State and county	Location and case No.	Date and name of newspaper where notice was published	Chief executive officer of community	Effective date of modification	Community
Douglas	Town of Parker (02–08–171P).	Oct. 10, 2002, Oct. 17, 2002, *Denver Post*.	The Honorable Gary Lasater, Mayor, Town of Parker, 20120 East Main Street, Parker, Colorado 80138.	Jan. 16, 2003	080310
Douglas	Unincorporated Areas (02–08–171P).	Oct. 10, 2002, Oct. 17, 2002, *Denver Post*.	The Honorable James R. Sullivan, Chairman, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, Colorado 80104.	Jan. 16, 2003	080049
Garfield	City of Rifle (02–08–123P).	Dec. 26, 2002, Jan. 2, 2003, *Citizen Telegram*.	The Honorable Keith Lambert, Mayor, City of Rifle, 202 Railroad Avenue, Rifle, Colorado 81650.	Dec. 4, 2002	085078
Larimer	City of Fort Collins (01–08–092P).	Nov. 7, 2002, Nov. 14, 2002, *Fort Collins Coloradoan*.	The Honorable Ray Martinez, Mayor, City of Fort Collins, P.O. Box 580, Fort Collins, Colorado 80522–0580.	May 30, 2001	080102
Hawaii.					
Hawaii	Hawaii County (99–09–680P).	Nov. 7, 2002, Nov. 14, 2002, *Hawaii Tribune Herald*.	The Honorable Harry Kim, Mayor, Hawaii County, 25 Aupuni Street, Hilo, Hawaii 96720.	Aug. 15, 2000	155166
Honolulu	City and County of Honolulu (00–09–244P).	Nov. 7, 2002, Nov. 14, 2002, *Honolulu Star Bulletin*.	The Honorable Jeremy Harris, Mayor, City and County of Honolulu, 530 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.	Feb. 1, 2001	150001
Missouri:.					
Clay	Unincorporated Areas (03–07–0112P).	Jan. 2, 2003, Jan. 9, 2003, *Kearney Courier*.	The Honorable Thomas Brandon, Presiding Commissioner, Clay County, Clay County Courthouse, One Courthouse Square, Liberty, Missouri 64068.	Apr. 24, 2003	290086
Montana:.					
Gallatin	City of Bozeman (00–08–367P).	Nov. 7, 2002, Nov. 14, 2002, *Bozeman Daily Chronicle*.	The Honorable Steven Kirchhoff, Mayor, City of Bozeman, P.O. Box 1230, Bozeman, Montana 59771–1230.	Dec. 20, 2000	300028
Texas:.					
Bexar	City of San Antonio (00–06–862P).	Nov. 7, 2002, Nov. 14, 2002, *San Antonio Express News*.	The Honorable Ed Garza, Mayor, City of San Antonio, P.O. Box 839966, San Antonio, Texas 78283–3966.	Apr. 2, 2001	480045
Utah:.					
Washington ...	City of St. George (02–08–101P).	Dec. 19, 2002, Dec 26, 2002, *Spectrum*.	The Honorable Daniel McArthur, Mayor, City of St. George, 175 East 200 North, St. George, Utah 84770.	Mar. 27, 2003	490177
Washington:.					
Spokane	Unincorporated Areas (02–10–614P).	Nov. 21, 2002, Nov. 28, 2002, *Spokesman-Review*.	Ms. Francine Boxer, Chief Executive Officer, Spokane County, 1116 West Broadway Avenue, Spokane, Washington 99260.	Mar. 25, 2003	530174

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, ''Flood Insurance'')

Dated: January 28, 2003.

Anthony S. Lowe,

Administrator, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–3184 Filed 2–7–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–04–U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMISSION

47 CFR Part 54

[CC Docket No. 96–45; DA 03–24]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission's (Commission) Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) adopts the Delphi version of the forward-looking cost model with certain incorporated technical improvements, which has been translated from Turbo-Pascal computer language, for calculating high-cost universal service support for non-rural carriers. To avoid the possibility of two successive changes in support amounts within a relatively short period of time, the Bureau defers calculating support for non-rural carriers using the Delphi version of the forward-looking cost model with incorporated technical improvements until the effective date of a Commission order in the separate proceeding addressing the non-rural high-cost support methodology adopted in the Ninth Report and Order, which was remanded to the Commission by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

DATES: Effective March 12, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Katie King or Thomas Buckley,
Attorneys, Wireline Competition
Bureau, Telecommunications Access
Policy Division, (202) 418–7400, TTY
(202) 418–0484.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a
summary of the Commission's Order in
CC Docket No. 96–45 released on
January 7, 2003. The full text of this
document is available for public
inspection during regular business
hours in the FCC Reference Center,
Room CY–A257, 445 12th Street, SW.,
Washington, DC 20554.

