

on the information included in Appendix A of the Imperial PM<sub>10</sub> Plan.

We are soliciting comments on these proposed actions. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for 30 days following publication of this proposal in the **Federal Register** and will consider these comments before taking final action.

## VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, redesignation of an area to attainment and the accompanying approval of a maintenance plan under section 107(d)(3)(E) are actions that affect the status of a geographic area and do not impose any additional regulatory requirements on sources beyond those imposed by state law. Redesignation to attainment does not in and of itself create any new requirements, but rather results in the applicability of requirements contained in the CAA for areas that have been redesignated to attainment. Moreover, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, these proposed actions merely propose to approve a State plan and redesignation request as meeting federal requirements and do not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For these reasons, these proposed actions:

- Are not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Are not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Do not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Are 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.*);
- Do 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);
- Do not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive

Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);

- Are not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Are not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Are 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 Clean Air Act; and
- Do not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, the State plan for which the EPA is proposing approval does not apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the proposed rule, as it relates to the maintenance plan, does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). However, the proposed redesignation would apply to Indian country within the nonattainment area. In those areas of Indian country, the proposed redesignation action will not result in the relaxation of measures and programs currently in place to protect air quality and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). The EPA has invited the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians and the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, who have lands within the Imperial PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area, to consult on today's proposed action.

### List of Subjects

#### 40 CFR Part 52

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

#### 40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

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

Dated: March 26, 2020.

**John Buserud,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2020-06818 Filed 4-1-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket Nos. 20-35, 17-105; FCC 20-19; FRS 16586]

### Records of Cable Operator Interests in Video Programming; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Commission seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify the Commission's rules requiring that cable operators maintain records in their online public inspection files regarding the nature and extent of their attributable interests in video programming services, as well as information regarding cable operators' carriage of such vertically integrated video programming services on cable systems in which they have an attributable interest.

**DATES:** Comments due on or before May 4, 2020; reply comments due on or before May 18, 2020.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chad Guo, *Chad.Guo@fcc.gov*, or 202-418-0652.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), FCC 20-19, in MB Docket Nos. 20-35, 17-105, adopted and released on March 2, 2020. The complete text of this document is available electronically via the search function on the FCC's Electronic Document Management System (EDOCS) web page at [https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/) ([https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/)). The complete document is available for inspection and copying in the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554 (for hours of operation, see <https://www.fcc.gov/general/fcc-reference-information-center>). To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) (mail to: [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov)) or call the FCC's

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (voice), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

### Synopsis

1. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), the Commission seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify section 76.1710 of the Commission's rules, which requires that cable operators maintain records in their online public inspection files regarding the nature and extent of their attributable interests in video programming services. The rule also requires that their online public inspection file contain information regarding cable operators' carriage of such vertically integrated video programming services on cable systems in which they have an attributable interest. The NPRM refers herein to both parts of this rule collectively as the "cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping" requirement. The Commission also seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify section 76.1700(a)(7), which lists cable operator interests in video programming as one of the records to be maintained by cable system operators in their public inspection file. In addition, the Commission seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify Note 2 to section 76.504, which cross-references section 76.1710. In conjunction with the Commission's Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative (Media Modernization), parties have urged the Commission to re-examine several categories of information in the online public inspection file that may be outdated, including records regarding cable operators' interests in video programming. The Commission's analysis of this rule indicates that its original purpose was to aid in the compliance of a Commission regulation that was reversed and remanded over eighteen years ago by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify this rule. Through this NPRM, the Commission advances its efforts to modernize its media regulations and eliminate outdated or unnecessary requirements.

### Background

2. The Commission originally adopted the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement in 1993 as a method of monitoring compliance with the Commission's cable channel occupancy limits, which restricted the number of channels that could be occupied on a

vertically integrated cable system by video programmers in which the cable operator had an attributable interest. The Commission's channel occupancy limits placed a 40% cap on the number of channels that could be occupied on a vertically integrated cable system (with up to 75 channels) by video programmers in which the cable operator had an attributable interest. For systems with more than 75 channels, the rule required that at least 45 channels be devoted to unaffiliated programming. The Commission adopted channel occupancy limits consistent with section 11 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. Under the recordkeeping requirement, cable operators are required to maintain in their public inspection files, for a period of at least three years, records regarding the nature and extent of their attributable interests in all video programming services as well as information regarding their carriage of such vertically integrated video programming services on cable systems in which they also have an attributable interest. The Commission initially proposed to enforce channel occupancy limits through a process of certification whereby cable operators would certify annually to the Commission that their cable systems are in compliance with the channel occupancy limits but, after receiving comments, the Commission determined that the recordkeeping requirement would be a preferable and less burdensome approach. The Commission stated that such records would enable local franchise authorities to aid the Commission in monitoring compliance with the channel occupancy limits in their respective franchise areas. Specifically, the Commission asserted that a franchise authority could request to inspect a local cable operator's records should the franchise authority have questions as to whether the cable operator was in violation of the channel occupancy limits. After such inspection, if a franchise authority believed that a violation existed, it could file a complaint with the Commission. The Commission also stated that other parties seeking to report potential violations of the channel occupancy limits could also contact the local franchise authority or report the matter directly to the Commission.

