(b)(4)(xiii), and revising paragraph (d)(2) to read as follows:''

Andrew Wheeler,

Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.5

James Clayton Owens,

Deputy Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

[FR Doc. 2020–14642 Filed 7–6–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA–HQ–SFUND–SFUND–1990–0010; FRL–10011–62–Region 5]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Deletion of the DuPage County Landfill/ Blackwell Forest Superfund Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 5 is publishing a direct final Notice of Deletion of the DuPage County Landfill/Blackwell Forest Superfund Site (DuPage County Landfill Site), located in Warrenville, Illinois, from the National Priorities List (NPL). The NPL, promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, is an appendix of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). This direct final deletion is being published by EPA with the concurrence of the State of Illinois, through the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA), because EPA has determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA, other than operation and maintenance, monitoring, and five-year reviews, have been completed. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

DATES: This direct final deletion is effective September 8, 2020 unless EPA receives adverse comments by August 7, 2020. If adverse comments are received, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final deletion in the **Federal Register** informing the public that the deletion will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1990–0010, by one of the following methods:

https://www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov.* EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.,* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit *https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets.*

Email: Deletions@usepa.onmicrosoft.com.

Phone: Public comment by phone may be made by calling (312) 353–6288 and following the directions provided for public comment.

Written comments submitted by mail are temporarily suspended and no hand deliveries will be accepted. We encourage the public to submit comments via email or at *https://www.regulations.gov.*

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1990–0010. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through *https://www.regulations.gov* or email. The *https://www.regulations.gov* website is an ''anonymous access'' system, which means EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an email comment directly to EPA without going through *https://www.regulations.gov,* your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the internet. If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD–ROM you submit. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: All documents in the docket are listed in the *https://www.regulations.gov* index, Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1990–0010. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *e.g.,* CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically at *https://www.regulations.gov* and at *https://www.epa.gov/superfund/dupage-county-landfill* or you may contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

The EPA is temporarily suspending its Docket Center and Regional Records Centers for public visitors to reduce the risk of transmitting COVID–19. In addition, many site information repositories are closed and information in these repositories, including the deletion docket, has not been updated with hardcopy or electronic media. For further information and updates on EPA Docket Center services, please visit us online at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

The EPA continues to carefully and continuously monitor information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), local area health departments, and our Federal partners so that we can respond rapidly as conditions change regarding COVID–19.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Cibulskis, NPL Deletion Coordinator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5, at (312) 886–1843 or via email at *cibulskis.karen@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

EPA Region 5 is publishing this direct final Notice of Deletion of the DuPage County Landfill Site, from the NPL. The NPL constitutes Appendix B of 40 CFR part 300, which is the NCP, which EPA promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of CERCLA of 1980, as amended. EPA maintains the NPL as the list of sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health, welfare, or the environment. Sites on the NPL may be the subject of remedial actions financed by the Hazardous Substance Superfund (Fund). As described in 40 CFR 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP, sites deleted from the NPL remain eligible for Fund-financed remedial actions if future conditions warrant such actions.

Section II of this document explains the criteria for deleting sites from the NPL. Section III of this document discusses the procedures that EPA is using for this action. Section IV of this document discusses where to access and review information that demonstrates how the deletion criteria have been met at the DuPage County Landfill Site. Section V of this document discusses EPA's action to delete the DuPage County Landfill Site from the NPL unless adverse comments are received during the public comment period.

II. NPL Deletion Criteria

The NCP establishes the criteria that EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate. In making such a determination pursuant to 40 CFR 300.425(e), EPA will consider, in consultation with the State, whether any of the following criteria have been met:

i. Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required;

ii. All appropriate Fund-financed response under CERCLA has been implemented, and no further response action by responsible parties is appropriate; or

iii. The remedial investigation has shown that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, the taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

Pursuant to CERCLA Section 121(c) and the NCP, EPA conducts five-year reviews to ensure the continued protectiveness of remedial actions where hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain at a site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. EPA conducts such five-year reviews even if a site is deleted from the NPL. EPA may initiate further action to ensure continued protectiveness at a deleted site if new information becomes available that indicates it is appropriate. Whenever there is a significant release from a site deleted from the NPL, the deleted site may be restored to the NPL without application of the hazard ranking system.

