

radius of Oceana NAS (Apollo Soucek Field) to 9.3 miles southwest of the TACAN and within a 2.7-mile radius of NALF Fentress. This Class E airspace area is effective during specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

Paragraph 6004 Class E Airspace Designated as an Extension to a Class D Surface Area.

* * * * *

AEA VA E4 Oceana NAS, VA [Amended]

Oceana NAS (Apollo Soucek Field)
(Lat. 36°49'22" N., long. 76°01'55" W.)

Navy Oceana TACAN

(Lat. 36°49'27" N., long. 76°02'13" W.)

NALF Fentress, VA

(Lat. 36°41'31" N., long. 76°08'04" W.)

That airspace extending upward from the surface within 1.8 miles each side of the Navy Oceana TACAN 213° radial extending from the 4.3-mile radius of Oceana NAS (Apollo Soucek Field) to 9.3 miles southwest of the TACAN and within a 2.7-mile radius of NALF Fentress. This Class E airspace area is effective during specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

Issued in College Park, Georgia, on July 24, 2013.

Jackson D. Allen,

Acting Manager, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Air Traffic Organization.

[FR Doc. 2013-18398 Filed 7-31-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 200

[Release No. 34-70049]

Delegation of Authority to Director of the Division of Enforcement

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is amending its rules to delegate to the Director of the Division of Enforcement the authority to appoint distribution fund administrators in enforcement administrative proceedings from a Commission-approved pool of administrators, and to set the amount of, or waive for good cause shown, the administrator's bond required by Rule 1105(c) of the Commission's rules on Fair Fund and Disgorgement Plans.

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 1, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Chase Burton, 202-551-4425,

Office of Distributions, Division of Enforcement, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549-6553.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In administrative proceedings instituted by the Commission to enforce the federal securities laws, the Commission, in the exercise of its discretion, seeks to distribute amounts collected as disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and penalties to investor victims. The federal securities laws authorize the Commission in administrative proceedings to establish disgorgement and other funds to accomplish this goal. *See, e.g.,* Section 308(a) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, 15 U.S.C. 7261; Sections 21B(e) and 21C(e) of the Securities Exchange Act ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. 78u-2(e) and 78u-3(e). According to the Commission's regulations, the "Commission or [a] hearing officer shall have discretion to appoint any person, including a Commission employee, as administrator of a plan of disgorgement or a Fair Fund plan and to delegate to that person responsibility for administering the plan." Rule 1105(a), 17 CFR 201.1105(a). To improve the efficiency of the Commission's distribution processes, and to centralize certain distribution-related functions within the Division of Enforcement, the Commission is formally delegating to the Director of the Division of Enforcement the authority to appoint certain persons as plan administrators if the person to be appointed is included in the Commission's approved pool of qualified administrators.¹ The

¹ On July 15, 2013, the Commission approved a pool of nine firms from which future fund administrators will be appointed to administer the distribution of disgorgement or fair funds. Each administrator in the pool will be evaluated annually by the Office of Distributions and, if performance is deemed in compliance with the requirements for selection, will be continued in the pool for another year, up to a total of five years, at which time a selection process for a new pool will take place. Beginning six months after approval of the delegation and every six months thereafter, the Office of Distributions must provide the Commission with a memorandum discussing the implementation of the delegation and issues relevant to the Commission's evaluation of the distribution processes. In particular, each memorandum must include (i) a list of all distributions assigned to pool participants at that time; (ii) the stage of each such distribution; and (iii) the Office of Distributions' evaluation of each administrator responsible for the distributions. Each memorandum must also discuss, as data becomes available, the following: (i) whether the delegation has resulted in lower cost of distributions; (ii) whether the delegation has resulted in a greater percentage of funds from the distribution funds being returned to harmed investors; and (iii) whether the delegation has resulted in more timely and efficient distributions. The Office of Distributions must follow these procedures in connection with the delegation authority.

Commission is also delegating to the Director, when the Director appoints an administrator pursuant to this delegation, the authority to set the amount of, or waive for good cause shown, the administrator's bond required by Rule 1105(c), 17 CFR 201.1105(c), of the Commission's rules on Fair Fund and Disgorgement Plans.

If the Division Director deems it appropriate, a recommendation to appoint an administrator from the qualified pool or to set the amount of, or waive for good cause shown, any administrator's bond may be submitted to the Commission for review.

Administrative Law Matters:

The Commission finds, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(A), that this amendment relates solely to agency organization, procedure, or practice, and does not relate to a substantive rule. Accordingly, the provisions of the APA regarding notice of rulemaking, opportunity for public comment, and publication of the amendment prior to its effective date are not applicable. For the same reason, and because this amendment does not substantively affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties, the provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, 5 U.S.C. 804(3)(C), are not applicable. Additionally, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which apply only when notice and comment are required by the APA or other law, 5 U.S.C. 603, are not applicable. Further, because this amendment imposes no new burdens on private persons, the Commission does not believe that the amendment will have any anti-competitive effects for purposes of Section 23(a)(2) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. 78w(a)(2). Finally, this amendment does not contain any collection of information requirements as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, as amended. Accordingly, the amendment is effective [insert date of **Federal Register** publication].

