

TABLE 1 TO SUBPART HHHHH OF PART 63—EMISSION LIMITS AND WORK PRACTICE STANDARDS FOR PROCESS VESSELS—Continued

[As required in § 63.8005, you must meet each emission limit and work practice standard in the following table that applies to your process vessels.]

For each . . .	You must . . .	And you must . . .
4. Halogenated vent stream from a process vessel subject to the requirements of item 2 or 3 of this table for which you use a combustion control device to control organic HAP emissions.	a. Use a halogen reduction device after the combustion control device; or b. Use a halogen reduction device before the combustion control device.	i. Reduce overall emissions of hydrogen halide and halogen HAP by ≥95 percent; or ii. Reduce overall emissions of hydrogen halide and halogen HAP to ≤0.45 kilogram per hour (kg/hr). Reduce the halogen atom mass emission rate to ≤0.45 kg/hr.

[FR Doc. 2023–03562 Filed 2–21–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 122 and 123

[EPA–HQ–OW–2022–0834; FRL–10123–05–OW]

RIN 2040–AG27

NPDES Small MS4 Urbanized Area Clarification; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: Due to the receipt of an adverse comment, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is withdrawing the direct final rule “NPDES Small MS4 Urbanized Area Clarification,” published on December 2, 2022.

DATES: Effective February 22, 2023, the EPA withdraws the direct final rule published at 87 FR 73965, on December 2, 2022.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather Huddle, Water Permits Division (MC4203), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20004; telephone number: (202) 564–7932; email address: huddle.heather@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 2, 2022, the EPA published a direct final rule (87 FR 73965). We stated in that direct final rule that if we received adverse comment by January 3, 2023 (extended to January 18, 2023 (87 FR 80079, December 29, 2022)), the direct final rule would not take effect and we would publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. Because the EPA subsequently received adverse comment on that direct final rule, we are withdrawing the direct final rule.

The EPA published a parallel proposed rule on the same day (87 FR 74066, December 2, 2022) as the direct

final rule, which proposed the same rule changes as the direct final rule. The proposed rule invited comment on the substance of these rule changes. The EPA will respond to comments as part of any final action it takes on the parallel proposed rule. As stated in the direct final rule and the parallel proposed rule, we will not institute a second comment period on this action.

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 122

Environmental protection, Stormwater, Water pollution.

40 CFR Part 123

Environmental protection, Stormwater, Water pollution.

Michael S. Regan,
Administrator.

■ Accordingly, as of February 22, 2023, the EPA withdraws the direct final rule amending 40 CFR parts 122 and 123, which published at 87 FR 73965, on December 2, 2022.

[FR Doc. 2023–03590 Filed 2–21–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA–HQ–OLEM–2022–0319; EPA–HQ–OLEM–2022–0527; EPA–HQ–OLEM–2022–0579; FRL–10632–02–OLEM]

Deletion From the National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces the deletion of one site and the partial deletion of two sites from the Superfund National Priorities List (NPL). The NPL, created under 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). The EPA and the states, through their designated state agencies, have determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA have been completed. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

DATES: The document is effective February 22, 2023.

ADDRESSES: *Docket:* EPA has established a docket for this action under the Docket Identification included in Table 1 in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. The Final Close-Out Report (FCOR, for a full site deletion) or the Partial Deletion Justification (PDJ, for a partial site deletion) is the primary document which summarizes site information to support the deletion. It is typically written for a broad, non-technical audience and this document is included in the deletion docket for each of the sites in this rulemaking. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *i.e.*, Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Docket materials are available through <https://www.regulations.gov> or at the corresponding Regional Records Centers. Locations, addresses, and phone numbers of the Regional Records Center follows.

- Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Mail code 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303.
- Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), U.S. EPA Superfund Division Records Manager, Mail code SRC–7J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 7th Floor South, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604; 312/886–4465.
- Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), US EPA Region 6 Records Center 1201 Elm

St., Suite 500, Dallas, TX 75270; 214/665-7544.

• EPA Headquarters Docket Center Reading Room (deletion dockets for all states), William Jefferson Clinton (WJC) West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004, (202) 566-1744.

EPA staff listed below in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section may assist the public in answering inquiries about deleted sites and accessing deletion support documentation, determining whether there are additional physical deletion dockets available, or if COVID restrictions affect deletion docket access.

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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

- Leigh Lattimore, U.S. EPA Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), *lattimore.leigh@epa.gov*, 404/562-8768.
- Karen Cibulskis, U.S. EPA Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), *cibulskis.karen@epa.gov*, 312/886-1843.
- Brian Mueller, U.S. EPA Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), *mueller.brian@epa.gov*, 214/665-7167.
- Charles Sands, U.S. EPA Headquarters, *sands.charles@epa.gov*, 202-566-1142.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NPL, created under section 105 of CERCLA, as amended, is an appendix of the NCP. 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. Partial deletion of sites is in accordance with 40 CFR 300.425(e) and are consistent with the Notice of Policy Change: Partial Deletion of Sites

Listed on the National Priorities List, 60 FR 55466, (November 1, 1995). The sites to be deleted are listed in Table 1, including docket information containing reference documents with the rationale and data principally relied upon by the EPA to determine that the Superfund response is complete. The NCP permits activities to occur at a deleted site, or that media or parcel of a partially deleted site, including operation and maintenance of the remedy, monitoring, and five-year reviews. These activities for the site are entered in Table 1 in this **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section, if applicable, under Footnote such that; 1= site has continued operation and maintenance of the remedy, 2= site receives continued monitoring, and 3= site five-year reviews are conducted. As described in 40 CFR 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP, a site or portion of a site deleted from the NPL remains eligible for Fund-financed remedial action if future conditions warrant such actions.

