

customers when their employees discuss opening IRAs or investing their IRAs in bank deposit products such as CDs. Some have also raised questions about the need for a special rule for cash sweep services. Still others have said that health savings accounts (HSAs) merit a special exclusion or streamlined exemption because they tend to be invested in shorter-term deposit products to pay qualifying health expenses.

15. Should there be an amendment to the Rule or streamlined exemption for particular classes of investment transactions involving bank deposit products and HSAs? If so, what conditions should apply, and should the conditions differ from the BIC Exemption?

Grandfathering

Section VII of the BIC Exemption provides a grandfathering provision to facilitate ongoing advice with respect to investments that predated the Rule, and to enable advisers to continue to receive compensation for those investments. Some commenters thought this provision could be expanded in ways that would minimize potential disruptions associated with the transition to a fiduciary standard and facilitate ongoing advice for the benefit of investors.

16. To what extent are firms and advisers relying on the existing grandfather provision? How has the provision affected the availability of advice to investors? Are there changes to the provision that would enhance its ability to minimize undue disruption and facilitate valuable advice?

PTE 84-24

17. If the Department provided an exemption for insurance intermediaries to serve as Financial Institutions under the BIC Exemption, would this facilitate advice regarding all types of annuities? Would it facilitate advice to expand the scope of PTE 84-24 to cover all types of annuities after the end of the transition period on January 1, 2018? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of these two exemption approaches (*i.e.*, expanding the definition of Financial Institution or expanding the types of annuities covered under PTE 84-24)? To what extent would the ongoing availability of PTE 84-24 for specified annuity products, such as fixed indexed annuities, give these products a competitive advantage vis-à-vis other products covered only by the BIC Exemption, such as mutual fund shares?

Communications With Independent Fiduciaries With Financial Expertise

The Fiduciary Rule contains a specific exclusion for communications with independent fiduciaries with financial expertise. Specifically, a party's communications with an independent fiduciary of a plan or IRA in an arm's length transaction are excepted from the Rule if certain disclosure requirements are met and the party reasonably believes that the independent fiduciary of the plan or IRA is a bank, insurance carrier, or registered broker-dealer or investment adviser, or any other independent fiduciary who manages or controls at least \$50 million. Some commenters have requested that the Department expand the scope of the exclusion.

18. To the extent changes would be helpful, what are the changes and what are the issues best addressed by changes to the Rule or by providing additional relief through a prohibited transaction exemption?

Signed at Washington, DC, this 29th day of June, 2017.

Timothy D. Hauser,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Operations, Employee Benefits Security Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2017-14101 Filed 7-5-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA-HQ-SFUND-1986-0005; FRL-9964-01-Region 1]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Deletion of the Shpack Landfill Superfund Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 1 is issuing a Notice of Intent to Delete the Shpack Landfill Superfund Site (Site) located on Union Rd. and Peckham Streets in Norton and Attleboro, Massachusetts, from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comments on this proposed action. 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). The EPA and

the State of Massachusetts, through the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP), have determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA, other than operation, maintenance, monitoring, and five-year reviews, have been completed. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

DATES: Comments must be received by August 7, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID no. EPA-HQ-SFUND-1986-0005, by mail or email to Elaine Stanley, Remedial Project Manager at EPA—Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Mail Code OSRR07-4, Boston, MA 02109-3912, email: Stanley.ElaineT@epa.gov or Sarah White, Community Involvement Coordinator at EPA—Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Mail Code ORA01-1, Boston, MA 02109-3912, email: White.Sarah@epa.gov. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elaine Stanley, Remedial Project Manager, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Mail Code OSRR07-4, Boston, MA 02109-3912, phone: 617-918-1332, email: Stanley.ElaineT@epa.gov or Sarah White, Community Involvement Coordinator at EPA—Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Mail Code ORA01-1, Boston, MA 02109-3912, phone: 617-918-1026, email: White.Sarah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the “Rules and Regulations” Section of today’s **Federal Register**, we are publishing a direct final Notice of Deletion of Shpack Landfill 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.

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

PART 300—NATIONAL OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES POLLUTION CONTINGENCY PLAN

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 300 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(d); 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 “MA”, “Shpack Landfill”, “Norton/Attleboro”.

Dated: May 9, 2017.

Deborah A. Szaro,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 1.

[FR Doc. 2017–14113 Filed 7–5–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 1, 32 and 65

[WC Docket No. 14–130, CC Docket No. 80–286; Report No. 3078]

Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petition for Reconsideration.

SUMMARY: A Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission’s proceeding by Paul Glist, on behalf of NCTA—The Internet & Television Association.

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before July 21, 2017. Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before July 31, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robin Cohn, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, at (202) 418–2747 or email: robin.cohn@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s document, Report No. 3078, released June 26, 2017. The full text of the Petition is available for viewing and copying at the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. It also may be accessed online via the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System at: <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/106050781930666>. The Commission will not send a Congressional Review Act (CRA) submission to Congress or the Government Accountability Office Pursuant to the CRA, 5 U.S.C. because no rules are being adopted by the Commission.

Subject: In the Matter of Comprehensive Review of the Part 32 Uniform System of Accounts; Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board, FCC 17–15, published at 82 FR 20833, May 4, 2017, in WC Docket No. 14–130 and CC Docket No. 80–286. This document is being published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). *See also* 47 CFR 1.4(b)(1) and 1.429(f), (g).

Number of Petitions Filed: 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017–14161 Filed 7–5–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P