3. The Commission reorganized its public file rules in 1999 to reduce the regulatory burden faced by cable operators with regard to the recordkeeping requirements. At that time, the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping

requirement was moved from the channel occupancy limits provision in Subpart J of Part 76 of the Commission's rules—where it was originally placed upon adoption—to its own section in Subpart U, which consolidated for ease of administration the documents to be maintained by multichannel video and cable television services for public inspection.

4. In 2001, the channel occupancy limits were reversed and remanded to the Commission by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. The court found that the Commission failed to justify its channel occupancy limits as not burdening substantially more speech than necessary. However, despite that decision, the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement has remained part of the public file requirements for cable operators. The Commission has sought comment on reinstating the channel occupancy limits but, to date, has found the record inadequate to support adopting a specific vertical limit on the ownership of video programming sources by owners of cable systems. The Commission transitioned the public file requirements for cable operators to an online format in 2016, when the Commission expanded the list of entities required to post public inspection files to the Commission's online database. Since then, the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement has been part of the online public inspection file to be maintained by cable system operators.

5. In its comments to the Commission's Media Modernization proceeding, Verizon listed cable operator interests in video programming as one of several categories of information that should be eliminated from the online public inspection file. Verizon stated that such information is of no use or interest to consumers and, further, that few people access the public inspection file, given that it does not provide the kind of information typically sought by consumers. Verizon instead contended that the Commission can request this information, if needed, upon reasonable notice and time for production. No commenter in the Media Modernization proceeding argued in favor of retaining the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement specifically or described the utility of such information in particular. UCC et al. argue for maintaining the online public inspection file as a whole but do not refer specifically to the cable operator

interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement.

### Discussion

6. The Commission seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping rule. Specifically, as discussed below, the Commission seeks comment on whether there is any remaining purpose for this rule, other potential sources for this information, the burdens this requirement places on cable operators, and possible modifications to the rule.

7. The Commission notes that the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement was adopted in order to assist in the enforcement of the Commission's cable channel occupancy limits. Given that those limits were reversed and remanded by the D.C. Circuit over eighteen years ago, should this requirement be eliminated? If not, what purpose does this rule serve today that would justify its retention?

8. The Commission seeks comment on whether and how this information regarding cable operator interests in video programming is used today, if at all. Do local franchising authorities, consumers, or other parties currently inspect the cable operator interests in video programming records in the online public inspection file? Are these records being utilized by local franchising authorities, consumers, or other parties to keep track of vertical integration? If so, for what purpose? The Commission notes that, as the recordkeeping requirement does not apply to other video programming distributors, the information in these records would only be useful for monitoring vertical integration in cable operators. Given the many video programming options from which consumers can choose today, have marketplace changes rendered this requirement less useful or relevant?

9. UCC *et al.*, assert generally that the online public inspection file database is used to research and analyze how the entities required to maintain such files are serving their communities and meeting their obligations under the Commission's rules. If evidence of a particular use exists, commenters are encouraged to cite specific examples of how the information is being used currently, or has been used recently, by any party for any related purpose. The Commission notes that, in the over 26 years since the requirement was adopted, it is aware of only one instance in which the rule has been invoked. The Commission is aware of only one complaint—which was subsequently

withdrawn—alleging violation of the rule. In one other instance, the Commission discovered an apparent violation of the rule but only took action based on other public inspection file violations. Commenters should inform the Commission as to the utility of the rule in today's competitive media marketplace.

