DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
FEB 9 1999

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
An Industry Coordination Committee	)	
System for Broadcast Digital	)	ET Docket No. 99-34
Television Service	)	

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

Adopted: January 28, 1999 ; Released: February 3, 1999

Comment Date: March 29, 1999
Reply Comment Date: April 28, 1999

By the Commission:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Para. No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. DISCUSSION	6
A. Committee Structure	12
B. Committee Functions	15
C. Committee Operations	19
D. Selection of Coordinators	25
E. Oversight	27
IV. PROCEDURAL MATTERS	29

Maximum Service Television, Inc. (MSTV), the Broadcasters' Caucus (Caucus), and other parties representing broadcasting interests had recommended an approach under which industry coordinating committees would evaluate proposals for changes to the DTV Table.[5] Under this approach, the industry committees would make recommendations to the Commission about how to dispose of allotment/assignment proposals or would provide the Commission with the detailed coverage and interference data necessary to make these decisions. A comprehensive plan for the structure, operating rules and composition of such industry coordinating committees was presented in a petition for further rule making submitted by the Caucus on January 10, 1997.[6]

4. In the *Sixth Report and Order*, we recognized and supported broadcasters' voluntary efforts to establish an industry coordination committee system to evaluate post-assignment changes to the DTV Table.[7] We agreed that an industry coordination system could promote a smoother and more orderly process for modifying the DTV Table and encouraged the industry to continue their voluntary coordination efforts. We indicated that an approach similar to that set forth in the Broadcasters Caucus' petition would appear to provide an appropriate model for industry coordination of DTV allotment and facility modifications. We stated that it is important, however, that any voluntary negotiation or coordination effort be open to all affected parties, including low power broadcasters and the public, and that we will require that such negotiations be open to all affected parties. In this regard, we stated that we will review all requests for modification of the DTV Table for their impact on low power stations. Industry coordinating committees therefore were strongly advised that they should consider LPTV and TV translator stations in developing proposed modifications to the DTV Table and avoid impact on such stations wherever possible. We also advised parties coordinating proposals for changes to the DTV Table that we will not consider requests for allotment modifications that would relocate an allotment to a channel in channels 60-69, nor will we consider creating new DTV allotments in this area of the spectrum.

---

[5] *See* for example, "Broadcasters' Proposed ATV Allotment/Assignment Approach submitted by MSTV in the DTV proceeding on January 13, 1995. Broadcasters elaborated on the idea of industry coordinating committees for DTV in their comments in response to the *Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making* in the DTV proceeding, MM Docket No. 87-268 (*Sixth Further Notice)*, 11 FCC Rcd 10968 (1996), and implemented a prototype of such a system in ten regions across the country.

[6] The Caucus suggested that DTV coordinating committees function according to the basic principles established in the private land mobile radio service for frequency coordinators. In particular, it proposed that the coordinating committees: 1) be representative of the industry; 2) generally process requests in the order in which they are received; 3) provide all stations that might be affected by a proposed change notice and an opportunity to comment, object, or submit their own proposals that could be precluded by a proposal under consideration; 4) provide coordination services on a nondiscriminatory basis for reasonable fees; 5) serve in a purely advisory role to the Commission; and 6) help resolve licensee disputes. The Caucus also proposed that the committees function on a coordinated fashion nationwide, using an updated data base.

[7] *See Sixth Report and Order*, at para. 182.

Commission retains the power to remedy discrimination or other abuses by coordinating committees; 5) an alternative coordinating committee would be recognized if it is more representative of the eligible licensees; 6) any coordination fees must be reasonable and cost-based; and 7) all requests for coordination must be considered. In 1982, Congress amended the Communications Act to affirm and clarify the Commission's authority to use frequency coordinators in the private mobile services and the fixed services.[11]

7. In its 1986 *Report and Order* in PR Docket No. 83-737 (*1986 Coordination Report and Order*), the Commission took a number of steps to improve the frequency coordination rules and procedures for the private land mobile services.[12] In that action, the Commission decided to recognize a single frequency coordinator for each radio service, group or pool of frequencies.[13] It also required that coordinators:[14]

