SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Public Law 94–409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee will hold a public meeting on Monday, November 9, 2020, via videoconference.

PLACE: The meeting will begin at 10:00 a.m. (ET) and will be open to the public. The meeting will be conducted by remote means (videoconference) and/or at the Commission’s headquarters, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549. Members of the public may watch the webcast of the meeting on the Commission’s website at www.sec.gov.

STATUS: On October 23, 2020, the Commission published notice of the Committee meeting (Release No. 33–10877), indicating that the meeting is open to the public and inviting the public to submit written comments to the Committee. This Sunshine Act notice is being issued because a majority of the Commission may attend the meeting.

MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED: The agenda for the meeting includes matters relating to rules and regulations affecting small and emerging businesses and their investors.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: For further information and to ascertain what, if any, matters have been added, deleted or postponed; please contact Vanessa A. Countryman from the Office of the Secretary at (202) 551–5400.


Vanessa A. Countryman,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020–24490 Filed 10–30–20; 4:15 pm]
BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations; MEMX LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Enable Members To Designate Certain Orders To Be Identified as Retail Orders to the Exchange


Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”) and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, notice is hereby given that on October 26, 2020, MEMX LLC (“MEMX” or the “Exchange”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange filed the proposal as a “non-controversial” proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is filing with the Commission a proposed rule change to adopt new Rule 11.21 to enable members of the Exchange (“Members”) to designate certain orders they submit to the Exchange on behalf of retail customers to be identified as retail orders to the Exchange. The text of the proposed rule change is provided in Exhibit 5.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to adopt new Rule 11.21 to enable Members to designate certain orders they submit to the Exchange on behalf of retail customers to be identified as retail orders to the Exchange. Under the proposed rule change, the Exchange would create a new class of market participant for any Member that satisfies the requirements under proposed Rule 11.21 called a Retail Member Organization (“RMO”), which would be eligible to submit certain retail order flow (“Retail Orders”) to the Exchange. Specifically, proposed Rule 11.21 would: (i) Define a Retail Order and RMO; (ii) set forth an RMO’s qualification and application requirements and the Exchange’s approval process; (iii) outline procedures for when an RMO fails to abide by the Retail Order requirements; and (iv) outline the procedures under which a Member may appeal the Exchange’s decision to disapprove it or disqualify it as an RMO. The Exchange notes that proposed Rule 11.21 is substantially similar to and based on paragraphs (a)–(d) of Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc. (“Cboe BZX”) Rule 11.25. Definitions

The Exchange proposes to adopt the following definitions under proposed Rule 11.21(a). First, the term “Retail Member Organization” or “RMO” would be defined as a Member (or a division thereof) that has been approved by the Exchange to submit Retail Orders. Second, the term “Retail Order” would be defined as an agency or riskless principal order that meets the criteria of FINRA Rule 5320.03 that originates from a natural person and is submitted to the Exchange by an RMO, provided that no change is made to the terms of the order with respect to price or size of market and the order does not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology.

RMO Qualifications and Approval Process

Under proposed Rule 11.21(b), any Member could qualify as an RMO if it conducts a retail business or routes retail orders on behalf of another broker-dealer. Proposed Rule 11.21(b)(1) makes clear that an RMO that carries retail customer accounts on a fully disclosed basis would be considered to conduct a retail business for purposes of the rule. The qualification standards and approval process under proposed Rule 11.21(b) are designed to ensure that Members are properly qualified as an RMO and only designate as Retail Orders those orders that meet the definition of Retail Orders under proposed Rule 11.21(a)(2) described above. Any Member that wishes to obtain RMO status would be required to submit: (i) an application form; (ii) supporting documentation sufficient to demonstrate the retail nature and characteristics of the applicant’s order flow; and (iii) an attestation, in a form prescribed by the Exchange, that substantially all orders submitted by the Member as a Retail Order will qualify as such under proposed Rule 11.21(b).

An RMO would be required to have written policies and procedures reasonably designed to assure that it will only designate orders as Retail Orders if all requirements of a Retail Order are met. Such written policies and procedures must require the Member to (i) exercise due diligence before entering a Retail Order to assure that entry as a Retail Order is in compliance with the requirements of proposed Rule 11.21, and (ii) monitor whether orders entered as Retail Orders meet the applicable requirements. If the RMO does not itself conduct a retail business or routes Retail Orders on behalf of another broker-dealer, the RMO’s supervisory procedures must be reasonably designed to assure that the orders it receives from such other broker-dealer that it designates as Retail Orders meet the definition of a Retail Order. Such an RMO must (i) obtain an annual written representation, in a form acceptable to the Exchange, from each other broker-dealer that sends it orders to be designated as Retail Orders that entry of such orders as Retail Orders will be in compliance with the requirements of proposed Rule 11.21,

and (ii) monitor whether Retail Order flow routed on behalf of such other broker-dealers continues to meet the applicable requirements. 8

If the Exchange disapproves a Member’s application to be an RMO, the Exchange would provide a written notice to the Member. The disapproved applicant could appeal the disapproval by the Exchange as provided in proposed Rule 11.21(d) and/or reapply for RMO status 90 days after the disapproval notice is issued by the Exchange. An RMO also could voluntarily withdraw from such status at any time by giving written notice to the Exchange.

As described above, under proposed Rule 11.21(b), any Member could qualify as an RMO if it conducts a retail business or routes retail orders on behalf of another broker-dealer, and Proposed Rule 11.21(b)(1) makes clear that an RMO that carries retail customer accounts on a fully disclosed basis would be considered to conduct a retail business for purposes of the rule. The Exchange proposes to distinguish an RMO’s routing services on behalf of another broker-dealer from services provided by an RMO that carries retail customer accounts on a fully disclosed basis, as described below. As background with respect to this aspect of the proposed change, the Exchange first would like to describe the terms “introducing broker”, “carrying firm” or “carrying broker-dealer”, and “fully disclosed,” as such terms are commonly used in the securities industry. An “introducing” broker-dealer is “one that has a contractual arrangement with another firm, known as the carrying or clearing firm, under which the carrying firm agrees to perform certain services for the introducing firm. Usually, the introducing firm submits its customer accounts to the carrying firm on a fully disclosed basis, then the carrying firm handles orders from its retail customers that are “introduced” by the introducing broker. However, as noted above, in contrast to a typical routing relationship on behalf of another broker-dealer, a carrying broker deals with a significant level of information regarding each customer introduced by the introducing broker. Accordingly, the Exchange proposes to state in Rule 11.21(b)(1) that for purposes of Rule 11.21, “conducting a retail business shall include carrying retail customer accounts on a fully disclosed basis.”

Failure of RMO To Abide by Retail Order Requirements

Proposed Rule 11.21(c) addresses an RMO’s failure to abide by Retail Order requirements. If an RMO designates orders submitted to the Exchange as Retail Orders and the Exchange determines, in its sole discretion, that those orders fail to meet any of the requirements of Retail Orders, the Exchange may disqualify a Member from its status as an RMO. When disqualification determinations are made, the Exchange would provide a written disqualification notice to the Member. A disqualified RMO could appeal the disqualification provided in proposed Rule 11.21(d) and/or reapply for RMO status 90 days after the disqualification notice issued by the Exchange.

---

8 The Exchange or another self-regulatory organization on behalf of the Exchange will review an RMO’s compliance with these requirements through an exam-based review of the RMO’s internal controls.


10 Id.
Proposed Rule 11.21(d) provides appeal rights to Members. If a Member disputes the Exchange’s decision to disapprove it as an RMO under proposed Rule 11.21(b) or disqualify it under proposed Rule 11.21(c), such Member may request, within five business days after notice of the decision is issued by the Exchange, that the Retail Member Organization Panel (the “RMO Panel”) review the decision to determine if it was correct. The RMO Panel would consist of the Exchange’s Chief Regulatory Officer (“CRO”), or a designee of the CRO, and two officers of the Exchange designated by the Exchange’s Chief Executive Officer. The RMO Panel would review the facts and render a decision within the time frame prescribed by the Exchange. The RMO Panel could overturn or modify an action taken by the Exchange and all determinations by the RMO Panel would constitute final action by the Exchange on the matter at issue.

