

Executive Order 13175, entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments,” (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), calls for EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure “meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications.” See also “EPA Policy for the Administration of Environmental Programs on Indian Reservations,” (November 8, 1984) and “EPA Policy on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribes,” (May 4, 2011). EPA consulted with the Quechan Tribe throughout Imperial County’s development of its closure and monitoring plans for the Picacho Landfill.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 258

Environmental protection, Final cover, Monitoring, Municipal landfills, Post-closure care groundwater, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control.

Dated: September 22, 2016.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, 40 CFR part 258 is amended as follows:

#### PART 258—CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILLS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 258 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1345(d) and (e); 42 U.S.C. 6902(a), 6907, 6912(a), 6944, 6945(c) and 6949a(c), 6981(a).

#### Subpart F—Closure and Post-Closure Care

■ 2. Section 258.62 is amended by removing “[Reserved]” at the end of the section and adding paragraph (b) to read as follows:

#### § 258.62 Approval of site-specific flexibility requests in Indian country.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Picacho Municipal Solid Waste Landfill—alternative list of detection monitoring parameters and alternative final cover.* This paragraph (b) applies to the Picacho Landfill, a Municipal Solid Waste Landfill operated by Imperial County on the Quechan Indian Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation in California.

(1) In accordance with § 258.54(a), the owner and operator may modify the list of heavy metal detection monitoring parameters specified in appendix I of this part, as required during Post-Closure Care by § 258.61(a)(3), by

replacing monitoring of the inorganic constituents, with the exception of arsenic, with the inorganic indicator parameters chloride, nitrate as nitrogen, sulfate, and total dissolved solids.

(2) In accordance with § 258.60(b), the owner and operator may replace the prescriptive final cover set forth in § 258.60(a), with an alternative final cover as follows:

(i) The owner and operator may install an evapotranspiration cover system as an alternative final cover for the 12.5 acre site.

(ii) The alternative final cover system shall be constructed to achieve an equivalent reduction in infiltration as the infiltration layer specified in § 258.60(a)(1) and (2), and provide an equivalent protection from wind and water erosion as the erosion layer specified in § 258.60(a)(3).

(iii) The final cover system shall consist of a minimum three-foot-thick multi-layer cover system comprised, from bottom to top, of:

(A) A minimum 30-inch thick infiltration layer consisting of:

(1) Existing intermediate cover; and  
(2) Additional cover soil which, prior to placement, shall be wetted to optimal moisture and thoroughly mixed to near uniform condition, and the material shall then be placed in lifts with an uncompacted thickness of six to eight inches, spread evenly and compacted to 90 percent of the maximum dry density, and shall:

(i) Exhibit a grain size distribution that excludes particles in excess of three inches in diameter;

(ii) Have a minimum fines content (percent by weight passing U.S. No. 200 Sieve) of seven percent for an individual test and eight percent for the average of ten consecutive tests;

(iii) Have a grain size distribution with a minimum of five percent smaller than five microns for an individual test and six percent for the average of ten consecutive tests; and

(iv) Exhibit a maximum saturated hydraulic conductivity on the order of 1.0E–03 cm/sec.; and

(3) A minimum six-inch surface erosion layer comprised of a rock/soil admixture and gradations for 3% slopes and 3:1 slopes are detailed below:

(i) 3% slopes: For the 3% slopes the surface admixture shall be composed of pea gravel (3/8-inch to 1/2-inch diameter) mixed with cover soil at the ratio of 25% rock to soil by volume with a minimum six-inch erosion layer.

(ii) For the 3:1 side slopes the surface admixture shall be composed of either: gravel/rock (3/4-inch to one-inch diameter) mixed with additional cover

soil as described in paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A)(2) of this section at the ratio of 50% rock to soil by volume and result in a minimum six-inch erosion layer, or gravel/rock (3/4-inch to two-inch diameter) mixed with additional cover soil as described in paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A)(2) of this section at the ratio of 50% rock to soil by volume and result in a minimum 12-inch erosion layer.

(iii) The owner and operator shall place documentation demonstrating compliance with the provisions of this section in the operating record.

(iv) All other applicable provisions of this part remain in effect.

(B) [Reserved]

[FR Doc. 2016–23839 Filed 10–5–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 02–376, RM–10617, RM–10690; DA 16–1062]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Sells, Willcox, and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; dismissal of application for review.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Media Bureau (Bureau) dismisses as moot the Application for Review filed jointly by KZLZ, LLC (KZLZ) and Lakeshore Media, LLC, the current and former licensee, respectively, of Station KWCX–FM. While the AFR was pending, KZLZ filed a minor modification application to change the community of license of Station KWCX–FM from Willcox to Tanque Verde, Arizona. Once the requested facility modification to Station KWCX–FM was granted, the assignment at Willcox was deleted, and this in turn rendered moot any Section 307(b) comparison between Davis-Monthan AFB and the deleted Willcox assignment.

**DATES:** Effective October 6, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Adrienne Denysyk, Media Bureau, (202) 418–2700.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Bureau’s *Letter*, DA 16–1062, released September 21, 2016. The full text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center (Room CY–A257), 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

This document does not contain information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. This document is not subject to the Congressional Review Act. (The Commission, is, therefore, not required to submit a copy of the *Letter* to GAO, pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) because the Application for Review was dismissed as moot.)

