**§ 180.532 Cyprodinil; tolerances for residues.**

(a) * * *

| Commodity | Parts per million |
|---|---|
| Acerola | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Artichoke, globe | 4.0 |
| * * * * * | |
| Feijoa | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Fruit, stone, group 12–12 | 2.0 |
| * * * * * | |
| Guava | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Jaboticaba | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Passionfruit | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Pomegranate | 10 |
| * * * * * | |
| Starfruit | 1.5 |
| * * * * * | |
| Wax jambu | 1.5 |

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2015–22031 Filed 9–8–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

**[EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0143; FRL–9932–06]**

## Propylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of propylene glycol monomethyl ether (PGME; CAS No. 107–98–2) when used as an inert ingredient under 40 CFR 180.910 as a solvent in pesticide formulations which include pre-and post–harvest use on crops. Syngenta Crop Protection submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of PGME.

**DATES:** This regulation is effective September 9, 2015. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before November 9, 2015, 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–2015–0143, 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:** Susan Lewis, 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 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

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

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at *http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.*

*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–2015–0143 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 November 9, 2015. 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–2015–0143, 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. Petition for Exemption

In the **Federal Register** of April 6, 2015 (80 FR 18327) (FRL–9924–00), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the filing of a pesticide petition inert ingredient (PP IN–10775) by Syngenta Crop Protection, P.O. Box 18300, Greensboro, NC 27409, The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.910 be amended by establishing an

exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of PGME (CAS No. 107–98–2) when used as an inert ingredient as a solvent in pesticide formulations applied to pre- and post–harvest use on crops. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Syngenta Crop Protection, the petitioner, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

**III. Inert Ingredient Definition**

Inert ingredients are all ingredients that are not active ingredients as defined in 40 CFR 153.125 and include, but are not limited to, the following types of ingredients (except when they have a pesticidal efficacy of their own): Solvents such as alcohols and hydrocarbons; surfactants such as polyoxyethylene polymers and fatty acids; carriers such as clay and diatomaceous earth; thickeners such as carrageenan and modified cellulose; wetting, spreading, and dispersing agents; propellants in aerosol dispensers; microencapsulating agents; and emulsifiers. The term ''inert'' is not intended to imply nontoxicity; the ingredient may or may not be chemically active. Generally, EPA has exempted inert ingredients from the requirement of a tolerance based on the low toxicity of the individual inert ingredients.

**IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety**

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for 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. . . .''

EPA establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance only in those cases where it can be clearly demonstrated that the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide chemical residues under reasonably foreseeable circumstances will pose no appreciable risks to human health. In order to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide inert ingredients, the Agency considers the toxicity of the inert in conjunction with possible exposure to residues of the inert ingredient through food, drinking water, and through other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings. If EPA is able to determine that a finite tolerance is not necessary to ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the inert ingredient, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance may be established.

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), 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 PGME including exposure resulting from the exemption established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with PGME follows.

*A. Toxicological Profile*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered their validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by PGME as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies are discussed in this unit.

PGME exhibits low acute toxicity by the oral, dermal, and inhalation routes. PGME is not a skin sensitizer or skin irritant and was only slightly irritating to the eye. In repeat dose inhalation studies ranging from 11 days to six months in duration, NOAELs of 300 parts per million (ppm) and higher were seen in rats, mice, rabbits, guinea pigs and monkeys. Effects observed included sedation, hepatic changes and a decrease in body weight gain. Oral NOAELs of 459.5 milligram/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day) and 919 mg/kg/day were observed in rat studies lasting 13 and 5 weeks, respectively. Observations included central nervous system (CNS) effects at very high doses (above limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg/day), enlarged livers and weight loss. In a reproduction study conducted via the inhalation route, offspring effects seen at 3,000 ppm appear to be related to decreased maternal body weight and secondary to general toxicity and nutritional stress. Decreased maternal body weight was also noted at the next lower dose. NOAELs in this study were 300 ppm for adults and 1,000 ppm for offspring. Studies with rats, mice, and rabbits showed that PGME was not a developmental toxicant (two inhalation and three gavage studies). Weight-of-evidence indicates that PGME is not genotoxic or carcinogenic. In a 2-year bioassay, there were no statistically significant increases in any tumor type in rats and mice.

*B. Toxicological Points of Departure/ Levels of Concern*

Once a pesticide's toxicological profile is determined, EPA identifies toxicological points of departure (POD) and levels of concern to use in evaluating the risk posed by human exposure to the pesticide. For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the toxicological POD is used as the basis for derivation of reference values for risk assessment. PODs are developed based on a careful analysis of the doses in each toxicological study to determine the dose at which the NOAEL and the LOAEL are identified. Uncertainty/ safety factors are used in conjunction with the POD to calculate a safe exposure level—generally referred to as a population-adjusted dose (PAD) or a reference dose (RfD)—and a safe margin of exposure (MOE). For non-threshold risks, the Agency assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of risk. Thus, the Agency estimates risk in terms of the probability of an occurrence of the adverse effect expected in a lifetime. For more information on the general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/riskassess.htm.*

No acute adverse effect level has been selected for PGME. The chronic NOAEL of 459.5 mg/kg/day was based on CNS effects at very high doses, enlarged livers and weight loss in a 13 week oral study in rats.

