release into ''spare'' status 888 vanity numbers that were set aside for subscribers holding corresponding 800 numbers. Your letter dated April 10, 1998, indicates that the 90-day schedule does not allow sufficient time for DSMI to process and verify RespOrg reports of subscriber requests for these numbers. The Bureau in this letter now extends the time for subscribers to request numbers that were set aside for them, for RespOrgs to report subscriber requests to DSMI, and for DSMI to process and verify RespOrg reports as they come in. It also directs DSMI to take several other actions, which are intended to ensure: (1) That all subscriber requests to retain their set-aside numbers are promptly assigned and activated as ''working''; (2) that no subscriber requests get rejected for being submitted late; and (3) that all set-aside numbers for which subscribers did not respond in writing are placed in ''unavailable'' status rather than ''spare'' status, while the Commission audits them to ensure that subscribers received adequate notice from the RespOrgs.

Under the current 90-day schedule, RespOrgs were required in the first 20 days, which ended April 25, 1998, to notify their subscribers that they may choose to reserve their set-aside numbers. In the next 30 days, subscribers must submit written requests to the RespOrgs in order to retain their numbers, and they are permitted to submit written requests to release the numbers as ''spare.'' In the following 30 days, RespOrgs must report the subscribers'' requests to DSMI, with documentation of each subscriber's request or certification that the subscriber did not respond. In the last 10 days, DSMI must complete processing the requests.

The Bureau is concerned that erroneously releasing a number into ''spare'' status contrary to a subscriber's intent would not be a correctable error if the number then becomes ''reserved,'' ''assigned,'' or activated as ''working'' for the account of another subscriber. (Erroneously assigning and activating a subscriber's set-aside number as ''working'' would presumably be correctable, by placing it in the proper status and ensuring that the subscriber is not charged for it.) It is therefore imperative to verify, for each number that a RespOrg certifies the subscriber did not respond, that the subscriber received adequate notice of right of first refusal from the RespOrg before releasing the number into ''spare'' status.

Other potential problems, in addition to inadequate notice, could also necessitate additional time for processing or for correction and re-processing. Among these may be, for example, failure by subscribers to mail their requests to RespOrgs or to mail them by May 24, 1998, or mishandling of written subscriber requests by RespOrgs or their agents, or failure or inability of RespOrgs or their agents to report subscriber requests correctly to DSMI. Compounding or contributing to these possibilities, other events might transpire during or after the 90-day period—for example, a subscriber might change RespOrgs, an 800 number might be disconnected or suspended, or an 888 number that is returned to RespOrg control for activation as ''working'' might instead be placed in ''reserved'' status (and 45 days later automatically moved to ''spare'' status if the subscriber fails to submit a further request to activate).

In light of these concerns, the Bureau modifies the process for handling the 888 numbers that were set aside for subscribers holding corresponding 800 numbers, as follows.

1. *Written subscriber requests received from RespOrgs by August 21, 1998—Processed by DSMI by September 10, 1998—Activated by September 30, 1998.* The Bureau directs DSMI to instruct the RespOrgs that additional time is allotted, until August 21, 1998, for RespOrgs to complete notifying subscribers of their right of first refusal, for subscribers to respond to the RespOrgs' notification in writing, and for RespOrgs to report all results to DSMI (with documentation of written subscriber requests and certification of all other results). The Bureau also directs DSMI to instruct the RespOrgs that they may set target dates for subscriber responses, consistent with this time schedule. The Bureau further directs DSMI that, for all 888 number requests that are reported to DSMI and received from RespOrgs by August 21, 1998, and that are documented by written subscriber requests (rather than by RespOrg certification of other results), DSMI will have an additional 20 days for processing those written subscriber requests, until September 10, 1998. In that time, DSMI must complete all processing, place into ''spare'' status all numbers to be released, place into ''assigned'' status all numbers that subscribers wish to retain, transfer to the RespOrgs control of numbers that are to be activated as ''working,'' and instruct the RespOrgs to complete activation of those numbers as ''working'' within 20 days thereafter, no later than September 30, 1998.