- Provide coordination services on a non-discriminatory basis, including charges for services rendered.
- Perform the coordination function by: 1) checking applications for completeness, accuracy and compliance with the applicable FCC rules; 2) identifying the most appropriate frequency (requests for specific frequencies were to be accompanied by a technical showing); 3) sending the application and recommendation to the FCC.
- Process applications in order of receipt even if this does not lead to actions in the same order.
- Forward a recommendation to the Commission within 20 work days of the receipt of an application (speed of service requirement).
- Assist in resolution of post-licensing conflicts.
- Handle inter-service sharing requests.
- Provide services on a reasonable cost-based fee schedule.
- Facilitate the introduction of new services.
- Provide a single nationwide point of contact with the Commission.

8. The Commission retained responsibility for making determinations on eligibility, permissible usage, whether the use of a particular communications facility is in the public interest, and waiver requests.[15] It also stated that it would oversee the performance of the

[11] *See* 47 U.S.C. 332(b); *see also* The Communications Amendments Act of 1982. P.L. 97-259, 96 Stat. 1087, September 13, 1982.

[12] *See Report and Order*, PR Docket No. 83-737, 103 FCC 2d 1093 (1986).

[13] *Id.*, at paras. 57-61.

[14] *Id.*, paras. 16-53.

[15] *Id.*, at para. 20.

process mandatory or voluntary. We therefore request comment on whether we should require television station applicants, construction permit holders, licensees and others with proposals that would affect TV spectrum to coordinate their proposals through the industry committee process or simply to make participation in that process voluntary. We note that under a mandatory approach, the industry coordination committee system would replace our existing rules for voluntary negotiation of DTV allotment and facility modifications. As we indicated in the *Allotment Reconsideration Order*, it is our intention that consideration of an industry coordination committee system not delay the implementation of DTV service.[17] In this regard, we advise broadcasters that we will continue to process applications for DTV stations and requests for modification of facilities during the course of this proceeding. Broadcasters preparing DTV applications and or station modification requests therefore should not delay the filing of those applications. We also encourage broadcasters to continue to participate in voluntary coordination activities and negotiations relating to allotment additions and modifications while we consider this matter.

A. Committee Structure

12. We believe the plan proposed in the Caucus' petition generally offers an appropriate structure for the DTV coordination committee system. Under this plan, the coordination of DTV allotment and station changes would be organized on the basis of regional committees operating under the umbrella of a national organization (national coordinator). The national coordinator would establish an organizational structure and administrative system for the regional committees, manage a nationwide television data base, maintain procedures and software systems for performing technical analyses, and monitor the work of the regional committees. The regional coordinating committees would conduct evaluations and provide recommendations/ advice to the Commission and also would coordinate among local stations and within the industry. We believe that a system of multiple committees that coordinate modification requests and other matters on the basis of regional areas would foster participation in the coordination process by local broadcasters and also allow the coordinators to focus specific experience in, and knowledge of, local matters to work out allotment solutions. Such experience and knowledge could perhaps be especially useful in resolving requests that are mutually exclusive. The national data base and analyses capabilities and monitoring function provided by the national umbrella organization would ensure that evaluations are conducted on a uniform basis, in accordance with applicable standards and policies, and consider all other pending requests, including those from other regions.

13. We request comment on this proposal for the general structure of a DTV industry coordination system. We are not presenting a plan for a specific number of regional coordinating committees or for the boundaries of the regions in which they would operate. Rather, we request that interested parties submit comments and suggestions with regard to

[17] *See Allotment Reconsideration Order*, at para. 147.

on these matters.[20] Such proposals would be evaluated for compliance with the Commission's technical rules for television station allotment and operation and, where applicable, interference impact to other stations. As suggested by the Caucus, the goal of the coordination system would be to accommodate reasonable requests for facility and allotment changes/additions without creating unacceptable interference to neighboring DTV or NTSC stations. In this regard, the industry coordinating committees would provide assistance to both broadcasters and the Commission in assessing the feasibility, in terms of effects on interference and service areas, of modifications in the power, antenna height, antenna pattern, or transmitter site of DTV and NTSC stations, of changes in DTV channels, including negotiated exchanges on an intra- or inter-market basis, and of proposed new DTV allotments. The coordinating committees would also work with the requesting parties and, as appropriate, any other affected parties to develop solutions where a request would result in conflicts or other problems. In addition, the coordinating committees would also serve as a resource to provide information on coverage and interference.

