percent if the value of plan assets used for minimum funding purposes were substituted for the asset value determined without regard to the segment rate stabilized interest provisions of ERISA section 303(h)(2)(iv) for purposes of determining such percentage.

d) Missed contributions resulting in a lien or outstanding minimum funding waivers. Reporting is waived for a person (that would be a filer if not for the waiver) for an information year if, for the plan year ending within the information year, reporting would have been required solely under §4010.4(a)(2) or (3), provided that the missed contributions or minimum funding waivers (as applicable) were reported to PBGC under part 4043 of this chapter by the due date for the 4010 filing.

e) Other waiver authority. PBGC may waive the requirement to submit information with respect to one or more filers or plans or may extend the applicable due date or dates specified in §4010.10. PBGC will exercise this discretion in appropriate cases where it finds convincing evidence supporting a waiver or extension; any waiver or extension may be subject to conditions.

§4010.11 Waivers and extensions.

(a) Plan funding/participant count waiver. Unless reporting is required by §4010.4(a)(2) or (3), reporting is waived for a person (that would be a filer if not for the waiver) for an information year if, for the plan year ending within the information year—

(1) The aggregate 4010 funding shortfall for all plans (including any exempt plans) maintained by the person’s controlled group (disregarding those plans with no 4010 funding shortfall) does not exceed $15 million; and

(2) The aggregate number of participants in all plans (including any exempt plans) maintained by the person’s controlled group is fewer than 500. For this purpose, the number of participants in any plan may be determined either as of the end of the plan year ending within the information year or as of the valuation date for that plan year.

(b) 4010 funding shortfall for waivers and exemptions—(1) General. A plan’s 4010 funding shortfall for a plan year equals the funding shortfall as provided under ERISA section 303(c)(4) and Code section 430(c)(4) determined as of the valuation date for the plan year, except that the value of plan assets is determined without regard to the reduction under ERISA section 303(f)(4)(B) and Code section 430(f)(4)(B) (dealing with reduction of assets by the amount of prefunding and funding standard carryover balances).

(2) Multiple employer plans. For purposes of §4010.8(c) and paragraph (a) of this section, the entire 4010 funding shortfall of any multiple employer plan of which the filer or any member of the filer’s controlled group is a contributing sponsor is included.

(c) Alternative 4010 FTAP. Unless reporting is required by §4010.4(a)(2) or (3), reporting is waived for a person for an information year if the 4010 funding target attainment percentage of each plan maintained by the person’s controlled group would be at least 80
treatment. Reimbursement is authorized under section 1728 when non-VA emergency treatment was rendered to such veteran for: The treatment of an adjudicated service-connected disability; a non-service-connected disability associated with and held to be aggravating a service-connected disability; any disability of a veteran if the veteran has a total disability permanent in nature from a service-connected disability; and for any illness, injury or dental condition if the veteran is participating in a vocational rehabilitation program and is determined to be in medical need of care or treatment to make possible the veteran’s entrance into a course of training, or prevent interruption of a course of training, or hasten the return to a course of training which was interrupted because of such illness, injury, or dental condition.

Current VA regulations implementing 38 U.S.C. 1725 and 1728 each state that covered emergency treatment includes “medication, including a short course of medication related to and necessary for the treatment of the emergency condition that is provided directly to the patient for use after the emergency condition is stabilized and the patient is discharged.” See 38 CFR 17.120(b) and 17.1002. It is undisputed that medications directly provided to the veteran or administered to the veteran as part of the emergency treatment are covered. However, the language “provided directly to the patient” has been found to be vague inasmuch as it does not clearly indicate that it also extends to a short course of necessary medication provided to the veteran by way of a prescription that is written or called in to an outpatient or commercial pharmacy by the emergency non-VA provider with instructions to the veteran-patient to obtain and use the medication post-discharge, as directed.

We note this issue was not addressed in the original rulemakings associated with the implementation of section 1725; it was raised however in subsequent amendatory rulemaking in 2011. In 2011, final rulemaking for §§ 17.120(b) and 17.1002 included changes to further define “emergency treatment.” Among other things, new language was added to §§ 17.120(b) and 17.1002 to indicate that emergency treatment includes “medication, including a short course of medication related to and necessary for the treatment of the emergency condition that is provided directly to the patient for use after the emergency condition is stabilized and the patient is discharged.” It was explained that such change merely reflected VA’s original intention and was done for clarification purposes only, in response to a commenter’s concerns. See 76 FR 79067, 79069–79070 (Dec. 21, 2011).

VA has interpreted, and still interprets, emergency treatment, for purposes of both §§ 17.120 and 17.1002, to extend to situations where the veteran receives, during the emergency treatment episode, a prescription from the non-VA emergency provider for a short course of necessary medication (related to and necessary for treatment of the emergency condition post-stabilization) which the veteran-patient is directed to obtain post-discharge and use at home as directed. Nor should it matter whether the non-VA emergency provider, in the course of providing such emergency treatment, provides the prescription in writing or, at the request of a patient, calls it into an outpatient or commercial pharmacy on the patient’s behalf. Again it was never intended or contemplated that the language “directly provided to the patient” would be interpreted to mean only medications actually administered to the patient during the emergency treatment episode and exclude such related prescriptions. The proposed amendments would be consistent with VA policy and would help ensure our regulations are not interpreted more narrowly than VA intends (as discussed herein).