10. If the Commission were to eliminate the cable operator interest in video programming recordkeeping rule, the Commission seeks comment on whether the Commission or interested parties could access such information through other methods that would be more efficient or less burdensome for cable operators than compiling such information and placing it in a public inspection file. For example, in the past, the Commission has used information from various sources, such as cable company websites, published articles, and SNL Kagan, to identify affiliations between programming services and MVPDs for its Video Competition Reports. Would it be more cost effective for the Commission to undertake targeted information collections to acquire such information, if needed, as it does in the merger context? The Commission notes that it has collected information on the percentage of video programming channels attributed to cable operator merger applicants via information requests in the past. The Commission also seeks comment on whether and to what extent such information is redundant with or superfluous to information the Commission otherwise collects. For example, the Commission regularly seeks information regarding, and subsequently reports on, the state of vertical integration in the video programming marketplace as part of its report on competition, albeit at the MVPD industry level rather than focusing on individual cable operators. Can such information be found readily online? Is there a publicly available database for such information? If so, are such alternative sources accurate and current? Are there costs associated with accessing these alternative sources? And are these sources adequate substitutes for information provided directly by cable operators themselves?

11. The Commission also seeks comment on the regulatory burden for cable operators to file this information, including the amount of time and resources required to complete each filing. Notably, there is no standard form filed by cable operators pursuant to this rule, and the rule does not state how frequently cable operators should file or update their information, instead stating only that they must maintain

records regarding the nature and extent of their interests in their file for a period of three years. How frequently are cable operators filing such information today? Is the information being provided and the filing frequency being adhered to consistent among different cable operators? Do the burdens and costs on cable operators outweigh the utility of the information? Do any burdens associated with this requirement place cable operators at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their video programming competitors?

12. If the Commission finds that the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping rule should be retained, the Commission seeks comment on whether modifications to the rule would be appropriate. If the Commission was to modify the rule, what changes should it make to reduce the burden on cable operators? For instance, should the Commission clarify how often cable operators need to update their information? Should the Commission retain part of rule that requires reporting of attributable interests but eliminate the part of the rule that requires reporting of carriage, given that channel lineup information is widely available elsewhere?

13. Finally, the Commission seeks information and data on the benefits and costs associated with possible elimination or modification of the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping rule. The Commission asks commenters supporting retention, modification, or elimination of the rule to explain the anticipated economic impact of any proposed action, including the impact on small and independent entities, and, where possible, to quantify benefits and costs of proposed actions and alternatives.

### Procedural Matters

14. *Ex Parte Rules—Permit-But-Disclose.* This proceeding shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation

consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda, or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (e.g., .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

15. *Filing Requirements—Comments and Replies.* Pursuant to sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated on the first page of this document. Comments may be filed using ECFS. Commenting parties may file comments in response to this Notice in MB Docket No. 20–35; interested parties are not required to file duplicate copies in the additional dockets listed in the caption of this notice.

- *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the ECFS: <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>.

- *Paper Filers:* Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.

- Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- All hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary must be delivered to FCC Headquarters at 445 12th St. SW, Room TW–A325,

Washington, DC 20554. The filing hours are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of *before* entering the building.

- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554.

16. *Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis.* The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), requires that a regulatory flexibility analysis be prepared for notice and comment rulemaking proceedings, unless the agency certifies that “the rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.” The RFA generally defines the term “small entity” as having the same meaning as the terms “small business,” “small organization,” and “small governmental jurisdiction.” In addition, the term “small business” has the same meaning as the term “small business concern” under the Small Business Act. A “small business concern” is one which: (1) Is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

17. With respect to this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) under the RFA is contained in the Appendix. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA and must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines as comments on this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, with a distinct heading designating them as responses to the IRFA. In addition, a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and the IRFA will be sent to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the SBA and will be published in the **Federal Register**.

18. *Paperwork Reduction Act.* This document seeks comment on whether the Commission should adopt new or modified information collection requirements. The Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens and pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, invites the general public and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to comment on these information collection requirements. In addition, pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C.

3506(c)(4), the Commission seeks specific comment on how it might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

19. *People with Disabilities.* To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice), 202–418–0432 (tty).

20. *Additional Information.* For additional information on this proceeding, please contact Chad Guo of the Media Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, [Chad.Guo@fcc.gov](mailto:Chad.Guo@fcc.gov), (202) 418–0652.

### Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

21. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, as amended (RFA), the Commission has prepared this Initial Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (IRFA) of the possible significant economic impact on small entities of the policies and rules proposed in this *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (NPRM). The Commission requests written public comments on this IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments specified in the NPRM. The Commission will send a copy of the NPRM, including this IRFA, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (SBA). In addition, the NPRM and IRFA (or summaries thereof) will be published in the **Federal Register**.

