

and that the effectiveness of the Commission's actions in mitigating that crisis is likely to be sharply reduced by delay. The Bureau seeks comment on this proposal.

Procedural Matters

50. *Paperwork Reduction Act Analysis.* This document contains proposed new or modified information collection requirements. As part of the Commission's continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, the Commission invites the general public and OMB to comment on the information collection requirements contained in this document, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. 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 the Commission might further reduce the information collection burden for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

51. *Ex Parte Rules.* Proceedings in this Notice 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 these proceedings should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 54

Communications common carriers, Internet, Libraries, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Schools, Telecommunications.

Federal Communications Commission.

Cheryl Callahan,

Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division Wireline Competition Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2021–05887 Filed 3–18–21; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 21–60; RM–11884; DA 21–203; FR ID 17521]

Television Broadcasting Services Superior and York, Nebraska

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission has before it a petition for rulemaking filed by Gray Television Licensee, LLC (Gray or Licensee), the licensee of television station KSNB–TV, channel 4, Superior, Nebraska, requesting an amendment of the DTV Table of Allotments to delete VHF channel 4 at Superior, Nebraska and allot it to York, Nebraska, and substitute UHF channel 24 at York for channel 4.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before April 21, 2021 and reply comments on or before May 6, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for petitioner as follows: Joan Stewart, Esq., Wiley Rein LLP, 1776 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joyce Bernstein, Media Bureau, at (202) 418–1647 or Joyce.Bernstein@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: According to Gray, problems with the reception of low-band digital channels are well known, and many viewers who receive a predicted principal community signal

from KSNB–TV on channel 4 are unable to receive a reliable over-the-air signal, particularly when using indoor antennas. Gray also applied to co-locate KSNB–TV with commonly-owned KOLN, Lincoln, Nebraska, a move of approximately 23.5 kilometers, and a change in community from Superior to York is necessary for KSNB–TV to make that move because it cannot put the required principal community signal over Superior from a channel 24 facility on the KOLN tower.

Gray asserts that York qualifies as a community for allotment purposes, has no local television allotment, and is the largest community in York County. Petitioner further asserts that while Superior will lose its only local television allotment, York is more deserving of an allotment, given its size and community and economic attributes. Thus, Gray seeks a waiver of the Commission policy that the removal of a community's first local service is presumptively inconsistent with the public interest except in the rare instance where removal might serve the public interest. Gray further requests a waiver of § 1.420(i) of the rules which provides that the Commission may modify a station's community of license without affording competing expressions of interest, where the modified facility is mutually exclusive; the channel 24 proposal at York is not mutually exclusive with KSNB–TV's current licensed operation on channel 4 at Superior.

The *NPRM* proposes to grant both requested waivers and seeks comment on those proposals. York is a larger community than Superior and allowing KSNB–TV to colocate with KOLN on channel 24 will result in important public benefits. In addition, the *NPRM* proposes to grant a waiver of § 1.420 of the rules; Gray has demonstrated that multiple channels are potentially available for future allotment in and around Superior, so that future applicants will not be deprived of the opportunity to apply for a station in the area if Gray's proposal is not opened for competing expressions of interest.

This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, MB Docket No. 21–69; RM–11884; DA 21–203, adopted February 22, 2021, and released February 22, 2021. The full text of this document is available for download at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. To request materials in accessible formats (braille, large print, computer diskettes, or audio recordings), please send an email to FCC504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer & Government Affairs Bureau at (202)

418-0530 (VOICE), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

This document does not contain 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, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited from the time a notice of proposed rulemaking is issued to the time the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, *see* 47 CFR 1.1208. There are, however, exceptions to this prohibition, which can be found in § 1.1204(a) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1204(a).

See §§ 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission’s rules for information regarding the proper filing procedures for comments, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas Horan,

Chief of Staff, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rule

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, 155, 301, 303, 307, 309, 310, 334, 336, and 339.

■ 2. In § 73.622(i), amend the Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments under Nebraska by revising the entry for Superior, and adding, in alphabetical order, an entry for York to read as follows:

§ 73.622 Digital television table of allotments.

* * * * *

(i) *Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments.*

Community	Channel No.
* * *	* * *
Nebraska	

Community	Channel No.
* * *	* * *
Superior
York	24
* * *	* * *

[FR Doc. 2021-04769 Filed 3-19-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 21-73; RM-11889; DA 21-270; FR ID 17558]

Television Broadcasting Services Toledo, Ohio

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Video Division has before it a petition for rulemaking filed November 27, 2020 (Petition) by Dominion Broadcasting, Inc. (Petitioner), the licensee of WLMB (IND), channel 5, Toledo, Ohio (WLMB or Station). The Petitioner requests the substitution of channel 35 for channel 5 at Toledo, Ohio in the DTV Table of Allotments.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before April 21, 2021 and reply comments on or before May 6, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for petitioner as follows: Joseph C. Chautin, III, Esq., Hardy, Carey, Chautin & Balkin, LLP, 1080 West Causeway Approach, Mandeville, LA 70471.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shaun Maher, Video Division, Media Bureau, at (202) 418-2324 or Shaun.Maher@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission’s *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, MB Docket No. 21-73; RM-11889; DA 21-270, adopted March 4, 2021, and released March 4, 2021. The full text of this document is available for download at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. To request materials in accessible formats (braille, large print, computer diskettes, or audio recordings), please send an email to FCC504@fcc.gov or call the Consumer & Government Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (VOICE), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

This document does not contain 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, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited from the time a notice of proposed rulemaking is issued to the time the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, *see* 47 CFR 1.1208. There are, however, exceptions to this prohibition, which can be found in § 1.1204(a) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1204(a).

See §§ 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission’s rules for information regarding the proper filing procedures for comments, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

In support of its channel substitution request, the Petitioner states that, since the Station transitioned to channel 5 in 2008 in conjunction with the Commission’s digital television transition, it has regularly received complaints from viewers unable to receive the Station’s over-the-air signal. Petitioner states that these issues have “continued unabated” for twelve years. Petitioner further states that it “has been forced to constantly scramble to retain viewers with a variety of methods, some costly.” Petitioner maintains that these propagation problems have put WLMB at a distinct competitive disadvantage to the other stations broadcasting in the Toledo market. Petitioner states that the Commission has long since recognized that “VHF channels have certain characteristics that have posed challenges for their use in providing digital television service” and that the Station’s experience is no different.

To remedy its propagation problems, Petitioner proposes substituting UHF channel 35 for VHF channel 5. Petitioner provides an Engineering Statement that it claims confirms that, with WLMB’s proposed parameters, including a 375 kW ERP, channel 35 can be substituted for channel 5 at Toledo, Ohio, in compliance with the Commission’s rules. Petitioner states that the proposed facility would continue to provide a principal community contour completely covering WLMB’s community of license and would not cause impermissible interference to any station.

Petitioner contends that the Engineering Statement also confirms