seek to address remaining corrective action obligations through an alternate authority. Regulators may be hesitant in parceling scenarios to release owners and operators and property purchasers from RCRA permit obligations because of concerns that doing so may allow them to avoid corrective action obligations. Regulators further may be concerned that selling parcels of a facility may deplete resources available to address corrective action obligations on the remaining facility.

These concerns may slow parceling decisions and hinder or even prevent real estate transactions, including transactions that might have provided for cleanup of facilities that might otherwise not be addressed. EPA is seeking to develop parceling practices for RCRA facilities that will provide guidelines for regulators enabling them to make timely and informed parceling decisions that promote redevelopment while ensuring that the goals of the statute are satisfied.

1. Benefits of Parceling

EPA requests comment on, and specific examples demonstrating, the benefits of removing portions of facilities from RCRA permits upon property transfer including but not limited to:

- Situations where removing the RCRA permit requirement from a facility parcel provided funds that otherwise would not have been available to implement corrective action as necessary to protect human health and the environment, including situations where the permittee was no longer viable.

2. Barriers to Parceling

EPA requests comment to help identify and better understand any barriers to parceling that may be created by the RCRA permit including but not limited to:

- Information explaining why the permit may be a barrier to a property transaction.
- Examples where the RCRA permit may have prevented or slowed property transfer, particularly where the transfer of property would have promoted cleanup.

3. Concerns Raised by Parceling Actions

EPA requests comment to help identify and better understand how parceling of a RCRA permitted facility and releasing the owner/operator and/or purchaser from permit obligations may impact whether the statutory obligation to protect human health and the environment is satisfied. EPA requests comment on regulators' experiences including but not limited to examples where parceling transactions have created incentives or hinderances for cleanup and redevelopment.

4. Overcoming Barriers to Parceling

EPA also requests comment on ways to overcome the barriers to parceling RCRA facilities while ensuring that the statutory requirement of RCRA for permit conditions necessary to protect human health and the environment, and for corrective action permit conditions and financial responsibility until corrective action is complete, discussed above, are met. In particular, EPA solicits comment on:

- Examples where a facility was parceled successfully and the permit was retained, and how barriers were overcome in that process.
- Ways to support program implementers processing requests for permit modifications associated with parceling transactions to enable them to process those requests in a timely manner.
- Practices or components of regulatory alternatives relied on in parceling actions that regulators have found to effectively assure that corrective action obligations at both the remaining RCRA permitted facility and at the parcel will be addressed after the parcel is sold and separated from the facility.
- Financial mechanisms that program implementers can rely on to finance future cleanup actions when RCRA financial assurance requirements no longer apply.

E. Other Areas for Permitting Reform

Finally, EPA is soliciting comment on any other opportunities for the Agency to improve the RCRA permitting program, streamline the RCRA permitting process, and improve efficiencies so the Nation can unleash economic growth while providing cost savings to hardworking Americans. Because protecting human health and the environment goes hand-in-hand with economic prosperity, the Agency requests input on ways to simplify regulations, remove redundancies, and reduce delays, while providing clear guidelines to aid businesses in navigating requirements and maintaining protectiveness. EPA is generally soliciting comment on RCRA permitting and specifically seeks ideas that would reduce the time, uncertainty, and costs involved in issuing a permit and enable the Agency to advance its strategic objective of achieving operational efficiencies while upholding its mission to protect human health and the environment.

III. Authority

EPA is authorized to implement the Hazardous Waste Permit Program under the authority of sections 1006, 2002(a), 3002, 3003, 3004, 3005, 3010, 3013, and 7004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1970, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended, by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA), 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), 6922, 6923, 6924, 6925, 6930, 6934, and 6974. These public laws combined are commonly referred to as the ''Resource Conservation and Recovery Act'' (RCRA). EPA is soliciting comments and announcing the virtual public engagement sessions to help inform future policy actions under this RCRA authority.

Steven Cook,

Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Land and Emergency Management.

[FR Doc. 2026–23882 Filed 11–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[FR ID 378871]

Deletion of Item From November 19, 2026 Open Meeting

November 18, 2026.

