

monitor the effectiveness of the ICS reforms, the Commission required all ICS providers to file annual reports providing data and other information on their ICS operations.

In particular, the Commission required each ICS provider to file a report annually specifying, for the prior calendar year: Interstate, international, and intrastate minutes of use by facility; and the name, size, and type of facility being served; fees for any ancillary services, the amount of these fees, and the number of times each fee was imposed; monthly site commission payments; rates and minutes of use for video calling services by facility, as well as ancillary fee charges for such services; the number of disability-related calls, problems associated with such calls, and ancillary fees charged in connection with such calls; and the number of complaints received related to, for example, dropped calls and poor call quality and the number of instances of each by TTY and TRS users. The annual reports ensure that the Commission has access to the information it needs to fulfill its regulatory duties, while minimizing the burden on ICS providers.

The Commission required that an ICS provider certify annually the accuracy of the data and other information submitted in the provider's annual report and the provider's compliance with the Commission's ICS rates. Pursuant to the authority delegated to it by the Commission in the *Second Report and Order*, the Commission's Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) created standardized templates for the annual reports (FCC Form 2301(a)) and certifications (FCC Form 2301(b)). The Bureau provided instructions that explain the reporting and certification requirements and reduce the burden of the data collection. The Commission also required ICS providers to disclose to consumers their interstate, intrastate, and international rates and ancillary service charges.

On June 13, 2017, the D.C. Circuit vacated the video visitation requirements in the annual report. Pursuant to the D.C. Circuit's mandate, the Commission has removed the video visitation reporting requirements in the annual report and amended the instructions to reflect the removal of this requirement. As part of the Commission's continued administration of the ICS data collection, the Commission has modified the instructions for FCC Form 2301(a) and FCC Form 2301(b) in several additional respects. These changes make the instructions clearer and will make the annual reports easier to understand and

analyze. The amended instructions require ICS providers to: Submit all reports using the electronic Excel template provided by the Commission, and to provide the data in a machine-readable, manipulatable format; provide city and state information for each facility served; group the facilities served by underlying contracts in the section for ICS Rates; separately report and explain their rates for debit/prepaid calls and collect calls; report fixed site commission payments by facility as well as by contract; and explain certain entries, including any entry that omits requested information. These changes will impose only a minimal additional burden on providers because they address only information that providers usually and customarily compile in the normal course of their business activities. The information will help the Commission continue to analyze changes in the ICS industry, to monitor compliance with the ICS rules, and to enforce these rules.

Federal Communications Commission.

Cecilia Sigmund,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019-27925 Filed 12-26-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 19-1215]

Filing Window for New Rural Digital Low Power Television and TV Translator Applicants Displaced by Incentive Auction and Station Repack December 2, 2019 to January 31, 2020

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Media Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission announces a window filing opportunity for pending new digital low power and TV translator stations (LPTV/translator stations) displaced by the Incentive Auction and station repack to amend their applications to specify a new channel between 2 to 36 (in core channels).

DATES: The window will open December 2, 2019 and close on January 31, 2020 at 11:59 p.m. ET.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shaun Maher, Video Division, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, *Shaun.Maher@fcc.gov*, (202) 418-2324.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 2009, the Media Bureau began accepting

applications for new rural digital LPTV/translator stations on a limited basis and then later froze those filings. The Media Bureau suspended processing of these applications due to the possibility that they could be displaced by the forthcoming Incentive Auction and repacking process. With the completion of the Incentive Auction and the progress made in the post-Incentive Auction transition, it is appropriate to give these applicants an opportunity to amend their applications to specify a new digital in core channel.

To be eligible to file in this window, the applicant must have a pending application for new digital LPTV/translator station that was displaced by the Incentive Auction and repacking process. In order to be considered "displaced" for purposes of filing in this window, an LPTV/translator applicant must: (1) Be subject to displacement by a full power or Class A television station on the repacked television band (channels 2-36) as a result of the Incentive Auction and repacking process, (2) have proposed a frequency repurposed for new, flexible use by a 600 MHz Band wireless licensee, or (3) have proposed a frequency that will serve as part of the 600 MHz Band guard bands (which includes the duplex gap).

In addition to specifying a new in core digital channel, applicants may modify their technical specifications provided such changes do not result in a change in transmitter site of more than 48 kilometers from the reference coordinates specified in their original application. To preserve the "rural" filing restriction in the original 2009 window, amended facilities must specify transmitting antenna site coordinates (geographic latitude and longitude) located more than 121 kilometers (75 miles) from the reference coordinates of the cities listed in Appendix A of the Public Notice. The proposed facilities may not cause interference to the predicted service of licenses and valid construction permits for full power television, Class A television and LPTV/translator stations nor the predicted service of any previously-filed application for any of these services. Eligible applicants may file an amendment to their pending application and such filing will be treated as a minor amendment provided it complies with these restrictions. There is no fee for filing this amendment.