Implementation

The Exchange notes that, under the proposed rule change, an order involving any Regulation NMS security traded on the Exchange that meets the definition of Retail Order would be eligible to be designated as such by an RMO. The Exchange also notes that orders designated as Retail Orders would only be designated as such to the Exchange and would not be designated as such on the Exchange’s market data feeds or otherwise identifiable as Retail Orders by any market participants or the public. Further, the Exchange notes that orders designated as Retail Orders would be handled in the exact same way under the Exchange’s rules as if such orders were not designated as Retail Orders. In other words, the designation of an order as a Retail Order would not in any way affect the priority or other handling procedures applicable to such order under the Exchange’s rules.

The purpose of enabling RMOs to designate orders as Retail Orders to the Exchange under the proposed rule change is so the Exchange may identify and track orders designated as such, which the Exchange believes will be useful for it in considering potential pricing modifications to such orders as it continues to evaluate its pricing structure following the recent commencement of its operations as a national securities exchange. The Exchange further believes that the proposed rule change would enable the Exchange to have the appropriate mechanisms and processes in place to implement any differentiated pricing for Retail Orders if and when the Exchange proposes to do so in the future. The Exchange notes that, at some point following the adoption and implementation of proposed Rule 11.21 as described in this proposed rule change, the Exchange may separately propose to amend its fee schedule to adopt a specific fee code for Retail Orders to be provided on an RMO’s execution reports and/or to provide differentiated pricing for Retail Orders, which the Exchange believes would attract additional retail order flow to the Exchange, thereby providing the benefits of exchange transparency, regulation, and oversight to more retail orders. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would allow it to be organized with the appropriate infrastructure (i.e., mechanisms and processes) in advance of any such proposal, and as such, would allow the Exchange to more quickly implement any such differentiated pricing.

Comparison To Existing Rules of Other Equity Exchanges

As noted above, proposed Rule 11.21 is substantially similar to and based on Cboe BZX Rule 11.25. Specifically, proposed Rule 11.21 is nearly identical to paragraphs (a)–(d) of Cboe BZX Rule 11.25, with the only differences being to the name of the RMO Panel, the deletion of a defined term not otherwise used in the rule, and that the Exchange’s Chief Executive Officer, rather than Chief Information Officer, designates two officers to serve on the RMO Panel, and otherwise differs from Cboe BZX Rule 11.25 only in that such rule contains a separate paragraph (e) that allows an RMO to designate a Retail Order to be identified as such on Cboe BZX’s proprietary data feeds. As noted above, proposed Rule 11.21 would not allow an RMO to designate a Retail Order to be identified as such on the Exchange’s market data feeds.

The Exchange further notes that proposed Rule 11.21 is also substantially similar to other exchange rules of several other equity exchanges. Certain of these exchanges include these rules as part of a retail attribution program, retail liquidity program or retail price improvement program. However, unlike those programs, the Exchange does not propose to attribute retail orders in its market data feeds, to adopt any special order handling for Retail Orders or orders intended to provide liquidity to Retail Orders, or to adopt any mechanics for price improvement for Retail Orders. Instead, as described above, the proposed rule change would only enable an RMO to designate that their Retail Orders be identified as such to the Exchange.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act, in particular, in that it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with these principles because it would increase competition among execution venues and enable the Exchange to implement future pricing changes to encourage the submission of additional Retail Orders to the Exchange. The Exchange notes that a significant percentage of the orders of retail investors are executed over-the-counter. The Exchange believes that it is appropriate to put in place the mechanisms and processes to enable the Exchange to subsequently offer any differentiated pricing for Retail Orders as the Exchange believes that such pricing could incentivize market participants to bring more retail order flow to the Exchange, thereby providing the benefits of exchange transparency, regulation, and oversight to more retail orders.

