For example, a PCS provider that is affiliated with an interexchange carrier having more than 1,500 employees would not meet the definition of a small business. We believe that our rules may affect certain subcategories within that estimate, i.e., wireline carriers and service providers, including local exchange carriers and competitive access providers; and wireless carriers, including cellular service carriers, broadband PCS licensees, and SMR licensees. We discuss those subcategories below in further detail. We believe, on the other hand, that our rules will not affect certain subcategories within that estimate, i.e., interexchange carriers, operator service providers, pay telephone operators, mobile service carriers, and resellers, and, moreover, will not affect small cable system operators.

12. *Wireline Carriers and Service Providers.* SBA has developed a definition of small entities for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. The Census Bureau reports that, there were 2,321 such telephone companies in operation for at least one year at the end of 1992.[33] According to SBA's definition, a small business telephone company other than a radiotelephone company is one employing fewer than 1,500 persons.[34] All but 26 of the 2,321 non-radiotelephone companies listed by the Census Bureau were reported to have fewer than 1,000 employees. Thus, even if all 26 of those companies had more than 1,500 employees, there would still be 2,295 non-radiotelephone companies that might qualify as small entities or small incumbent LECs. Although it seems certain that some of these carriers are not independently owned and operated, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of wireline carriers and service providers that would qualify as small business concerns under SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 2,295 small entity telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone companies that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

13. *Local Exchange Carriers.* Neither the Commission nor SBA has developed a definition of small providers of local exchange services (LECs). The closest applicable definition under SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. The most reliable source of information regarding the number of LECs nationwide of which we are aware appears to be the data that we collect annually in connection with the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS). According to our most recent data, 1,347 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of local exchange services.[35] Although it seems certain that some of these carriers are not independently owned and operated, or have more than 1,500 employees, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of LECs that would qualify as small

---

[33] 1992 Census, supra note 31, at Firm Size 1-123.

[34] 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 4812.

[35] Federal Communications Commission, CCB, Industry Analysis Division, Telecommunications Industry Revenue: TRS Fund Worksheet Data, Tbl. 1 (Average Total Telecommunications Revenue Reported by Class of Carrier) (Dec. 1996) (TRS Worksheet).

business concerns under SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 1,347 small incumbent LECs that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

14. *Competitive Access Providers.* Neither the Commission nor SBA has developed a definition of small entities specifically applicable to providers of competitive access services (CAPs). The closest applicable definition under SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. The most reliable source of information regarding the number of CAPs nationwide of which we are aware appears to be the data that we collect annually in connection with the TRS. According to our most recent data, 57 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of competitive access services.[36] Although it seems certain that some of these carriers are not independently owned and operated, or have more than 1,500 employees, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of CAPs that would qualify as small business concerns under SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 57 small entity CAPs that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

15. *Wireless (Radiotelephone) Carriers.* SBA has developed a definition of small entities for radiotelephone (wireless) companies. The Census Bureau reports that there were 1,176 such companies in operation for at least one year at the end of 1992.[37] According to SBA's definition, a small business radiotelephone company is one employing fewer than 1,500 persons.[38] The Census Bureau also reported that 1,164 of those radiotelephone companies had fewer than 1,000 employees. Thus, even if all of the remaining 12 companies had more than 1,500 employees, there would still be 1,164 radiotelephone companies that might qualify as small entities if they are independently owned are operated. Although it seems certain that some of these carriers are not independently owned and operated, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of radiotelephone carriers and service providers that would qualify as small business concerns under SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 1,164 small entity radiotelephone companies that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

16. *Cellular Service Carriers.* Neither the Commission nor SBA has developed a definition of small entities specifically applicable to providers of cellular services. The closest applicable definition under SBA rules is for telephone communications companies other than radiotelephone (wireless) companies. The most reliable source of information regarding the number of cellular service carriers nationwide of which we are aware appears to be the data

---

[36] Id.

