

members required to take action on behalf of the agency where such deliberations determine or result in the conduct or disposition of official agency business." 5 U.S.C. 552b(a)(2). Finally, the term "member" means "an individual who belongs to a collegial body heading an agency." 5 U.S.C. 552b(a)(3).

174. The statutory language makes clear that to be considered a "meeting" of the agency, there would have to be deliberations of individuals belonging to the collegial body heading the agency, i.e., FCC commissioners. See *Hunt v. NRC*, 611 F.2d 33 (10th Cir. 1979). Most of the meetings referenced by Alascom included no FCC members and thus were not "meetings of the agency."

175. Although not raised by Alascom, we note that some FCC commissioners did attend two of the gatherings of the State members of the Joint Board mentioned by Alascom in their pleading. At one of these sessions two FCC commissioners who are members of the Joint Board independently made very brief appearances at the beginning but left before substantive discussions commenced. They did not participate in any way in deliberations of issues before the Joint Board and, thus, consistent with the definition of meeting, the open meetings requirement of the Sunshine Act did not apply.

176. There has been only one session involving the State Joint Board members where an FCC commissioner who is a member of the Joint Board attended and engaged in substantive discussions. We do not believe a session attended by only a single FCC Commissioner can be deemed "deliberations of" a "number of individual agency members" within the meaning of the term "meeting." Further, this one FCC Commissioner could not have been in the position to determine the "joint conduct or disposition of official agency business," 5 U.S.C. 552b(a)(2), as the term "joint" necessarily implies the presence of more than one member of the Commission.

Accordingly, we conclude that no Sunshine Act violation occurred.²⁰²

4. The Anchorage Public Hearing

177. On July 1, 1993, the Joint Board conducted a hearing in Anchorage in

²⁰²In our view, the three FCC commissioners on the Joint Board also are not a subdivision of the Commission. A subdivision must be "authorized to act on behalf of the agency." 5 U.S.C. 552b(a). That requirement is not met since only the full Joint Board (of which the FCC commissioners are a minority) is authorized to make recommendations to the Commission and only the full Commission act on those recommendations. Nor is the Joint Board a subdivision of the Commission, as it is not a subdivision of the "collegial body." See 5 U.S.C. 552b(a)(1); *Hunt v. NRC*, 611 F.2d at 336 n.2.

which interested persons, most especially Alaska residents, were permitted to make presentations regarding the proposals under consideration by the Joint Board. The federal and state commissioners participated in person and via satellite and telephone link-up. Alascom alleges that the Commission violated its own rules by failing to provide written notice to the parties of the Alaska proceeding regarding this public hearing and by failing to publish public notice of the meeting in the Federal Register until the day of the hearing.

178. Section 1.423 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR 1.423 (1992), states that when the Commission requests oral argument in a Rulemaking proceeding, it shall give written notice to the parties and publish notice in the Federal Register. As an initial matter, since this was a Joint Board hearing, not a Commission hearing, it appears that the rule is not applicable and that no violation occurred. But, to the extent the rule may be viewed as applying since all FCC commissioners were present, it is not apparent what injury Alascom has suffered. It had actual notice of the meeting—indeed, an Alascom representative made a presentation at the July public hearing. To the extent a violation of § 1.423 occurred, it is difficult to construe it as anything more than harmless error, particularly given that reply comments to the hearing were permitted until July 12, 1993, and *ex parte* presentations were permitted thereafter.

VIII. Ordering Clause

179. Accordingly, pursuant to the authority contained in section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934 As Amended, it is ordered that this Final Recommended Decision be transmitted to the Federal Communications Commission.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 93-29185 Filed 11-30-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

Public Reading Room

AGENCY: Federal Housing Finance Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Housing Finance Board (Finance Board) announces that it has established a Public Reading Room (Reading Room) with an operational effective date of December 1, 1993. The

Reading Room at 1777 F Street, NW., room 103, Washington, DC 20006, will be a repository of all Finance Board's public documents. The Reading Room will be open to the public from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. (noon), Monday-Friday. The telephone number is (202) 408-2969.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 1, 1993.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elaine L. Baker, Executive Secretary to the Board, (202) 408-2837.

Philip L. Conover,
Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 93-29407 Filed 11-30-93; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6725-01-P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

[Docket R-0817]

Federal Reserve Bank Services

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ACTION: Notice of proposed service enhancement.

SUMMARY: The Board is requesting comment on a proposal to expand the Fedwire funds transfer format and adopt a more comprehensive set of data elements. The Board is proposing implementation of the new format by late 1996. An expanded Fedwire funds transfer format would improve efficiency in the payments mechanism by reducing the need for manual intervention when processing and posting transfers. Further, truncation of payment-related information would be minimized when forwarding payment orders through Fedwire that were received via other large-value transfer systems, such as the Clearing House Interbank Payments Systems (CHIPS) and Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication (SWIFT). A more comprehensive set of data elements would also permit the inclusion of more complete name and address information for all parties to a transfer, which would be required under regulations proposed by Treasury (58 FR 46021, Aug. 31, 1993). The Board is also requesting comment on the benefits and costs to depository institutions, to their customers, and to the overall payments mechanism of expansion of the Fedwire funds transfer format.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before February 23, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Comments, which should refer to Docket No. R-0817, may be mailed to Mr. William W. Wiles, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington,