

The NRC may post materials related to this document, including public comments, on the Federal Rulemaking Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID NRC–2015–0186. The Federal Rulemaking Web site allows you to receive alerts when changes or additions occur in a docket folder. To subscribe: (1) navigate to the docket folder (NRC–2015–0186); (2) click the “Sign up for Email Alerts” link; and (3) enter your email address and select how frequently you would like to receive emails (daily, weekly, or monthly).

#### List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 72

Administrative practice and procedure, Criminal penalties, Hazardous waste, Indians, Intergovernmental relations, Manpower training programs, Nuclear energy, Nuclear materials, Occupational safety and health, Penalties, Radiation protection, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Spent fuel, Whistleblowing.

For the reasons set out in the preamble and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended; and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553; the NRC is adopting the following amendments to 10 CFR part 72:

#### PART 72—LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INDEPENDENT STORAGE OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL, HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE, AND REACTOR-RELATED GREATER THAN CLASS C WASTE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 72 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Atomic Energy Act of 1954, secs. 51, 53, 57, 62, 63, 65, 69, 81, 161, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 189, 223, 234, 274 (42 U.S.C. 2071, 2073, 2077, 2092, 2093, 2095, 2099, 2111, 2201, 2210e, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2273, 2282, 2021); Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, secs. 201, 202, 206, 211 (42 U.S.C. 5841, 5842, 5846, 5851); National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332); Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, secs. 117(a), 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 141, 145(g), 148, 218(a) (42 U.S.C. 10137(a), 10152, 10153, 10154, 10155, 10157, 10161, 10165(g), 10168, 10198(a)); 44 U.S.C. 3504 note.

■ 2. In § 72.214, Certificate of Compliance No. 1031 is revised to read as follows:

#### § 72.214 List of approved spent fuel storage casks.

\* \* \* \* \*

Certificate Number: 1031.

Initial Certificate Effective Date: February 4, 2009, superseded by Initial Certificate, Revision 1, on February 1, 2016.

Initial Certificate, Revision 1, Effective Date: February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 1 Effective Date: August 30, 2010, superseded by Amendment Number 1, Revision 1, on February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 1, Revision 1, Effective Date: February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 2 Effective Date: January 30, 2012, superseded by Amendment Number 2, Revision 1, on February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 2, Revision 1, Effective Date: February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 3 Effective Date: July 25, 2013, superseded by Amendment Number 3, Revision 1, on February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 3 Revision 1, Effective Date: February 1, 2016.

Amendment Number 4 Effective Date: April 14, 2015.

Amendment Number 5 Effective Date: June 29, 2015.

SAR Submitted by: NAC International, Inc.

SAR Title: Final Safety Analysis Report for the MAGNASTOR® System. Docket Number: 72–1031.

Certificate Expiration Date: February 4, 2029.

Model Number: MAGNASTOR®.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of November, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Glenn M. Tracy,

Acting, Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 2015–29424 Filed 11–17–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

#### Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Parts 1, 11, 16, 106, 110, 114, 117, 120, 123, 129, 179, and 211

[Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0920]

RIN 0910–AG36

#### Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food; Clarification of Compliance Date for Certain Food Establishments

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule; clarification of compliance date for certain food establishments.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is clarifying the compliance date that we provided for certain food establishments subject to a final rule that published in the **Federal Register** of September 17, 2015. Among other things, that final rule amended our regulation for current good manufacturing practice in manufacturing, packing, or holding human food to modernize it, and to add requirements for domestic and foreign facilities that are required to register under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act) to establish and implement hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls for human food. We are taking this action in response to requests for clarification of the compliance date for facilities that manufacture, process, pack, or hold grade “A” milk or milk products and that are regulated under the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (NCIMS) system.

**DATES:** The compliance date under the Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food rule (published on September 17, 2015 at 80 FR 55908) for grade “A” milk and milk products covered by NCIMS under the PMO is September 17, 2018.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jenny Scott, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–300), Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740, 240–402–2166.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

In the **Federal Register** of September 17, 2015 (80 FR 55908), we published a final rule entitled “Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food” (the final human preventive controls rule). Among other things, the final human preventive controls rule amended our regulation for current good manufacturing practice in manufacturing, packing, or holding human food to modernize it, and to add requirements for domestic and foreign facilities that are required to register under section 415 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 350d) to establish and implement hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls for human food. In the preamble to the final human preventive controls rule (80 FR 55908), we stated that the rule is effective November 16, 2015, and provided for compliance dates of 1 to 3 years in most cases.