Federal Communications Commission.

**Nazifa Sawez,**

*Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 2016–24174 Filed 10–5–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

## **SURFACE TRANSPORTATION**

### **49 CFR Parts 1108 and 1115**

**[Docket No. EP 730]**

#### **Revisions to Arbitration Procedures**

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board.

**ACTION:** Final rules.

**SUMMARY:** The Surface Transportation Board (Board or STB) adopts changes to its arbitration procedures to conform to the requirements of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Act of 2015.

**DATES:** These rules are effective on October 30, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Information or questions regarding these final rules should reference Docket No. EP 730 and be in writing addressed to: Chief, Section of Administration, Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Amy C. Ziehm at 202–245–0391.

[Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under Section 13 of the STB Reauthorization Act (codified at 49 U.S.C. 11708), the Board must “promulgate regulations to establish a voluntary and binding arbitration process to resolve rail rate and practice complaints” that are subject to the Board’s jurisdiction. Section 11708 sets forth specific requirements and procedures for the Board’s arbitration process. While the Board’s existing arbitration regulations<sup>1</sup>

are for the most part consistent with the new statutory provisions, certain changes are needed so that the Board’s regulations conform fully to the requirements under section 11708.

On May 12, 2016, the Board issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR), proposing to modify its existing arbitration regulations, set forth at 49 CFR part 1108 and 49 CFR 1115.8, to conform to the provisions set forth by the statute and to make other minor clarifying changes. Specifically, the Board proposed adding rate disputes to the list of matters eligible for arbitration under its arbitration program and barring two matters from the arbitration program (disputes to prescribe for the future any conduct, rules, or results of general, industry-wide applicability and disputes solely between two or more rail carriers). For rate disputes, pursuant to section 11708(c)(1)(C), the proposed rules indicated that arbitration would be available only if the rail carrier has market dominance (as determined under 49 U.S.C. 10707). The Board sought comment on whether parties should be given the option to concede market dominance, thereby forgoing the need for a determination by the Board under 49 U.S.C. 10707.

The Board also proposed that, as an alternative to filing a written complaint, arbitration could be initiated by the parties if they submit a joint notice to the Board indicating their consent to arbitrate. In accordance with section 11708(g), the Board proposed setting the maximum amount of relief that could be awarded under the arbitration program to \$25,000,000 in rate disputes and \$2,000,000 in practice disputes. The Board also proposed rules to establish a process for creating and maintaining a roster of arbitrators and selecting arbitrators from the roster in accordance with section 11708(f). Pursuant to section 11708(d) and (h), the proposed rules would also modify the requirements for, and applicable standard of review of, arbitration decisions, which are to be “consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics.” The proposed rules would also modify the deadlines governing the arbitration process in accordance with the statutory provisions. Lastly, the proposed rules would correct an inadvertent omission made in Docket No. EP 699 that unintentionally removed the Board’s standard of review for labor arbitration cases.

Board adopted modified rules governing the use of mediation and arbitration to resolve matters before the Board. The rules established a new arbitration program under which shippers and carriers may voluntarily agree in advance to arbitrate certain disputes with clearly defined limits of liability.

The Board sought comments on the proposed regulations by June 13, 2016, and replies by July 1, 2016. The Board received comments from seven parties: Association of American Railroads (AAR), American Chemistry Council (ACC), National Grain and Feed Association (NGFA), Growth Energy, Rail Customer Coalition (RCC), National Industrial Transportation League (NITL), and Samuel J. Nasca on behalf of SMART/Transportation Division, New York State Legislative Board (SMART/TD–NY). AAR, ACC, and SMART/TD–NY also filed replies. After giving consideration to the comments and suggestions submitted by parties, the Board clarifies and modifies its proposed rules, as discussed below.

*Creating and Maintaining the Roster.* Under section 11708(f)(1), arbitrators on the roster must be “persons with rail transportation, economic regulation, professional or business experience, including agriculture, in the private sector.” The NPR further proposed that arbitrators be required to have training in dispute resolution and/or experience in arbitration or other forms of dispute resolution. Under the proposed rules, the Chairman would have discretion as to whether an individual meets the qualifications to be added to the roster.

NGFA and ACC suggest revising the proposed rules so that all Board members would have input as to which applicants are qualified and should be included in the roster. (NGFA Comments 6, ACC Comment 4.) The Board agrees that all Board Members should have input in establishing the roster of arbitrators. (See NGFA Comments 6.) The final rules will provide that the Chairman will solicit input and recommendations from all Members in selecting qualified individuals to be included in the arbitrator roster, which will then be established by a Board no-objection vote.

AAR asserts that the Board should have no discretion to exclude qualified individuals from the roster. (AAR Comment 5.) Rather, AAR suggests that the Board adopt a more transparent process in which individuals meeting set criteria would automatically be added to the roster. Under this process, an applicant would submit a narrative describing his or her qualifications, which would then be posted for a 20-day comment period. (AAR Comment 6.) The Board would add all uncontested applicants to the roster, but if there is an objection, the Board would decide whether the individual should or should not be added and issue a decision explaining its reasoning. (*Id.*) The Board finds this additional process

<sup>1</sup> In *Assessment of Mediation & Arbitration Procedures*, EP 699 (STB served May 13, 2013), the