[37] 1992 Census, supra note 31, at Firm Size 1-123.

[38] 13 C.F.R. § 121.201, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 4812.

that we collect annually in connection with the TRS. According to our most recent data, 792 companies reported that they were engaged in the provision of cellular services.[39] Although it seems certain that some of these carriers are not independently owned and operated, or have more than 1,500 employees, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of cellular service carriers that would qualify as small business concerns under SBA's definition. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 792 small entity cellular service carriers that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

17. *Broadband PCS Licensees.* The broadband PCS spectrum is divided into six frequency blocks designated A through F, and the Commission has held auctions for each block. The Commission defined "small entity'' for Blocks C and F as an entity that has average gross revenues of less than $40 million in the three previous calendar years.[40] For Block F, an additional classification for "very small business" was added and is defined as an entity that, together with their affiliates, has average gross revenues of not more than $15 million for the preceding three calendar years. [41] These regulations defining "small entity'' in the context of broadband PCS auctions have been approved by the SBA. No small businesses within the SBA-approved definition bid successfully for licenses in Blocks A and B. There were 90 winning bidders that qualified as small entities in the Block C auctions. A total of 93 small and very small business bidders won approximately 40 percent of the 1,479 licenses for Blocks D, E, and F.[42] However, licenses for blocks C through F have not been awarded fully; therefore, there are few, if any, small businesses currently providing PCS services. Based on this information, we conclude that the number of small broadband PCS licensees will include the 90 winning C Block bidders and the 93 qualifying bidders in the D, E, and F blocks, for a total of 183 small PCS providers as defined by the SBA and the Commission's auction rules.

18. *SMR Licensees.* Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 90.814(b)(1), the Commission has defined "small entity" in auctions for geographic area 800 MHz and 900 MHz SMR licenses as a firm that had average annual gross revenues of less than $15 million in the three previous calendar years. This definition of a "small entity" in the context of 800 MHz and 900 MHz

---

[39] Id.

[40] See Amendment of Parts 20 and 24 of the Commission's Rules -- Broadband PCS Competitive Bidding and the Commercial Mobile Radio Service Spectrum Cap, Report and Order, FCC 96-278, WT Docket No. 96-253, ¶¶ 57-60 (rel. June 24, 1996) (Amendment of Parts 20 and 24 Order); see also 47 C.F.R. § 24.720(b).

[41] See Amendment of Parts 20 and 24 Order at ¶ 60.

[42] FCC News, Broadband PCS, D, E and F Block Auction Closes, No. 71744 (rel. Jan. 14, 1997).

SMR has been approved by the SBA.[43] The rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order may apply to SMR providers in the 800 MHz and 900 MHz bands that either hold geographic area licenses or have obtained extended implementation authorizations. We do not know how many firms provide 800 MHz or 900 MHz geographic area SMR service pursuant to extended implementation authorizations, nor how many of these providers have annual revenues of less than $15 million. We assume, for purposes of this Supplemental FRFA, that all of the extended implementation authorizations may be held by small entities, which may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

19. The Commission's auctions for geographic area licenses in the 900 MHz SMR band concluded in April of 1996. There were 60 winning bidders who qualified as small entities in the 900 MHz auction. Based on this information, we conclude that the number of geographic area SMR licensees affected by the rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order includes these 60 small entities. No auctions have been held for 800 MHz geographic area SMR licenses. Therefore, no small entities currently hold these licenses. A total of 525 licenses will be awarded for the upper 200 channels in the 800 MHz geographic area SMR auction. However, the Commission has not yet determined how many licenses will be awarded for the lower 230 channels in the 800 MHz geographic area SMR auction. There is no basis, moreover, on which to estimate how many small entities will win these licenses. Given that nearly all radiotelephone companies have fewer than 1,000 employees and that no reliable estimate of the number of prospective 800 MHz licensees can be made, we assume, for purposes of this Supplemental FRFA, that all of the licenses may be awarded to small entities who, thus, may be affected by the decisions in this First Reconsideration Order.

