SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Released: June 30, 1998.

The next meeting of the North American Numbering Council (NANC) will be held on Wednesday, July 22, 1998, from 8:30 a.m., until 5:00 p.m., and on Thursday, July 23, 1998, from 8:30 a.m., until 12 noon at the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Room 856, Washington, DC.

This meeting will be open to members of the general public. The FCC will attempt to accommodate as many people as possible. Admittance, however will be limited to the seating available. The public may submit written statements to the NANC, which must be received two business days before the meeting. In addition, oral statements at the meeting by parties or entities not represented on the NANC will be permitted to the extent time permits. Such statements will be limited to five minutes in length by any one party or entity, and requests to make an oral statement must be received two business days before each meeting. Requests to make an oral statement or provide written comments to the NANC should be sent to Linda Simms at the address under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT,** stated above.

Proposed Agenda

The planned agenda for the July 22–23, meeting is as follows:

1. Approval of meeting minutes.
2. Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report. Report out on estimate of times to complete preport (PP) with efficient data representation (EDR), and port on demand (POD) architectures.
3. N11 Ad Hoc Working Group Report and Recommendation. Responsibilities under First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, In the Matter of Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements, CC Docket 92–105, FCC 97–51.
4. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group Report. Discussion and review status of telephone number reservation recommendation.
5. Industry Numbering Committee Report. Tutorial on service provider inventory and industry inventory intervals; including service provider request date to the pooling administrator; pooling administrator allocation date and actual effective date for a block to be put into service.
6. Cost Recovery Working Group Report.
7. COCUS and Proposed Line Number Utilization Survey. Discussion and review of contributions on question of complete, timely and accurate data reporting; obtaining forecasts from resellers, and the issue of audits.
8. North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) report on statement of work for net costs associated with extension to 1000s block number pooling administration.

Federal Communications Commission.

Geraldine A. Matise,

Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 98–17976 Filed 7–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 98–1239]

Notice of Publix Network Corporation's Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Certification; CC Docket No. 90–571 and NSD-L–98–65

Released: June 30, 1998.

Notice is hereby given that the application for certification of the Publix Network Corporation's Interstate Telecommunication Relay Services (TRS) program has been granted, subject to the condition described below, pursuant to Title IV of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 47 U.S.C. 225(f)(2), and section 64.605(b) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 64.605(b). On the basis of Publix Network Corporation's application, the Commission has determined that:

(1) The TRS program of Publix Network Corporation meets or exceeds all operational, technical, and functional minimum standards contained in section 64.604 the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 64.604;

(2) The TRS program of Publix Network Corporation makes available adequate procedures and remedies for enforcing the requirements of the program; and,

(3) the TRS program of Publix Network Corporation in no way conflicts with federal law.

On May 14, 1998, the Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that proposes ways to enhance the quality of existing telecommunications relay services (TRS) and expand those services for better use by individuals with speech disabilities. See Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CC Docket No. 98–67, FCC 98–90 (rel. May 20, 1998). Because the Commission may adopt changes to the rules governing relay programs, including state relay programs, the certification granted herein is conditioned on a demonstration of compliance with any new rules ultimately adopted by the Commission. The Commission will provide guidance to the states on demonstrating compliance with such rule changes.

This certification, as conditioned herein, is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until July 25, 2003. One year prior to the expiration of this certification, July 25, 2002, Publix Network Corporation may apply for renewal of their TRS program certification by filing documentation in accordance with the Commission's rules, pursuant to 47 CFR 64.605(a) and (b).

A copy of the certification letter is available for public inspection at the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau, Network Services Division, Room 235, 2000 M Street, NW, Washington, DC, Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. (closed 12:30 to 1:30 p.m.) and the FCC Reference Center, Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, DC, daily, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m..

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al McCloud, (202) 418–2499, amccloud@fcc.gov; Helene Nankin, (202) 418–1466, hnankin@fcc.gov; or Kris Monteith, (202) 418–1098, kmonteit@fcc.gov, (TTY, 202–418–0484), at the Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission.

Federal Communications Commission.

Geraldine A. Matise,

Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

[FR Doc. 98–17925 Filed 7–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CS Docket No. 98–102, FCC 98–137]

Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in Markets for the Delivery of Video Programming

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of inquiry.

