

court made clear, means “callers . . . have no need to train every retail employee on the finer points of revocation” and have “every incentive to avoid TCPA liability by making available clearly-defined and easy-to-use opt-out methods.” The Bureau seeks comment on what opt-out methods would be sufficiently clearly defined and easy to use such that “any effort to sidestep the available methods in favor of idiosyncratic or imaginative revocation requests might well be seen as unreasonable.” For example, what opt-out method would be clearly defined and sufficiently easy to use for unwanted calls? Pushing a standardized code (such as “*7”)? Saying “stop calling” in response to a live caller? Offering opt-out through a website? For unwanted texts, would a response of “stop” or similar keywords be sufficiently easy to use and clearly defined? What other methods would be sufficient? And must callers offer all or some combination of such methods to qualify?

8. *Fourth*, in light of the court’s decision on several key TCPA issues, the Bureau seeks renewed comment on two pending petitions for reconsideration of the Commission’s *Broadnet Declaratory Ruling*. In the first, National Consumer Law Center asks the Commission to reconsider its interpretation of “person” and clarify that federal government contractors, regardless of their status as common-law agents, are “persons” under the TCPA. In the second, Professional Services

Council asks the Commission to reconsider its reliance on common-law agency principles and clarify that contractors acting on behalf of the federal government are not “persons” under the TCPA.

9. The Bureau seeks comment on issues raised in those petitions and whether contractors acting on behalf of federal, state, and local governments are “persons” under the TCPA. While the question of whether contractors acting on behalf of state and local governments are “persons” for purposes of the TCPA is not raised in the pending petitions for reconsideration of the *Broadnet Declaratory Ruling*, the Commission has not addressed these questions. Should it do so now? Are all three levels of government subject to the same legal framework in determining whether they are “persons”? How is a state or local government official, or a contractor making calls on their behalf, legally similar to or different from federal government callers?

10. *Fifth*, the Bureau seeks renewed comment on the pending petition for reconsideration of the *2016 Federal Debt Collection Rules*, published at 81 FR 80594, November 16, 2016, filed by Great Lakes Higher Education Corp. *et al.* Great Lakes asks the Commission to reconsider several aspects of the rules, including the applicability of the TCPA’s limits on calls to reassigned wireless numbers. In light of the court’s opinion on reassigned numbers, the Bureau seeks renewed comment on this and other issues raised by the petition.

11. The Bureau also seeks comment on the interplay between the *Broadnet* decision and the Budget Act amendments—if a federal contractor is not a “person” for purposes of the TCPA (as the Commission held in *Broadnet*), would the rules adopted in the *2016 Federal Debt Collection Rules* even apply to a federal contractor collecting a federal debt?

Do persons who are not federal contractors collect federal debts? Or does the Budget Act amendment underlying the *2016 Federal Debt Collection Rules* undermine the rationale of *Broadnet*?

Federal Communications Commission.

Gregory Haledjian,

Legal Advisor, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2018–12084 Filed 6–5–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Notice of Termination of Receiverships

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC or Receiver), as Receiver for each of the following insured depository institutions, was charged with the duty of winding up the affairs of the former institutions and liquidating all related assets. The Receiver has fulfilled its obligations and made all dividend distributions required by law.

NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF RECEIVERSHIPS

Fund	Receivership name	City	State	Termination date
10092	Community First Bank	Prineville	OR	6/1/2018
10189	Rainier Pacific Bank	Tacoma	WA	6/1/2018
10252	High Desert State Bank	Albuquerque	NM	6/1/2018
10388	The First National Bank of Olathe	Olathe	KS	6/1/2018

The Receiver has further irrevocably authorized and appointed FDIC-Corporate as its attorney-in-fact to execute and file any and all documents that may be required to be executed by the Receiver which FDIC-Corporate, in its sole discretion, deems necessary, including but not limited to releases, discharges, satisfactions, endorsements, assignments, and deeds. Effective on the termination dates listed above, the Receiverships have been terminated, the Receiver has been discharged, and the Receiverships have ceased to exist as legal entities.

Dated at Washington, DC, on May 31, 2018.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2018–12092 Filed 6–5–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Agency Information Collection Activities: Announcement of Board Approval Under Delegated Authority and Submission to OMB

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SUMMARY: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) is adopting a proposal to extend for three years, without revision, the Survey of Consumer Finances (FR 3059; OMB No.7100–0287).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Federal Reserve Board Clearance Officer—Nuha Elmaghrabi—Office of the Chief Data Officer, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551, (202) 452–3829. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) users may contact (202) 263–4869, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.