All amendments submitted during the window will be considered filed on the last day of the window. Mutually exclusive (MX) applicants will be given an opportunity to resolve their MX through settlement or engineering

amendment that may be submitted during a settlement window to be announced by the Media Bureau by separate public notice. If two or more applications remain MX with one another after the close of the settlement window, the applications will be subject to the Commission’s competitive bidding rules.

Applications that are not amended to specify an in core channel during this window will be subsequently dismissed.

For additional information or questions, please contact Mark Colombo (technical), Mark.Colombo@fcc.gov, (202) 418–7611 or Shaun Maher (legal), Shaun.Maher@fcc.gov, (202) 418–2324 of the Video Division, Media Bureau.

Barbara Kreisman,
Chief, Video Division, Media Bureau.

APPENDIX A

Amendments filed during the window to allow applicants for new digital low power

television and television translator stations on channels 37 to 51 (out of core channels) to specify a channel between 2 and 36 (in core channels) may not propose facilities located within 121 kilometers (75 miles) of the reference coordinates listed below for the following cities. Source of cities: January 1, 2008 Nielsen Media Research Estimates. Source of coordinates: Section 76.53 of the Commission’s Rules.

DMA Ranking Market	North latitude	West longitude
1. New York City, New York	40–45–06	073–59–39
2. Los Angeles, California	34–03–15	118–14–28
3. Chicago, Illinois	41–52–28	87–38–22
4. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	39–56–58	75–9–21
5. Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas	32–47–09	096–47–37
6. San Francisco, California	37–46–39	122–24–40
7. Boston, Massachusetts	42–21–24	71–3–25
8. Atlanta, Georgia	33–45–10	84–23–37
9. Washington, District of Columbia	38–53–51	77–0–33
10. Houston, Texas	29–45–26	95–21–37
11. Detroit, Michigan	42–19–48	83–2–57
12. Phoenix, Arizona	33–27–12	112–4–28
13. Tampa, Florida	27–56–58	82–27–26
14. Seattle, Washington	47–36–32	122–20–12
15. Minneapolis, Minnesota	44–58–57	93–15–43
16. Miami, Florida	25–46–37	80–11–32
17. Cleveland, Ohio	41–29–51	81–41–50
18. Denver, Colorado	39–44–58	104–59–22
19. Orlando, Florida	28–32–42	81–22–38
20. Sacramento, California	38–34–57	122–23–34
21. St. Louis, Missouri	38–37–45	90–12–22
22. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	40–26–19	80–0–0
23. Portland, Oregon	45–31–6	122–40–35
24. Baltimore, Maryland	39–17–26	76–36–45
25. Charlotte, North Carolina	35–13–44	80–50–45
26. Indianapolis, Indiana	39–46–7	86–9–46
27. San Diego, California	32–42–53	117–9–21
28. Raleigh, North Carolina	35–46–38	78–38–21
29. Hartford, Connecticut	41–46–12	72–40–49
30. Nashville, Tennessee	36–9–33	86–46–55
31. Kansas City, Missouri	39–4–56	94–35–20
32. Columbus, Ohio	39–57–47	83–0–17
33. Cincinnati, Ohio	39–6–7	84–30–35
34. Milwaukee, Wisconsin	43–2–19	87–54–15
35. Salt Lake City, Utah	40–45–23	111–51–26
36. Greenville, South Carolina	34–50–50	82–24–1
37. San Antonio, Texas	29–25–37	98–29–6
38. West Palm Beach, Florida	26–42–36	80–3–5
39. Grand Rapids, Michigan	42–58–3	85–40–13
40. Birmingham, Alabama	33–31–1	86–48–36
41. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	40–15–43	76–52–59
42. Norfolk, Virginia	36–51–10	76–17–21
43. Las Vegas, Nevada	36–10–20	115–8–37
44. Albuquerque, New Mexico	35–5–1	106–39–5
45. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	35–28–26	97–31–4
46. Greensboro, North Carolina	36–4–17	79–47–25
47. Memphis, Tennessee	35–8–46	90–3–13
48. Louisville, Kentucky	38–14–47	85–45–49
49. Jacksonville, Florida	30–19–44	81–39–42
50. Buffalo, New York	42–52–52	78–52–21
51. Austin, Texas	30–16–9	97–44–37
52. Providence, Rhode Island	41–49–32	71–24–41
53. New Orleans, Louisiana	29–56–53	90–4–10
54. Scranton, Pennsylvania	41–24–32	75–39–46
55. Fresno, California	36–44–12	119–47–11
56. Albany, New York	42–39–1	73–45–1
57. Little Rock, Arkansas	34–44–52	92–16–37
58. Knoxville, Tennessee	35–57–39	83–55–7
59. Richmond, Virginia	37–32–15	77–26–9

DMA Ranking Market	North latitude	West longitude
60. Tulsa, Oklahoma	36-9-12	95-59-34
61. Mobile, Alabama	30-41-36	88-2-33
62. Dayton, Ohio	39-45-32	84-11-43
63. Fort Myers, Florida	26-38-42	81-52-6
64. Lexington, Kentucky	38-2-50	84-29-46
65. Huntington, West Virginia	38-25-12	82-26-33
66. Flint, Michigan	43-0-50	83-41-33
67. Roanoke, Virginia	37-16-13	79-56-44
68. Tucson, Arizona	32-13-15	110-58-8
69. Wichita, Kansas	37-41-30	97-20-16
70. Green Bay, Wisconsin	44-30-48	88-0-50
71. Des Moines, Iowa	41-35-14	93-37-0
72. Toledo, Ohio	41-39-14	83-32-39
73. Honolulu, Hawaii	21-18-36	157-51-48
74. Springfield, Missouri	37-13-3	93-17-32
75. Omaha, Nebraska	41-15-42	95-56-14
76. Portland, Maine	43-39-33	70-15-19
77. Spokane, Washington	47-39-32	117-25-33
78. Rochester, New York	43-9-41	77-36-21
79. Paducah, Kentucky	37-5-13	88-35-56
80. Syracuse, New York	43-3-4	76-9-14
81. Columbia, South Carolina	34-0-2	81-2-0
82. Shreveport, Louisiana	32-30-46	93-44-58
83. Huntsville, Alabama	34-44-18	86-35-19
84. Champaign, Illinois	40-7-5	88-14-48
85. Madison, Wisconsin	43-4-23	89-22-55
86. Chattanooga, Tennessee	35-2-41	85-18-32
87. Cedar Rapids, Iowa	41-58-48	91-39-48
88. Harlingen, Texas	26-11-29	97-41-35
89. South Bend, Indiana	43-40-33	86-15-1
90. Jackson, Mississippi	32-17-56	90-11-6
91. Johnson City, Tennessee	36-19-4	82-20-56
92. Burlington, Vermont/Plattsburgh, New York	44-28-34	73-12-46
93. Colorado Springs, Colorado	38-50-7	104-49-16
94. Baton Rouge, Louisiana	30-26-58	91-11-0
95. Waco, Texas	31-33-12	97-8-0
96. Davenport, Iowa	41-31-24	90-34-21
97. Savannah, Georgia	32-4-42	81-5-37
98. El Paso, Texas	31-45-36	106-29-21
99. Johnstown, Pennsylvania	40-19-35	78-55-3
100. Charleston, South Carolina	32-46-35	79-55-53

[FR Doc. 2019-27941 Filed 12-26-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

[Docket No. OP-1681]

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

RIN 3064-ZA08

Extension of Comment Period; Request for Information on Application of the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System

AGENCY: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

ACTION: Notice and request for information; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On October 31, 2019, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) and the Federal

Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) (collectively, the agencies) published in the **Federal Register** a request for information (RFI) seeking information and comments from interested parties regarding the consistency of ratings assigned by the agencies under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System (UFIRS). The agencies have determined that an extension of the comment period until February 28, 2020, is appropriate.

DATES: The comment period for the notice published on October 31, 2019 (84 FR 58383), regarding the RFI on application of UFIRS, is extended from December 30, 2019, to February 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the methods identified in the proposal.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Board: Alex Kobulsky, Senior Financial Institution Policy Analyst II, (202) 452-2031, and Anna Lee Hewko, Associate Director, (202) 530-6260,

Division of Supervision and Regulation; or Patricia Yeh, Senior Counsel, (202) 452-3089, Legal Division, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th and C Streets NW, Washington, DC 20551. For the hearing impaired only, Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD), (202) 263-4869.

FDIC: Rae-Ann Miller, Associate Director, Risk Management Policy; Samuel B. Lutz, Counsel, Supervision and Legislation Branch, Legal Division, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 550 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20429.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 31, 2019, the agencies published in the **Federal Register** a RFI seeking information and comments from interested parties regarding the consistency of ratings assigned by the agencies under UFIRS. The assigned ratings are commonly known as CAMELS ratings. The agencies also sought feedback concerning the current