

pressure toward this end because applicants know that only the best application in an MX group will win.

9. The Commission also rejects Discount Legal's argument that "the idea than an applicant must be dismissed because it is comparatively inferior to an unqualified applicant being dismissed" violates the Supreme Court's holding in *Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. FCC*. The Commission previously considered and rejected this argument in a prior decision affirming the one-grant policy and explained that *Ashbacker* "[does not] require the Commission to engage in secondary analyses of inferior applications simply because they do not conflict with the tentative selectee."

10. *Administrative Burdens*. The Commission rejects Discount Legal's contention that the concern about administrative burdens "does not hold up." Discount Legal does not consider the extensive work required following the issuance of tentative selectee orders. The Commission explains that a tentative selection is not final until the entire administrative process of resolving petitions to deny, and any subsequent pleadings, is complete. Commission review of any petitions and associated point audits is a weighty and oftentimes lengthy process, requiring extensive analysis to determine the status of every tentative selectee's application and the merits of every petition to deny. If a petition to deny is granted, a new tentative selectee must be chosen, and petitions to deny must again be entertained.

11. The one-grant policy incentivizes applicants to resolve mutual exclusivities through the more expeditious settlement process, thereby accelerating new NCE service to the public. The Commission rejects Discount Legal's argument that it is irrational to allow multiple grants in an MX group in the settlement context but not engage in secondary analysis through the point system. This argument does not account for the fundamentally different nature of the two conflict-resolution methods and the time each process entails.

12. The Commission also rejects the argument that secondary grants would better accomplish the section 152 and 303(g) statutory objectives of efficient and effective radio use. The Commission explains that simply granting as many applications as possible in any given window will not

result in greater long-term efficiency and effectiveness. Rather, the one-grant policy better serves the policy goals of sections 152 and 303(g) by incentivizing better applications as well as cooperative settlements that encourage more intensive and higher quality use of spectrum.

13. *Established One-Grant Policy*. Finally, the Commission's rejects Discount Legal's argument that the one-grant policy was not endorsed by the Commission, but rather, originated with the Bureau staff. The Commission explains that Discount Legal's characterization is directly at odds with the Commission's explicit mandate in the 2001 *NCE Comparative MO&O*, the subsequent Commission decisions stating that the Bureau correctly applied the *NCE Comparative MO&O*, and the Commission's recent reaffirmation of the one-grant policy in the *2019 Report and Order*. These decisions reflect that it has been, and remains, the resolve of the Commission—not the staff—that the Bureau process applications based on a "one-grant" policy.

Ordering Clauses

14. *It is ordered* that the Petition for Reconsideration filed on March 12, 2020, by Discount Legal *is dismissed*, and alternatively and independently, *is denied*.

15. *It is further ordered* that should no further petitions for reconsideration or petitions for judicial review be timely filed, MB Docket No. 19–3 *shall be terminated*, and its docket *closed*.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene Dortch,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020–23306 Filed 12–2–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178 and 180

[Docket No. PHMSA–2017–0108 (HM–2150)]

RIN 2137–AF32

Hazardous Materials: Harmonization With International Standards

Correction

In rule document 2020–06205, beginning on page 27810, in the issue of

Monday, May 11, 2020, make the following correction:

■ On page 27852, in the second column, amendatory instruction 2d is corrected to read as follows:

§ 171.7 [Corrected]

d. Add paragraphs (w)(53), (62), (66), (69), (71), (72), and (75) through (77);

[FR Doc. C1–2020–06205 Filed 12–2–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1301–00–D

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

[FF09E21000 FXES11110900000 212]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Eleven Species Not Warranted for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notification of findings.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce findings that eleven species are not warranted for listing as endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). After a thorough review of the best available scientific and commercial information, we find that it is not warranted at this time to list the Doll's daisy, Puget Oregonian, Rocky Mountain monkeyflower, southern white-tailed ptarmigan, tidewater amphipod, tufted puffin, Hamlin Valley pyrg, longitudinal gland pyrg, subglobose snake pyrg, the Johnson Springs Wetland Complex population of relict dace, or Clear Lake hitch. However, we ask the public to submit to us at any time any new information relevant to the status of any of the species mentioned above or their habitats.

DATES: The findings in this document were made on December 3, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Detailed descriptions of the bases for these findings are available on the internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> under the following docket numbers:

Species	Docket No.
Doll's daisy	FWS–R5–ES–2020–0066.
Puget Oregonian	FWS–R1–ES–2020–0067.