merely proposes to approve state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. For that reason, this proposed action:

- Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- Does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and the EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: December 13, 2013.

Dennis J. McLerran,

Regional Adminstrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 2013–30857 Filed 12–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 13–302, RM–11709; DA 13–2391]

Television Broadcasting Services; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission has before it a petition for rulemaking filed by Family Broadcasting Group, Inc. (''Family Broadcasting''), the licensee of station KSBI(TV), channel 51, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, requesting the substitution of channel 23 for channel 51 at Oklahoma City. While the Commission instituted a freeze on the acceptance of full power television rulemaking petitions requesting channel substitutions in May 2011, it subsequently announced that it would lift the freeze to accept such petitions for rulemaking seeking to relocate from channel 51 pursuant to a voluntary relocation agreement with Lower 700 MHz A Block licensees. Family Broadcasting has entered into such a voluntary relocation agreement with U.S. Cellular Corporation and states that operation on channel 23 would eliminate potential interference to and from wireless operations in the adjacent Lower 700 MHZ A Block.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before January 10, 2014, and reply comments on or before January 27, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for petitioner as follows: John W. Bagwell, Esq., Lerman Senter PLLC, 2000 K Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, DC 20006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joyce Bernstein, *Joyce.Bernstein@fcc.gov,* Media Bureau, (202) 418–1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MB Docket No. 13–302, adopted December 16, 2013, and released December 16, 2013. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Information Center at Portals II, CY–A257, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. This document will also be available via ECFS (*http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/*). (Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Word 97, and/or Adobe Acrobat.) This document may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 1–800–478–3160 or via email *www.BCPIWEB.com.* To request this document in accessible formats (computer diskettes, large print, audio recording, and Braille), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY). This document does not contain proposed information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden ''for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,'' pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding. Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts (other than *ex parte* presentations exempt under 47 CFR 1.1204(a)) are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1208 for rules governing restricted proceedings.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see §§ 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

Barbara A. Kreisman,

Chief, Video Division, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rules

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334, 336, and 339.

§ 73.622 [Amended]

■ 2. Section 73.622(i), the Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments under Oklahoma is amended by adding channel 23 and removing channel 51 at Oklahoma City.

[FR Doc. 2013–30827 Filed 12–24–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 79

[MB Docket No. 11–154; DA 13–2392]

Media Bureau Seeks Comment on Application of the IP Closed Captioning Rules to Video Clips

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document seeks updated information on the closed captioning of video clips delivered by Internet protocol (''IP''), including the extent to which industry has voluntarily captioned IP-delivered video clips. The Commission directed the Media Bureau to issue this document to seek comment on the industry's progress in captioning IP-delivered video clips. The Commission stated that, if the resulting record demonstrates that lack of captioning of IP-delivered video clips denies consumers access to critical areas of video programming, then the Commission may reconsider the need for a requirement to provide closed captioning on IP-delivered video clips.

DATES: Comments may be filed on or before January 27, 2014; reply comments may be filed on or before February 26, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diana Sokolow, *Diana.Sokolow@fcc.gov,* of the Media Bureau, Policy Division, (202) 418–2120. Press contact: Janice Wise, *Janice.Wise@fcc.gov,* (202) 418–8165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Media Bureau's *Public Notice,* MB Docket No. 11–154, DA 13–2392, released December 13, 2013. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. This document will also be available via ECFS at *http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/.* Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Microsoft Word, and/or Adobe Acrobat. The complete text may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554. Alternative formats are available for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), by sending an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or calling the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Summary

1. Through this document, the Media Bureau seeks updated information on the closed captioning of video clips delivered by Internet protocol (''IP''), including the extent to which industry has voluntarily captioned IP-delivered video clips.[1]

2. In the *IP Closed Captioning Order,* pursuant to the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 (''CVAA''),[2] the Commission imposed closed captioning requirements on the owners, providers, and distributors of IP-delivered video programming. The Commission determined that the IP closed captioning rules initially should apply to full-length programming and not to video clips, but it also stated its belief that Congress intended ''to leave open the extent to which [video clips] should be covered under this section at some point in the future.'' [3] Specifically, the Commission noted that statements in the legislative history of the CVAA that Congress ''intends, *at this time,* for the regulations to apply to full-length programming and not to video clips or outtakes,'' [4] suggested that Congress only intended to exclude video clips initially.[5] Given Congress's intent to ''update the communications laws to help ensure that individuals with disabilities are able to . . . better access video programming,'' [6] the Commission stated that it may later determine that this intent is best served by requiring captioning of IP-delivered video clips.[7] Although not required by the *IP Closed Captioning Order,* the Commission also encouraged video programming owners, providers, and distributors to provide closed captions for IP-delivered video clips, especially news clips.[8] The Commission stated that if it finds that consumers who are deaf or hard of hearing are denied access to critical areas of programming, such as news, it may reconsider the need for a requirement to provide closed captioning on video clips to achieve Congressional intent.[9]

3. A coalition of consumer groups filed a petition for reconsideration of this issue.[10] Shortly thereafter, in support of their request, the consumer groups submitted a report on the state of closed captioning of IP-delivered video programming, in which they asserted a lack of captioning of video clips.[11] Consumers expressed particular concern about the unavailability of captioned news clips.[12] In an order addressing other petitions for reconsideration of the IP closed captioning rules, the Commission deferred a final decision on whether to reconsider the issue of requiring closed captioning of video clips, noting that since such live and near-live programming only became subject to the IP closed captioning requirements less than three months before the *IP Closed*

[1] *See Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010,* Order on Reconsideration and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 28 FCC Rcd 8785, 8803–04, ¶ 30 (2013) (''*IP Closed Captioning Order on Recon and FNPRM*'').

[2] Pub. L. No. 111–260, 124 Stat. 2751 (2010). *See also* Amendment of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111–265, 124 Stat. 2795 (2010) (making technical corrections to the CVAA); *Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010,* Report and Order, 27 FCC Rcd 787 (2012) (''*IP Closed Captioning Order*'').

[3] *IP Closed Captioning Order,* 27 FCC Rcd at 816, 818, ¶¶ 44, 48. ''Full-length programming'' is defined as video programming that appears on television and is distributed to end users, substantially in its entirety, via IP. *Id.* at 816, ¶ 44. ''Video clips'' are defined as excerpts of full-length programming. *Id.* at 816, ¶ 45.

[4] S. Rep. No. 111–386, 111th Cong., 2d Sess. at 13–14 (2010) (''Senate Committee Report'') (emphasis added); H.R. Rep. No. 111–563, 111th Cong., 2d Sess. at 30 (2010) (''House Committee Report'') (emphasis added).

[5] *IP Closed Captioning Order,* 27 FCC Rcd at 817–18, ¶ 48. The authors of the CVAA have expressed their support for the Commission ''reconsidering its decision to exempt video clips from the IP closed captioning rules.'' *See* Letter from Sen. Mark Pryor and Sen. Edward J. Markey to the Honorable Tom Wheeler, Chairman, FCC (Dec. 6, 2013).

[6] Senate Committee Report at 1; House Committee Report at 19.

[7] *IP Closed Captioning Order,* 27 FCC Rcd at 818, ¶ 48.

[8] *Id.* at 817–818, ¶¶ 46, 48.

[9] *Id.* at 818, ¶ 48.

[10] Consumer Groups, Petition for Reconsideration of the Commission's Report and Order, at 1–17 (filed Apr. 27, 2012).

[11] Consumer Groups and California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Report on the State of Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming, MB Docket No. 11–154, at ii-iii, 5–13, 18–20 (May 16, 2013).

[12] *See id.* at ii-iii, 20.