III. Deletion Procedures

The following procedures apply to deletion of the DuPage County Landfill Site:

(1) EPA consulted with the State of Illinois prior to developing this direct final Notice of Deletion and the Notice of Intent to Delete co-published today in the ''Proposed Rules'' section of the **Federal Register**.

(2) EPA has provided the State thirty (30) working days for review of this action and the parallel Notice of Intent to Delete prior to their publication today, and the State, through the IEPA, concurred with the deletion of the DuPage County Landfill Site from the NPL on May 19, 2020.

(3) Concurrently with the publication of this direct final Notice of Deletion, an announcement of the availability of the parallel Notice of Intent to Delete is being published in a major local newspaper, the Chicago suburban Daily Herald. The newspaper notice announces the 30-day public comment period concerning the Notice of Intent to Delete the DuPage County Landfill Site from the NPL.

(4) EPA placed copies of documents supporting the proposed deletion in the deletion docket and made these items available for public inspection and copying at *https://www.regulations.gov,* Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1990–0010 and at *https://www.epa.gov/superfund/dupage-county-landfill.*

(5) If adverse comments are received within the 30-day public comment period on this deletion action, EPA will publish a timely notice of withdrawal of this direct final Notice of Deletion in the **Federal Register** before its effective date and will prepare a response to comments and continue with the deletion process on the basis of the Notice of Intent to Delete and the comments already received.

Deletion of a site from the NPL does not itself create, alter, or revoke any individual's rights or obligations. Deletion of a site from the NPL does not in any way alter EPA's right to take enforcement actions, as appropriate. The NPL is designed primarily for informational purposes and to assist EPA management. Section 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP states that the deletion of a site from the NPL does not preclude eligibility for future response actions, should future conditions warrant such actions.

IV. Basis for Site Deletion

The EPA placed a copy of its Final Close Out Report for the Site and other documents supporting the proposed deletion in the deletion docket. The material provides explanation of EPA's rationale for the deletion and demonstrates how it meets the deletion criteria. This information is made available for public inspection in the deletion docket available at *https://www.regulations.gov,* Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–SFUND–1990–0010 and at *https://www.epa.gov/superfund/dupage-county-landfill.*

V. Deletion Action

EPA, with concurrence of the State of Illinois through the IEPA, has determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA, other than operation and maintenance, monitoring and five-year reviews have been completed at the DuPage County Landfill Site. Therefore, EPA is deleting the DuPage County Landfill Site from the NPL.

Because EPA considers this action to be noncontroversial and routine, EPA is taking it without prior publication. This action will be effective September 8, 2020 unless EPA receives adverse comments by August 7, 2020. If adverse comments are received within the 30-day public comment period, EPA will publish a timely withdrawal of this direct final Notice of Deletion before its effective date and the deletion will not take effect. EPA will prepare a response to comments and continue with the deletion process on the basis of the Notice of Intent to Delete and the comments already received. There will be no additional opportunity to comment.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Dated: June 29, 2020.

Kurt Thiede,

Regional Administrator, Region 5.

For the reasons set out in this document, 40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:

PART 300—NATIONAL OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES POLLUTION CONTINGENCY PLAN

■ 1. The authority citation for part 300 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.;* 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 13626, 77 FR 56749, 3 CFR, 2013 Comp., p. 306; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

Appendix B to Part 300—[Amended]

■ 2. Table 1 of Appendix B to part 300 is amended by removing the entry ''IL,'' ''DuPage County Landfill/Blackwell Forest'', ''Warrenville''.

[FR Doc. 2020–14588 Filed 7–7–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 51, 54, 61, and 69

[WC Docket No. 18–155; FCC 20–79; FRS 16861]

Updating the Intercarrier Compensation Regime To Eliminate Access Arbitrage

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Order on reconsideration.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission responds to a petition for reconsideration of the *Access Arbitrage Order* filed by Iowa Network Services d/b/a Aureon Network Services (Aureon) in Iowa. Upon review of the record, we dismiss Aureon's Petition as procedurally defective, and independently, and in the alternative, deny it on substantive grounds.

DATES: The denial of the petition for reconsideration was effective June 11, 2020.