List of Subjects in 17 CFR Part 200

Administrative practice and procedure, Authority delegations (Government agencies).

Text of Amendment

For the reasons set out in the preamble, Title 17, Chapter II of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

**PART 200—ORGANIZATION;
CONDUCT AND ETHICS; AND
INFORMATION AND REQUESTS**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 200, subpart A, continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 77o, 77s, 77sss, 78d, 78d-1, 78d-2, 78w, 78ll(d), 78mm, 80a-37, 80b-11, 7202, and 7211 *et seq.*, unless otherwise noted.

* * * * *

■ 2. Section 200.30-4 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(17) to read as follows:

§ 200.30-4 Delegation of authority to Director of Division of Enforcement.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(17) With respect to disgorgement and Fair Fund plans established in administrative proceedings instituted by the Commission pursuant to the federal securities laws, to appoint a person as a plan administrator, if that person is included in the Commission's approved pool of administrators, and, for an administrator appointed pursuant to this delegation, to set the amount of or waive for good cause shown, the administrator's bond required by § 201.1105(c) of this chapter.

* * * * *

By the Commission.

Dated: July 26, 2013.

Elizabeth M. Murphy,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013-18468 Filed 7-31-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

20 CFR Parts 404 and 416

[Docket No. SSA-2012-0066]

RIN 0960-AH52

Change in Terminology: “Mental Retardation” to “Intellectual Disability”

AGENCY: Social Security Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule adopts, without change, the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) we published in the *Federal Register* on January 28, 2013. We are replacing the term “mental retardation” with “intellectual disability” in our Listing of Impairments (listings) that we use to evaluate claims involving mental disorders in adults and children under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act (Act) and in other appropriate sections of our rules. This change reflects the widespread

adoption of the term “intellectual disability” by Congress, government agencies, and various public and private organizations.

DATES: This final rule is effective September 3, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cheryl Williams, Office of Medical Listings Improvement, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21235-6401, (410) 965-1020. For information on eligibility or filing for benefits, call our national toll-free number, 1-800-772-1213, or TTY 1-800-325-0778, or visit our Internet site, Social Security Online, at <http://www.socialsecurity.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 28, 2013, we published an NPRM that proposed replacing the term “mental retardation” with “intellectual disability” in our listings that we use to evaluate claims involving mental disorders in adults and children under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act (Act) and in other appropriate sections of our rules.¹ We are finalizing the proposed rule without change.

Why are we changing the term “mental retardation” to “intellectual disability”?

The term “intellectual disability” is gradually replacing the term “mental retardation” nationwide. Advocates for individuals with intellectual disability have rightfully asserted that the term “mental retardation” has negative connotations, has become offensive to many people, and often results in misunderstandings about the nature of the disorder and those who have it.

In October 2010, Congress passed Rosa's Law, which changed references to “mental retardation” in specified Federal laws to “intellectual disability,” and references to “a mentally retarded individual” to “an individual with an intellectual disability.”² Rosa's Law also required the Federal agencies that administer the affected laws to make conforming amendments to their regulations. Rosa's Law did not specifically include titles II and XVI of the Act within its scope, and therefore, did not require any changes in our existing regulations. However, consistent with the concerns expressed by Congress when it enacted Rosa's Law, and in response to numerous inquiries from advocate organizations, we are revising our rules to use the term

¹ 78 FR 5755.

² Public Law 111-256.

“intellectual disability” in the name of our current listings and in our other regulations. In so doing, we join other agencies that responded to the spirit of the law, even though Rosa's Law did not require them to change their terminology.³

Public Comments

In the NPRM, we provided the public a 30-day comment period, which ended on February 27, 2013. We received 76 comments. Seventy-one commenters enthusiastically supported our proposal to replace the term “mentally retarded” with intellectual disability or another term, while only five opposed the change. The comments came from national advocacy and disability rights groups, professional organizations, disability examiners, parents, and members of the public. We summarized and paraphrased the significant comments in our responses below. We carefully considered all of the comments. However, we did not make any changes to the final rule.

Support for Replacing the Term “Mental Retardation”

Comment: Seventy-one commenters enthusiastically supported replacing the term “mentally retarded” and 66 commenters supported the use of the term “intellectual disability.” Organizations including The Arc, The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, The National Disability Rights Network, American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, and National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., commented in support of our proposed changes.

Almost all commenters noted the negative connotations and offensive nature of term “mental retardation.” Often, commenters referred to the word “retarded” as “the R-word.” Several provided personal stories about the effect the words “retarded” and “mental retardation” have had on a loved one with a disability and expressed their gratitude for our proposing to remove the term from the listings. One organization observed that the “change in terminology is consistent with the widely expressed desire of people with intellectual disability for the use of modern, respectful language.” Another organization stated, “We appreciate SSA's commitment to eliminate outdated terminology and the negative stereotypes that they perpetuate for people with disabilities.” One commenter, a graduate student in vocational rehabilitation, observed how

³ See 77 FR 29002 and 77 FR 6022-01.