

§ 180.434 [Amended]

12. Section 180.434 is amended by removing the entries for poultry, fat; poultry, kidney; poultry, liver; poultry, meat byproducts, except kidney and liver; poultry, meat; and egg from the table in paragraph (a).

[FR Doc. 03-17730 Filed 7-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 54

[CC Docket No. 96-45; FCC 03-115]

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Promoting Deployment and Subscribership in Unserved and Underserved Areas, Including Tribal and Insular Areas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document is being issued in order to ensure that enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up support is targeted to the most underserved segments of our Nation. The Commission sought comment on the same questions present herein in the *Tribal Stay Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*. This Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeks to bolster the record on how to define the geographic areas that are adjacent to reservations or are otherwise part of the reservation's community of interest, in a manner that is consistent with our goal of targeting enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up support to the most underserved segments of the Nation.

DATES: Comments are due on or before August 15, 2003. Reply comments are due on or before September 2, 2003. Written comments by the public on the proposed information collections are due on or before September 2, 2003. Written comments must be submitted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on the proposed information collections on or before September 15, 2003.

ADDRESSES: All filings must be sent to the Commission's Secretary, William F. Caton, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, a copy of any comments on the information collection(s) contained herein should be submitted to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1-C804, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554, or

via the Internet to jboley@fcc.gov and to Edward C. Springer, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, or via the Internet to vhuth@omb.eop.gov. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for further filing instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Shannon Lipp, Attorney, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, (202) 418-7400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) in CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 03-115, released on May 21, 2003. This Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was also released with a companion Order on Reconsideration and Report and Order (Order). 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. Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

1. In this Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM), we seek further comment on potential modifications to our rules regarding availability of enhanced Federal Lifeline and Link-Up assistance to qualifying low-income consumers living "near reservations."

A. Discussion

2. We seek further comment on the proposals in the record to identify geographic areas that are adjacent to the reservations, consistent with the goal of targeting enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up to the most underserved areas of the Nation. As set forth in the *Tribal Stay and Order*, 65 FR 58721, October 2, 2000, the term "near reservation," as defined by BIA at the time of adoption of the *Twelfth Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 65 FR 47941, August 4, 2000, and codified in our rules in this Order, includes wide geographic areas that do not possess the same characteristics that warrant the targeting of support to reservations, such as geographic isolation, high rates of poverty, and low telephone subscribership. As several commenters note, this definition of "near reservation" incorporates many highly populated, urban areas across the Nation, including major cities such as Phoenix, Sacramento, Seattle, and Las Vegas. As set forth in the *Tribal Stay and Order*, we continue to find that using this definition of "near reservation" will not target enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up appropriately.

3. We issue this FNPRM to obtain more detailed information on proposals contained in the current record, as well as additional proposals that may be more consistent with our goal of targeting enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up support to only the most underserved areas of our Nation and that may impose fewer administrative burdens. For instance, USCC recommends excluding major metropolitan areas from the enhanced low-income programs by excluding Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (CMSAs) from receiving enhanced low-income support. Washington UTC suggests that enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up support be provided in the entirety of any telephone exchange that contains all or any portion of a tribal reservation. In addition, Smith Bagley, Inc. (SBI) proposes that a person qualify for enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up benefits if he or she resides within 50 miles of a recognized Native American reservation and in a county that has a population density of no more than 50 persons per square mile.

4. We seek comment on data that addresses whether these proposed target areas share the same characteristics of reservation areas. For example, SBI fails to explain why it recommends choosing a population density of 50 persons per square mile. We seek record support regarding these issues. Moreover, the proposals of USCC, Washington UTC, and SBI may not adequately ensure that the enhanced Lifeline and Link-Up support mechanisms are targeted only to those areas that share the same attributes as reservations. For example, we believe that these proposals may not exclude large cities from the definition of "near reservation." We seek comment on how these proposals may be tailored to exclude such large cities.

5. We seek comment on how to minimize any administrative burdens raised by these proposals. For example, SBI proposes that the Commission produce and distribute maps outlining all areas that are within a 50 mile radius of a reservation in which the county contains less than 50 persons per square mile. We believe that the Commission may not be the appropriate entity to undertake such tasks because it has no particular expertise with regard to such mapmaking. In addition, we are not aware of any current map that contains all reservations as defined by the Commission. We seek comment on alternative sources for such maps. We seek comment on the feasibility of having prospective ETCs bear the cost and burden of producing their own maps showing the areas in which they request ETC designation.