20. *Cable System Operators.* SBA has developed a definition of small entities for cable and other pay television services, which includes all such companies generating less than $11 million in revenue annually. This definition includes cable systems operators, closed circuit television services, direct broadcast satellite services, multipoint distribution systems, satellite master antenna systems and subscription television services. According to the Census Bureau, there were 1,432 such cable and other pay television services generating $11 million or less in annual receipts that were in operation for at least one year at the end of 1992.[44]

21. The Commission has developed its own definition of a small cable system operator for the purposes of rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable

---

[43] See Amendment of Parts 2 and 90 of the Commission's Rules to Provide for the Use of 200 Channels Outside the Designated Filing Areas in the 896-901 MHz and the 935-940 MHz Bands Allotted to the Specialized Mobile Radio Pool, PR Docket No. 89-553, Second Order on Reconsideration and Seventh Report & Order, 11 FCC Rcd 2639, 2693-702 (1995); Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of SMR Systems in the 800 MHz Frequency Band, PR Docket No. 93-144, First Report and Order, Eighth Report and Order, and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 1463 (1995).

[44] 1992 Census, supra note 31, at Firm Size 1-123.

company," is one serving fewer than 400,000 subscribers nationwide.[45] Based on our most recent information, we estimate that there were 1,439 cable operators that qualified as small cable system operators at the end of 1995.[46] Since then, some of those companies may have grown to serve over 400,000 subscribers, and others may have been involved in transactions that caused them to be combined with other cable operators. Consequently, we estimate that there are fewer than 1,468 small entity cable system operators that may be affected by the decisions and rules adopted in this First Reconsideration Order.

22. The Communications Act also contains a definition of a small cable system operator, which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than 1 percent of all subscribers in the United States and is not affiliated with any entity or entities whose gross annual revenues in the aggregate exceed $250,000,000."[47] There were 63,196,310 basic cable subscribers at the end of 1995, and 1,450 cable system operators serving fewer than one percent (631,960) of subscribers.[48] Although it seems certain that some of these cable system operators are affiliated with entities whose gross annual revenues exceed $250,000,000, we are unable at this time to estimate with greater precision the number of cable system operators that would qualify as small cable operators under the definition in the Communications Act.

D. Summary Analysis of the Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements and Steps Taken to Minimize the Significant Economic Impact of this First Reconsideration Order on Small Entities and Small Incumbent LECs, Including the Significant Alternatives Considered and Rejected

23. *Structure of the Analysis.* In this Section of the Supplemental FRFA, we analyze the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements that may apply to small entities and small incumbent LECs as a result of this First Reconsideration Order.[49] As a part of this discussion, we mention some of the types of skills that will be needed to meet the new requirements. We also describe the steps taken to minimize the

[45] 47 C.F.R. § 76.901(e). The Commission developed this definition based on its determination that a small cable system operator is one with annual revenues of $100 million or less. Implementation of Sections of the 1992 Cable Act: Rate Regulation, Sixth Report and Order and Eleventh Order on Reconsideration, 10 FCC Rcd 7393.

[46] Paul Kagan Associates, Inc., Cable TV Investor, Feb. 29, 1996 (based on figures for Dec. 30, 1995).

[47] 47 U.S.C. § 543(m)(2).

[48] Paul Kagan Associates, Inc., Cable TV Investor, Feb. 29, 1996 (based on figures for Dec. 30, 1995).

[49] See 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(4).

economic impact of our decisions on small entities and small incumbent LECs, including the significant alternatives considered and rejected.[50]

24. We provide this summary analysis to provide context for our analysis in this Supplemental FRFA. To the extent that any statement contained in this Supplemental FRFA is perceived as creating ambiguity with respect to our rules or statements made in the First Report & Order or preceding Sections of this First Reconsideration Order, the rules and statements set forth in the First Report & Order and those preceding Sections of this First Reconsideration Order shall be controlling.