The Exchange notes that the proposed rule change is substantially similar to paragraphs (a)–(d) of Cboe BZX Rule 11.25 and the existing rules of several other equity exchanges, as described in more detail above. Specifically, proposed Rule 11.21 contains nearly identical definitions, standards and qualification procedures as Cboe BZX Rule 11.25 and the comparable retail order rules of Cboe EDGX, Cboe BYX,
Nasdaq BX, and NYSE Arca.¹⁹ However, unlike certain of these exchanges’ rules, the proposed rule change does not propose to attribute retail orders in the Exchange’s market data feeds, to adopt any special order handling for Retail Orders or orders intended to provide liquidity to Retail Orders, or to adopt any mechanics for price improvement for Retail Orders, as described above.

The Exchange also believes its proposed qualification standards and review process under proposed Rule 11.21 promote just and equitable principles and are not unfairly discriminatory because they are designed to ensure that Members are properly qualified as RMOs and only designate as Retail Orders those orders that meet the definition of Retail Orders under proposed Rule 11.21(a)(1) described above. The qualification process proposed herein by the Exchange is not designed to permit unfair discrimination, but rather ensure that orders that are designated as Retail Orders are, in fact, orders submitted by a retail customer that satisfy the proposed definition of Retail Order. Lastly, the Exchange notes that these qualification and review provisions are nearly identical to those included in the qualification and review provisions under proposed Rule 11.21(a)(1) described above. The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange believes that the proposed amendment would not burden intramarket competition because the ability to designate Retail Orders to be identified as such to the Exchange would be open to all Members that wish to send Retail Orders to the Exchange. The Exchange believes the proposed rule change would not burden, but rather increase, intramarket competition by permitting RMOs to identify orders as Retail Orders when submitted to the Exchange, which would ultimately enable the Exchange to better compete with other exchanges that offer retail order programs.²¹ As noted above, at this time the Exchange is not proposing to attribute retail orders in the Exchange’s market data feeds, to adopt any special order handling for Retail Orders or orders intended to provide liquidity to Retail Orders, or to adopt any mechanics for price improvement for Retail Orders. Rather, adoption of the proposed rule will enable the Exchange to have the appropriate mechanisms and processes in place to implement differentiated pricing for Retail Orders if and when the Exchange proposes to do so in the future.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes its proposed rule change would not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange believes that the proposed amendment would not burden intramarket competition because the ability to designate Retail Orders to be identified as such to the Exchange would be open to all Members that wish to send Retail Orders to the Exchange. The Exchange believes the proposed rule change would not burden, but rather increase, intramarket competition by permitting RMOs to identify orders as Retail Orders when submitted to the Exchange, which would ultimately enable the Exchange to better compete with other exchanges that offer retail order programs.²¹ As noted above, at this time the Exchange is not proposing to attribute retail orders in the Exchange’s market data feeds, to adopt any special order handling for Retail Orders or orders intended to provide liquidity to Retail Orders, or to adopt any mechanics for price improvement for Retail Orders. Rather, adoption of the proposed rule will enable the Exchange to have the appropriate mechanisms and processes in place to implement differentiated pricing for Retail Orders if and when the Exchange proposes to do so in the future.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes its proposed rule change would not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange believes that the proposed amendment would not burden intramarket competition because the ability to designate Retail Orders to be identified as such to the Exchange would be open to all Members that wish to send Retail Orders to the Exchange. The Exchange believes the proposed rule change would not burden, but rather increase, intramarket competition by permitting RMOs to identify orders as Retail Orders when submitted to the Exchange, which would ultimately enable the Exchange to better compete with other exchanges that offer retail order programs.²¹ As noted above, at this time the Exchange is not proposing to attribute retail orders in the Exchange’s market data feeds, to adopt any special order handling for Retail Orders or orders intended to provide liquidity to Retail Orders, or to adopt any mechanics for price improvement for Retail Orders. Rather, adoption of the proposed rule will enable the Exchange to have the appropriate mechanisms and processes in place to implement differentiated pricing for Retail Orders if and when the Exchange proposes to do so in the future.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization’s Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) Significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act ²² and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) ²³ thereunder.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

