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| ***FCC - News from the Federal Communications Commission***  **Media Contact:**  Janice Wise, (202) 418-8165  janice.wise@fcc.gov  **For Immediate Release**  **FCC SEEKS TO UPDATE RECORDKEEPING RULES ON CABLE OPERATOR INTERESTS IN VIDEO PROGRAMMING**  WASHINGTON, February 28, 2020—The Federal Communications Commission today adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comment on whether to eliminate or modify its rules that require cable operators to maintain records in their online public inspection files regarding their interests in video programming services, as well as their carriage of these services on cable systems they own. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking reflects comments received in the Commission’s *Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative*.  These recordkeeping rules were originally adopted to aid compliance with FCC cable channel occupancy limits, which were reversed and remanded by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in 2001. Therefore, the Commission is seeking comment on whether there is any remaining purpose for these recordkeeping rules, whether there are other potential sources for similar information, the burdens this requirement places on cable operators, and possible modifications to the rules. This is the FCC’s 20th proceeding as part of the *Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative* to eliminate or modify media regulations that are outdated, unnecessary, or unduly burdensome.  Action by the Commission February 28, 2020 by Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 20-19). Chairman Pai, Commissioners O’Rielly and Carr approving. Commissioners Rosenworcel and Starks concurring. Chairman Pai, Commissioners O’Rielly, Rosenworcel, and Starks issuing separate statements.  MB Docket Nos. 20-35, 17-105  ###  **Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 / ASL: (844) 432-2275 / TTY: (888) 835-5322 / Twitter: @FCC / www.fcc.gov**  *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).* |