SUMMARY: The Commission is required to report annually to Congress on the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. On June 23, 1998, the Commission adopted a *Notice of Inquiry* to solicit information from the public for use in preparing the competition report that is to be submitted to Congress in December 1998. The *Notice of Inquiry* will provide parties with an opportunity to submit

comments and information to be used in conjunction with publicly available information and filings submitted in relevant Commission proceedings to assess the extent of competition in the market for the delivery of video programming.

DATES: Comments are due by July 31, 1998, and reply comments are due by August 31, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Office of the Secretary, Room 222, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marcia Glauberman, Cable Services Bureau, (202) 418–7200 or TTY (202) 418–7172.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Inquiry* in CS Docket No. 98–102, FCC 98–137, adopted June 23, 1998, and released June 26, 1998. The complete text of this *Notice of Inquiry* is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20554, and may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service (''ITS, Inc.''), (202) 857–3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis of the Notice of Inquiry

1. Section 628(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (''Communications Act''), 47 U.S.C. 548(g), requires the Commission to deliver an annual report to Congress on the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. The *Notice of Inquiry* (''*NOI*'') is designed to assist the Commission in gathering the information, data and public comment necessary to prepare its fifth annual report on competition in markets for the delivery of video programming (''1998 Competition Report''). The Commission expects to use the information submitted by commenters to supplement publicly available information and relevant comments that have been filed in other Commission proceedings.

2. For the 1998 Competition Report, we request information and comment regarding the cable industry, existing and potential competitors in markets for the delivery of video programming, and the prospects for increasing competition in these markets. We seek information to update our assessment of the status of competition and on changes in the competitive environment since our *1997 Competition Report*, summarized at 63 FR 10222 (March 2, 1998), was submitted to Congress. Commenters also are invited to identify and comment on existing statutory provisions and Commission regulations they perceive as restraining competition or inhibiting development of robust competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. We note that, pursuant to section 623(c)(4) of the Communications Act, the Commission's authority under section 623(c)(3) to review complaints submitted by local franchising authorities concerning increases in rates for cable programming service (''CPS'') tiers sunsets on March 31, 1999. *See* 47 U.S.C. 543(c)(3) and (c)(4). The information gathered in this report will present the last comprehensive picture of the state of cable competition prior to the sunset date. For this year's report, to the extent feasible, we ask parties to submit data and information that are current as June 30, 1998.

3. As in previous reports, we seek factual information and statistical data regarding the status of video programming distributors using different technologies, and changes that have occurred in the past year. We ask for information on multichannel video programming distributors (''MPVDs'') using predominantly wired distribution technologies, including cable systems, private cable or satellite master antenna television (''SMATV'') systems, and open video systems (''OVS''). We also request data for those relying predominantly on wireless distribution technologies, such as over-the-air broadcast television, multichannel multipoint distribution service (''MMDS''), instructional television fixed service (''ITFS''), local multipoint distribution service (''LMDS''), direct broadcast satellite (''DBS'') service, and home satellite dish (''HSD'') service.

4. In addition to statistical data on each of these delivery services, we seek information regarding: (a) the number of homes passed (for wired technologies) and the number of homes capable of receiving service (for wireless technologies); (b) the number of operators; (c) the identities of the ten largest operators (national market only); (d) the number of subscribers and penetration rates; (e) channel capacities and the number and types of channels offered; and (f) the number and types of services offered. In addition, we request financial information for each technology, including firm and industry revenues, in the aggregate and by sources (e.g., subscriber revenues, advertising revenues, programming revenues); cash flow; changes in stock prices; investments; capital acquisition; and capital expenditures.

5. For each video programming distribution technology, we also request information describing: (a) technological advances (e.g., deployment of digital services) that make or may make the technology competitive; (b) the effort (including steps, costs and time) needed to increase the number of homes passed or capable of receiving service; (c) the effort (including steps, costs and time) needed to increase the number of channels and types of services offered; and (d) regulatory and judicial developments that affect the use of different technologies. In addition, in evaluating the extent of competition among various MVPDs' services or technologies, we seek information and analysis on the degree to which viewers or consumers consider the different types of MVPDs to be substitutes and on the extent to which customers have switched from one provider or technology to another one.