2. *Late-filed written requests—Acceptance—Requests to reserve.* The Bureau directs DSMI to instruct the RespOrgs that they may not reject written requests from subscribers received after August 21, 1998, and that they must submit to DSMI, on an ongoing basis, all written requests with accompanying documentation as they come in from subscribers no later than 30 days after receiving them. The Bureau instructs DSMI to process all such requests within 20 days of receiving them, and, upon completion of processing, place into ''spare'' status all numbers requested to be released, place into ''assigned'' status all numbers that subscribers wish to retain, transfer to the RespOrgs control of numbers that are to be activated as ''working,'' and instruct the RespOrgs to complete activation of those numbers as ''working'' within 20 days thereafter. The Bureau permits DSMI to request more than 20 days to process late-filed requests, if DSMI's request is due to a reduction in DSMI's work force needed to comply with this letter.

3. *''No response'' numbers—''Unavailable'' status—Commission audit.* The Bureau directs DSMI to retain in ''unavailable'' status those set-aside 888 numbers for which subscribers did not respond, and not to release those numbers into the general pool as ''spare'' unless and until the Commission informs DSMI otherwise. The Bureau also directs DSMI to instruct the RespOrgs that, for DSMI to verify documentation, each certification of no subscriber response that a RespOrg submits to DSMI must include subscriber contact information, containing at least the name, address, and phone number of the subscriber and the date and means by which the RespOrg notified the subscriber of the right of first refusal. The Bureau further directs DSMI to inform the RespOrgs that, after September 10, 1998, the Commission will audit those numbers and the documentation with which the RespOrgs certify that subscribers did not respond in writing, to ensure that the subscribers received adequate notice from the RespOrgs of their right of first refusal.

Following completion of the process directed in this letter, the time for subscribers to exercise their rights of first refusal will come to an end when the Bureau directs DSMI to release the remaining ''unavailable'' set-aside 888 numbers into ''spare'' status.

Sincerely,

Geraldine A. Matise,

Chief, Network Services Division.

[FR Doc. 98–14378 Filed 5–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. 2279]

Petitions For Reconsideration and Clarification of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

May 22, 1998.

Petitions for reconsideration and clarification have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceedings listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of these documents are available for viewing and copying in Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857–3800. Oppositions to these petitions must be filed June 16, 1998. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rule (47 CFR 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Banks, Redmond, Sunriver and Corvallis, Oregon) (MM Docket No. 96–7, RM–8732, RM–8845).

Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, The Dallas and Corvallis, Oregon) (MM Docket No. 96–12, RM–8741).

Madgekal Broadcasting, Inc. Station KFLY(FM), Corvallis, Oregon.

For Construction Permit to Modify Licensed Facilities (One-Step Upgrade).

Number of Petitions Filed: 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–14375 Filed 5–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The application also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act. Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than June 17, 1998.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Lois Berthaume, Vice President) 104 Marietta Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2713:

1. Compass Bancshares, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama; Compass Banks of Texas, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama; and Compass Bancorporation of Texas, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Hill Country Bank, Austin, Texas.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 27, 1998.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 98–14441 Filed 5–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 961–0005]

Institutional Pharmacy Network, et al.; Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed Consent Agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 31, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 6th St. and Pa. Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William Baer or Willard Tom, FTC/H–374, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–2032 or 326–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for May 21, 1998), on the World Wide Web, at ''http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions97.htm.'' A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H–130, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326–3627. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement to a proposed consent order from Institutional Pharmacy Network (IPN) and its five members: Evergreen Pharmaceutical, Inc.; NCS Healthcare of Oregon, Inc.; NCS Healthcare of Washington, Inc.; United Professional Companies, Inc.; and White, Mack and Wart, Inc.

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for reception of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty (60) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order, and it is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed order or to modify in any way their terms. The proposed consent order has been entered into for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by any proposed respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in the complaint.

Description of the Draft Complaint

A complaint that the Commission prepared for issuance along with the proposed order alleges the following:

Evergreen Pharmaceutical, Inc.; NCS Healthcare of Oregon, Inc.; NCS Healthcare of Washington, Inc.; United Professional Companies, Inc.; and White, Mack and Wart, Inc., are institutional pharmacies that compete to serve institutional care facilities, such as nursing homes. Institutional pharmacies provide specialized services, including providing medications in single dose packages, maintaining an ''emergency box'' at the client facility with drugs for use in emergency situations, and providing consulting and quality assurance services to institutional care facilities. The institutional pharmacy/respondents together provide pharmacy services for approximately 80 percent of the patients that receive institutional pharmacy services in Oregon.

The State of Oregon created the Oregon Health Plan (''OHP'') in 1994 to provide health care to Medicaid recipients and other needy Oregonians. Under OHP, the state contracts with Fully Capitated Health Plans (''Plans''), which are managed care organizations that receive a fixed payment to care for