

Dated: September 10, 2012.

Lois Rossi,
 Director, Registration Division, Office of
 Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is
 amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180
 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

- 2. Section 180.568 is amended by:
 - a. Alphabetically adding the following
 commodities to the table in paragraph
 (a);
 - b. Removing the commodity, “bean,
 dry seed” from the table in paragraph
 (a).

The amendments read as follows:

**§ 180.568 Flumioxazin; tolerances for
 residues.**

(a) * * *

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * *	*
Grain, aspirated fractions	100
* * * *	*
Pea and bean, dried shelled, except soybean, subgroup 6C	0.07
* * * *	*
Rapeseed subgroup 20A	0.40
* * * *	*
Sunflower subgroup 20B	0.50
* * * *	*
Wheat, forage	0.02
Wheat, grain	0.40
Wheat, hay	0.02
Wheat, straw	6.0

* * * * *
 [FR Doc. 2012-23352 Filed 9-20-12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM
 PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR
 SEVERELY DISABLED**

41 CFR Parts 51-1

**Substitution of Term in a Definition;
 Addition and Adoption of the Use of
 Specific Interchangeable or
 Synonymous Terms**

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From
 People Who Are Blind or Severely
 Disabled.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Committee for Purchase
 From People Who Are Blind or Severely

Disabled (the Committee) administers
 the AbilityOne® Program pursuant to
 the authority of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day
 (JWOD) Act. The Committee is
 substituting the term “disabled” for
 “handicapped” in a term defined in its
 regulation. Additionally, the Committee
 has deliberated and unanimously voted
 to approve the use of “severely”
 disabled and “significantly” disabled as
 interchangeable or synonymous terms
 when referring to people who are
 severely disabled within the AbilityOne
 Program. The Committee’s approval to
 use “severely” and “significantly” as
 interchangeable or synonymous terms
 within the AbilityOne Program
 specifically does not make any change
 to the definition of “severely disabled
 individual” in the JWOD Act or expand
 the population of individuals served
 within the AbilityOne Program.

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 21,
 2012.

ADDRESSES: The Committee office is
 located at 1421 Jefferson Davis
 Highway, Suite 10800, Arlington, VA
 22202-3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Dennis Lockard, General Counsel, by
 telephone (703) 603-7740, or by
 facsimile at (703) 603-0030, or by mail
 at the Committee for Purchase From
 People Who Are Blind or Severely
 Disabled, 1421 Jefferson Davis Hwy.,
 Suite 10800, Arlington, VA 22202-3259.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Committee for Purchase From
 People Who Are Blind or Severely
 Disabled (Committee) administers the
 AbilityOne® Program pursuant to the
 authority of the Javits-Wagner-O’Day
 (JWOD) Act (41 U.S.C. 8501*et seq.*). The
 AbilityOne Program provides
 employment opportunities for people
 who are blind or have other severe
 disabilities through the manufacture
 and delivery of products and services to
 the Federal Government. 41 U.S.C.
 8503(d) authorizes the Committee to
 make rules and regulations necessary to
 carry out the purpose of the Act and the
 Committee has done so at 41 CFR
 Chapter 51. Within the AbilityOne
 Program, the term “severely disabled” is
 used to describe people with severe
 disabilities who qualify to participate in
 the program; however, within the
 Committee’s regulation, the terms *other
 severely handicapped and severely
 handicapped individuals* are used to
 define persons with severe disabilities.
 The Committee is amending its
 regulation to correct the terminology
 and remove references to “handicap” or
 “handicapped” in the list of definitions.

Additionally, the Committee is aware
 that the term “severely disabled” is no
 longer the description of choice of all
 disability advocates and terms such as
 “significantly disabled” have gained
 acceptance within the disability
 communities. The Committee is also
 cognizant that the term “individual with
 a significant disability” (instead of
severe disability) was included and
 defined in the 1998 reauthorization of
 the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the
 term is being included in other
 congressional actions and agency
 regulations. In conjunction with the
 broader use of the terms “significant”
 disability and “significantly” disabled,
 the AbilityOne Program’s participants,
 stakeholders and supporters have
 increasingly accepted and used these
 terms within the program.

Consequently, in order to ensure
 alignment and consistency throughout
 the AbilityOne Program, the Committee
 has voted to permit use of the terms
 “significant” or “significantly” as
 interchangeable or synonymous with
 “severe” or “severely” when describing
 individuals with severe disabilities who
 qualify to participate in the AbilityOne
 Program. The action by the Committee
 to use the terms interchangeably or
 synonymously does not, however, result
 in any change to the definition or
 eligibility (either expand or narrow) of
 the population served in the AbilityOne
 Program under the authority of the
 JWOD Act. In addition, this action does
 not make any change to the statutory
 name of the Committee or permit the
 use of the synonymous term when
 describing the Committee.

The Committee has issued a final rule
 because this rule does not have a
 significant effect beyond the internal
 operating procedures of the AbilityOne
 Program and does not have a significant
 cost or administrative impact on others
 not associated with the AbilityOne
 Program. Therefore, public comment is
 not required. This interpretive rule is
 action by the Committee to ensure that
 appropriate terminology is used within
 the AbilityOne Program to describe a
 significant portion of the people who
 are served under this program.

