ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

Trinexapac-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance for residues of trinexapac-ethyl in or on poppy, seed. Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC requested this tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) in order to cover residues of trinexapac-ethyl in imported poppy seed commodities.

DATES: This regulation is effective March 15, 2018. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before May 14, 2018, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2016–0365, is available at http://www.regulations.gov or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at http://www.epa.gov/dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael L. Goodis, Director, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; Main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: RDFRNotices@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

• Crop production (NAICS code 111).
• Animal production (NAICS code 112).
• Food manufacturing (NAICS code 31).
• Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?


C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2016–0365 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before May 14, 2018. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2016–0365, by one of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
• Mail: OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001.
• Hand Delivery: To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html. Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at http://www.epa.gov/dockets.

II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the Federal Register of November 30, 2016 (81 FR 86312) (FRL–9954–06), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 6E8462) by Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC., P.O. Box 18300, Greensboro, NC 27419. The petition requested that 40 CFR part 180 be amended by establishing a tolerance for residues of the herbicide trinexapac-ethyl, ethyl 4-(cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxocyclohexanecarboxylate expressed as its primary metabolite trinexapac, 4-(cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxocyclohexanecarboxylic acid, in or on poppy, seed at 8 parts per million (ppm). That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC, the registrant, which is available in the docket, http://www.regulations.gov. There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is “safe.” Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA
defines ‘safe’ to mean that ‘‘there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.’’ This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ‘‘ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .’’

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(ID), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(ID), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for trinexapac-ethyl including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action.

In the Federal Register of May 20, 2015 (80 FR 28843) (FRL–9926–62), EPA amended tolerances for herbicide trinexapac-ethyl, ethyl 4- (cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxycyclohexanecarboxylate expressed as its primary metabolite trinexapac, 4- (cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxycyclohexanecarboxylic acid in or on several commodities. Because the majority of the Agency’s conclusions remain the same, EPA is incorporating the discussions from the May 20, 2015, Federal Register document into this document and relying on the same supporting documents. The only difference is the potential to impact dietary exposure; because the use on poppy seeds is not approved in the United States, there is no impact on drinking water exposures or residential exposures.

The Agency has determined that a new dietary exposure assessment is not needed because poppy seed is not a significant part of the diet, and residues of trinexapac-ethyl do not concentrate in poppy seed oil. Therefore, residues in poppy seed oil are not expected to have an impact on the EPA’s previous findings. Therefore, EPA relies upon the findings made in the May 20, 2015, Federal Register document, as well as the review of the poppy seed data in support of this rule. EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children from aggregate exposure to trinexapac-ethyl residues.


International Residue Limits

In making its tolerance decisions, EPA seeks to harmonize U.S. tolerances with international standards whenever possible, consistent with U.S. food safety standards and agricultural practices. EPA considers the international maximum residue limits (MRLs) established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), as required by FFDCA section 408(b)(4). The Codex Alimentarius is a joint United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization food standards program, and it is recognized as an international food safety standards-setting organization in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. EPA may establish a tolerance that is different from a Codex MRL; however, FFDCA section 408(b)(4) requires that EPA explain the reasons for departing from the Codex level. The Codex has not established a MRL for trinexapac-ethyl.

IV. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of trinexapac-ethyl, ethyl 4- (cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxycyclohexanecarboxylate expressed as its primary metabolite trinexapac, 4- (cyclopropylhydroxymethylene)-3,5-dioxycyclohexanecarboxylic acid in or on poppy seed, at a concentration of 8 ppm.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(d) in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled ‘‘Regulatory Planning and Review’’ (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this action has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled ‘‘Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use’’ (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001); Executive Order 13045, entitled ‘‘Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks’’ (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997); or Executive Order 13177, entitled ‘‘Reducing Regulations and Controlling Regulatory Costs’’ (82 FR 9339, February 3, 2017). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled ‘‘Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations’’ (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), do not apply.

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled ‘‘Federalism’’ (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled ‘‘Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments’’ (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology

VI. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the Federal Register. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 7, 2018.

Michael L. Goodis,
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:


■ 2. In § 180.662 adding alphabetically the entry for “Poppy, seed imported” and footnote 1 to the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 180.662 Trinexapac-ethyl; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Parts per million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppy, seed imported</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * *

[FRC Doc. 2016–05284 Filed 3–14–18; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64


Modernization of Payphone Compensation Rules

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, a Report and Order takes a number of actions aimed at modernizing the Commission’s payphone compensation procedure rules by eliminating costly requirements that are no longer necessary in light of technological and marketplace changes. These actions further the Commission’s goal of regularly examining and updating its rules to keep pace with technology and the changing communications landscape, and to eliminate requirements that are no longer necessary, thereby reducing the costs and burdens of rules that have outlived their purpose. These have no impact on Completing Carriers’ continuing obligations under the Commission’s rules to maintain accurate call tracking systems and to fully compensate payphone service providers for the calls covered by these rules.

DATES: Effective April 16, 2018, except for the amendment to 47 CFR 64.1310(a)(3), which contains information collection requirements that have not been approved by OMB. The Federal Communications Commission will publish a document in the Federal Register announcing the effective date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wireline Competition Bureau, Competition Policy Division, Michele Berlove, at (202) 418–1477, Michele.Berlove@fcc.gov. For additional information concerning the Paperwork Reduction Act information collection requirements contained in this document, send an email to PRA@fcc.gov or contact Nicole Ongele at (202) 418–2991.


Synopsis

I. Introduction

1. In this Report and Order, we continue our efforts to modernize our rules by eliminating costly requirements that are no longer necessary in light of technological and marketplace changes. Based on the substantial decline in payphone use and corresponding payphone compensation, we eliminate rules that are no longer needed to ensure that payphone service providers (PSPs) receive the compensation to which they are entitled. Specifically, first, we eliminate all payphone call tracking system audit and associated reporting requirements. Second, we revise our rules to permit a company official other than the chief financial officer (CFO) to certify that a Completing Carrier’s quarterly compensation payments to PSPs are accurate and complete. A Completing Carrier is “a long distance carrier or switch-based long distance reseller that completes a coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call or a local exchange carrier that completes a local, coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call.” Our rules require that “a Completing Carrier that completes a coinless access code or subscriber toll-free payphone call from a switch that the Completing Carrier either owns or leases shall compensate the payphone service provider for the call at a rate agreed upon by the parties by contract.” Finally, we eliminate expired interim and intermediate per-payphone compensation rules that no longer apply to any entity. The actions we take today further our goal of regularly examining and updating our rules to keep pace with technology and the changing communications landscape, and to eliminate requirements that are no longer necessary, thereby reducing the costs and burdens of rules that have outlived their purpose.

II. Background

2. Section 276 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, directs the Commission to ensure that PSPs are fairly compensated for all completed calls using their payphones. In 2003, the Commission revised its rules to require Completing Carriers to establish effective call tracking systems, undergo initial and annual audits verifying the accuracy of those tracking systems, and file associated audit reports with the Commission.

3. On June 22, 2017, the Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order (NPRM) proposing and seeking comment on