16. In addition to the station/allotment coordination function, there are a number of activities relating to evaluations of service coverage and interference and selection of channels that the coordinating committees could perform to aid in the implementation of DTV service. In this regard, we ask whether the coordinating committees should perform or assist with the following additional activities:

- Coordination of station and allotment additions/changes with land mobile licensees operating on frequencies in the TV bands and on frequencies in adjacent bands to avoid interference.[21]
- Coordination of station and allotment additions/changes on channel 6, at 82-88 MHz, with noncommercial FM radio stations in the reserved band, at 88-92 MHz, to avoid interference.
- Assist in identifying and resolving any other issues or problems that might arise with regard to a proposal, such as proximity of television operations to AM radio

[20] "NTSC" is the name commonly used for the existing analog television transmission system. This system was developed by, and named for, the National Television Systems Committee, an industry group established many years ago to develop television broadcast standards. We currently have on file a number of applications for modification of existing NTSC stations. Also, we have on file a number of applications and petitions for rule making seeking to establish new NTSC stations. However, effective July 25, 1996, we no longer accept petitions for rule making for new NTSC allotments and effective September 20, 1996, we no longer accept applications for new NTSC stations (except in cases where a petition filed before July 25, 1996, is granted). *See Sixth Further Notice*, at paras. 60-61.

[21] The rules currently authorize sharing between land mobile and TV operations on frequencies in the range of UHF TV channels 14-20, which occupy the 470-512 MHz band, in 13 urbanized areas, the Gulf of Mexico and Hawaii. *See* 47 CFR 2.106, notes NG66, NG 114, and NG 127. In addition, channels 60-69, which occupy the 746-806 MHz band, were reallocated for public safety and a broad range of other services, including broadcasting, in the *Report and Order* in ET Docket No. 97-157, 12 FCC Rcd 22953 (1998). Existing TV stations and DTV stations in this band will share spectrum with new services until the end of the transition.

overlapping requests in adjacent regions. The national coordinator would further be responsible for monitoring the performance of the regional committees to ensure that studies and evaluations were being performed in a consistent manner and in accordance with all applicable policies and regulations. This monitoring would take place on a regular basis, through a random review of processing actions and meetings with the regional coordinating committees.

18. We request comment on these functions for the coordinating committee system and whether there are other functions that the coordinating committees and the national coordinator could perform. For example, we note that the Advanced Television Systems Committee has adopted a specification for a Program and System Information Protocol (PSIP) for the transmission of system information and program guide data for broadcast DTV stations.[25] We seek comment on whether the coordination committees and the national coordinator could assist in the administration of this voluntary industry system by assigning the unique PSIP station identifier and negotiating the naming and numbering of channels among broadcasters in local markets. We also request comment on whether the coordinating committee system could be established in a time frame that would allow it to administer the assignment of PSIP station identifiers or whether more expeditious arrangements need to be made to perform this task.

C. Committee Operations

19. Coordination committee actions would begin with the submission of a request for facility or allotment changes or for information on interference and coverage. Requests would be submitted to the appropriate regional coordinators on standard forms, with justification as applicable. Applicants requesting changes would also have to be prepared to submit technical studies to assist the coordinators in evaluating their requests. The coordinators would then evaluate the proposed request for compliance with the applicable FCC technical and/or spacing rules, and where appropriate or necessary, seek to develop alternative solutions that would resolve any interference or mutually exclusivity among requests. In cases where UHF DTV stations would seek to increase their power above the interim 200 kilowatt power limit under the policy recently adopted in the *Second*

