(i) In the case of a Camp Lejeune family member who resided at Camp Lejeune between January 1, 1957, and December 31, 1987, for hospital care and medical services received prior to the date an application for benefits is filed per paragraph (c) of this section, the hospital care and medical services must have been provided on or after March 26, 2013, but no more than 2 years prior to the date that VA receives the application. The claim for payment or reimbursement must be received by VA no more than 60 days after VA approves the application;

(ii) In the case of a Camp Lejeune family member who resided at Camp Lejeune between August 1, 1953, and December 31, 1956, for hospital care and medical services received prior to the date an application for benefits is filed per paragraph (c) of this section, the hospital care and medical services must have been provided on or after December 16, 2014, but no more than 2 years prior to the date that VA receives the application. The claim for payment or reimbursement must be received by VA no more than 60 days after VA approves the application;

(iii) For hospital care and medical services provided on or after the date an application for benefits is filed per paragraph (c) of this section, the claim for payment or reimbursement must be received by VA no more than 2 years after the later of either the date of discharge from a hospital or the date that medical services were rendered;

(2) The Camp Lejeune family member's treating physician certifies that the claimed hospital care or medical services were provided for a covered illness or condition as defined in § 17.400(b), and provides information about any co-morbidities, risk factors, or other exposures that may have contributed to the illness or condition;

(3) VA makes the clinical finding, under VA clinical practice guidelines, that the illness or condition did not result from a cause other than the residence of the family member at Camp Lejeune;

(4) VA would be authorized to provide the claimed hospital care or medical services to a veteran under VA's medical benefits package in § 17.38;

(5) The Camp Lejeune family member or hospital care or medical service provider has exhausted without success all claims and remedies reasonably available to the family member or provider against a third party, including health-plan contracts; and

(6) Funds were appropriated to implement 38 U.S.C. 1787 in a sufficient amount to permit payment or reimbursement.

(e) *Payment or reimbursement amounts.* Payments or reimbursements under this section will be in amounts determined in accordance with this paragraph (e).

(1) If a third party is partially liable for the claimed hospital care or medical services, then VA will pay or reimburse the lesser of the amount for which the Camp Lejeune family member remains personally liable or the amount for which VA would pay for such care under §§ 17.55 and 17.56.

(2) If VA is the sole payer for hospital care and medical services, then VA will pay or reimburse in accordance with §§ 17.55 and 17.56, as applicable.

(The information collection requirements have been submitted to OMB and are pending OMB approval.)

[FR Doc. 2017–09163 Filed 5–4–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R01–OAR–2012–0950; FRL–9959–68–Region 1]

Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency, (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a final rule approving a New Hampshire's State Implementation Plan (SIP) submissions that addressed infrastructure requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 2010 sulfur dioxide (SO_2) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the **Federal Register** on July 8, 2016. An error in the nonregulatory table in New Hampshire's SIP is identified and corrected in this action.

DATES: This rule is effective May 5, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ida E. McDonnell, Manager, Air Permits, Toxics, and Indoor Programs Unit, Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, (OEP05–2), Boston, MA 02109–3912, phone number (617) 918–1653, fax number (617) 918–0653, email *McDonnell.Ida@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a final rule in the **Federal Register** on July 8, 2016 (81 FR 44542). An error occurred in the amendatory instructions to the table in 40 CFR 52.1520(e). The table entry for ''Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 NO_2 NAAQS'' was unintentionally removed and later restored. This corrective action adds an entry for ''Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 SO_2 NAAQS'' to the table in 40 CFR 52.1520(e), as was originally intended.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides.

Dated: March 16, 2017.

Deborah A. Szaro,

Acting Regional Administrator, EPA New England.

Correction

In final rule FR Doc. 2016–15623, published in the issue of Friday, July 8, 2016 (81 FR 44542), make the following correction:

On page 44553, in the third column, remove amendatory instruction 3.