6. In the *NOI*, we request information on interservice competition and service to multiple dwelling unit (''MDU'') buildings. We further seek information that will allow us to compare the cost to consumers of subscriptions to, and equipment needed to receive, alternative MVPD services (cable, DBS, MMDS, SMATV, or OVS) and to permit us to better understand the factors considered by consumers when choosing among alternative MVPDs. Further, we seek comment on the appropriate method for comparing the services and costs of different MVPDs.

7. As in prior reports, we will provide updated information in the 1998 Competition Report on the structure of, and rivalry in, markets for the delivery of video programming. To evaluate market concentration at the local, regional and national levels, we ask commenters to provide updated information on industry transactions, including information on mergers, acquisitions, consolidations, swaps and trades, cross-ownership, and other structural developments that affect distributors' delivery of video programming. In local markets where incumbent cable operators face competition from one or more other video programming distributors, we seek information on: (a) the identity of the competitors; (b) the distribution technology used by each competitor; (c) the date that each competitor entered the market; (d) the location of the market, including whether it is predominantly urban or rural; (e) an estimate of the subscribership and market share for the services of each competitor; (f) a description of the service offerings of each competitor; (g) differentiation strategies each competitor is pursuing; and (h) the prices charged for the service offerings.

8. With respect to regional concentration (i.e., ''clustering''), for cable and other MVPDs, we seek information on the geographic areas served by particular companies and comment regarding the effects industry consolidation and clustering have had on competition. We also seek data regarding current national subscribership levels of all MVPDs, changes in these levels since the *1997 Competition Report*, and the reasons for these changes, including whether such changes are the result of merger and acquisition activity, marketing strategies, or other factors. We also would like to evaluate MVPD service providers in the economic context of the larger communications marketplace based on their relative size and resources (e.g., revenues) and the extent to which participants have the ability to enter each others' market.

9. In the 1998 Competition Report, we will update information on existing and planned programming services, with particular focus on those programming services that are affiliated with video programming distributors. We seek information and ask a variety of questions on programming services that are affiliated with cable operators, affiliated with non-cable video programming distributors and unaffiliated with any MVPD.

10. For this year's report, we also request information on the various program options offered by each MVPD technology, including exclusive program offerings, the number of channels available, and the comparability of the program options and packages available with each technology. We ask whether there are certain programming services or specific classes of service that an MVPD needs to provide to subscribers in order to be successful. We request information regarding the extent that local cable operators or broadcasters are providing local or regional news or sports channels. In addition, we solicit information on the extent to which MVPDs offer or plan to offer electronic programming guides. We also seek information on the extent to which MVPDs are now offering or plan to offer consumers discrete programming choices (i.e., service on an ''a la carte'' or individual channel basis) rather than programming service packages (i.e., tiers of programming services) and the technical feasibility of offering programming in a customized manner. Moreover, we seek information and comment regarding public, educational and governmental (''PEG'') access and leased access channels.

11. We further seek information and analysis regarding the effect of increased programming costs on rates, especially for cable service. We request information and comment on the factors that affect programming costs for cable operators and other MVPDs. We also ask about the extent to which the increased programming costs are passed through to MVPD subscribers and to advertisers.

12. As in previous reports, we will update our assessment of our program access, program carriage and channel occupancy rules. Commenters are asked to provide information regarding the effectiveness of these rules. We request information on whether the coverage of the program access rules is appropriate, on whether there have been any cases of MVPDs being denied programming when a satellite delivered service becomes terrestrially delivered or by non-vertically integrated programmers, and on any other issues of concern relating to the availability and distribution of programming.

13. We seek updated information on various technological advances that may affect industry structure and competition in markets for the delivery of video programming, including system upgrades and the deployment of digital technology. We ask whether upgrades are being undertaken only in specific geographic areas and whether they are conducted mainly in response to competitive entry. We seek information on the feasibility of combining distribution technologies (e.g., DBS and SMATV) and data regarding MVPDs' current use of combined distribution technologies. We also solicit data on estimated roll-out or launch dates for new technologies. In addition, we note that an important aspect of the technological developments taking place relates to the deployment of set top boxes, integrated receiver/decoders, or receivers that facilitate or differentiate MVPD service offering. We ask commenters to identify and describe each type of device, including its function and capabilities, its costs and availability to consumers.