ADDRESSES: The complete text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554, or at the following internet address: At *https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-20-79A1.pdf.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, please contact Victoria Goldberg, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at *Victoria.goldberg@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order on Reconsideration (Order) in WC Docket No. 18–155, adopted June 11, 2020 and released June 11, 2020. The full text of this document is available on the Commission's website at *https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/FCC-20-79A1.pdf.*

I. Introduction

1. In the 2019 *Access Arbitrage Order* (84 FR 57629, Oct. 28, 2019), we tackled, once again, the troublesome use of ''free'' conference calling, chat lines, and certain other services operated out of rural areas to take advantage of inefficiently high access charges allowed under the existing intercarrier compensation regime. As we explained, access stimulation schemes adapted to shrinking end office termination charges by taking advantage of access charges that had not transitioned or were not transitioning to bill-and-keep. As such, these schemes were structured to ensure that interexchange carriers (IXCs) would pay high tandem switching and tandem switched transport charges to access-stimulating local exchange carriers (LECs) and to the intermediate access providers chosen by those access-stimulating LECs. We also found that the vast majority of access-stimulation traffic was bound for LECs that subtended two centralized equal access (CEA) providers, Iowa Network Services d/b/a Aureon Network Services (Aureon) in Iowa and South Dakota Network, LLC (SDN) in South Dakota.

2. To eliminate the financial incentives to engage in access arbitrage, we adopted rules making access-stimulating LECs—rather than IXCs—financially responsible for the tandem switching and transport service access charges associated with the delivery of traffic from an IXC to the access-stimulating LEC end office or its functional equivalent. To facilitate the implementation of the rules in Iowa and South Dakota, we also modified the section 214 authorizations for Aureon and SDN to permit traffic terminating at access-stimulating LECs that subtend those CEA providers' tandems to bypass the CEA tandems.

3. Now Aureon seeks reconsideration of the *Access Arbitrage Order.* In its Petition, Aureon reiterates several of the arguments it made on the record in the Access Arbitrage proceeding. In particular, Aureon objects to our decision to adopt rules making access-stimulating LECs responsible for paying for tandem switching and transport services, and argues that we should instead have adopted one of its proposals—either to ban access stimulation or to require consumers placing calls to access-stimulating LECs to pay their IXCs an additional charge for each such call. Aureon also objects to our decision to modify its section 214 authorization, and it argues that we should have addressed its cost and rate complaints that are at issue in other Commission proceedings. Upon review of the record, we dismiss Aureon's Petition as procedurally defective, and independently, and in the alternative, deny it on substantive grounds.

II. Background

4. The Commission has been combating access stimulation for more than a decade. Traditionally, access-stimulating LECs relied on the existence of high end office terminating switched access rates in rural areas that allowed them to increase their revenue by inflating their terminating call volumes through arrangements with entities that offer high-volume calling services. Because LECs entering traffic-inflating revenue-sharing agreements were not required to reduce their access rates to reflect their increased volume of minutes, access stimulation increased access minutes-of-use and access payments (at constant, per-minute-of-use rates that exceed the actual average per-minute cost of providing access). As a result, IXCs and their customers had to pay those inflated intercarrier compensation charges.

5. In the 2011 *USF/ICC Transformation Order* (76 FR 73830, Nov. 29, 2011), the Commission found that access-stimulating LECs were ''realiz[ing] significant revenue increases and thus inflated profits that almost uniformly [made] their interstate switched access rates unjust and unreasonable.'' The record showed that the ''total cost of access stimulation to IXCs [had] been more than $2.3 billion over the [preceding] five years'' and that ''Verizon estimate[d] the overall costs to IXCs to be between $330 and $440 million per year.'' The Commission explained that all long distance customers ''bear these costs, even though many of them do not use the access stimulator's services, and, in essence, ultimately support businesses designed to take advantage of today's above-cost intercarrier compensation rates.'' The Commission also found that ''[a]ccess stimulation imposes undue costs on consumers, inefficiently diverting capital away from more productive uses such as broadband deployment,'' and that it ''harms competition by giving companies that offer a 'free' calling service a competitive advantage over companies that charge their customers for the service.''

6. The Commission sought to eliminate the detrimental effect of