

Accordingly, the Board is adopting the June 2014 proposed rule as final without change.

### III. Regulatory Procedures

#### A. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)<sup>4</sup> requires NCUA to prepare an analysis to describe any significant economic impact a rule may have on a substantial number of small entities (defined for purposes of the RFA to include credit unions with assets less than \$50 million).<sup>5</sup> The amendments to parts 701 and 722 will only reduce regulatory impacts on credit unions by exempting them from certain regulatory requirements. Accordingly, the Board certifies the final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small credit unions.

#### B. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) applies to rulemakings in which an agency by rule creates a new paperwork burden on regulated entities or increases an existing burden.<sup>6</sup> For purposes of the PRA, a paperwork burden may take the form of a reporting or recordkeeping requirement, both referred to as information collections. This final rule would not impose or expand upon any existing reporting or recordkeeping requirements. Accordingly, this final rule would not create new paperwork burdens or increase any existing paperwork burdens.

#### C. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132 encourages independent regulatory agencies to consider the impact of their actions on state and local interests. NCUA, an independent regulatory agency, as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(5), voluntarily complies with the executive order to adhere to fundamental federalism principles. The final rule would not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. NCUA has, therefore, determined that this final rule does not constitute a policy that has federalism implications for purposes of the executive order.

#### D. Assessment of Federal Regulations and Policies on Families

NCUA has determined that this final rule will not affect family well-being within the meaning of § 654 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999, Public Law 105–277, 112 Stat. 2681 (1998).

#### E. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996<sup>7</sup> (SBREFA) provides generally for congressional review of agency rules. A reporting requirement is triggered in instances where NCUA issues a final rule as defined by Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act.<sup>8</sup> NCUA does not believe this final rule is a “major rule” within the meaning of the relevant sections of SBREFA because it will only reduce regulatory burden on credit unions by exempting them from certain regulatory requirements. NCUA has submitted the rule to the Office of Management and Budget for its determination in that regard.

#### List of Subjects

##### 12 CFR Part 701

Advertising, Aged, Civil rights, Credit, Credit unions, Fair housing, Individuals with disabilities, Insurance, Marital status discrimination, Mortgages, Religious discrimination, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sex discrimination.

##### 12 CFR Part 722

Appraisals, Credit unions, Mortgages, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on December 11, 2014.

**Gerard Poliquin,**

*Secretary of the Board.*

For the reasons discussed above, the NCUA Board amends 12 CFR parts 701 and 722 as follows:

### PART 701—ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 701 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1752(5), 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, 1761a, 1761b, 1766, 1767, 1782, 1784, 1786, 1787, 1789. Section 701.6 is also authorized by 15 U.S.C. 3717. Section 701.31 is also authorized by 15 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*; 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 3601–3610. Section 701.35 is also authorized by 42 U.S.C. 4311–4312.

<sup>7</sup> Public Law 104–121, 110 Stat. 857 (1996).

<sup>8</sup> 5 U.S.C. 551.

### § 701.31 [Amended]

■ 2. Amend § 701.31 as follows:

■ a. In paragraph (a)(1), remove the words “, which is as follows:” and remove the indented definition parenthetical “An oral or written request for an extension of credit that is made in accordance with procedures established by a creditor for the type of credit requested”.

■ b. In paragraph (c)(5) in the first sentence, remove the words “a copy of the appraisal used in connection with that member’s real estate-related loan application” and add in their place the words “a copy of the appraisal used in connection with that member’s application for a loan to be secured by a subordinate lien on a dwelling”, and, in the second sentence, remove the words “real estate-related loan application” and add in their place the words “application for a loan to be secured by a subordinate lien on a dwelling”.

### PART 722—APPRAISALS

■ 3. The authority citation for part 722 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1766, 1789 and 3339.

### § 722.3 [Amended]

■ 4. Amend § 722.3 as follows:

■ a. In paragraph (a)(5) introductory text add the word “lending” before the words “credit union”;

■ b. In paragraph (a)(5)(i) remove the word “and” and add in its place the word “or”; and

■ c. In paragraph (a)(5)(ii) add the words “, even with the advancement of new monies” to the end of the paragraph.

[FR Doc. 2014–29635 Filed 12–18–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7535–01–P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA–R04–OAR–2014–0267; FRL–9920–60–Region 4]

#### Approval of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas; Georgia; Redesignation of the Georgia Portion of the Chattanooga, 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Area to Attainment

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** On September 14, 2012, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, through the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA

<sup>4</sup> 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*

<sup>5</sup> 78 FR 4032 (Jan. 18, 2013).

<sup>6</sup> 44 U.S.C. 3507(d); 5 CFR part 1320.