#### A. Need for, and Objectives of, the Proposed Rules

22. This NPRM seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify the requirement that cable operators maintain records in their online public inspection file regarding the nature and extent of their attributable interests in all video programming services as well as information regarding their carriage of such vertically integrated video programming services on cable systems in which they have an attributable interest for a period of at least three years. An attributable interest is an ownership interest in, or relationship to, an entity that gives the interest holder a certain degree of influence or control over the entity as defined in the Commission's rules. Vertically integrated video programming is video programming carried by a cable system and produced by an entity in which the cable system's operator has an attributable interest. The rule's original

purpose was to aid in the enforcement of the Commission's channel occupancy limits, which have been reversed and remanded by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Eliminating or modifying this rule would reduce the burden of maintaining the public inspection file on cable operators.

#### B. Legal Basis

23. The proposed action is authorized under sections 1, 4(i), 4(j), 303(r), and 613 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 154(i), 154(j), 303(r), and 533.

#### C. Description and Estimate of the Number of Small Entities to Which the Proposed Rules Will Apply

24. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of, and where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities that may be affected by the proposed rule revisions, if adopted. The RFA generally defines the term "small entity" as having the same meaning as the terms "small business," "small organization," and "small governmental jurisdiction." In addition, the term "small business" has the same meaning as the term "small business concern" under the Small Business Act (SBA). A small business concern is one which: (1) Is independently owned and operated; (2) is not dominant in its field of operation; and (3) satisfies any additional criteria established by the SBA. Below, the Commission provides a description of such small entities, as well as an estimate of the number of such small entities, where feasible.

25. *Cable Companies and Systems (Rate Regulation Standard)*. The Commission has developed its own small business size standards for the purpose of cable rate regulation. Under the Commission's rules, a "small cable company" is one serving 400,000 or fewer subscribers nationwide. Industry data indicate that, of 4,200 cable operators nationwide, all but 9 are small under this size standard. In addition, under the Commission's rate regulation rules, a "small system" is a cable system serving 15,000 or fewer subscribers. Industry data indicate that, of 4,200 systems nationwide, 3,900 have fewer than 15,000 subscribers, based on the same records. Thus, under this standard, the Commission estimates that most cable systems are small entities.

26. *Cable System Operators (Telecom Act Standard)*. The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, also contains a size standard for small cable system operators, which is "a cable operator that, directly or through an affiliate, serves in the aggregate fewer than one 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." As of 2018, there were approximately 50,504,624 cable video subscribers in the United States. Accordingly, an operator serving fewer than 505,046 subscribers shall be deemed a small operator if its annual revenues, when combined with the total annual revenues of all its affiliates, do not exceed \$250 million in the aggregate. Based on available data, the Commission finds that all but six incumbent cable operators are small entities under this size standard. The Commission notes that it neither requests nor collects information on whether cable system operators are affiliated with entities whose gross annual revenues exceed \$250 million. Therefore the Commission is 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.

27. *Cable and Other Subscription Programming*. The Census Bureau defines this category as follows: "This industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in operating studios and facilities for the broadcasting of programs on a subscription or fee basis. . . . These establishments produce programming in their own facilities or acquire programming from external sources. The programming material is usually delivered to a third party, such as cable systems or direct-to-home satellite systems, for transmission to viewers." The SBA size standard for this industry establishes as small, any company in this category which has annual receipts of \$38.5 million or less. Census data for 2012 show that there were 367 firms that operated for that entire year. Of that number, 319 operated with annual receipts of less than \$25 million a year. Thus, under this size standard, the majority of such businesses can be considered small entities.

28. *Motion Picture and Video Production*. These entities may be indirectly affected by the Commission's action. The Census Bureau defines this category as follows: "This industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in producing, or producing and distributing motion pictures, videos, television programs, or television commercials." The Commission notes that establishments in this category may be engaged in various industries, including cable programming. The SBA has developed a small business size standard for this category, which is: Those having \$32.5 million or less in

annual receipts. Census data for 2012 show that there were 8,203 firms that that operated that year. Of that number, 8,075 had annual receipts of \$24,999,999 or less. Thus, under this size standard, the majority of such businesses can be considered small entities.

29. *Motion Picture and Video Distribution*. The Census Bureau defines this category as follows: "This industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in acquiring distribution rights and distributing film and video productions to motion picture theaters, television networks and stations, and exhibitors." The Commission notes that establishments in this category may be engaged in various industries, including cable programming. The SBA has developed a small business size standard for this category, which is: those having \$32.0 million or less in annual receipts. Census data for 2012 show that there were 307 firms that operated for that entire year. Of that number, 294 had annual receipts of \$24,999,999 or less. Thus, under this size standard, the majority of such businesses can be considered small entities.