Specifically, we propose to amend § 17.120(b) to clarify that VA would reimburse the cost of a short course of medication prescribed for the veteran at the time that the veteran was receiving emergency treatment, by stating that emergency treatment would include “a short course of medication related to and necessary for the treatment of the emergency condition that is provided directly to or prescribed for the patient for use after the emergency condition is stabilized and the patient is discharged.” We propose to make similar amendment to the introductory paragraph of § 17.1002.

Effect of Rulemaking

Title 38 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised by this rulemaking, would represent the exclusive legal authority on this subject. No contrary rules or procedures would be authorized. All VA guidance would be read to conform with this proposed rulemaking if possible or, if not possible, such guidance would be superseded by this rulemaking.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule contains no provisions constituting a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612. This proposed rule would directly affect only individuals and would not directly affect small entities. Further, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), this rulemaking is exempt from the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604.

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the 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 effects, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review) emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, reducing costs, harmonizing rules, and promoting flexibility. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) defines a “significant regulatory action,” requiring review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), unless OMB waives such review, as “any regulatory action that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.”

The economic, interagency, budgetary, legal, and policy implications of this regulatory action have been examined, and it has been determined not to be a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866. VA’s impact analysis can be found as a supporting document at http://www.regulations.gov, usually.
within 48 hours after the rulemaking document is published. Additionally, a copy of the rulemaking and its impact analysis are available on VA’s Web site at http://www.va.gov/orpm/, by following the link for “VA Regulations Published From FY 2004 Through Fiscal Year to Date.”

Unfunded Mandates

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year. This proposed rule would have no such effect on State, local, and tribal governments, or on the private sector.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance numbers and titles for the programs affected by this document are 64.007, Blind Rehabilitation Centers; 64.008, Veterans Domiciliary Care; 64.009, Veterans Medical Care Benefits; 64.010, Veterans Nursing Home Care; 64.011, Veterans Dental Care; 64.012, Veterans Prescription Service; 64.014, Veterans State Domiciliary Care; 64.015, Veterans State Nursing Home Care; 64.018, Sharing Specialized Medical Resources; 64.019, Veterans Rehabilitation Alcohol and Drug Dependence; 64.022, Veterans Home Based Primary Care; and 64.024, VA Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem Program.

Signing Authority

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or designee, approved this document and authorized the undersigned to sign and submit the document to Office of the Federal Register for publication electronically as an official document of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Robert L. Nabors II, Chief of Staff, Department of Veterans Affairs, approved this document on July 20, 2015, for publication.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 17

Administrative practice and procedure, Alcohol abuse, Alcoholism, Claims, Day care, Dental health, Drug abuse, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Health records, Homeless, Mental health programs, Nursing homes, Veterans.

Dated: July 22, 2015.

William F. Russo, Acting Director, Office of Regulation Policy & Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, VA proposes to amend 38 CFR part 17 as follows:

PART 17—MEDICAL

1. The authority citation for part 17 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501, and as noted in specific sections.

§ 17.120 [Amended]

2. Amend the first sentence of § 17.120(b) by adding “or prescribed for” immediately after “provided directly to”.

§ 17.1002 [Amended]

3. Amend the introductory text of § 17.1002 by adding “or prescribed for” immediately after “provided directly to”.

[FR Doc. 2015–18331 Filed 7–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

ENVIROMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for the State of Alabama: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve the State of Alabama’s March 27, 2015, State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision, submitted by the Alabama Department of Environmental Management. This SIP revision provides Alabama’s state-determined allowance allocations for existing electric generating units (EGUs) in the State for the 2016 control periods and replaces the allowance allocations for the 2016 control periods established by EPA under the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR). The CSAPR addresses the “good neighbor” provision of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) that requires states to reduce the transport of pollution that significantly affects downwind nonattainment and maintenance areas. EPA is proposing to approve Alabama’s SIP revision, incorporate the state-determined allocations for the 2016 control periods into the SIP, and amend the regulatory text of the CSAPR Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) to reflect approval and inclusion of the state-determined allocations. EPA is proposing to approve Alabama’s SIP revision because it meets the requirements of the CAA and the CSAPR requirements to replace EPA’s allowance allocations for the 2016 control periods. This action is being taken pursuant to the CAA and its implementing regulations. In the Final Rules Section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the State’s implementation plan revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before August 26, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2015–0313, by one of the following methods:

1. www.regulations.gov: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. Email: R4-A RMS@epa.gov.

3. Fax: (404) 562–9019.


5. Hand Delivery or Courier: Ms. Lynorae Benjamin, Chief, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office’s normal hours of operation. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Twunjala Bradley, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S.