EPD), submitted a request to redesignate the Georgia portion of Chattanooga, TN-GA-AL fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) nonattainment area (hereafter referred to as the “Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area” or “Area”) to attainment for the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and to approve a state implementation plan (SIP) revision containing a maintenance plan for the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. The Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area is comprised of two Counties: Catoosa and Walker Counties in Georgia. EPA is approving the redesignation request and the related SIP revision for the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area, including GA EPD’s plan for maintaining attainment of the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard in the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. EPA is also approving, into the Georgia SIP, the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for the year 2025 for the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. On April 23, 2013, and November 13, 2014, Alabama and Tennessee (respectively) submitted requests to redesignate the Alabama and Tennessee portions of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. EPA will be taking separate action on the requests from Alabama and Tennessee.

**DATES:** This rule will be effective December 19, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0267. All documents in the docket are listed on the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or in hard copy at the Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joydeb Majumder, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Joydeb Majumder may be reached by phone at (404) 562-9121 or via electronic mail at [majumder.joydeb@epa.gov](mailto:majumder.joydeb@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. What is the background for the actions?**

On September 14, 2012, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, through GA EPD, submitted a request to EPA for redesignation of the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, and for approval of a Georgia SIP revision containing a maintenance plan for the Area.<sup>1</sup> On November 12, 2014, EPA proposed to redesignate the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, and to approve, as a revision to the Georgia SIP, the State’s 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS maintenance plan, including the MVEBs for direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, for the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area.<sup>2</sup> See 79 FR 67120. EPA also proposed to determine that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area is continuing to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and that attainment can be maintained through 2025. EPA received no adverse comments on the November 12, 2014, proposed rulemaking. EPA notes that it inadvertently referred to the Area as the “Chattanooga, TN-GA Area” in the November 12, 2014, proposed rulemaking. In today’s final rulemaking, EPA is clarifying this Area should have been referred to as the “Chattanooga, TN-GA-AL Area” to account for a correction for the name of this Area that was published in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 2014, at 79 FR 25508.

In its November 12, 2014, proposed action, EPA stated that the adequacy public comment period on the 2025 NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs for the Georgia portion of the Area (as contained in Georgia’s September 14, 2012, submittal) began on March 4, 2013, and

<sup>1</sup> EPA designated the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area as nonattainment for the annual 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS on January 5, 2005 (70 FR 944) as supplemented on April 14, 2005 (70 FR 19844).

<sup>2</sup> On February 8, 2012, EPA approved, under section 172(c)(3) of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), Georgia’s 2002 base-year emissions inventory for the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area as part of the SIP revision submitted by GA EPD to provide for attainment of the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in the Area. See 77 FR 6467.

closed on April 3, 2013. No comments were received during this public comment period, and therefore, EPA deems the 2025 NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs adequate for the Georgia portion of the Area for the purposes of transportation conformity.

As stated in EPA’s November 12, 2014, proposal notice, the 3-year design value of 12.9 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m<sup>3</sup>) for the Area for 2007–2009 meets the PM<sub>2.5</sub> Annual NAAQS of 15.0 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. EPA has reviewed the most recent ambient monitoring data, which confirms that the Area continues to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS beyond the 3-year attainment period of 2007–2009.

**II. What are the actions EPA is taking?**

In today’s rulemaking, EPA is also approving Georgia’s redesignation request to change the legal designation of Catoosa and Walker Counties in Georgia from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, and as a revision to the Georgia SIP, the State’s 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS maintenance plan and the MVEBs for direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> for the Georgia portion of the Area included in that maintenance plan. The maintenance plan is designed to demonstrate that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area will continue to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS through 2025. EPA’s approval of the redesignation request is based on EPA’s determination that the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area meets the criteria for redesignation set forth in the CAA, including EPA’s determination that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area has attained and continues to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and that attainment can be maintained through 2025. EPA’s analyses of Georgia’s redesignation request and maintenance plan are described in detail in the November 12, 2014, proposed rule. See 79 FR 67120. Through this final action, EPA is finding the 2025 NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> MVEBs adequate for the Georgia portion of the Area for transportation conformity purposes.

EPA is now taking final action as described above. Additional background for today’s action is set forth in EPA’s November 12, 2014, proposal and is summarized below.

EPA has reviewed the most recent ambient monitoring data for the Area, which indicate that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area continues to attain the 1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS beyond the submitted 3-year attainment period of 2007–2009. As stated in EPA’s November 12, 2014, proposal notice, the 3-year design value of 12.9 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for the

Area for 2007–2009 meets the NAAQS of 15.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . Quality assured and certified data in EPA's Air Quality System (AQS) for 2013 provide a 3-year design value of 10.5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for the Area for 2011–2013. Furthermore, preliminary monitoring data for 2014 indicate that the Area is continuing to attain the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS. The 2014 preliminary data are available in AQS although the data are not yet quality assured and certified.