1. Implementation Schedule

25. *Summary of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements.* In the First Report & Order, we required local exchange carriers operating in the 100 largest MSAs to offer long-term service provider portability, according to a phased deployment schedule commencing on October 1, 1997, and concluding by December 31, 1998, set forth in Appendix F of the First Report & Order.[51] In this First Reconsideration Order, we extend the end dates for Phase I of our deployment schedule by three months, and for Phase II by 45 days. Thus, deployment will now take place in Phase I from October 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998, and in Phase II from January 1, 1998, through May 15, 1998. We also clarify that LECs need only provide number portability within the 100 largest MSAs in switches for which another carrier has made a specific request for the provision of portability. LECs must make available lists of their switches for which deployment has and has not been requested. The parties involved in such requests identifying preferred switches may need to use legal, accounting, economic and/or engineering services.

26. *Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Small Incumbent LECs, and Alternatives Considered.* In this First Reconsideration Order, we lighten the burdens on rural and smaller LECs by establishing a procedure whereby, within as well as outside the 100 largest MSAs, portability need only be implemented in the switches for which another carrier has made a specific request for the provision of portability. If, as petitioners allege, competition is not imminent in the areas covered by rural/small LEC switches,[52] then the rural or smaller LEC should not receive requests from competing carriers to implement portability, and thus need not expend its resources until competition does develop. By that time, extensive non-carrier-specific testing will likely have been done, and rural and small LECs need not expend their resources on such testing.[53] We note that the

---

[50] See 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(5).

[51] First Report & Order, 11 FCC Rcd at 8393.

[52] See GTE Petition at 8; GTE Opposition at 15; JSI Petition at 9; NTCA/OPASTCO Reply at 2-4.

[53] NTCA/OPASTCO Reply at 4-5.

majority of parties representing small or rural LECs specified as the relief sought that we only impose implementation requirements where competing carriers have shown interest in portability.[54] Moreover, our extension of Phases I and II of our deployment schedule may permit smaller LECs to reduce their testing costs by allowing time for larger LECs to test and resolve the problems of this new technology.[55]

27. Indeed, in this First Reconsideration Order, we reject several alternatives put forth by parties that might impose greater burdens on small entities and small incumbent LECs. We reject requests put forth by ACSI, KMC, ICG, NEXTLINK, and ALTS to accelerate the deployment schedule for areas both within and outside the 100 largest MSAs.[56] We also reject the procedures proposed by some parties that would require LECs to file waiver requests for their specific switches if they believe there is no competitive interest in those switches, instead of requiring LECs to identify in which switches of other LECs they wish portability capabilities.[57] The suggested waiver procedures would burden the LEC from whom portability is requested with preparing and filing the petition for waiver. In addition, a competing carrier that opposes the waiver petition would be burdened with challenging the waiver. In contrast, under the procedure we establish, the only reporting burden on requesting carriers is to identify and request their preferred switches. Carriers from which portability is being requested, which may be small incumbent LECs, only incur a reporting burden if they wish to lessen their burdens further by requesting more time in which to deploy portability. Finally, we clarify that CMRS providers, like wireline providers, need only provide portability in requested switches, both within and outside the 100 largest MSAs.

2. Exemptions for Rural or Small LECs

28. *Summary of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements.* Section 251(f)(2) provides that LECs with fewer than two percent of the nation's subscriber lines may petition a state commission for a suspension or modification of any requirements of Sections 251(b) and 251(c). Section 251(f)(2) is available to all LECs, including competitive LECs, which may be small entities. A small incumbent LEC or a competitive LEC, which may be a small entity, seeking under 251(f)(2) to modify or suspend the number portability requirements imposed by Section 251(b)(2), bears the burden of proving that the number portability requirements would: (1) create a significant adverse economic impact on telecommunications users; (2) be unduly economically burdensome; or

---

[54] See JSI Petition at 9; NECA Petition at 3; NTCA/OPASTCO Petition at 3-4; NTCA/OPASTCO Reply at 1-4; USTA Comments at 2; ALLTEL Opposition at 4-5; Sprint Opposition at 13; GTE Petition at 9-10.