#### D. Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements

30. The NPRM seeks comment on whether to eliminate or revise the recordkeeping requirement, in section 76.1710 of the Commission's rules, regarding cable operator interests in video programming. This rule requires cable operators maintain records in their online public inspection files regarding the nature and extent of their attributable interests in video programming services, as well as information regarding cable operators' carriage of such vertically integrated video programming services on cable systems in which they have an attributable interest. Elimination of these rules would reduce compliance requirements for cable operators. The NPRM also seeks comment on whether, if the rule is retained, it should be revised and, if so, how.

#### E. Steps Taken To Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

31. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small

entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

32. The NPRM seeks comment on whether to eliminate or modify a current requirement that cable operators maintain records in their online public inspection file, specifically the cable operator interests in video programming recordkeeping requirement. Eliminating or modifying this obligation would reduce the overall public inspection file burden on cable operators. There could also be an impact on small independent video programmers to the extent any programmers relied on the public file in question for information that is not easily available elsewhere. The NPRM seeks comment on eliminating or modifying this public file requirement, including any comments that might oppose eliminating or modifying this requirement.

*F. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rule*

33. None.

#### List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 76

Cable Television, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Cecilia Sigmund,**

*Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

#### Proposed Rules

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission amends 47 part 76 as follows:

#### 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, 302a, 303, 303a, 307, 308, 309, 312, 315, 317, 325, 339, 340, 341, 503, 521, 522, 531, 532, 534, 535, 536, 537, 543, 544, 544a, 545, 548, 549, 552, 554, 556, 558, 560, 561, 571, 572, 573.

#### § 76.504 [Amended]

■ 2. Amend § 76.504 by removing Note 2.

#### § 76.1700 [Amended]

■ 3. Amend § 76.1700 by removing and reserving paragraph (a)(7).

#### § 76.1710 [Removed and reserved]

■ 4. Remove and reserve § 76.1710.

[FR Doc. 2020–06631 Filed 4–1–20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 20

[Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2019–0004; FF09M21200–201–FXMB1231099BPP0]

**RIN 1018–BD89**

#### Migratory Bird Hunting; Proposed Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2020–21 Season

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (hereinafter, Service or we) proposes special migratory bird hunting regulations for certain Tribes on Federal Indian reservations, off-reservation trust lands, and ceded lands for the 2020–21 migratory bird hunting season.

**DATES:** *Written Comments:* You must submit comments on the proposed regulations by May 4, 2020.

*Information Collection Requirements:* If you wish to comment on the information collection requirements in this proposed rule, please send your comments and suggestions on this information collection by June 1, 2020 to: Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: PRB/PERMA (JAO/1N), Falls Church, VA 22041–3803 (mail); or *Info\_Coll@fws.gov* (email).

**ADDRESSES:** *Written Comments:* You may submit comments on the proposals by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2019–0004.

- *U.S. mail or hand delivery:* Public Comments Processing, Attn: FWS–HQ–MB–2019–0004, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; MS: PRB/PERMA (JAO/1N); 5275 Leesburg Pike; Falls Church, VA 22041–3803.

We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see Public Comments, below, for more information).

*Information Collection Requirements:* Send your comments and suggestions on the information collection requirements to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: PRB/PERMA (JAO/1N), Falls Church, VA 22041–3803 (mail); or *Info\_Coll@fws.gov* (email). Please reference OMB Control Number 1018–0171 in the subject line of your comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jerome Ford, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, (202) 208–1050.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Process for the Annual Migratory Game Bird Hunting Regulations

As part of the Department of the Interior's retrospective regulatory review, we developed a schedule for migratory game bird hunting regulations that is more efficient and provides hunting season dates much earlier than was possible under the old process. Under the new process, we develop proposed hunting season frameworks for a given year in the fall of the prior year. We then finalize those frameworks a few months later, thereby enabling the State agencies to select and publish their season dates in early summer. We provided a detailed overview of the new process in the August 3, 2017, **Federal Register** (82 FR 36308).

#### Special Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations for Indian Tribes

We developed the guidelines for establishing special migratory bird hunting regulations for Indian Tribes in response to tribal requests for recognition of their reserved hunting rights and, for some Tribes, recognition of their authority to regulate hunting by both tribal and nontribal hunters on their reservations. The guidelines include possibilities for:

(1) On-reservation hunting by both tribal and nontribal hunters, with hunting by nontribal hunters on some reservations to take place within Federal frameworks but on dates different from those selected by the surrounding State(s);

(2) On-reservation hunting by tribal members only, outside of the usual Federal frameworks for season dates and length, and for daily bag and possession limits; and

(3) Off-reservation hunting by tribal members on ceded lands, outside of usual framework dates and season length, with some added flexibility in daily bag and possession limits.

In all cases, the regulations established under the guidelines must