### III. Why is EPA taking these actions?

EPA has determined that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area has attained the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS and has also determined that all other criteria for the redesignation of the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area from nonattainment to attainment of the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS have been met. See CAA section 107(d)(3)(E). One of those requirements is that the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area has an approved plan demonstrating maintenance of the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS over the ten-year period following redesignation. EPA has determined that attainment can be maintained through 2025 and is taking final action to approve the maintenance plan for the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area as meeting the requirements of sections 175A and 107(d)(3)(E) of the CAA. The detailed rationale for EPA's findings and actions is set forth in the November 12, 2014, proposed rulemaking. See 79 FR 67120.

### IV. What are the effects of these actions?

Approval of the redesignation request changes the legal designation of Catoosa and Walker Counties from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS. EPA is modifying the regulatory table in 40 CFR 81.311 to reflect a designation of attainment for these counties. EPA is also approving, as a revision to the Georgia SIP, the State's plan for maintaining the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS in the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. The maintenance plan includes contingency measures to remedy possible future violations of the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS and establishes 2025 MVEBs for direct  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  for the Georgia portion of Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. Within 24 months of the effective date of EPA's approval of the maintenance plan, the transportation partners will need to demonstrate conformity to the new  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  MVEBs pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e).

### V. Final Action

EPA is taking final action to approve the redesignation and change the legal designation of Catoosa and Walker Counties in Georgia from nonattainment to attainment for the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS. Through this action, EPA is also approving into the Georgia SIP the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  maintenance plan for the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area, which includes the new 2025  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  MVEBs of 44.2 tons per year (tpy) and 1,386.5 tpy, respectively, for this Area. EPA's approval of the redesignation request is based on the Agency's determination that the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area meets the criteria for redesignation set forth in CAA, including EPA's determination that the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area has attained and continues to attain the 1997 Annual  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  NAAQS and that attainment can be maintained through 2025. Finally, EPA is finding the 2025  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  MVEBs contained in Georgia's September 14, 2012, SIP revision adequate for the purposes of transportation conformity. Within 24 months from this final rule, the transportation partners will need to demonstrate conformity to the new  $\text{NO}_x$  and VOC MVEBs pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e).

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(d), EPA finds that there is good cause for this action to become effective immediately upon publication. This is because a delayed effective date is unnecessary due to the nature of a redesignation to attainment, which relieves the Area from certain CAA requirements that would otherwise apply to it. The immediate effective date for this action is authorized under both 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1), which provides that rulemaking actions may become effective less than 30 days after publication if the rule grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction, and section 553(d)(3), which allows an effective date less than 30 days after publication as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule. The purpose of the 30-day waiting period prescribed in section 553(d) is to give affected parties a reasonable time to adjust their behavior and prepare before the final rule takes effect. Today's rule, however, does not create any new regulatory requirements such that affected parties would need time to prepare before the rule takes effect. Rather, today's rule relieves the State of various requirements for the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area. For these reasons, EPA finds good

cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) for this action to become effective on the date of publication of this action.

### VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, redesignation of an area to attainment and the accompanying approval of the maintenance plan under CAA section 107(d)(3)(E) are actions that affect the status of geographical area and do not impose any additional regulatory requirements on sources beyond those required by state law. A redesignation to attainment does not in and of itself impose any new requirements, but rather results in the application of requirements contained in the CAA for areas that have been redesignated to attainment. Moreover, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For these reasons, these actions:

- Are not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Do not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Are certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Do not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Do not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Are not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Are not significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Are not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because

application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and,

- Do not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action 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**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by February 17, 2015. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. *See* section 307(b)(2).

**List of Subjects**

*40 CFR Part 52*

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations,

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and Particulate matter.

*40 CFR Part 81*

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks.

Dated: December 9, 2014.

**Heather McTeer Toney**,  
*Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

Therefore, 40 CFR parts 52 and 81 are amended as follows:

**PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF PLANS**

- 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

**Subpart L—Georgia**

- 2. In § 52.570, the table in paragraph (e) is amended by adding the entry “1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area” at the end of the table to read as follows:

**§ 52.570 Identification of plan.**

*	*	*	*	*
(e)	*	*	*	*

**EPA-APPROVED GEORGIA NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS**

Name of non-regulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* * 1997 Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan for the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga TN-GA-AL Area.	* Catoosa and Walker Counties	* 9/14/12	* 12/19/14 [Insert <b>Federal Register</b> citation].	* “Chattanooga, TN-GA-AL:” to read as follows: <b>§ 81.311 Georgia.</b> * * * * *

**PART 81—DESIGNATION OF AREAS FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING PURPOSES**

- 3. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*  
■ 4. In § 81.311, the table entitled “Georgia—1997 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS” is amended by revising the entry for

**GEORGIA—1997 ANNUAL PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS**  
[Primary and Secondary]

Designated area	Designation <sup>a</sup>		Classification	
	Date <sup>1</sup>	Type	Date <sup>2</sup>	Type
* * Chattanooga, TN-GA-AL: Catoosa County ..... Walker County .....	* ..... 12/19/14 12/19/14	* ..... Attainment Attainment	* ..... ..... .....	* ..... ..... .....

