

including answers to questions such as the following:

- Are the requirements in the proposed priorities and requirements clearly stated?
- Do the proposed priorities and requirements contain technical terms or other wording that interferes with their clarity?
- Does the format of the proposed priorities and requirements (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing, etc.) aid or reduce their clarity?
- Would the proposed priorities and requirements be easier to understand if we divided them into more (but shorter) sections?
- Could the description of the proposed priorities and requirements in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this preamble be more helpful in making the proposed priorities and requirements easier to understand? If so, how?
- What else could we do to make the proposed priorities and requirements easier to understand?

To send any comments about how the Department could make these proposed priorities and requirements easier to understand, see the instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Intergovernmental Review: This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

This document provides early notification of our specific plans and actions for this program.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification: The Secretary certifies that these proposed priorities and requirements would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Participation in the SPDG program is voluntary. In addition, the only eligible entities for this program are SEAs, which do not meet the definition of a small entity. For these reasons, the proposed priorities and requirements would not impose any additional burden on small entities. We expect that in determining whether to apply for SPDG program funds, an eligible entity would evaluate the requirements of preparing an application and any associated costs and weigh them against the benefits likely to be achieved by receiving an SPDG program grant. An eligible entity probably would apply

only if it determines that the likely benefits exceed the costs of preparing an application.

We believe that these proposed priorities and requirements would not impose any additional burden on a small entity applying for a grant than the entity would face in the absence of the proposed action. That is, the length of the applications those entities would submit in the absence of the proposed regulatory action and the time needed to prepare an application would likely be the same.

This proposed regulatory action would not have a significant economic impact on a small entity once it receives a grant because it would be able to meet the costs of compliance using the funds provided under this program. We invite comments from eligible small entities as to whether they believe this proposed regulatory action would have a significant economic impact on them and, if so, request evidence to support that belief.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

These proposed priorities and requirements contain information collection requirements that are approved by OMB under OMB control number 1820-0028. The proposed priorities and requirements do not affect the currently approved data collection.

Accessible Format: On request to the program contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format. The Department will provide the requestor with an accessible format that may include Rich Text Format (RTF) or text format (txt), a thumb drive, an MP3 file, braille, large print, audiotope, or compact disc, or other accessible format.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. You may access the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations at www.govinfo.gov. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit

your search to documents published by the Department.

Glenna Wright-Gallo,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 2024-06656 Filed 3-27-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 24-278; MB Docket No. 24-83; FR ID 210721]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Mattoon, Illinois

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on the proposal to substitute Channel 245B1 for vacant Channel 245B at Mattoon, Illinois. The existing vacant Channel 245B at Mattoon is not in compliance with the minimum distance separation requirements of the Federal Communications Commission's (Commission) rules. A staff engineering analysis indicates that Channel 245B1 can be allotted to Mattoon, Illinois, consistent with the minimum distance separation requirements of the Commission's rules, with a site restriction of 12.2 kilometers (7.6 miles) southeast of the community. The reference coordinates are 39-23-17 NL and 88-17-21 WL.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 13, 2024, and reply comments on or before May 28, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rolanda F. Smith, Media Bureau, (202) 418-2054, Rolanda-Faye.Smith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MB Docket No. 24-83, adopted March 19, 2024, and released March 20, 2024. The full text of this Commission decision is available online at <https://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs>. The full text of this document can also be downloaded in Word or Portable Document Format (PDF) at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. This document does not contain proposed 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). The Commission will publish the required summary of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>, pursuant to The Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, see 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(4).

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio, Radio broadcasting.
Federal Communications Commission.
Nazifa Sawez,
Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rules

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, 339.

- 2. In § 73.202, in paragraph (b), amend the Table of FM Allotments under Illinois by adding in alphabetical an entry for “Mattoon” to read as follows:

§ 73.202 Table of Allotments.

* * * * *
(b) * * *

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (b)

[U.S. States]	Channel No.
* * * * *	
Illinois	
* * * * *	
Mattoon	245B1

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (b)—
Continued

[U.S. States]	Channel No.
* * * * *	

[FR Doc. 2024–06616 Filed 3–27–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket No. 98–204; FCC 24–18; FR ID 207778]

Review of the Commission’s Broadcast and Cable Equal Employment Opportunity Rules and Policies

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) refreshes the existing record regarding the statutorily mandated collection of workforce composition data for multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) on FCC Form 395–A.

DATES: Comments due on or before April 29, 2024; reply comments due on or before May 13, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by MB Docket No. 98–204, by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic Filers:* Comments may be filed electronically using the internet by accessing the ECF’s: <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>.

- *Paper Filers:* Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing.

Filings can be sent by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9050 Junction Drive, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701.

- U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554.

- Effective March 19, 2020, and until further notice, the Commission no longer accepts any hand or messenger delivered filings. This is a temporary

measure taken to help protect the health and safety of individuals, and to mitigate the transmission of COVID–19. See FCC Announces Closure of FCC Headquarters Open Window and Change in Hand-Delivery Policy, Public Notice, DA 20–304 (March 19, 2020). <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-closes-headquarters-open-window-and-changes-hand-delivery-policy>.

People with Disabilities: To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to fcc504@fcc.gov (mail to: fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the FCC’s Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information on this proceeding, please contact Christopher Sova of the Media Bureau, Industry Analysis Division, christopher.sova@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (*Second FNPRM*) FCC 24–18, in MB Docket No. 98–204, adopted on February 7, 2024, and released on February 22, 2024. The complete text of this document is available electronically via the search function on the FCC’s website at <https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-24-18A1.pdf>.

Synopsis

1. Having addressed the issues concerning the reinstatement of the Form 395–B data collection, we now seek, by this Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (*Second FNPRM*), to refresh the existing record regarding the statutorily mandated collection of Form 395–A data pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 554(d)(3)(A)–(B). Since 1984 the Commission has required MVPDs with six or more full-time employees to file the FCC Form 395–A. Similar to the Form 395–B collected from broadcasters, Form 395–A seeks to gather workforce composition data from multichannel video programming distributors (MVPDs) on an annual basis. The Commission suspended the filing of Form 395–A in 2001 in the wake of the decision by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the *District of Columbia Circuit in MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Associations v. FCC (MD/DC/DE Broadcasters)*, which vacated certain aspects of the Commission’s EEO requirements for broadcasters. While the similar requirements for MVPDs have never been challenged, the Commission suspended the collection of both Forms 395–A and B, along with various EEO