

wood chips with the direct intent of producing a composite product. The commenter further stated that in order for this process to be economically feasible, the majority of the raw materials are sourced within close proximity of the mill or plant. The commenter stated that this practice greatly limits the number of species that could be included in the product.

We have decided to publish another ANPR to solicit comments addressing the following questions:

- Is the scope of the proposed definition for *composite plant materials* appropriate, and if not, how could it be revised?

- What would be an appropriate threshold for a de minimis exception from the declaration requirement for composite plant materials under the first approach identified above? We especially invite comment on the feasibility of providing importers an exemption from identifying in a declaration the genus, species, and country of harvest for up to 5 percent of the composite plant material in a product being imported so long as it does not include material from plants of conservation concern that are listed in an appendix to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species; as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; or pursuant to any State law that provides for the conservation of species that are indigenous to the State and are threatened with extinction. We also invite comment on whether that percentage should be higher or lower, and why. Additional data on why commenters support either the 5 percent threshold or an alternative threshold would be useful for the rulemaking process. We note that where a paper or paperboard plant product includes recycled plant product the statute only requires that the importer identify an average percent of recycled content without regard for the species or country of harvest of a recycled product, in addition to the information otherwise required for the non-recycled plant content.

- Would the second approach discussed above, in which the declaration would have to contain the average percent composite plant content, measured on the basis of either weight or volume (in addition to information as to genus, species, and country of harvest for any non-composite plant content) be appropriate as a de minimis exception to the Lacey Act declaration requirement and consistent with the statute? Would such an approach affect U.S. manufacturers who export finished products to Europe

and other market nations that may require their traders to authenticate the source of wood or wood products?

- Would an alternative approach to either of those described above concerning the import declaration requirement be appropriate in the case of composite products, and why?

- What specific activities would affected entities (including importers and their suppliers) need to engage in in order to identify the species and country of harvest of plants in composite plant materials and thereby comply with the declaration requirement for products containing such plant materials?

- How would those specific activities be affected by various levels of a de minimis exception to the declaration requirement products containing composite plant materials?

- In commenting on any of the approaches described above or proposing an alternative threshold, comments should take into consideration that a de minimis exception to a statutory requirement is being proposed, which means that the exception should be appropriately limited and consistent with the statute.

This action has been determined to be significant for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 3371 *et seq.*; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

Done in Washington, DC, this 3rd day of July 2018.

**Greg Ibach,**

*Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14625 Filed 7-6-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### 10 CFR Part 431

[EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029]

#### Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Water-Source Heat Pumps

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On June 22, 2018, the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) published in the **Federal Register** a request for information (RFI) to consider whether to amend DOE’s test procedure for commercial water-source heat pumps (“WSHPs”). This notice

announces an extension of the public comment period for submitting comments on the RFI or any other subject within the scope of the RFI. The comment period is extended to September 21, 2018.

**DATES:** The comment period for the RFI published on June 22, 2018 (83 FR 29048) is extended. Written comments and information are requested and will be accepted on or before September 21, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are encouraged to submit comments using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Alternatively, interested persons may submit comments, identified by docket number EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029, by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- **Email:** to [WSHP2017TP0029@ee.doe.gov](mailto:WSHP2017TP0029@ee.doe.gov). Include the docket number EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029 in the subject line of the message.

- **Postal Mail:** Appliance and Equipment Standards Program, U.S. Department of Energy, Building Technologies Office, Mailstop EE-5B, Test Procedure RFI for Water-Source Heat Pumps, Docket No. EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585-0121. Telephone: (202) 287-1445. If possible, please submit all items on a compact disc (“CD”), in which case it is not necessary to include printed copies.

- **Hand Delivery/Courier:** Appliance and Equipment Standards Program, U.S. Department of Energy, Building Technologies Office, 950 L’Enfant Plaza SW, 6th Floor, Washington, DC 20024. Telephone: (202) 287-1445. If possible, please submit all items on a CD, in which case it is not necessary to include printed copies.

No telefacsimilies (faxes) will be accepted.

