

Media Contact: Janice Wise, (202) 418-8165 janice.wise@fcc.gov

For Immediate Release

FCC BEGINS COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF NATIONAL TELEVISION OWNERSHIP CAP

WASHINGTON, December 14, 2017—The Federal Communications Commission today adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking initiating a comprehensive review of the national television audience reach cap, including the so-called UHF discount used by broadcasters to determine compliance with the cap. The national cap limits entities from owning or controlling television stations that, together, reach more than 39 percent of the television households in the country. The Commission's last review of this rule occurred when the video marketplace looked very different and most Americans had fewer options for watching video programming.

Today's Notice makes no tentative conclusions about whether the rule should be modified, retained, or eliminated. It asks questions about whether a cap is still needed and what public interest goals it would promote, where the cap should be set if still needed, and how compliance with the cap should be calculated, including the question of whether the UHF discount should be eliminated. The Notice also invites comment on the Commission's legal authority to take such actions. Finally, the Notice seeks information, including data and empirical analysis, on the benefits and costs of modifying, retaining, or eliminating the national cap.

Action by the Commission December 14, 2017 by Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 17-169). Chairman Pai, Commissioners O'Rielly and Carr approving. Commissioners Clyburn and Rosenworcel dissenting. Chairman Pai, Commissioners Clyburn, O'Rielly, Carr and Rosenworcel issuing separate statements.

MB Docket No. 17-318

###

Office of Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 ASL Videophone: (844) 432-2275 TTY: (888) 835-5322 Twitter: @FCC www.fcc.gov/office-media-relations

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).