by any one party or entity, and requests to make an oral statement must be received two business days before the meeting. Requests to make an oral statement or provide written comments to the NANC should be sent to Jeannie A. Grimes at the address under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT,** stated above.

Agenda

The planned agenda for the July 22, 1997, meeting is as follows:

1. Number Pooling Update: Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report, and Wireless Perspective on Pooling Solutions.
2. Discussion and Resolution of INC Guideline Issues Presented at June 10, 1997, NANC Meeting.
3. CLC Ad Hoc Committee Report: Update on Short-Term Solutions to NXX Exhaust.
4. NANPA Central Office (CO) Code Transition Task Force: Update.
5. Attendance at NANC Meetings.
6. Other Business.
7. Statement of Actions Items and Decisions Reached.

Federal Communications Commission.

Geraldine A. Matise,

Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 97–17646 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CC Docket No. 92–297]

Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification

AGENCY: Notice; Correction.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Alston (202) 418–0270.

SUMMARY: This document corrects Report No. 2203 regarding petitions for reconsideration and clarification published in the **Federal Register** on June 17, 1997, (FR Doc 97–15816). On page 32809, column three, the number of petitions filed is corrected to read 5 instead of 3.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–17573 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Emergency Management Agency has submitted the following proposed information collection to the Office of Management and Budget for review and clearance in accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Title: National Fire Academy Course Evaluation Form.

FEMA Form Number: 95–20.

Type of Information Collection: Revision of a currently approved collection.

OMB Number: 3067–0234.

Abstract: FEMA uses the National Fire Academy Course Evaluation Form to evaluate on-campus courses delivered at the NFA facility, located in Emmitsburg, Maryland. It is also used to evaluate NFA regional courses, which are identical to the NFA resident courses, offered in selected regions to students unable to travel to the Emmitsburg campus. The data that is provided by students evaluating an NFA course is used to determine the need for course improvements and the degree of student satisfaction with the course experience.

Affected Public: Individuals.

Number of Respondents: 5,500.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 15 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,375.

Frequency of Response: The evaluation form is completed after the completion of a course.

Comments: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to Victoria Wassmer, Desk Officer for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 within 30 days of the date of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be made to Muriel B. Anderson, FEMA Information Collections Officer, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Room 311, Washington, DC 20472. Telephone number (202) 646–2625, FAX number (202) 646–3524, e-mail address Muriel.Anderson@FEMA.gov.

Dated: June 24, 1997.

Reginald Trujillo,

Director, Program Services Division, Operations Support Directorate.

[FR Doc. 97–17630 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–01–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Disaster Assistance; Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (Subpart N)

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice revises the current designation process for disaster declarations for assistance under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), authorized by Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 7, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert F. Shea, Mitigation Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472; (202) 646–3619, (facsimile) (202) 646–3104.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the past, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMCP) funds were only available in counties designated eligible by FEMA for Individual Assistance (IA) or Public Assistance (PA). Pursuant to the Stafford Act, both PA and IA funds address damage or hardship resulting from the major disaster, however, HMGP funds are intended to reduce the