Part 52 of chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is corrected by making the following correcting amendment:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart EE—New Hampshire

■ 2. In § 52.1520, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by adding the entry ''Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 SO_2 NAAQS'' after the entry ''Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 SO_2 NAAQS'' to read as follows:

§ 52.1520 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

NEW HAMPSHIRE NON REGULATORY

Name of nonregulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/effective date	EPA approved date [3]	Explanations
* *	*	*	*	* *
Infrastructure SIP for the 2010 SO_2 NAAQS.	Statewide	9/13/2013	7/8/2016, 81 FR 44553	Approved submittal, except for certain aspects relating to PSD which were conditionally approved. See 52.1519.
* *	*	*	*	* *

[3] In order to determine the EPA effective date for a specific provision listed in this table, consult the **Federal Register** notice cited in this column for the particular provision.

[FR Doc. 2017–09028 Filed 5–4–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 13–236; FCC 17–40]

National Television Multiple Ownership Rule

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: An *Order on Reconsideration* reinstates the UHF discount, which allows commercial broadcast television station owners to discount the audience reach of their UHF stations when calculating compliance with the national television ownership rule. With the reinstatement of the discount, the Commission will commence a proceeding later this year to consider whether the national television audience reach cap, including the UHF discount, remains in the public interest. The *Order on Reconsideration* finds that the UHF discount is inextricably linked to the national cap, and when the Commission voted previously to eliminate the discount, it failed to consider whether this *de facto* tightening of the national cap was in the public interest and justified by current marketplace conditions. The *Order on Reconsideration* grants in part the Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) filed by ION Media Networks and Trinity Christian Center of Santa Ana, Inc. (Petitioners), and dismisses as moot requests to reconsider the grandfathering provisions applicable to broadcast station combinations affected by elimination of the discount and the decision to forego a VHF discount.

DATES: Effective June 5, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brendan Holland, Industry Analysis Division, Media Bureau, *Brendan.Holland@fcc.gov* (202) 418–2757.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Order on Reconsideration* in MB Docket No. 13–236, FCC 17–40, adopted April 20, 2017, and released April 21, 2017. The full text of this document is available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554, or online at *https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/0426267477284.* To request this document in accessible formats for people with disabilities (*e.g.* braille, large print, electronic files, audio format, etc.) or to request reasonable accommodations (*e.g.* accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the FCC's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Synopsis

1. *Background.* In 1985, when the Commission revised the national television multiple ownership rule to prohibit a single entity from owning television stations that collectively exceeded 25 percent of the total nationwide audience, it also adopted a 50 percent UHF discount to reflect the coverage limitations faced by analog UHF stations. The discount was intended to mitigate the competitive disadvantage that UHF stations suffered in comparison to VHF stations, as UHF stations were technically inferior, producing weaker over-the-air signals, reaching smaller audiences, and costing more to build and operate. This technical inferiority, inherent in analog television broadcasting, was significant in 1985 because the vast majority of viewers received programming from broadcast television stations via over-the-air signals.

2. Eleven years later, in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Congress directed the Commission to increase the national audience reach cap from 25 percent to 35 percent. Subsequently, the Commission reaffirmed the 35 percent national cap in its *1998 Biennial Review Order.* The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia later remanded the *1998 Biennial Review Order* after finding that the decision to retain the national cap was arbitrary and capricious. In addition, the court found that the Commission failed to demonstrate that the national cap advanced competition, diversity, or localism. In the *2002 Biennial Review Order,* the Commission determined the cap should be raised to 45 percent. In both of these *Orders,* the Commission also considered and retained the UHF discount.

3. Following adoption of the *2002 Biennial Review Order* and while an appeal of that order was pending, Congress revised the cap by including a provision in the 2004 Consolidated Appropriations Act (CAA) directing the Commission to modify its rules to set the cap at 39 percent of national television households. The CAA further amended Section 202(h) of the 1996 Act to require a quadrennial review of the Commission's broadcast ownership rules, rather than the previously mandated biennial review. In doing so, Congress excluded consideration of any rules relating to the 39 percent national audience reach limitation from the quadrennial review requirement.

4. Prior to the enactment of the CAA, several parties had appealed the Commission's *2002 Biennial Review Order* to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (Third Circuit). In June 2004, the Third Circuit found that the challenges to the Commission's actions with respect to the national audience reach cap and the UHF discount were moot as a result of Congress's action. Specifically, the court held that the CAA rendered moot the challenges to