[25] *See Program and System Information for Broadcast and Cable*, Advanced Television Systems Committee, Doc. A/65, December 23, 1997. The PSIP information and data would be used to enable a number of features of DTV television service, including the naming/identification of service channels and digital bit streams, electronic program guides, and program ratings. It also provides for selection through the program guide function of the type and language of closed captioning to be viewed and transmission of program ratings information to allow parents to use technological features ('v-chip" technology) to selectively block the display of programs on consumer receiving equipment, as required under the provisions of the Sections 551(c), (d), and (e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). Section 551of this Act amends Sections 303 and 330 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. *See* 47 U.S.C. 303 and 330. We adopted requirements for inclusion of v-chip blocking capabilities in TV receivers in the *Report and Order* in ET Docket No. 97-206, 13 FCC Rcd 11245 (1998). We are not addressing herein the standards to be specified for DTV closed captioning. That matter will be addressed in a separate proceeding.

coordination committees would be permitted to charge reasonable, cost-based fees for providing information to stations and processing requests for facility and channel changes/additions. If necessary, coordination fees would be reviewed by the Commission, but only to ensure that they reasonably reflect the cost of providing the overall coordination service. Parties with concerns about fees could submit complaints to the Commission asking for review. If we were to find abuses, we would move expeditiously to address and correct any such problems. We believe this approach would achieve an appropriate balancing of the concerns in this issue by providing the coordinators with the flexibility to allow for the differences in the costs of providing different services and addressing requests of differing complexity, while ensuring the fees charged for services are reasonable.

23. Processing Order and Timeliness. In order to ensure fair treatment of those requesting services, we are proposing to require that, as a general practice, the committee coordinators process requests in the order received and to require that they maintain logs. We agree with the Caucus that exceptions should be made for cases that reflect coordination among stations, such as where a group of stations might propose a market or area-wide change in channels and/or facilities, and would allow a coordinator to take requests out of order to consider all stations in an affected group together.

24. We recognize that coordination requests will vary greatly in complexity, and that the time needed to respond will vary with the nature of the request. Tasks could range from a request to evaluate the interference to a single station to a joint request from multiple stations for service and interference analyses and assistance in determining appropriate channels and facilities. We therefore are not proposing to establish a specific time limit for completing actions in response to requests or to require that such actions be completed in the order in which the requests were received. Rather, we are proposing simply to require that requests be processed in a timely manner. To enable monitoring of speed of service, we are proposing to require that the coordinating committees record completion dates in the logs indicated above. We are further proposing to require that the request and processing logs be made available to the Commission on request. We would investigate complaints relating to processing order and speed and take appropriate action where a problem was found to exist in these areas.

D. Selection of Coordinators

25. We request comment on how those who would lead the DTV coordination committee system should be selected and how we should provide for the start-up of this organization. One approach would be for the Commission to select an entity to head the national committee organization, and then allow the national organization to proceed with selection of the regional committees, in accordance with that organization's stated plan for the regional committee structure and administrative system. This plan would be the most administratively efficient for the Commission and would allow the industry, through the national organization, to implement its plan for the regional committee organizations at the start-up phase of the coordination system. Another approach would be for the Commission to

28. We recognize that establishing these coordinating committees to perform some of the functions proposed herein, including advising the Commission on some of these matters, could implicate the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).[27] We note that when Congress authorized the Commission to use frequency coordinators in the private mobile and fixed services area, it explicitly provided that "[a]ny advisory coordinating committee which furnishes assistance to the Commission under this subsection shall not be subject to the provisions of the FACA."[28] We invite comment on this issue and on how the application of FACA would affect all of the issues discussed above.

IV. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

29. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis. This Notice of Proposed Rule Making has been analyzed with respect to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-13, and found to impose no new or modified information collection requirements on the public.

30. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis. As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. § 603, the Commission has prepared an initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the expected impact on small entities of the proposals suggested in this document. The IRFA is set forth in Appendix A. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. These comments must be filed in accordance with the same filing deadlines as comments on the rest of the Notice of Proposed Rule Making, but they must have a separate and distinct heading designating them as responses to the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis.