**II. Statutory and Executive Order
 Reviews**

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563
 direct agencies to assess costs, benefits
 and burdens of available regulatory
 alternatives and, if regulation is
 necessary, to select regulatory
 approaches that maximize net benefits
 (including potential economic,
 environmental, public health and safety
 effective, distributive impacts, and
 equity). This is not a significant

regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under Section 6(b) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804; therefore, Congressional notification is not required.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because notice and opportunity for comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law, the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) are inapplicable. Therefore, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required and has not been prepared.

Administrative Procedure Act

The Committee finds under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(A) that the statute does not apply to interpretive rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice. This final rule simply substitutes a word in a term defined in the regulation and authorizes the use of specific interchangeable or synonymous terms when describing individuals who are eligible to participate in the AbilityOne Program. Further, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(A), this rule of agency organization, procedure and practice is not subject to the requirement to provide prior notice and an opportunity for public comment. The Committee also finds that the 30-day delay in effectiveness, required under 5 U.S.C. 553(d), is inapplicable because this rule is not a substantive rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

The Committee has determined that the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, does not apply because this rule does not contain any information collection requirements that require approval of OMB.

List of Subjects in 41 CFR Part 51–1

Government procurement, Individuals with disabilities.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled amends 41 CFR Part 51–1 as set forth below:

41 CFR PART 51–1—GENERAL

- 1. The authority for 41 CFR part 51–1 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 56 FR 48976, Sept. 26, 1991, unless otherwise noted.

- 2. Amend § 51–1.3 by amending the heading of the definition “*Other severely handicapped and severely handicapped individuals*” by removing

the word “handicapped” and adding the word “disabled” in its place, and adding the definition “*Severely disabled individual; Severe disability; Significantly disabled individual; Significant disability*” to read as follows:

§ 51–1.3 Definitions.

* * * * *

Severely disabled individual; Severe disability; Significantly disabled individual; Significant disability; are interchangeable or synonymous terms used within the AbilityOne Program to describe persons with severe disabilities who qualify to participate in the AbilityOne Program.

* * * * *

III. Approval Authority

The Executive Director of the Committee has approved the publication of this notice and authorized the undersigned to sign and submit the document to the Office of the Federal Register.

Dated: September 18, 2012.

Barry S. Lineback,

Director, Business Operations.

[FR Doc. 2012–23330 Filed 9–20–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 541

[Docket No. NHTSA–2012–0072]

Final Theft Data; Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Publication of 2010 final theft data.

SUMMARY: This document publishes the final data on thefts of model year (MY) 2010 passenger motor vehicles that occurred in calendar year (CY) 2010. The final 2010 theft data indicated a decrease in the vehicle theft rate experienced in CY/MY 2010. The final theft rate for MY 2010 passenger vehicles stolen in calendar year 2010 is 1.17 thefts per thousand vehicles, a decrease of 12.03 percent from the rate of 1.33 thefts per thousand in 2009. Publication of these data fulfills NHTSA’s statutory obligation to periodically obtain accurate and timely theft data and publish the information for review and comment.

DATES: *Effective date:* September 21, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Deborah Mazyck, Office of International Policy, Fuel Economy and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Mazyck’s telephone number is (202) 366–4139. Her fax number is (202) 493–2990.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NHTSA administers a program for reducing motor vehicle theft. The central feature of this program is the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, 49 CFR part 541. The standard specifies performance requirements for inscribing and affixing vehicle identification numbers (VINs) onto certain major original equipment and replacement parts of high-theft lines of passenger motor vehicles.

The agency is required by 49 U.S.C. 33104(b)(4) to periodically obtain, from the most reliable source, accurate and timely theft data and publish the data for review and comment. To fulfill this statutory mandate, NHTSA has published theft data annually beginning with MYs 1983/84. Continuing to fulfill the § 33104(b)(4) mandate, this document reports the final theft data for CY 2010, the most recent calendar year for which data are available.

In calculating the 2010 theft rates, NHTSA followed the same procedures it used in calculating the MY 2009 theft rates. (For 2009 theft data calculations, see 76 FR 65610, October 24, 2011). As in all previous reports, NHTSA’s data were based on information provided to NHTSA by the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The NCIC is a government system that receives vehicle theft information from nearly 23,000 criminal justice agencies and other law enforcement authorities throughout the United States. The NCIC data also include reported thefts of self-insured and uninsured vehicles, not all of which are reported to other data sources.

The 2010 theft rate for each vehicle line was calculated by dividing the number of reported thefts of MY 2010 vehicles of that line stolen during calendar year 2010 by the total number of vehicles in that line manufactured for MY 2010, as reported to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The final 2010 theft data show a decrease in the vehicle theft rate when compared to the theft rate experienced in CY/MY 2009. The final theft rate for MY 2010 passenger vehicles stolen in calendar year 2010 decreased to 1.17