# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 76

[CS Docket No. 95-178; FCC 99-116]

Definition of Markets for Purposes of the Cable Television Broadcast Signal Carriage Rules

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications

Commission.

**ACTION:** Correcting amendments.

**SUMMARY:** This document makes a minor correction to part 76 of the Commission's rules pertaining to definition of markets which were published in the **Federal Register**, 64 FR 33796, June 24, 1999, regarding cable television broadcast signals.

**DATES:** Effective April 9, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kenneth Lewis, Media Bureau (202)

418-2622.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Order on Reconsideration and Second Report and Order, FCC 99–116, adopted May 21, 1999; released May 26, 1999, approved a final rule regarding the change of market definitions from Arbitron's areas of dominant influence to Nielsen Media Research's designated market areas for must-carry/retransmission elections. In this document we make a non-substantive change to update Nielsen Media Research's address in the publication of § 76.55(e)(2)(i) of the Commission's rules.

# **Need for Correction**

As published, the final regulations contain an old address for Nielsen Media Research.

# List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 76

Cable television.

■ Accordingly, 47 CFR part 76 is corrected by making the following correcting amendments:

# PART 76—MULTICHANNEL VIDEO AND CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 76 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 153, 154, 301, 302, 303, 303a, 307, 308, 309, 312, 315, 317, 325, 338, 339, 503, 521, 522, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 543, 544, 544a, 545, 548, 549, 552, 554, 556, 558, 560, 561, 571, 572, 573.

### §76.35 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 76.55, in paragraph (e)(2)(i), "299 Park Avenue" is revised to read "770 Broadway".

Federal Communications Commission.

### Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–8577 Filed 4–8–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

# **Surface Transportation Board**

49 CFR Parts 1109, 1111 and 1114

[STB Ex Parte No. 638]

Procedures to Expedite Resolution of Rate Challenges to be Considered Under the Stand-Alone Cost Methodology

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rules and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Board amends its regulations to expedite the resolution of rail rate challenges considered under the stand-alone cost (SAC) methodology. The revisions institute a requirement for mandatory, non-binding post-complaint mediation between the shipper and railroad under Board auspices, and establish expedited processes, using Board staff, for resolving discovery and evidentiary disputes. The Board also requests comments on the following discoveryrelated issues: developing a list of standard information that should be routinely made available in discovery; limiting the number of discovery requests available to the parties; limiting the number of years of data for which discovery responses would be required, and establishing a cut-off date for updating discovery responses; and costsharing for production of discovery responses.

**DATES:** The final rules are effective on May 9, 2003; comments are due on June 9, 2003, with reply comments due on June 19, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Send comments (an original plus 10 copies) referring to Ex Parte No. 638 to: Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423–0001.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jamie P. Rennert (202) 565–1566. [Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) (Hearing Impaired): (800) 877–8339.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Surface Transportation Board requests comments as follows:

### **Standard Discovery Requests**

We are asking each interested party to (1) submit lists of all of the information and documents that (a) it believes it should be entitled to obtain as a matter of course in discovery in a SAC case and (b) it would expect to produce to the other party as a matter of course in discovery in a SAC case, and then (2) comment on the lists submitted by other parties in this proceeding. After reviewing the parties' lists and comments, we will decide whether to issue a list of standard information and documents that the parties to a SAC case would be required to produce. We also seek comment on the practical aspects of this proposal, such as the appropriate timing for such initial disclosures. For example, would it be practical to require the complainant's initial disclosures to be made contemporaneously with the filing of the complaint, and to make the defendant's initial disclosures due at the same time as its answer to the complaint?

## **Additional Discovery**

A suggestion was made to place a limit on the number of discovery requests that each party would be allowed to make, absent permission from the Board. This is the procedure that applies to complex commercial litigation conducted in the federal courts, in Rule 33(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (which limits a party to 25 written interrogatories, including all discrete subparts, without leave of court). We seek comment on (1) the appropriate number of interrogatories and document requests that could be made without our leave, and why, and (2) whether such a limitation is a necessary and appropriate measure to prevent parties from requesting data in multiple formats or versions. Commenters should address this proposal both as if it were to be adopted alone and as if it were to be adopted in conjunction with a list of standard information and documents that the parties to a SAC case would be required to produce as initial disclosures.

# Time Periods

Suggestions were also made to limit the number of years for which data would need to be produced for a SAC case, absent permission from the Board, and to establish a cut-off date for discovery after which responses to discovery requests would not need to be updated. We seek comment on (1) the advantages and disadvantages of establishing such limits, (2) whether