TABLE 1

Site name	City/county, state	Type	Docket No.	Footnote
U.S. Finishing/Cone Mills	Greenville, SC	Partial	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2022-0579.	1,2,3
Wauconda Sand & Gravel	Wauconda, IL	Partial	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2022-0319	
River City Metal Finishing	San Antonio, TX	Full	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2022-0527.	

Information concerning the sites to be deleted and partially deleted from the NPL, the proposed rule for the deletion

and partial deletion of the sites, and information on receipt of public comment(s) and preparation of a

Responsiveness Summary (if applicable) are included in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Site name	Date, proposed rule	FR citation	Public comment	Responsiveness summary	Full site deletion (full) or media/parcels/description for partial deletion
U.S. Finishing/Cone Mills	8/17/2022	87 FR 50596	No	No	70-acres of Operable Unit 1 Main Facility which includes soil, surface water, and sediment.
Wauconda Sand & Gravel	8/17/2022	87 FR 50596	No	No	Approximately 76-acres of soil.
River City Metal Finishing	8/17/2022	87 FR 50596	Yes	Yes	Full.

For the sites proposed for deletion, the closing date for comments in the proposed rule was September 16, 2022. The EPA received two public comments on the River City Metal Finishing site in this final rule. EPA placed the comments in the docket specified in Table 1, on <https://www.regulations.gov>, and in the appropriate Regional Records Center listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. One public comment was not germane to the proposed rulemaking. The second commentator believes CERCLA gives no guarantee that harm will not be done to public health again in the future at the site. The commenter believes if a site is no longer considered to be a hazard, it

should be noted that it was once classified as a priority and ranked lower overall on the NPL rather than deleted from the NPL. In response, no hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remain at the Site above levels that preclude unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. This means that under the current and future residential, commercial, and industrial land use scenarios, the site poses no unacceptable risks to human health and the environment. Thus, EPA concluded that no action is warranted under CERCLA, and the site can be deleted from the NPL.

The deletion criteria for the Site have been met. A Responsiveness Summary was prepared and placed in the site deletion docket, EPA-HQ-OLEM-2022-0527 on <https://www.regulations.gov>, and in the appropriate Regional Records Centers listed in the **ADDRESSES** section.

For all other sites not specified above, no adverse comments were received.

EPA maintains the NPL as the list of sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health, welfare, or the environment. Deletion from the NPL does not preclude further remedial action. 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. Deletion of a site from the NPL does not affect responsible party liability in the unlikely event that future conditions warrant further actions.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping

requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Larry Douchand,
Office Director, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation.

For reasons set out in the preamble, the EPA amends 40 CFR part 300 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.

■ 2. In Appendix B to part 300 amend Table 1 by:

- a. Revising the entry for “IL”, “Wauconda Sand & Gravel”, “Wauconda”;
- b. Removing the entry for “TX”, “River City Metal Finishing”, “San Antonio”.

The revision reads as follows:

Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
IL	Wauconda Sand & Gravel	Wauconda	P

*P = Sites with partial deletion(s).

[FR Doc. 2023–03147 Filed 2–21–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket Nos. 03–123, 13–24, 22–408; FCC 22–97; FR ID 127353]

Order Denying Petition for Reconsideration of 2020 IP CTS Compensation Order

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Denial of petitions for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) denies petitions for reconsideration of several aspects of the Commission’s final rule setting compensation from the Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) Fund for the provision of Internet Protocol Captioned Telephone Service (IP CTS). The document also denies a related request filed jointly by six IP CTS providers. In denying these petitions and requests, the Commission finds that they do not raise any new arguments or provide sufficient evidence that the Commission’s initial treatment of the issues in question was incorrect or incomplete. Additionally, the Commission finds that it fully considered the issues, based its decision

on the evidence in the record, and fully explained the rationale behind its decision.

DATES: This ruling is effective March 24, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Scott, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, at (202) 418–1264, or *Michael.Scott@fcc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s Order on Reconsideration, document FCC 22–97, adopted on December 21, 2022, released on December 22, 2022, in CG Docket Nos. 03–123, 13–24, and 22–408. The full text of document FCC 22–97 is available for public inspection and copying via the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530.

Synopsis

Background

1. Section 225 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act), 47 U.S.C. 225, requires the Commission to ensure that TRS are available to persons who are deaf, hard of hearing, or DeafBlind or have speech disabilities, “to the extent possible and in the most efficient manner.” TRS are defined as “telephone transmission services” enabling such persons to communicate

by wire or radio “in a manner that is functionally equivalent to the ability of a hearing individual who does not have a speech disability to communicate using voice communication services.”

2. IP CTS, a form of TRS, permits an individual who can speak but who has difficulty hearing over the telephone to use a telephone and an IP-enabled device via the Internet to simultaneously listen to the other party and read captions of what the other party is saying. IP CTS is supported entirely by the TRS Fund, which is composed of mandatory contributions collected from telecommunications carriers and voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service providers based on a percentage of each company’s annual revenue. IP CTS providers receive monthly payments from the TRS Fund to compensate them for the reasonable cost of providing the service, in accordance with a per-minute compensation formula approved by the Commission.

3. Before 2018, compensation for IP CTS providers was determined by proxy, by averaging the payments made by state TRS programs to providers of an analogous service, Captioned Telephone Service (CTS). In 2018, the Commission determined that this approach had resulted in providers receiving compensation greatly in excess of the average cost actually incurred to provide IP CTS. Instead, the Commission proposed that compensation be determined as a weighted average of the actual allowable