I. Introduction

1. The Bureau adopts the Delphi
version of the forward-looking cost
model, which has been translated from
Turbo-Pascal computer language, for
calculating high-cost universal service
support for non-rural carriers. The
Bureau also finds that certain technical
improvements are necessary to ensure
that the forward-looking cost
mechanism operates as designed in the
Fifth Report and Order, 63 FR 63993,
November 18, 1998. To avoid the
possibility of two successive changes in
support amounts within a relatively
short period of time, the Bureau shall
defer calculating support for non-rural
carriers using the Delphi version of the
forward-looking cost model with
incorporated technical improvements
until the effective date of an order in the
separate proceeding addressing the non-
rural high-cost support methodology
adopted in the *Ninth Report and Order*,
64 FR 67416, December 1, 1999, which
was remanded to the Commission by the
United States Court of Appeals for the
Tenth Circuit. The Bureau finds,
however, that adopting the Delphi
version with incorporated technical
improvements at this time is
appropriate to enable its staff to perform
necessary work to determine cost per
loop estimates used to calculate high-
cost support and to allow the
Commission to consider such estimates
in conjunction with its review of the
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal
Service's (Joint Board)
recommendations in the *Ninth Report
and Order* remand proceeding.

II. Discussion

2. In this Order, the Bureau
determines that it should use the Delphi
version of the forward-looking cost
model for calculating and targeting
support for non-rural carriers. The
Bureau also finds that the technical
improvements incorporated into the
Delphi version of the model and

discussed herein are necessary and
appropriate to ensure that the forward-
looking cost mechanism operates as
designed in the *Fifth Report and Order.*
As discussed below, calculating support
using the Delphi version of the cost
model with incorporated technical
improvements could lead to changes in
support amounts. The *Ninth Report and
Order* remand proceeding also could
lead to modifications of the non-rural
high-cost support methodology that, in
turn could lead to changes within a
relatively brief time in support amounts.
To avoid the possibility of two
successive changes in support amounts
resulting from adoption of the Delphi
version with incorporated technical
improvements and thereafter a final
Commission action in the *Ninth Report
and Order* remand proceeding, the
Bureau shall defer calculating support
for non-rural carriers using the Delphi
version with incorporated technical
improvements until the effective date of
an order in the *Ninth Report and Order*
remand proceeding.

3. *Translation to Delphi Computer
Language.* The Bureau concludes that it
is appropriate to use the outside plant
portion of the forward-looking cost
model that has been translated to Delphi
computer language. Delphi, essentially
an upgraded version of the previously
used Turbo-Pascal language, is a more
advanced and easier-to-use computer
language than Turbo-Pascal. In
particular, unlike Turbo-Pascal, Delphi
computer language allows a user to step
through the source code line-by-line.
This improvement will allow the
Bureau and interested parties to better
understand and follow the logic of the
model in reaching its results. In
addition, the Delphi computer language
processes data more quickly and is more
adaptable to the Windows operating
system than Turbo-Pascal. As such,
translation to Delphi will enable the
Bureau and interested parties to more
easily use and analyze the cost model
and its results.

4. The Bureau deferred adoption of
Delphi computer language for the model
last year in part to allow it to consider
arguments that it should instead adopt
a version of the outside plant portion of
the model in Visual Basic computer
language submitted by Qwest. Based on
an examination of the record developed
in response to the *Delphi Public Notice,*
66 FR 34447, June 28, 2001, the Bureau
does not adopt the Visual Basic model
submitted by Qwest for the reasons
stated below. Because Delphi computer
language uses the same logic in its
programming steps as Turbo-Pascal, the
translation to Delphi does not
fundamentally change the organization

of the model logic. Interested parties
and Bureau staff already have invested
a substantial amount of time
understanding, testing, and fine tuning
the Turbo-Pascal and Delphi computer
code. Visual Basic, on the other hand,
is an entirely different computer
language. As a result, the Bureau finds
it would be less reasonable to adopt the
Visual Basic version than the Delphi
translation. Rather, on this record, the
Bureau finds it appropriate to use the
outside plant portion of the model that
has been translated to Delphi computer
language.