• Use the Commission’s internet comment form (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml); or
• Send an email to rule-comments@sec.gov. Please include File Number SR–MEMX–2020–13 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

• Send paper comments in triplicate to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–MEMX–2020–13. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission’s internet website (http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for website viewing and printing in the Commission’s Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change. Persons submitting comments are cautioned that we do not redact or edit

¹⁹ Id.
²⁰ Id.
²¹ See supra notes 5 and 12 [sic].
personal information from comment submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–MEMX–2020–13 and should be submitted on or before November 24, 2020.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.

J. Matthew DeLesaDernier,
Assistant Secretary.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION


Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.: Notice of Designation of a Longer Period for Commission Action on Proceedings To Determine Whether To Approve or Disapprove a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Rule 14.11, Other Securities


On April 29, 2020, Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc. (“Exchange” or “BZX”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Act”) 4 and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, 2 a proposed rule change to amend one of the continued listing requirements relating to certain exchange-traded products (“ETPs”) under BZX Rule 14.11. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the Federal Register on May 7, 2020. 3 On June 16, 2020, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, 4 the Commission designated a longer period within which to approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change. 5 On August 4, 2020, the Commission instituted proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) of the Act 6 to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change. 7 The Commission has received one comment letter on the proposed rule change. 8

Section 19(b)(2) of the Act 9 provides that, after initiating disapproval proceedings, the Commission shall issue an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change not later than 180 days after the date of publication of notice of filing of the proposed rule change. The Commission may extend the period for issuing an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change by not more than 60 days if the Commission determines that a longer period is appropriate and publishes reasons for such determination. The proposed rule change was published for notice and comment in the Federal Register on May 7, 2020. November 3, 2020 is 180 days from that date, and January 2, 2021 is 240 days from that date.

The Commission finds it appropriate to designate a longer period within which to issue an order approving or disapproving the proposed rule change so that it has sufficient time to consider the proposed rule change. Accordingly, the Commission, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act, 10 designates January 2, 2021 as the date by which the Commission shall either approve or disapprove the proposed rule change (File No. SR–CboeBZX–2020–036).

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.

J. Matthew DeLesaDernier,
Assistant Secretary.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

30-Day Notice of Intent To Seek Extension of Approval for Information Collection: Rail Service Data

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Surface Transportation Board (STB or Board) gives notice of its intent to seek approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for an extension of the information collection of Rail Service Data, as described below. The Board previously published a notice about this collection in the Federal Register. That notice allowed for a 60-day public review and comment period. No comments were received.

DATES: The comment period for the notice published September 2, 2020, at 85 FR 54614, is extended. Comments on this information collection should be submitted by December 3, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be identified as “Paperwork Reduction Act Comments, Rail Service Data.” These comments should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory


SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Disaster Declaration #16633 and #16634; Louisiana Disaster Number LA–00103]

Presidential Declaration Amendment of a Major Disaster for the State of Louisiana

AGENCY: U.S. Small Business Administration.

ACTION: Amendment 6.


DATES: Issued on 08/28/2020.

Physical Loan Application Deadline Date: 11/27/2020

Economic Injury (EIDL) Loan Application Deadline Date: 05/28/2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit completed loan applications to: U.S. Small Business Administration, Processing and Disbursement Center, 14925 Kingsport Road, Fort Worth, TX 76155.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The notice of the President’s major disaster declaration for the State of Louisiana, dated 08/28/2020, is hereby amended to extend the deadline for filing applications for physical damages as a result of this disaster to 11/27/2020. All other information in the original declaration remains unchanged.