

specific way that would require a rulemaking regardless of the outcome of the negotiated rulemaking. On the contrary, Congress specifically directed that the final rule must result from the negotiated rulemaking, which will likely simplify the comment process enough to enable the agency to meet these relatively short deadlines.

By establishing the Committee in today's Notice, EPA is fulfilling the Lautenberg Act's requirement to "enter into a negotiated rulemaking pursuant to" the NRA to develop and publish a proposed rule. 15 U.S.C. 2607(a)(6)(A). When viewed under the lens of the statutory structure, any requirement for EPA to actually "develop and publish" a proposed rule must necessarily also result from consensus being reached by the Committee.

For these reasons, EPA respectfully disagrees with the commenter. If consensus cannot be reached, and there is no agreement upon which to base a proposal, then there is no further statutory obligation to issue a proposal or a final rule. However, as noted in the December 15, 2016, Notice, EPA commits to working in good faith to seek consensus on a proposal that is consistent with the legal mandate of TSCA.

*D. Definition of Consensus Should Not Require Unanimous Concurrence of the Committee*

The commenter recommended that the Committee use a definition of consensus that does not require unanimous concurrence among the Committee, citing the potential for one Committee member's veto to result in no agreement. The NRA defines consensus as unanimous concurrence, unless the Committee agrees otherwise. 5 U.S.C. 562. A unanimous concurrence definition is important in ensuring no one interest or group of interests is able to control the process. While EPA believes that unanimous concurrence is not an unreasonably high bar, particularly with the assistance of a highly skilled neutral facilitator with expertise in building consensus, the Committee has the power under the NRA to agree to another definition of consensus.

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*

Dated: May 24, 2017.

**Wendy Cleland-Hamnett,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention.*

[FR Doc. 2017-11570 Filed 5-31-17; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[19961-58-OEI]

### Cross-Media Electronic Reporting: Authorized Program Revision Approval, State of Utah

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces EPA's approval of the State of Utah's request to revise/modify certain of its EPA-authorized programs to allow electronic reporting.

**DATES:** EPA's approval is effective June 5, 2017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Karen Seeh, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information, Mail Stop 2823T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 566-1175, [seeh.karen@epa.gov](mailto:seeh.karen@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 13, 2005, the final Cross-Media Electronic Reporting Rule (CROMERR) was published in the **Federal Register** (70 FR 59848) and codified as part 3 of title 40 of the CFR. CROMERR establishes electronic reporting as an acceptable regulatory alternative to paper reporting and establishes requirements to assure that electronic documents are as legally dependable as their paper counterparts. Subpart D of CROMERR requires that state, tribal or local government agencies that receive, or wish to begin receiving, electronic reports under their EPA-authorized programs must apply to EPA for a revision or modification of those programs and obtain EPA approval. Subpart D provides standards for such approvals based on consideration of the electronic document receiving systems that the state, tribe, or local government will use to implement the electronic reporting. Additionally, § 3.1000(b) through (e) of 40 CFR part 3, subpart D provides special procedures for program revisions and modifications to allow electronic reporting, to be used at the option of the state, tribe or local government in place of procedures available under existing program-specific authorization regulations. An application submitted under the subpart D procedures must show that the state, tribe or local government has sufficient legal authority to implement the electronic reporting components of the programs covered by the application and will use electronic document receiving systems that meet the applicable subpart D requirements.

On March 28, 2017, the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UT DEQ) submitted an application titled "NPDES e-Reporting Tool" for revisions/modifications to its EPA-approved programs under title 40 CFR to allow new electronic reporting. EPA reviewed UT DEQ's request to revise/modify its EPA-authorized programs and, based on this review, EPA determined that the application met the standards for approval of authorized program revisions/modifications set out in 40 CFR part 3, subpart D. In accordance with 40 CFR 3.1000(d), this notice of EPA's decision to approve Utah's request to revise/modify its following EPA-authorized programs to allow electronic reporting under 40 CFR parts 122, 125, 403-471, 501, and 503, is being published in the **Federal Register**:

Part 123—EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System;

Part 403—General Pretreatment Regulations for Existing and New Sources of Pollution; and

Part 501—State Sludge Management Program Regulations.

UT DEQ was notified of EPA's determination to approve its application with respect to the authorized programs listed above.

**Matthew Leopard,**

*Director, Office of Information Management.*

[FR Doc. 2017-11513 Filed 6-2-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060-xxxx and 3060-0029]

### Information Collections Being Submitted for Review and Approval to the Office of Management and Budget

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or the Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection. Comments are requested concerning: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility;