(4) Are there rules that are ineffective and if so, how can they be made effective?

(5) Are there rules that are not tailored to impose the least burden on the public? What are some suggestions that PBGC can use to reduce the burden on such rules as well as suggestions that generally assure that PBGC’s regulations promote and achieve its mission in ways that are efficient and less burdensome?

(6) Are there rules that have become outdated and, if so, how can they be modernized to better accomplish their regulatory objectives?

(7) Are there rules that are still necessary, but which have not operated as well as expected such that a modified, stronger, or slightly different approach is justified?

(8) Are there regulations, or regulatory processes that are unnecessarily complicated or could be streamlined to achieve regulatory objectives more efficiently?

(9) Are there any technological developments that can be leveraged to modify, streamline, or repeal any existing regulatory requirements?

(10) How can PBGC best obtain and consider accurate, objective information and data about the costs, burdens, and benefits of existing regulations? Are there existing sources of data PBGC can use to evaluate the effects of regulations over time?

(11) Are there regulations that are working well that can be expanded or used as a model to fill gaps in other PBGC regulatory programs?

PBGC notes that this Request for Comment is issued solely for information and program-planning purposes. The agency will give careful consideration to the responses, and may use them as appropriate during the retrospective review, but does not anticipate providing a response to each comment submitted. However, all submissions will be made publically available on http://www.regulations.gov. Responses to this Request for Comment do not bind PBGC to any further actions related to the response.

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 29th day of March 2011.

Joshua Gothaum,
Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2011–7805 Filed 3–31–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7709–01–P
today’s Federal Register, we are publishing a direct final Notice of Deletion of Norwood PCBs Superfund Site without prior Notice of Intent to Delete because we view this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this deletion in the preamble to the direct final Notice of Deletion, and those reasons are incorporated herein. If we receive no adverse comment(s) on this deletion action, we will not take further action on this Notice of Intent to Delete. If we receive adverse comment(s), we will withdraw the direct final Notice of Deletion, and it will not take effect. We will, as appropriate, address all public comments in a subsequent final Notice of Deletion based on this Notice of Intent to Delete. We will not institute a second comment period on this Notice of Intent to Delete. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time.

For additional information, see the direct final Notice of Deletion which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

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


Dated: March 17, 2011.

Ira W. Leighton, Acting Regional Administrator, EPA Region 1.

[FR Doc. 2011–7776 Filed 3–31–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 1

[GEN Docket No. 86–285; FCC 11–27]

Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission seeks comments to clarify the rules on the payment of filing fees by winning bidders in auctions of construction permits in the broadcast services in conjunction with their long-form applications.

DATES: Comments are due April 18, 2011, and reply comments are due May 2, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by GEN Docket No. 86–285, by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

• Federal Communications Commission’s Web Site: http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

• E-mail: ecfs@fcc.gov. Include GEN Docket No. 86–285 in the subject line of the message.

• Mail: Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail, and Priority Mail, must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743, U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail should be addressed to 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roland Helvajian, Office of Managing Director at (202) 418–0444.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. By this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, adopted on February 28, 2011 and released on March 3, 2011, we seek to clarify the rules on the payment of filing fees by winning bidders in auctions of construction permits in the broadcast services in conjunction with their long-form applications. In the Broadcast Competitive Bidding First Report and Order, the Commission required the filing of application fees in such cases, and section 1.1104, the Schedule of Charges for Media Bureau Service filings, requires the payment of a fee when the long-form application is filed. § However, section 1.2107(c) of the rules provides with regard to the filing of long-form applications by winning bidders in auctions that, “Notwithstanding any other provision in Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations to the contrary, high bidders need not submit an additional application filing fee with their long-form applications.” § To resolve any inconsistency and to conform Section 1.2107(c) to the Commission’s determination in the Broadcast Competitive Bidding First Report and Order as reflected in section 1.1104, we propose to amend section 1.2107(c) by revising the cited sentence to read as follows: “Except as otherwise provided in section 1.1104 of the rules, high bidders need not submit an additional application fee with their long-form applications.” We seek comment on this proposal.

Procedural Matters

2. Regulatory Flexibility Act. The rule change proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities or impose significant costs on parties to Commission proceedings.

3. Comment Filing Procedures. Pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking 15 days after publication in the Federal Register, and reply comments 15 days after the comment deadline. Comments may be filed using the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, 63 FR 24121 (1998).

• Electronic Filers. Comments may be electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/. Filers should follow the instructions provided on the Web site for submitting comments.

• ECFS filers must transmit one electronic copy of the comments for Gen. Docket No. 86–285. In completing the transmittal screen, filers should include their full name, U.S. Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail.

• Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and four copies of each filing. Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail (although we continue to experience delays in receiving U.S. Postal Service mail due to security measures). All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.


2 To resolve any inconsistency and to conform Section 1.2107(c) to the Commission’s determination in the Broadcast Competitive Bidding First Report and Order as reflected in section 1.1104, we propose to amend section 1.2107(c) by revising the cited sentence to read as follows: “Except as otherwise provided in section 1.1104 of the rules, high bidders need not submit an additional application fee with their long-form applications.” We seek comment on this proposal.