<sup>a</sup> Includes Indian Country located in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.  
<sup>1</sup> This date is 90 days after January 5, 2005, unless otherwise noted.  
<sup>2</sup> This date is July 2, 2014, unless otherwise noted.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2014-29702 Filed 12-18-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 168**

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9919-63]

RIN 2070-AJ53

**Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is revising the regulations that pertain to the labeling of pesticide products and devices that are intended solely for export. Pesticide products and devices intended solely for export will be able to meet the Agency's export labeling requirements by attaching a label to the immediate product container or by providing collateral labeling that is either attached to the immediate product being exported or that accompanies the shipping container of the product being exported at all times when it is shipped or held for shipment in the United States. Collateral labeling will ensure the availability of the required labeling information, while allowing pesticide products and devices that are intended solely for export to be labeled for use in, and consistent with the applicable requirements of the importing country.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective February 17, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607, 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:** Kathryn Boyle, Field and External Affairs Division (7506P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental

Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; telephone number: (703) 305-6304; email address: [boyle.kathryn@epa.gov](mailto:boyle.kathryn@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Executive Summary***A. Does this action affect me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you export a pesticide product, a pesticide device, or an active ingredient used in producing a pesticide. 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, but are not limited to: Pesticide and other agricultural chemical manufacturing (NAICS code 325320), e.g., Pesticides manufacturing, Insecticides manufacturing, Herbicides manufacturing, Fungicides manufacturing, etc.

*B. What is the agency's authority for taking this action?*

This action is issued under the authority of section 25(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), 7 U.S.C. 136w(a), to carry out the provisions of FIFRA section 17(a), 7 U.S.C. 136o(a).

*C. What action is the agency taking?*

EPA is revising the regulations that pertain to the labeling of pesticide products and devices that are intended solely for export. Pesticide products and devices intended solely for export will be able to meet the Agency's labeling requirements by attaching a label to the immediate product container or by providing collateral labeling that either is attached to the immediate product being exported or accompanies the shipping container of the product being exported at all times when it is shipped or held for shipment in the United States. Collateral labeling will ensure the availability of the required labeling information, while allowing pesticide products and devices that are intended solely for export to be labeled for use in and consistent with the applicable requirements of the importing country.

*D. What are the impacts of this action?*

There are no costs associated with this action, and the benefits provided are related to avoiding potential costs. Without these labeling provisions, registrants would be required to place export-related labeling on the immediate package of each individual pesticide product in a shipping

container that is intended solely for export. According to stakeholders, the inability to use the labeling method allowed before the regulations were amended in 2013 could significantly increase their costs and create trade barriers.

**II. Background**

In the **Federal Register** of January 18, 2013 (78 FR 4073) (FRL-9360-8), EPA published a final rule to revise its export label regulations, in 40 CFR part 168, subpart D, concerning the labeling of pesticide products and devices intended solely for export. The revisions were effective on March 19, 2013, with a compliance date of January 21, 2014.

Industry stakeholders subsequently expressed concern to EPA that certain labeling provisions allowing the use of "supplemental labeling" had been removed from this subpart, and that the inability of registrants to use the labeling method allowed in the previous regulations could create trade barriers and increase costs. EPA agreed and in the **Federal Register** of April 30, 2014 (79 FR 24347) (FRL-9909-82), published a direct final rule to replace the provision that was inadvertently removed. Since EPA received written adverse comment on the direct final rule, EPA withdrew that direct final rule in the **Federal Register** of July 11, 2014 (79 FR 39975) (FRL-9913-18) and in the same **Federal Register** issue published a proposed rule (79 FR 40040) (FRL-9913-19) seeking to make the same changes.

In the proposed rule entitled "Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements," EPA proposed to restore the inadvertently eliminated provisions that allowed exporters to use such "collateral labeling" attached to, or accompanying, the product shipping container of the export pesticide at all times when shipped or held for shipment in the United States. (As EPA explained in the direct final rule, the term "collateral labeling" is more appropriate than "supplemental labeling" to describe the materials other than labels that are acceptable for meeting these requirements.) Additionally, the document proposed to restructure 40 CFR part 168, subpart D, by moving the text in § 168.68 and some of the text in § 168.66 to new § 168.65.

The public comment period closed on August 11, 2014. EPA received four comments. Three commenters stated their support for finalizing the proposal. Another commenter stated that "transporting dangerous substances across any part of the U.S. without