

that no small or large entities presently engage in such activities. Since this SNUR will require a person who intends to engage in such activity in the future to first notify EPA by submitting a SNUN, no economic impact will occur unless someone files a SNUN to pursue a significant new use in the future or forgoes profits by avoiding or delaying the significant new use. Although some small entities may decide to conduct such activities in the future, EPA cannot presently determine how many, if any, there may be. However, EPA's experience to date is that, in response to the promulgation of SNURs covering over 1,000 chemical substances, the Agency receives only a handful of notices per year. During the six year period from 2005–2010, only three submitters self-identified as small in their SNUN submission (Ref. 2). EPA believes the cost of submitting a SNUN is relatively small compared to the cost of developing and marketing a chemical new to a firm or marketing a new use of the chemical and that the requirement to submit a SNUN generally does not have a significant economic impact.

Therefore, EPA believes that the potential economic impact of complying with this proposed SNUR is not expected to be significant or adversely impact a substantial number of small entities. In a SNUR that published as a final rule on August 8, 1997 (62 FR 42690) (FRL–5735–4), the Agency presented its general determination that proposed and final SNURs are not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, which was provided to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

#### *D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)*

Based on EPA's experience with proposing and finalizing SNURs, State, local, and Tribal governments have not been impacted by these rulemakings, and EPA does not have any reason to believe that any State, local, or Tribal government would be impacted by this rulemaking. As such, the requirements of sections 202, 203, 204, or 205 of UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, do not apply to this action.

#### *E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism*

This action will not have a substantial direct effect on States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in

Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999).

#### *F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

This proposed rule does not have Tribal implications because it is not expected to have any effect (*i.e.*, there will be no increase or decrease in authority or jurisdiction) on Tribal governments, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes. Thus, Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) does not apply to this action.

#### *G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because this action is not intended to address environmental health or safety risks for children.

#### *H. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use*

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001), because this action is not expected to affect energy supply, distribution, or use.

#### *I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)*

Since this action does not involve any technical standards, section 12(d) of NTTAA, 15 U.S.C. 272 note, does not apply to this action.

#### *J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*

This proposed rule does not invoke special consideration of environmental justice related issues as delineated by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994), because EPA has determined that this action will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. This action does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment.

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 721**

Environmental protection, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 30, 2015.

**Wendy C. Hamnett,**

*Director, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.*

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR chapter I be amended as follows:

#### **PART 721—[AMENDED]**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 721 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 2604, 2607, and 2625(c).

■ 2. Add § 721.10851 to subpart E to read as follows:

#### **§ 721.10851 Trichloroethylene.**

(a) *Chemical substance and significant new uses subject to reporting.*

(1) The chemical substance trichloroethylene (CAS 79–01–6) is subject to reporting under this section for the significant new use described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

(2) Manufacture or processing for use in a consumer product except for use in cleaners and solvent degreasers, film cleaners, hoof polishes, lubricants, mirror edge sealants, and pepper spray.

(b) [Reserved]

[FR Doc. 2015–19348 Filed 8–6–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 54**

[WC Docket Nos. 10–90 and 14–259; Report 3025]

#### **Petition for Reconsideration of Action in a Rulemaking Proceeding**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Petition for reconsideration.

**SUMMARY:** A Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission's Rulemaking proceeding by Harold Mordkofsky, on behalf of Halstad Telephone Company.

**DATES:** Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before August 24, 2015. Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before September 1, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alexander Minard, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, (202) 418–7400, email: [Alexander.Minard@fcc.gov](mailto:Alexander.Minard@fcc.gov), TTY (202) 418–0484.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of Commission's document,

Report No. 3025, released July 20, 2015. The full text of Report No. 3025 is available for viewing and copying in Room CY-B402, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC or may be accessed online via the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System at <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>. The Commission will not send a copy of this *document*

pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A), because this *document* does not have an impact on any rules of particular applicability.  
*Subjects:* Connect America Fund; Rural Broadband Experiments, released by the Commission on June 15, 2015, in WC Docket Nos. 10–90 and 14–259, and published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e).

*See also* § 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules.

*Number of Petitions Filed:* 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–19374 Filed 8–6–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**