31. Comments. Pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR §§ 1.415, 1.419, interested parties may file comments on before March 29, 1999, and reply comments on or before April 28, 1999. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rule Making Proceedings, 63 FR 24,121 (1998).

32. Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rule making numbers appear in the caption of this proceeding, however, commenting parties must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rule making number referenced in the caption. In completing the transmittal screen, commenting parties should include their full name, Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rule making number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments,

[27] *See* 5 U.S.C. App. 2; 41 CFR §§ 101-6.1001 to 101.6.1035.

[28] 47 U.S.C. § 332(b)(4).

37. For additional information concerning this matter, contact Alan Stillwell, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 418-2470.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Magalie Roman Salas

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary

APPENDIX A
INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS

As required by Section 603 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act,[29] the Commission has prepared an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) of the expected significant economic impact on small entities by the policies and rules proposed in this Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket No. 99-34. Written public comments are requested on the IRFA. Comments must be identified as responses to the IRFA and must be filed by the deadlines for comments on the Notice provided above in Section VI.

Need for and Objectives of the Proposed Rule:

In this rule making action the Commission seeks comment on proposals for the establishment of an industry DTV coordination committee system to process and evaluate proposed changes to the Table of Allotments for digital television (DTV) service and related matters involving use of the television frequencies. We believe that such an industry committee system may aid our efforts to provide fair and efficient means for adjusting the DTV Table and for managing requests for DTV station modifications as the transition to DTV progresses. In this regard, we believe that an industry coordination committee system could serve to improve our existing procedures by minimizing the number of petitions for rule making that are filed to change the DTV Table and encouraging the development of regional solutions to shared problems. A coordination committee system might also serve to provide assistance in managing any further requests for modification of analog (NTSC) television stations during the transition and on other issues such as inter-service sharing arrangements. The objective of this action is to obtain comment and information that will assist us in determining whether such an industry committee system is needed and to establish rules and policies for its structure, functions, operation, membership selection and oversight by the Commission.

Legal Basis:

The proposed action is authorized under Sections 4(i), 7, 301, 303, 307, and 336 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Sections 154(i), 301, 302, 303, 307, and 336.

Description and Estimate Of The Number Of Small Entities To Which The Rules Will Apply:

1. Definition of a "Small Business"

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, small entities may include small organizations, small businesses, and small governmental jurisdictions. 5 U.S.C. § 601(6). The Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. § 601(3) generally defines the term "small business" as having the

[29] 5 U.S.C. § 603.

of both firms. 13 CFR §121.104(d)(1). The SBA defines affiliation in 13 CFR § 121.103. While we refer to an affiliate generally as a station affiliated with a network, the SBA's definition of affiliate is analogous to our attribution rules. Generally, under the SBA's definition, concerns are affiliates of each other when one concern controls or has the power to control the other, or a third party or parties controls or has the power to control both. 13 CFR § 121.103(a)(1). The SBA considers factors such as ownership, management, previous relationships with or ties to another concern, and contractual relationships, in determining whether affiliation exists. 13 CFR § 121.103(a)(2). Instead of making an independent determination of whether television stations were affiliated based on SBA's definitions, we relied on the industry data bases available to us to afford us that information.

3. Estimates Based on Census and BIA Data

According to the Census Bureau, in 1992, there were 1,155 out of 1,478 operating television stations with revenues of less than ten million dollars. This represents 78 percent of all television stations, including non-commercial stations.[31] *See 1992 Census of Transportation, Communications, and Utilities, Establishment and Firm Size*, May 1995, at 1-25. The Census Bureau does not separate the revenue data by commercial and non-commercial stations in this report. Neither does it allow us to determine the number of stations with a maximum of 10.5 million dollars in annual receipts. Census data also indicates that 81 percent of operating firms (that owned at least one television station) had revenues of less than $10 million.[32]

We have also performed a separate study based on the data contained in the BIA Publications, Inc. Master Access Television Analyzer Database, which lists a total of 1,141 full-power commercial television stations. It should be noted that the percentage figures derived from the data base may be underinclusive because the data base does not list revenue estimates for noncommercial educational stations, and these are therefore excluded from our calculations based on the data base. Non-commercial stations would be subject to the allotment rules and policies proposed herein. The data indicate that, based on 1995 revenue estimates, 440 full-power commercial television stations had an estimated revenue of 10.5 million dollars or less. That represents 54 percent of commercial television stations with

[31] Our own records indicate that there are approximately 1,600 UHF and VHF commercial and noncommercial full service television stations that could make use of the coordination services proposals set forth in this Notice.

[32] Alternative data supplied by the U.S. Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy indicate that 65 percent of TV owners (627 of 967) have less than $10 million in annual revenue and that 39 percent of TV stations (627 of 1,591) have less than $10 million in annual revenue. U.S. Small Business Administration 1992 Economic Census Industry and Enterprise Receipts Report, Table 2D (U.S. Census Business Data adopted by SBA). These data were prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract to the Small Business Administration. These data show a lower percentage of small businesses than the data supplied directly to us by the Census Bureau. Therefore, for purposes of our worst case analysis, we will use the data supplied directly to us by the Census Bureau.

Employment Opportunity Rule (EEO) for broadcasting.[33] Thus, radio or television stations with fewer than five full-time employees are exempted from certain EEO reporting and recordkeeping requirements.[34] We estimate that the total numbers of commercial and noncommercial television stations with 4 or fewer employees are 132 and 136, respectively.[35] These estimates do not include LPTV stations, for which we do not collect employment data.

Description of Projected Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements:

The proposals set forth in this action would involve no changes to reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements beyond what is already required under the current regulations.

Federal Rules Which Overlap, Duplicate or Conflict With These Rules

None.

Significant Alternatives To Proposed Rules Which Minimize Significant Economic Impact of Small Entities and Accomplish Stated Objectives:

The DTV industry coordination committee system proposed in this action would be available for use by all commercial and noncommercial broadcast television stations desiring to change their DTV facilities and/or channels or their NTSC facilities and by parties seeking to add new channel allotments to the DTV Table of Allotments. This coordination system would be used by existing full service stations, low power stations and those seeking to establish new stations on a voluntary basis. Stations would also be allowed to use their own

---

[33] Our definition of a small broadcast station for purposes of applying the EEO rule was adopted prior to the requirement of approval by the Small Business Administration pursuant to Section 3(a) of the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. § 632(a), as amended by Section 222 of the Small Business Credit and Business Opportunity Enhancement Act of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-366, § 222(b)(1), 106 Stat. 999 (1992), as further amended by the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-403, § 301, 108 Stat. 4187 (1994). However, this definition was adopted after the public notice and the opportunity for comment. See Report and Order in Docket No. 18244, 23 FCC 2d 430 (1970).

[34] See, e.g., 47 CFR § 73.3612 (Requirement to file annual employment reports on Form 395 applies to licensees with five or more full-time employees); First Report and Order in Docket No. 21474 (In the Matter of Amendment of Broadcast Equal Employment Opportunity Rules and FCC Form 395), 70 FCC 2d 1466 (1979). We are currently considering how to decrease the administrative burdens imposed by the EEO rule on small stations while maintaining the effectiveness of our broadcast EEO enforcement. Order and Notice of Proposed Rule Making in MM Docket No. 96-16 (In the Matter of Streamlining Broadcast EEO Rule and Policies, Vacating the EEO Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amending Section 1.80 of the Commission's Rules to Include EEO Forfeiture Guidelines), 11 FCC Rcd 5154 (1996). One option under consideration is whether to define a small station for purposes of affording such relief as one with ten or fewer full-time employees. Id. at ¶ 21.

[35] Compilation of 1995 Broadcast Station Annual Employment Reports (FCC form 395B), Equal Opportunity Employment Branch, Mass Media Bureau, FCC.

and TV translator stations that will need to modify their existing operations or seek displacement channels to avoid interference to DTV service. We seek comment on whether there are specific actions we could take in establishing the industry coordination system to further aid low power stations.