

2. Should the Commission include MTOs in a proposed demurrage billing regulation?

3. Should a proposed demurrage billing regulation distinguish between the demurrage MTOs charge to shippers and the demurrage MTOs charge to VOCCs? That is, should the Commission regulate the format in which MTOs bill VOCCs?

4. What percentage of demurrage and detention bills contain inaccurate information, and which information is most often disputed?

5. How much does the type of information included on or with demurrage and detention billings vary among common carriers, among marine terminal operators, and between VOCCs and NVOCCs?

B. Minimum billing information.

6. What type of information should be required on billings. Should the Commission require certain essential information included on invoices such as:

- a. Bill of lading number
- b. Container number
- c. Billing date
- d. Payment due date
- e. Start/end of free time
- f. Start/end of demurrage/detention/per diem clock
- g. Demurrage/detention/per diem rate schedule
- h. Location of the notice of the charge (*i.e.*, tariff, service contract number and section or MTO schedule)
- i. For import shipments:
 - i. Vessel arrival date
 - ii. Container availability date
- j. For export shipments:
 - i. Earliest return date, including identifying any modifications to the earliest return date
 - k. Any intervening clock-stopping events, for example:
 - i. Unavailability of container
 - ii. Unavailability of pickup or return locations
 - iii. Unavailability of appointments (where applicable)
 - iv. Restrictions on chassis accepted
 - v. Force majeure-related events
 - l. Please note if any portion of the charge is a pass-through of charges levied by the MTO or Port.

C. Billing practices.

7. What information or timeframes should be required for VOCC and NVOCC demurrage and detention bills? Should the Commission require different types of information or timeframes?

8. Do common carriers invoice multiple parties for demurrage and/or detention charges? If multiple parties are invoiced for charges, should the

billing party be required to identify all such parties receiving an invoice for the charges at issue?

9. Should the billing party be required to identify the basis of why the invoiced party is the proper party in interest and therefore liable for the charges? (*i.e.*, as shipper, consignee, beneficial cargo owner, motor carrier or an agent, or as a party acting on behalf of another party pursuant to the common carrier's merchant clause in its bill of lading.)

10. Should the Commission, for purposes of clarity and visibility of charges, require MTOs to bill demurrage directly to shippers (rather than billing VOCCs who then bill shippers for demurrage)? In that scenario, MTOs would bill shippers directly for demurrage, and carriers would continue to bill detention to shippers.

11. How long from the point of accrual of a demurrage or detention charge does it typically take to receive a demurrage or detention invoice or billing?

12. Should the Commission require demurrage and detention invoices to be issued within 60 days of date when the detention/demurrage/per diem stops accruing?

13. Should the Commission require specific information be included on the invoice regarding how to dispute a charge? If so, what information should be required? For example, should the Commission require invoices to include contact information for disputing charges, identify circumstances for when a charge may be waived, or identify the billing parties' evidentiary requirements sufficient to support a waiver of the charges?

14. How long from the point of dismissal of a charge does it typically take to receive a refund? Should the Commission require that refunds of demurrage or detention bills be issued within a certain time period and what should that timeframe be?

15. How would a regulation on demurrage and detention billing requirements impact, conflict with, or preempt any other applicable laws, regulations, or arrangements (such as the UIIA)?

16. Please provide any other views or data you believe would help inform the Commission's decision whether to pursue a proposed regulation on demurrage and detention billing information and practices.

By the Commission.

William Cody,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2022-02981 Filed 2-14-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-02-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 22-39; RM-11917; DA 22-87; FR ID 71247]

Television Broadcasting Services; Billings, Montana; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission published a document in the **Federal Register** of February 4, 2022, concerning a petition for rulemaking filed by Scripps Broadcasting Holdings LLC, licensee of KTVQ(TV), channel 10, Billings, Montana, requesting the substitution of channel 20 for channel 10 in the Table of Allotments. The document contained the incorrect call sign of the licensee. The document also contained an incorrect licensee name.

DATES: February 15, 2022.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joyce Bernstein, Media Bureau, at (202) 418-1647 or Joyce.Bernstein@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In FR Doc. 2022-02337, in the **Federal Register** of February 4, 2022, appearing on page 6473, in the third column, correct the first sentence in the **SUMMARY** caption to read:

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (Commission) has before it a petition for rulemaking filed by Scripps Broadcasting Holdings LLC (Petitioner), the licensee of KTVQ(TV), channel 10, Billings, Montana.

Dated: February 7, 2022.

Thomas Horan,
Chief of Staff, Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2022-03069 Filed 2-14-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS-R2-ES-2021-0041; FF09E21000; FXES1111090FEDR 223]

RIN 1018-BE65

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species for Prostrate Milkweed and Designation of Critical Habitat

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.