In Comment 214 in the final human preventive controls final rule (80 FR 55908 at 55986 to 55987), we described comments that discuss facilities that comply with the Grade “A” PMO and are regulated under the NCIMS system, and we used the term “PMO facilities” as an abbreviation for these facilities. As previously discussed (78 FR 3646 at 3662; January 16, 2013), the PMO is a model regulation published and recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service/FDA for voluntary adoption by State dairy regulatory agencies to regulate the production, processing, storage and distribution of Grade “A” milk and milk products to help prevent milk-borne disease. Some comments recommended that we make full use of the existing milk safety system of State regulatory oversight for Grade “A” milk and milk products provided through the NCIMS and the food safety requirements of the PMO. Some comments asked us to exempt PMO-regulated facilities (or the PMO-regulated part of a PMO facility that also produces food products not covered by the PMO) from the requirements of the rule for hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls, or to otherwise determine that facilities operating in compliance with the PMO are also in compliance with those requirements. These comments suggested we could, as an interim step if we find it necessary, stay the application of these requirements to PMO-regulated facilities and work with the NCIMS cooperative program to enact any modifications to the PMO as may be needed to warrant an exemption or comparability determination. In response to these comments, we established a compliance date of September 17, 2018, for “PMO facilities” (see Response 214, 80 FR 55908 at 55987 to 55988).

## II. Clarification of the Compliance Date for Facilities Regulated Under the NCIMS System

On September 10, 2015, the Office of the Federal Register made a pre-publication copy of the final human preventive controls rule available to the public through its procedures for advance display (Ref. 1). Since September 10, 2015, we have provided opportunities for stakeholders to ask questions about the rule, through webinars and through a Web portal for submission of questions (Refs. 2 and 3). Some PMO facilities, in addition to manufacturing, processing, packing, or holding grade “A” milk or milk products, manufacture, process, pack, or hold other food subject to the final human preventive controls rule. Some of these facilities have asked us to

clarify whether the extended compliance date for “PMO facilities” applies only to grade “A” milk and milk products covered by NCIMS under the PMO, or whether the extended compliance date applies broadly to all activities conducted by the facility (*e.g.*, activities related to other food produced at the facility).

In this document, we are clarifying that the extended compliance date of September 17, 2018, for “PMO facilities” applies only to grade “A” milk and milk products covered by NCIMS under the PMO, and not to the manufacturing, processing, packing, or holding of other food. As we discussed in Response 214 (80 FR 55908 at 55987 to 55988), we agreed that we should make use of the existing system of State regulatory oversight for Grade “A” milk and milk products provided through the NCIMS and the food safety requirements of the PMO. We described our reasons for deciding to extend the compliance date for “PMO-regulated facilities” to comply with the requirements of subparts C and G to September 17, 2018. Those reasons related to the current provisions of the PMO, the work already begun by NCIMS to modify the PMO to include all of the requirements established in the final human preventive controls rule, and complex implementation issues concerning the interstate movement of milk and milk products and imported milk. We explained that in establishing a compliance date of September 17, 2018, for PMO facilities, we considered: (1) The extent of revisions that must be made to incorporate the requirements of this rule for hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls into the PMO; (2) the process to revise the PMO; and (3) the date at which the necessary revisions to the PMO could begin to be made. All of these discussions in the human preventive controls final rule related to the activities regulated by NCIMS under the PMO.

## III. Economic Analysis of Impacts

We have examined the impacts of this final rule under Executive Order 12866, Executive Order 13563, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4). Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct us to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). We have developed a comprehensive Economic

Analysis of Impacts that assesses the impacts of this final rule (Ref. 4). We believe that this final rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires us to analyze regulatory options that would minimize any significant impact of a rule on small entities. Because this final rule is making no change to the compliance date announced for facilities regulated under the NCIMS system in the human preventive controls rule published on September 17, 2015, we have determined that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (section 202(a)) requires us to prepare a written statement, which includes an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits, before proposing “any rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year.” The current threshold after adjustment for inflation is \$144 million, using the most current (2014) Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product. This final rule would not result in an expenditure in any year that meets or exceeds this amount.

## IV. Environmental Impact, No Significant Impact

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.30(j) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

## V. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This final rule contains no collection of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.

## VI. References

The following references are on display in the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**) and are available for viewing by interested persons between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday; they are also available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>. FDA has verified the Web site addresses, as of the date this document publishes in the **Federal Register**, but Web sites are subject to change over time.

1. Office of the Federal Register, "Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food," September 10, 2015. Available at <https://s3.amazonaws.com/public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2015-21920.pdf>.

2. FDA, "FSMA Webinar Series: Preventive Controls for Human and Animal Food Final Rules," 2015. Available at <http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/FSMA/ucm461512.htm>.

3. FDA, "Contact FDA About FSMA," 2015. Available at <http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/FSMA/ucm459719.htm>.

4. FDA, "Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food; Clarification of Compliance Date for Certain Food Establishments," 2015. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/ReportsManualsForms/Reports/EconomicAnalyses/default.htm>.

Dated: November 10, 2015.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2015-29340 Filed 11-17-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4164-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

### 24 CFR Part 570

[Docket Nos. FR 5797-I-01 and FR 5797-C-02]

RIN 2506-AC39

### Changes to Accounting Requirements for the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) Program; Correction

**AGENCY:** Office of the General Counsel, HUD.

**ACTION:** Interim final rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects a technical error in HUD's interim final rule on CDBG accounting requirements, published November 12, 2015.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* December 14, 2015.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stanley Gimont, Director, Office of Block Grant Assistance, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Community Planning and Development, 451 7th Street SW., Suite 7286, Washington, DC 20410 at 202-708-3587, (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with speech or hearing impairments may access this number via TTY by calling the Federal Relay Service, toll-free, at 800-877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** HUD published a document in the **Federal Register** on November 12, 2015, at 80 FR 69864, amending the accounting

requirements for the CDBG program, including 24 CFR 570.489. The amendments included clarification of how HUD determines compliance with planning and administration cost limits. In the preamble to the rule, at page 69867, first column, HUD stated that the regulations revised by rule modify the limits on administrative and planning expenses by adding to the existing compliance test a new test for grants with an origin year of 2015 and subsequent years, which would continue to remain in place for all grants. However, language was inadvertently included in the regulatory text that limited the existing test to CDBG grants with an origin year prior to 2015. This document corrects that limiting language.

#### Correction

In interim final rule FR Doc. 2015-28700, published on November 12, 2015 (80 FR 69864), make the following correction:

On page 69872, in the first column, in § 570.489, correct paragraph (a)(3)(ii) to read as follows:

#### § 570.489 Program administrative requirements.

(a) \* \* \*

(3) \* \* \*

(ii) The combined expenditures by the State and its funded units of general local government for planning, management, and administrative costs shall not exceed 20 percent of the aggregate amount of the origin year grant, any origin year grant funds reallocated by HUD to the State, and the amount of any program income received during the program year.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: November 13, 2015.

**Camille Acevedo,**

*Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations.*

[FR Doc. 2015-29478 Filed 11-17-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-67-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employee Benefits Security Administration

#### 29 CFR Part 2509

RIN 1210-AB74

### Interpretive Bulletin Relating to State Savings Programs That Sponsor or Facilitate Plans Covered by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974

**AGENCY:** Employee Benefits Security Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Interpretive bulletin.

**SUMMARY:** This document sets forth the views of the Department of Labor (Department) concerning the application of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to certain state laws designed to expand the retirement savings options available to private sector workers through ERISA-covered retirement plans. Concern over adverse social and economic consequences of inadequate retirement savings levels has prompted several states to adopt or consider legislation to address this problem. The Department separately released a proposed regulation describing safe-harbor conditions for states and employers to avoid creation of ERISA-covered plans as a result of state laws that require private sector employers to implement in their workplaces state-administered payroll deduction IRA programs (auto-IRA laws). This Interpretive Bulletin does not address such state auto-IRA laws.

**DATES:** This interpretive bulletin is effective on November 18, 2015.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Office of Regulations and Interpretations, Employee Benefits Security Administration, (202) 693-8500. This is not a toll-free number.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In order to provide a concise and ready reference to its interpretations of ERISA, the Department publishes its interpretive bulletins in the Rules and Regulations section of the **Federal Register**. The Department is publishing in this issue of the **Federal Register**, ERISA Interpretive Bulletin 2015-02, which interprets ERISA section 3(2)(A), 29 U.S.C. 1002(2)(A), section 3(5), 29 U.S.C. 1002(5), and section 514, 29 U.S.C. 1144, as they apply to state laws designed to expand workers' access to retirement savings programs. Some states have adopted laws or are exploring approaches designed to expand the retirement savings options available to their private sector workers through ERISA-covered retirement plans. One of the challenges the states face in expanding retirement savings opportunities for private sector employees is uncertainty about ERISA preemption of such efforts. ERISA generally would preempt a state law that required employers to establish and maintain ERISA-covered employee benefit pension plans. The Department also has a strong interest in promoting retirement savings by employees. The Department recognizes that some employers currently do not provide pension plans for their employees. The