[55] See CBT Comments at 3-4.

[56] See ACSI Petition at 3, 7-12; KMC Petition at 2-3, 5-13; NEXTLINK Petition at 5-6; ICG Comments at 3-5; ALTS Opposition at 6.

[57] See USTA Petition at 16; GTE Opposition at 14-15; Pacific Comments at 4; Sprint Opposition at 11.

(3) be technically infeasible. The parties involved in such a proceeding may need to use legal, accounting, economic and/or engineering services.

29. *Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Small Incumbent LECs, and Alternatives Considered.* As explained above in the First Reconsideration Order, we consider it unnecessary to create a general exemption for all small and/or rural LECs, as suggested by some parties.[58] We have effectively granted the small and rural LEC petitioners' requests that we waive number portability requirements for rural and/or small LECs serving areas in the largest 100 MSAs until receipt of a bona fide request, since we now require all competing carriers specifically to request, of any LEC, the particular switches in which they desire portability.[59] To the extent that portability is requested in a rural or small LEC's switch, and that LEC has difficulty complying with the request, it may apply for an extension of time on the basis of extraordinary circumstances beyond its control that prevent it from complying with the Commission's deployment schedule[60] or, if eligible, it may petition the appropriate state commission for suspension or modification of the requirements of Section 251(b).[61] Our grant of petitioners' requests to limit deployment to requested switches, however, decreases the likelihood that smaller and rural LECs will have to apply for extensions of time or file petitions under section 251(f)(2).

30. As we stated in the Local Competition Order, the determination whether a Section 251(f)(2) suspension or modification should be continued or granted lies primarily with the relevant state commission.[62] By largely leaving this determination to the states, the Local Competition Order stated, our decisions permit this fact-specific inquiry to be administered in a manner that minimizes regulatory burdens and the economic impact on small entities and small incumbent LECs.[63] However, to minimize further regulatory burdens and minimize the economic impact of our decision, in the Local Competition Order we adopted several rules that may facilitate the efficient resolution of such inquiries, provide guidance, and minimize uncertainty.[64] In the Local Competition Order, we found that the rural LEC or smaller LEC must prove to the state commission that the financial harm shown to justify a suspension or modification would be greater than the harm that might typically be

---

[58] See First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶ 114.

[59] See First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶ 60.

[60] First Report & Order, 11 FCC Rcd at 8397; see First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶ 115.

[61] 47 U.S.C. § 251(f)(2); see First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶ 115.

[62] Local Competition Order, 11 FCC Rcd at 16,176.

[63] Id.

[64] Id. at 16,176-77.

expected as a result of competition.[65] Finally, we concluded that Section 251(f) adequately provides for varying treatment for smaller or rural LECs where such variances are justified. As a result, we stated, we expect that Section 251(f) will significantly minimize regulatory burdens and economic impacts from the rules adopted in the First Report & Order and this First Reconsideration Order.[66]

3. Reporting Requirements by the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, on Carriers' Progress

31. *Summary of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements.* In the First Report & Order, the Commission delegated authority to the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, to require reports from cellular, PCS, and covered SMR providers in order to monitor the progress of these providers toward implementing long-term number portability. These reporting requirements were not defined in sufficient detail in the First Report & Order to obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget. Separate approval will be requested when the specific requirements are imposed by the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

32. *Steps Taken to Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Small Incumbent LECs, and Alternatives Considered.* Although no party to this proceeding suggested that changes to these reporting requirements would affect small entities or small incumbent LECs, several parties requested that the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, be given greater authority to act to increase flexibility in the schedule.[67] As explained above in this First Reconsideration Order, we lighten the burden on smaller and rural wireless carriers by modifying our rules so that CMRS providers, like wireline providers, need only provide portability in requested switches, both within and outside the 100 largest MSAs.[68] We also decline at this time to alter further the implementation schedule imposed by the First Report & Order for wireless carriers because we find that enough flexibility has been incorporated into the implementation schedule for wireless carriers, and that no modification is needed.[69]

---

[65] Id. at 16,177.