*C. Exposure Assessment*

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to PGME, EPA considered

exposure under the proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. EPA assessed dietary exposures from PGME in food as follows:

An acute dietary risk assessment was not conducted because no endpoint of concern following a single exposure was identified in the available studies. A chronic dietary exposure assessment was completed and performed using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model DEEM–FCID™, Version 3.16.which includes food consumption information from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, ''What We Eat In America'', (NHANES/WWEIA). This dietary survey was conducted from 2003 to 2008. In the absence of actual residue data, the inert ingredient evaluation is based on a highly conservative model that assumes that the residue level of the inert ingredient would be no higher than the highest established tolerance for an active ingredient on a given commodity. Implicit in this assumption is that there would be similar rates of degradation between the active and inert ingredient (if any) and that the concentration of inert ingredient in the scenarios leading to these highest of tolerances would be no higher than the concentration of the active ingredient. The model assumes 100 percent crop treated (PCT) for all crops and that every food eaten by a person each day has tolerance-level residues. A complete description of the general approach taken to assess inert ingredient risks in the absence of residue data is contained in the memorandum entitled ''Alkyl Amines Polyalkoxylates (Cluster 4): Acute and Chronic Aggregate (Food and Drinking Water) Dietary Exposure and Risk Assessments for the Inerts'' (D361707, S. Piper, 2/25/09) and can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2008–0738.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* For the purpose of the screening level dietary risk assessment to support this request for an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for PGME, a conservative drinking water concentration value of 100 parts per billion (ppb) based on screening level modeling was used to assess the contribution to drinking water for the chronic dietary risk assessments for parent compound. These values were directly entered into the dietary exposure model.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* textiles (clothing and diapers), carpets, swimming pools, and hard surface disinfection on walls, floors, tables). The highest exposures to consumers are likely to be associated with the use of paints and varnishes that contain PGME with some small dermal exposures possible. Inhalation exposures to relatively high concentrations of PGME are believed to be self-limiting due to the irritant effects of the chemical. Based on this residential exposure assessment, exposure to PGME would be low (less than 2 mg/kg/day). This level of exposure would be two orders of magnitude below that which would be of concern for PGME.

4. *Cumulative effects from substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of FFDCA requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider ''available information'' concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

EPA has not found PGME to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and PGME does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that PGME does not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see EPA's Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative.*

### *D. Safety Factor for Infants and Children*

1. *In general.* Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold (10X) margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the database on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines based on reliable data that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. This additional margin of safety is commonly referred to as the Food Quality Protection Act Safety Factor (FQPA SF). In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional safety factor when reliable data available to EPA support the choice of a different factor.

2. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* Studies in laboratory animals indicate that PGME is not a developmental toxicant when administered via inhalation or ingestion. Developmental studies conducted in rats and rabbits with PGME administered via inhalation showed no developmental toxicity in the rabbit and developmental delays (delayed sternebral ossification) in the rat but only in the presence of maternal toxicity. In oral developmental studies in rats, mice, and rabbits, developmental delays were seen only in the rat fetuses at the highest dose tested.

3. *Conclusion.* Based on this information there is no concern for increased sensitivity to infants and children to PGME when used as an inert ingredient in pesticide formulations. For the same reason, a safety factor analysis has not been used to assess risk to PGME and, therefore, the additional safety factor for the protection of infants and children is also unnecessary.

EPA has determined that reliable data show the safety of infants and children would be adequately protected if the FQPA SF were reduced to 1X. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for PGME is complete.

ii. There is a clinical signs of neurotoxicity observed at very high oral doses. However, there are no concern at this time because the clinical signs were observed at or above limit doses. Therefore there is no need for a developmental neurotoxicity study or additional UFs to account for neurotoxicity.

iii. There is no evidence that PGME results in increased susceptibility in *in utero* rats or rabbits in the prenatal developmental studies or in young rats in the 2-generation reproduction study.

iv. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100% CT and model estimates from the use of PGME in pesticidal formulations resulting in chronic dietary exposure estimates for food and drinking water below the Agency's level of concern. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to PGME in drinking water. EPA used similarly conservative assumptions to assess postapplication exposure of children as well as incidental oral exposure of toddlers. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by PGME.

### *E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety*

*Determination of safety section.* EPA determines whether acute and chronic dietary pesticide exposures are safe by comparing aggregate exposure estimates to the acute PAD (aPAD) and chronic

PAD (cPAD). For linear cancer risks, EPA calculates the lifetime probability of acquiring cancer given the estimated aggregate exposure. Short-, intermediate-, and chronic-term risks are evaluated by comparing the estimated aggregate food, water, and residential exposure to the appropriate PODs to ensure that an adequate MOE exists.