**Docket:** The docket for this activity, which includes **Federal Register** notices, comments, and other supporting documents/materials, is available for review at <http://www.regulations.gov>. All documents in the docket are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index. However, some documents listed in the index, such as those containing information that is exempt from public disclosure, may not be publicly available.

The docket web page can be found at: <https://www.regulations.gov/docket/Browser?rpp=25&po=0&D=EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029>. The docket web page contains instructions on how to access

all documents, including public comments, in the docket.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mr. Antonio Bouza, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building Technologies Office, EE-5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585-0121. Telephone: (202) 586-4563. Email: [ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov](mailto:ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov).

Mr. Eric Stas, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of the General Counsel, GC-33, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585. Telephone: (202) 586-9507. Email: [Eric.Stas@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Eric.Stas@hq.doe.gov).

For further information on how to submit a comment, or review other public comments and the docket, contact the Appliance and Equipment Standards Program staff at (202) 287-1445 or by email: [ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov](mailto:ApplianceStandardsQuestions@ee.doe.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 22, 2018, the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) published in the **Federal Register** a request for information (RFI) to consider whether to amend DOE’s test procedure for commercial water-source heat pumps (“WSHPs”). 83 FR 29048. The document provided for submitting written comments and information by July 23, 2018. DOE has received a request from the Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI), dated June 23, 2018, to provide an additional 60 days to submit comments pertaining to the RFI for WSHP test procedures. This request can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029-0002>.

An extension of the comment period would allow additional time for AHRI and other interested parties to consider the issues presented in the RFI, gather any additional data and information, and submit comments to DOE. The RFI can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EERE-2017-BT-TP-0029-0001>. In view of the request from AHRI, DOE has determined that a 60-day extension of the public comment period is appropriate. The comment period is extended to September 21, 2018.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 28, 2018.

**Kathleen B. Hogan,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14606 Filed 7-6-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. FAA-2018-0587; Product Identifier 2018-NM-054-AD]

**RIN 2120-AA64**

**Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** We propose to supersede Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2012-22-10, which applies to certain Bombardier, Inc., Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702) airplanes, Model CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705) airplanes, Model CL-600-2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) airplanes, and Model CL-600-2E25 (Regional Jet Series 1000) airplanes. AD 2012-22-10 requires repetitive inspections to determine that cotter pins are installed at affected wing-to-fuselage attachment joints and replacement if necessary. Since we issued AD 2012-22-10, we determined that additional nuts of the forward keel beam attachment joint should be inspected, and that repetitive inspections of certain wing-to-fuselage attachment joints are not necessary. This proposed AD would retain the initial inspection of the wing-to-fuselage attachment joints, and remove the repetitive inspections of all but the forward keel beam attachment joint. This proposed AD would also change the repetitive inspection interval for the forward keel beam attachment joint. We are proposing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

**DATES:** We must receive comments on this proposed AD by August 23, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Fax:* 202-493-2251.

- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M-30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery:* Deliver to Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this NPRM, contact Bombardier, Inc.,

400 Côte-Vertu Road West, Dorval, Québec H4S 1Y9, Canada; Widebody Customer Response Center North America toll-free telephone 1-866-538-1247 or direct-dial telephone 514-855-5000; fax 514-855-7401; email [ac.yul@aero.bombardier.com](mailto:ac.yul@aero.bombardier.com); internet <http://www.bombardier.com>. You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Standards Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206-231-3195.

**Examining the AD Docket**

You may examine the AD docket on the internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA-2018-0587; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this NPRM, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone 800-647-5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Aziz Ahmed, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe and Mechanical Systems Section, FAA, New York ACO Branch, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; telephone 516-228-7329; fax 516-794-5531.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Comments Invited**

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this proposal. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include “Docket No. FAA-2018-0587; Product Identifier 2018-NM-054-AD” at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed AD. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this proposed AD based on those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this proposed AD.

**Discussion**

We issued AD 2012-22-10, Amendment 39-17246 (77 FR 67267, November 9, 2012) (“AD 2012-22-10”), for certain Bombardier, Inc., Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701,