[66] Id.

[67] See, e.g., RTG Comments at 4-5.

[68] See First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶¶ 136-138.

[69] See First Reconsideration Order, supra ¶¶ 134-135.

E. Report to Congress

33. The Commission shall send a copy of this Supplemental FRFA, along with this First Reconsideration Order, in a report to Congress pursuant to the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A). A copy of this Supplemental FRFA will also be published in the Federal Register.

APPENDIX E - IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Implementation must be completed by the carriers in the relevant MSAs during the periods specified below:

Phase I -- 10/1/97-3/31/98		Phase II -- 1/1/98-5/15/98		Phase III -- 4/1/98-6/30/98	
Chicago, IL	3	Detroit, MI	6	Indianapolis, IN	34
		Cleveland, OH	20	Milwaukee, WI	35
				Columbus, OH	38
Philadelphia, PA	4	Washington, DC	5	Pittsburgh, PA	19
		Baltimore, MD	18	Newark, NJ	25
				Norfolk, VA	32
Atlanta, GA	8	Miami, FL	24	New Orleans, LA	41
		Fort Lauderdale, FL	39	Charlotte, NC	43
		Orlando, FL	40	Greensboro, NC	48
				Nashville, TN	51
				Las Vegas, NV	50
		Cincinnati, OH	30		
		Tampa, FL	23		
New York, NY	2	Boston, MA	9	Nassau, NY	13
				Buffalo, NY	44
Los Angeles, CA	1	Riverside, CA	10	Orange Co, CA	15
		San Diego, CA	14	Oakland, CA	21
				San Francisco, CA	29
				Rochester, NY	49
Houston, TX	7	Dallas, TX	11	Kansas City, KS	28
		St. Louis, MO	16	Fort Worth, TX	33
				Hartford, CT	46
Minneapolis, MN	12	Phoenix, AZ	17	Denver, CO	26
		Seattle, WA	22	Portland, OR	27

Phase IV -- 7/1/98-9/30/98		Phase V -- 10/1/98-12/31/98	
Grand Rapids, MI	56	Toledo, OH	81
Dayton, OH	61	Youngstown, OH	85
Akron, OH	73	Ann Arbor, MI	95
Gary, IN	80	Fort Wayne, IN	100
Bergen, NJ 42		Scranton, PA	78
Middlesex, NJ	52	Allentown, PA	82
Monmouth, NJ	54	Harrisburg, PA	83
Richmond, VA	63	Jersey City, NJ	88
		Wilmington, DE	89
Memphis, TN	53	Birmingham, AL	67
Louisville, KY	57	Knoxville, KY	79
Jacksonville, FL	58	Baton Rouge, LA	87
Raleigh, NC	59	Charleston, SC	92
West Palm Beach, FL	62	Sarasota, FL	93
Greenville, SC	66	Mobile, AL	96
		Columbia, SC	98
Honolulu, HI	65	Tulsa, OK	70
Providence, RI	47	Syracuse, NY	69
Albany, NY	64	Springfield, MA	86
San Jose, CA	31	Ventura, CA	72
Sacramento, CA	36	Bakersfield, CA	84
Fresno, CA	68	Stockton, CA	94
		Vallejo, CA	99
San Antonio, .TX	37	El Paso, TX	74
Oklahoma City, OK	55	Little Rock, AR	90
Austin, TX	60	Wichita, KS	97
		New Haven, CT	91
Salt Lake City, UT	45	Omaha, NE	75
Tucson, AZ	71	Albuquerque, NM	76
		Tacoma, WA	77