The following item was adopted by the Commission on November 16, 2026 and deleted from the list of items scheduled for consideration at the Thursday, November 19, 2026, Open Meeting. The item was previously listed in the Commission's Sunshine Notice on Thursday, November 12, 2026.

Item No.	Bureau	Subject
4	Wireline Competition	*Title:* Reforming the High-Cost Program for an All-IP Future (WC Docket No. 26–96) and Connect America Fund: A National Broadband Plan for our Future High-Cost Universal Support (WC Docket No. 10–90).

Item No.	Bureau	Subject
		Summary: The Commission will consider a Report and Order that would adopt a limited two-year extension of Alternative Connect America Cost Model (A–CAM I) support through December 31, 2028. A–CAM I currently provides predictable, model-based support to rural rate-of-return carriers in exchange for defined broadband deployment obligations, and this extension would prevent a loss of support for nine carriers while the Commission considers broader reforms to its high-cost support mechanisms.

Authority: This meeting is held, in accordance with the Government in the Sunshine Act (Sunshine Act), Public Law 94–409, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552b).

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2026–23828 Filed 11–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[GN Docket No. 25–59; DA 26–1248; FR ID 378982]

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Comment on Whether Proposed Upper C-Band Relocation Coordinator Satisfies Selection Criteria

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice; solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) invites interested parties to comment on whether the proposed Relocation Coordinator selected by the eligible space station operators in the Upper C-band satisfies the criteria established by the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) in *Upper C-band (3.98–4.2 GHz); Expanding Flexible Use of the 3.7 to 4.2 GHz Band,* GN Docket Nos. 25–59 and 18–122, Report and Order, Order of Proposed Modification, and Order on Reconsideration, FCC 26–46 (July 24, 2026) (*Upper C-band R&O*). In the *Upper C-band R&O,* the Commission adopted rules to make 160 megahertz of mid-band spectrum available for flexible use throughout the contiguous United States by transitioning incumbent Fixed Satellite Service (FSS) operations out of 4.0–4.16 GHz. The *Upper C-band R&O* required eligible space station operators to select a Relocation Coordinator that will be responsible for managing the overall transition and coordinating relocation actions among eligible FSS space station operators, incumbent FSS earth station operators, and new Upper C-band flexible use licensees.

DATES: Comments are due on or before December 3, 2026; reply comments are due on or before December 14, 2026.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by GN Docket No. 25–59, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Communications Commission's Website: https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filings/standard.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *People with Disabilities:* Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by email: *FCC504@fcc.gov* or phone: 202–418–0530.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew McArdell, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at *Andrew.McArdell@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's document (*Public Notice*), in GN Docket No. 25–59, DA 26–1248, released on November 18, 2026. The complete text of this document is available on the Commission's website at *https://docs.fcc.gov/public/attachments/DA-26-1248A1.pdf,* or by using the search function for GN Docket No. 25–59 on the Commission's ECFS web page at *https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs.*

Ex Parte Rules. This proceeding shall be treated as a ''permit but-disclose'' proceeding in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules. Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (*e.g.,* .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

Synopsis

With this Public Notice, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) seeks comment on whether the proposed Relocation Coordinator selected by the eligible space station operators in the Upper C-band satisfies the criteria established by the Commission in the *Upper C-band R&O.*

On July 24, 2026, the Commission released the *Upper C-band R&O,* which adopted rules to make 160 megahertz of mid-band spectrum available for flexible use throughout the contiguous United States by transitioning incumbent Fixed Satellite Service (FSS) operations out of 4.0–4.16 GHz.

The *Upper C-band R&O* required eligible Fixed Satellite Service (FSS) space station operators to select, no later than January 1, 2027, a Relocation Coordinator that will be responsible for managing the overall transition and coordinating relocation actions among eligible FSS space station operators, incumbent FSS earth station operators, and new Upper C-band flexible use licensees. The *Upper C-band R&O* required that the Relocation Coordinator ''must be able to demonstrate that it has