5. *Technical Improvements.* As noted
above, the Commission foresaw that
technical improvements would be
necessary to ensure that the model
operates as designed and instructed the
Bureau to implement such
improvements where necessary and
appropriate. After posting a Delphi
version of the model, the Bureau sought
recommendations on improvements to
that Delphi version, incorporated
technical improvements where
necessary, and then posted a revised
Delphi version of the model on the
Bureau's website. In the *2002 Line
Counts Update Order,* 67 FR 3118,
January 23, 2002, the Bureau stated that
more time was needed to study the
effect these improvements would have
on high-cost support calculations.

6. After investigating the various
technical improvements incorporated
into the posted Delphi version of the
model, the Bureau discovered that two
changes in particular impacted cost
estimates generated by the model,
which in turn could affect high-cost
support calculations. First, a correction
was made to locate drop terminals using
the 360 feet square grid cell assumption
adopted in the *Fifth Report and Order,*
63 FR 63993, November 18, 1998, rather
than 1000 feet square grid cells. This
correction places drop terminals closer
to customer locations and results in an
overall decrease in distribution cable
and structure costs. Second, Bureau staff
corrected the coding that caused the
model to read the wrong row of input
tables for drop terminal, manhole, and
service area interfaces (SAIs) costs. This
coding error caused the model to
retrieve incorrect values for these
outside plant inputs. Correcting this
coding error results in higher costs in
certain wire centers.

7. The Bureau finds that
implementation of these technical
improvements is necessary and
appropriate to ensure that the model
operates as designed in the *Fifth Report
and Order.* The Bureau analysis
indicates that these technical
improvements cause small changes in

cost estimates generated by the model. For instance, using year-end 2000 line counts as input values, the combined effect of these technical improvements would cause the nationwide average cost per line to increase by less than $0.03 for 2002. However, the effect on statewide average cost per line varies by state. The statewide average cost per line increases in states containing wire centers with higher density zones because such service areas require more underground structure, larger SAIs, and larger drop terminals. By contrast, the average cost per line for states containing wire centers with lower density zones decreases, relative to the nationwide average, because their service areas require less underground structure, smaller SAIs, and fewer large drop terminals. Under the benchmark methodology adopted in the *Ninth Report and Order,* minor changes in nationwide or statewide average costs will affect non-rural high-cost support amounts.

8. The Bureau shall defer calculating support for non-rural carriers using the Delphi version of the cost model with incorporated technical improvements until the effective date of an order in the *Ninth Report and Order* remand proceeding. The *Ninth Report and Order* remand proceeding could lead to modifications to the non-rural high-cost support methodology that, in turn, would lead to changes in support

amounts. Calculating support using the Delphi version of the cost model with incorporated technical improvements likewise could lead to changes in support amounts. Section 254(b)(5) of the Communications Act of 1996 Act states that the universal support mechanism should be specific and predictable. Consistent with this principle, the Bureau finds that coordinating the determination of support for non-rural carriers using the revised Delphi version of the cost model, incorporating the technical improvements described above, with the effective date of an order in the *Ninth Report and Order* remand proceeding will avoid the possibility of two successive changes in the model's calculations and support amounts within a relatively short period of time. Specifically, the Delphi version of the model with incorporated technical improvements will be used for purposes of estimating forward-looking costs and determining support for non-rural carriers following the effective date of an order in the *Ninth Report and Order* remand proceeding. In the intervening interim period, non-rural support shall continue to be based on cost estimates of the Turbo-Pascal version of the cost model using the data updates adopted in the *2002 Line Counts Update Order*. In addition, the Bureau will continue to adjust support amounts calculated using the current model's cost estimates to

reflect the lines reported by non-rural carriers each quarter. The Bureau finds that adopting the Delphi version with incorporated technical improvements at this time is appropriate to enable the staff to perform necessary work to determine cost estimates under this version. Accompanying this Order is a Public Notice seeking comment on updating line counts and other input values for the Delphi version of the cost model consistent with the framework adopted in the *2001 and 2002 Line Counts Update Orders,* 65 FR 81759, December 27, 2000. Such action will enable the Commission to consider such estimates in conjunction with its consideration of the Joint Board recommendations in the *Ninth Report and Order* remand proceeding.

III. Ordering Clause

9. *It is ordered* pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1–4, 201–205, 214, 218–220, 254, 303(r), 403, and 410 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151–154, 201–205, 214, 218–220, 254, 303(r), 403, and 410, this Order *is adopted.*

10. *It is further ordered* that this Order will be effective March 12, 2003.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–3111 Filed 2–7–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P