

comment by interested parties, however, the Commission requests that any small entities participating in the comment process discuss any benefits or drawbacks associated with the proposed approaches, provide information on their current costs of compliance with the Commission's existing rules, as well as provide data and information on any differential impacts faced by small entities. The Commission expects the information the Commission receives in comments to help the Commission identify and evaluate relevant matters for small entities, including compliance costs, and identify other burdens that may result from the matters raised in the *FNPRM*.

E. Discussion of Significant Alternatives Considered That Minimize the Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities

39. The RFA directs agencies to provide a description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rules that would accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes, and minimize any significant economic impact on small entities. The discussion is required to include alternatives such as: “(1) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirements under the rules for such small entities; (3) the use of performance rather than design standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for such small entities.

40. In developing its proposals in the *FNPRM* for minimizing significant economic impact on small entities, the Commission considered significant alternatives. The Commission will continue to consider a number of approaches to refining its section 106 processing rules, including by seeking comment on whether to expand the batching approach to section 106 submissions. The Commission will also consider the record in refining its compliance with the ESA. Part of the determination process will include consideration of savings in time and financial resources for small entities.

41. In addition, the *FNPRM* invites comment from small entities on alternative approaches in which the Commission could refine its historic preservation section 106 processing rules and its compliance with ESA in ways that will reduce economic impact and regulatory burdens on project sponsors. The Commission then will decide what actions it should take based

on the subsequently developed record. Part of the decisional process will include evaluating the impact of these decisions on small entities and what alternatives the Commission might adopt to lessen significant economic impacts and regulatory burdens on small entities. The Commission will consider alternative proposals and approaches from commenters that would minimize the economic impact on small entities. The Commission's evaluation of the comments filed in this proceeding will shape the final conclusions it reaches, the final alternatives it considers, and the actions it ultimately takes to minimize any significant economic impact that may occur on small entities from the final rules.

F. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules

42. None.

III. Ordering Clauses

43. *It is ordered*, pursuant to sections 4(i), 301, 302, 303(r), 308, 309, and 333 of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 301, 302a, 303(r), 308, 309, 333, that this *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, is adopted as set forth above.

44. *It is further ordered* that the Office of the Secretary *shall send* a copy of this *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analyses, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

Federal Communications Commission

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026–21347 Filed 10–16–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 4

[PS Docket Nos. 21–346 and 15–80; ET Docket No. 04–35; Report No. 3236; FR ID 372261; FR ID 372959]

Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission published a document in the **Federal Register** concerning a Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission's proceeding by Thomas Goode on behalf

of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. That document contained incorrect dates.

DATES: October 19, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jeanne Stockman, Attorney Advisor, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau at (202) 418–7830 or Jeanne.Stockman@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of October 13, 2026 in FR Doc. 2026–20895 on page 64872, in the third column, correct the **DATES** caption to read:

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before October 28, 2026. Replies to oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before November 9, 2026.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026–21312 Filed 10–16–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 26–287; RM–12028; DA 26–1077; FR ID 372215]

Television Broadcasting Services Des Moines, Iowa

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to amend the Table of TV Allotments (Table) of the Federal Communications Commission's (Commission) rules in response to a petition for rulemaking filed by Iowa Public Broadcasting Board (Licensee), the licensee of noncommercial educational PBS member television station KDIN–TV (KDIN–TV), Des Moines, Iowa (Des Moines). The Licensee holds a construction permit (CP) to construct a facility on UHF channel *34 at Des Moines, and now requests to substitute VHF channel *11 for UHF channel *34 in the Table, with the technical parameters as set forth in KDIN–TV's current license. The Media Bureau previously granted a petition for rulemaking submitted by the Licensee to substitute UHF channel *34 in place of VHF channel *11 at Des Moines. The Licensee states that it is now unable to complete construction of the channel *34 facility within the time specified on the construction permit, and therefore

requests amendment of the Table to allow it to continue to operate on VHF channel *11 at its currently licensed technical parameters to provide uninterrupted service to viewers. Given that the Licensee proposes to utilize its currently licensed parameters, we believe VHF channel *11 can be substituted for UHF channel *34 at Des Moines as proposed, in compliance with the principal community coverage requirements. In addition, we find that this channel change meets the technical requirements as well as the Commission’s interference protection requirements.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before November 18, 2026 and reply comments on or before December 3, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for the Petitioner as follows: Derek Teslik, Gray Miller Persh LLP, 2233 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 226, Washington, DC 20007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Emily Harrison at *Emily.Harrison@fcc.gov*, (202) 418–1665 or Mark Colombo at *Mark.Colombo@fcc.gov*, (202) 418–7611.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission’s *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, MB Docket No. 26–287; RM–12028; DA 26–1077, adopted October 6, 2026, and released October 6, 2026. The full text of this

document is available online at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. This document does not contain 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). Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, do not apply to this proceeding. Members of the public should note that all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited from the time a notice of proposed rulemaking is issued to the time the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, *see* 47 CFR 1.1208. There are, however, exceptions to this prohibition, which can be found in § 1.1204(a) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.1204(a). *See* §§ 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission’s rules for information regarding the proper filing procedures for comments, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420. *Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act:* The Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, Public Law 118–9, requires each agency, in providing notice of a rulemaking, to post online a brief plain-language summary of the proposed rule. The required summary of this notice of proposed rulemaking is available at <https://www.fcc.gov/proposed-rulemakings>.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73
Television.

Federal Communications Commission.
Thomas Horan,
Chief of Staff, Media Bureau.

Proposed Rule
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 § 73.622, in the table in paragraph (j), under Iowa, revise the entry for “Des Moines” to read as follows:

§ 73.622 Digital television table of allotments.

	*	*	*	*	*
(j)	*	*	*		
Community			Channel No.		
*	*	*	*	*	
Iowa					
*	*	*	*	*	
Des Moines				8, *11, 13,	16, 19
*	*	*	*	*	