14. Currently, basic and cable programming service rates are deregulated where a cable operator faces ''effective competition'' as defined in the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. 543(l). We seek comment on whether the existing test for effective competition is an appropriate measurement of the existence of competition. Where commenters believe it is not the correct measure of competition, all or in part, we ask for suggested alternative means for determining competition.

15. In the last two reports, we examined several case studies of local markets where cable operators faced actual competition from MVPD entrants. We seek updated information on the effects of actual and potential competition in these and other local markets where consumers have, or soon will have, a choice among MVPDs, including specific data regarding areas where head-to-head competition exists between cable and other MVPDs, or among various types of MVPDs, and information on how such competition has affected prices, service offerings, quality of service, and other relevant factors.

16. We also would like to gather information on video delivery competition for and within MDUs. We request information on how common is it for consumers to have options to choose between or among MVPD services within a particular MDU and how program offerings and prices charged by competing MVPDs serving MDUs compare. We solicit information on how many exclusive service contracts, and how many so-called ''perpetual'' exclusive contracts, exist in MDUs at present and whether their use is increasing or decreasing. We request comment on the impact that the recent inside wiring, over-the-air reception device (''OTARD''), and cable bulk rate rules have had on MDU competition.

17. Finally, we request information regarding existing or potential regulatory impediments that may deter entry or prevent expansion of competitive opportunities in video program delivery markets. We also ask commenters to identify specific Commission rules, policies or regulations that ought to be reexamined in light of current competitive opportunities within multichannel video programming markets.

Administrative Matters:

Ex Parte

18. There are no ex parte or disclosure requirements applicable to this proceeding pursuant to 47 CFR 1.1204(a)(4).

Comment Dates

19. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in §§ 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before July 31, 1998, and reply comments on or before August 31, 1998. To file formally in this proceeding, participants must file an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments and supporting comments. If participants

want each Commissioner to receive a personal copy of their comments, an original plus ten copies must be filed. Comments and reply comments should be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239) of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20554.

Ordering Clauses

20. This Notice of Inquiry is issued pursuant to authority contained in sections 4(i), 4(j), 403 and 628(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–17831 Filed 7–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 10:02 a.m. on Wednesday, July 1, 1998, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider matters relating to the Corporation's supervisory activities.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Vice Chairman Andrew C. Hove, Jr., seconded by Director Joseph H. Neely (Appointive), concurred in by Mr. Richard M. Riccobono, acting in the place and stead of Director Ellen S. Seidman (Director, Office of Thrift Supervision), Director Julia L. Williams (Acting Comtroller of the Currency), and Chairman Donna Tanoue, that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matters could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of subsections (c)(6), (c)(8), and (c)(9)(A)(ii) of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6), (c)(8), and (c)(9)(A)(ii)).

The meeting was held in the Board Room of the FDIC Building located at 550—17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Dated: July 1, 1998.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–18024 Filed 7–2–98; 10:22 am]

BILLING CODE 6714–01–M

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

Announcing an Open Meeting of the Board

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 8, 1998.

PLACE: Board Room, Floor, Federal Housing Finance Board, 1777 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

STATUS: The entire meeting will be open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED DURING PORTIONS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

—Revisions to Procedures for Review of Disputed Supervisory Determinations

—Appointment of Federal Home Loan Bank Directors of Dallas and Topeka

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Elaine L. Baker, Secretary to the Board, (202) 408–2837.

William W. Ginsberg,

Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 98–18122 Filed 7–2–98; 3:10 pm]

BILLING CODE 6725–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of Banks or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than July 20, 1998.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Karen L. Grandstrand, Vice President) 90 Hennepin Avenue, P.O. Box 291, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480-0291:

1. Lonnie E. Clark, Chandler, Minnesota; to acquire additional voting shares of Chandler Bancshares, Inc., Chandler, Minnesota, and thereby indirectly acquire State Bank of Chandler, Chandler, Minnesota.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (D. Michael Manies, Assistant Vice President) 925 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64198-0001:

1. Leonard R. Scoleri and Synthia L. Scoleri, both of Guernsey, Wyoming; to acquire voting shares of Community Bankshares of Wyoming, Guernsey, Wyoming, and thereby indirectly acquire Oregon Trail Bank, Guernsey, Wyoming.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, June 30, 1998.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 98–17864 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

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 July 30, 1998.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Lois Berthaume, Vice President) 104