anticipated to cause adverse effects to human health or adverse environmental effects.” In contrast, EPCRA section 313(d)(2)(A) mandates that the EPA consider whether “a chemical is known to cause or can reasonably be anticipated to cause significant adverse acute human health effects at concentration levels that are reasonably likely to exist beyond facility site boundaries.” The contrast demonstrates that when Congress intends to specifically require a risk assessment, it does so. It decided not to do so in CAA section 112(b)(3). The CAA is silent on the issue of noncancer hazards and quantitative cancer risk evaluation and does not explicitly prohibit the EPA from considering it when making a determination under CAA section 112(b)(3)(B). As previously explained in section II.C, the EPA also believes that in making its obligation under CAA section 112(b)(3)(B), the Administrator has discretion in forming her decision to either grant or deny a petition to add a substance to the CAA section 112(b)(1) HAP list. We believe this discretion would allow her, where appropriate, to consider risk evaluation of a substance in order to make the requisite determination as to whether a substance is “known to cause or may reasonably be anticipated to cause adverse effects to human health or adverse environmental effects,” under CAA section 112(b)(3)(B).

Thus, the EPA concludes that the petitioners have met the CAA section 112(b)(3)(A) requisite showing of adequate data by estimating nPB emissions and ambient concentrations that are likely to result beyond a facility’s fence line and providing adequate evidence of adverse health effects of nPB. Because the EPA is granting the petition for reasons stated above, the agency does not find it necessary to make determinations regarding other elements of the petition, such as a petitioner’s noncancer hazards and quantitative cancer risk evaluation, or whether nPB presents adverse environmental effects.

V. EPA’s Decision To Grant the Petitions

Based on the EPA’s evaluation of the petitions submitted by HSIA and NYSDEC, we conclude that the petitioners have provided sufficient information demonstrating the adverse health effects of nPB. The documented adverse health effects of nPB, which are based on established sound scientific principles, include carcinogenicity, reproductive toxicity, and neurotoxicity. The EPA also concludes that the petitioner’s assessment regarding estimates of potential ambient concentrations of nPB that are likely to result at a facility’s fence line and process emissions related information and chemical usage information representative of normal operating conditions are reasonable. The EPA concludes that there is adequate evidence to support a determination that nPB is an air pollutant and that emissions and ambient concentrations of nPB may reasonably be anticipated to cause adverse effects to human health. As mentioned above, we are seeking comments on all aspects of this notice, including EPA’s technical review of the HSIA and NYSDEC petitions, whether the criteria for listing have been met, and the agency’s rationale for the decision to grant these petitions.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Review

Additional information about this Executive Order can be found at http://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders.

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is a significant regulatory action that was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review because it raises novel legal or policy issues. Any changes made in response to OMB recommendations have been documented in the docket. Accordingly, the EPA is issuing this draft notice announcing the decision to grant petitions to add nPB to the CAA section 112(b)(1) HAP list.


Gina McCarthy,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017–00158 Filed 1–6–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
[60Day–17–17IY]

Proposed Data Collection Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

AGENCY: Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)

ACTION: Notice with comment period; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announces the withdrawal of the notice published under the same title on December 30, 2016 for public comment.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Information Collection Review Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road NE., MS–D74, Atlanta, Georgia 30329; phone: 404–639–7570; Email: omb@cdc.gov.


A new and corrected notice published on January 3, 2017 under the same title.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, January 12, 2017 at 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC (Ninth Floor).

STATUS: This meeting will be open to the public.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: Draft Advisory Opinion 2016–21: Great America PAC
Revised Proposal To Launch Rulemaking To Ensure That U.S.