1. *Acute risk.* An acute aggregate risk assessment takes into account acute exposure estimates from dietary consumption of food and drinking water. No adverse effect resulting from a single oral exposure was identified and no acute dietary endpoint was selected. Therefore, PGME is not expected to pose an acute risk.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to PGME from food and water will utilize 15.4% of the cPAD for children 1–2 years old, the population group receiving the greatest exposure. Based on the explanation in this unit, regarding residential use patterns, chronic residential exposure to residues of PGME is not expected.

3. *Short-term risk.* Short-term aggregate exposure takes into account short-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level).

PGME may be used as an inert ingredient in pesticide products that are registered for uses that could result in short-term residential exposure, and the Agency has determined that it is appropriate to aggregate chronic exposure through food and water with short-term residential exposures to PGME.

Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for short-term exposures, EPA has concluded the combined short-term food, water, and residential exposures are below EPA's level of concern for PGME based on highly conservative assumptions made regarding residential and dietary exposures to PGME as described in Unit IV. Section C.

4. *Intermediate-term risk.* Intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level).

PGME may be used as an inert ingredient in pesticide products that are registered for uses that could result in intermediate-term residential exposure, and the Agency has determined that it is appropriate to aggregate chronic exposure through food and water with short-term residential exposures to PGME.

Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for short-term exposures, EPA has concluded the combined intermediate-term food, water, and residential exposures are below EPA's level of concern for PGME based on highly conservative assumptions made regarding residential and dietary exposures to PGME as described in Unit IV. Section C.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in two adequate rodent carcinogenicity studies, PGME is not expected to pose a cancer risk to humans.

6. *Determination of safety.* Based on these risk assessments, 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 PGME residues.

## V. Other Considerations

### *A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology*

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes since the Agency is establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance without any numerical limitation.

### *B. 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 Nation 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 PGME.

## VI. Conclusions

Therefore, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established under 40 CFR 180.910 for PGME (CAS No. 107–98–2) when used as an inert ingredient (as a solvent) in pesticide formulations applied to crops, post-harvest.

## VII. 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) or Executive Order 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). 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 Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

**VIII. 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, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: August 17, 2015.

**Susan Lewis,**

*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:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.910, add alphabetically the following inert ingredient to the table to read as follows:

**§ 180.910 Inert ingredients used pre- and post-harvest; exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance.**

* * * * *

| Inert ingredients | Limits | Uses |
|---|---|---|
| * * * * | * * | * |
| Propylene glycol monomethyl ether (CAS No. 107–98–2) | none | solvent. |
| * * * * | * * | * |

[FR Doc. 2015–22030 Filed 9–8–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

**47 CFR Part 76**

**[MB Docket No. 15–53; FCC 15–62]**

## Concerning Effective Competition; Implementation of Section 111 of the STELA Reauthorization Act

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; announcement of effective date.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) announces that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved, for a period of three years, the information collection requirements associated with the Commission's *Report and Order,* MB Docket No. 15–53, FCC 15–62. This document is consistent with the *Report and Order,* which stated that the Commission would publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing OMB approval and the effective date of the requirements.

**DATES:** The rule amendments and FCC Form 328, published at 80 FR 38001, July 2, 2015 are effective on September 9, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cathy Williams, *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov,* (202) 418–2918.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document announces that, on August 25, 2015, OMB approved the information collection requirements contained in the Commission's *Report and Order,* FCC 15–62, published at 80 FR 38001, July 2, 2015. The OMB Control Numbers 3060–0550 and 3060–0560. The Commission publishes this document as an announcement of the effective date of the requirements. If you have any comments on the burden estimates listed below, or how the Commission can improve the collections and reduce any burdens caused thereby, please contact Cathy Williams, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–C823, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. Please include the OMB Control Numbers, 3060–0550 and 3060–0560 in your correspondence. The Commission will also accept your comments via email at *PRA@fcc.gov.*

To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

**Synopsis**

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507), the FCC is notifying the public that it received OMB approval on August 25, 2015, 2015, for the information collection requirements contained under OMB control numbers 3060–0550 and 3060–0560, and FCC Form 328.

Under 5 CFR part 1320, an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a current, valid OMB Control Number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act that does not display a current, valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Numbers are 3060–0550 and 3060–0560.

The foregoing notice is required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, October 1, 1995, and 44 U.S.C. 3507.

The total annual reporting burdens and costs for the respondents are as follows:

*OMB Control Number:* 3060–0550.

*OMB Approval Date:* August 25, 2015.

*OMB Expiration Date:* August 31, 2018.

*Title:* Local Franchising Authority Certification, FCC Form 328; Section 76.910, Franchising Authority Certification.

*Form No.:* FCC Form 328.

*Respondents:* State, local or tribal governments; Businesses or other for-profit entities.

*Number of Respondents and Responses:* 7 respondents; 13 responses.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 2 hours.

*Frequency of Response:* One-time reporting requirement; Third party disclosure requirement.

*Obligation to Respond:* Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory