The Department is continuing to review its other existing regulations thoroughly. To the extent the Secretary can identify further opportunities for regulatory reform, the Secretary will take appropriate action to revise or eliminate existing regulations, reduce burden, and increase flexibility.

In these final regulations, we take the following three deregulatory actions:


   In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Accordingly, some changes to the ESEA have rendered whole parts of the regulations in part 200 inconsistent with the statute. The superseded regulations in part 200 that the Department rescinds are: 34 CFR 200.7 (Disaggregation of Data); 200.12 (State Accountability System); 200.13–200.22 (Adequate Yearly Progress); 200.27–200.28 (Schoolwide Programs); 200.30–200.53 (LEA and School Improvement); 200.55–200.57 and 200.59–200.60 (Highly Qualified Teachers and Duties of Paraprofessionals); 200.81(d), 200.81(f), 200.81(g), and 200.81(h) (Migrant Education Program (MEP)); and 200.89(a) (Allocation of funds under the MEP for FY 2006 and subsequent years).

2. **Part 237 (RIN 1810–AB37)**

   The Department rescinds the regulations governing the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program. We take this action because this program is no longer authorized under the Higher Education Act. The program was last funded in 1995.

3. **Part 299 (1810–AB38)**

   The Department rescinds the regulations establishing the priority for activities in an Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community. We take this action because the last Congressional extension of tax benefits to Empowerment Zones ended in 2017 and, thus, the program is no longer viable.

Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking

Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553), the Department generally offers interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed regulations. However, the APA provides that an agency is not required to conduct notice-and-comment rulemaking when the agency, for good cause, finds that the requirement is impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) and (d)(3)). There is good cause to waive rulemaking in this case because these final regulations merely remove existing regulations that are outdated, unnecessary, or superseded by recent statutory changes. This regulatory action adopts no new regulations and does not establish or affect substantive policy. Therefore, under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Secretary has determined that proposed regulations are unnecessary and, thus, waives notice-and-comment rulemaking.

The APA also requires that regulations be published at least 30 days before their effective date, unless the agency has good cause to implement its regulations sooner (5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3)). Again, because the final regulations merely reflect statutory changes and remove outdated or unnecessary regulatory provisions, the Secretary also has good cause to waive the 30-day delay in the effective date of these regulatory changes under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13771

Regulatory Impact Analysis

Under Executive Order 12866, the Secretary must determine whether this regulatory action is “significant” and, therefore, subject to the requirements of the Executive order and subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 defines a “significant regulatory action” as an action likely to result in a rule that may—

1. Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely affect a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities in a material way (also referred to as an “economically significant” rule)
2. Create serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency
3. Materially alter the budgetary impacts of entitlement 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 stated in the Executive order.

This regulatory action is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by OMB under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866.

Under Executive Order 13771, for each new regulation that the Department proposes for notice and comment or otherwise promulgates that is a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866 and that imposes total costs greater than zero, it must identify two deregulatory actions. For FY 2018, any new incremental costs associated with a new regulation must be fully offset by the elimination of existing costs through deregulatory actions. Because this final rule is not a significant regulatory action, the requirement to offset new regulations in Executive Order 13771 does not apply.

We have also reviewed these regulations under Executive Order 13563, which supplements and explicitly reaffirms the principles, structures, and definitions governing regulatory review established in Executive Order 12866. To the extent permitted by law, Executive Order 13563 requires that an agency—
(1) Propose or adopt regulations only upon a reasoned determination that their benefits justify their costs (recognizing that some benefits and costs are difficult to quantify);
(2) To the extent feasible, specify performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance that regulated entities must adopt; and
(3) Identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives—such as user fees or marketable permits—to encourage the desired behavior, or provide information that enables the public to make choices.

Executive Order 13563 also requires an agency “to use the best available techniques to quantify anticipated present and future benefits and costs as accurately as possible.” The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB has emphasized that these techniques may include “identifying changing future compliance costs that might result from technological innovation or anticipated behavioral changes.”

We are issuing this regulatory action only upon a reasoned determination that it provides benefits and will not have any costs. In choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, we selected the approach that maximizes net benefits. Based on the analysis that follows, the Department believes that these regulations are consistent with the principles in Executive Order 13563. We also have determined that this regulatory action would not unduly interfere with State, local, and Tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

Need for the Regulatory Action

This regulatory action is necessary to remove superseded, outdated, or unnecessary regulations from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

Analysis of Costs and Benefits

This regulatory action is a benefit to the public, grant recipients, and the Department as the action will remove any confusion that might be caused by maintaining superseded, outdated, or unnecessary regulations in the CFR.

The Department has also analyzed the costs of this regulatory action and has determined that it will impose no additional costs ($0). As detailed earlier, this regulatory action reflects statutory changes and removes superseded, outdated, or unnecessary regulatory provisions.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 601(2), the Regulatory Flexibility Act applies only to rules for which an agency publishes a general notice of proposed rulemaking. The Regulatory Flexibility Act does not apply to this rulemaking because there is good cause to waive notice and comment under 5 U.S.C. 553.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This rule does not contain any information collection requirements. The previously OMB-approved information collections that were associated with part 237 are no longer active information collections (OMB Control Numbers 1810–0532 and 1810–0537). The OMB-approved information collection associated with the sections of part 200 (Consolidated State Plans OMB 1810–0576) that this rule removes has been modified as necessary to align with the requirements of the ESSA.

Intergovernmental Review

Some of these programs are subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.
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List of Subjects

34 CFR Part 200
Education of disadvantaged, Elementary and secondary education, Grant programs—education, Indians—education, Infants and children, Juvenile delinquency, Migrant labor, Private schools, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

34 CFR Part 237
Elementary and secondary education, Grant programs—education, Scholarships and fellowships, Teachers.

34 CFR Part 299
Administrative practice and procedure, Elementary and secondary education, Grant programs—education, Private schools, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.
Dated: August 9, 2018.
Frank Brogan,
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.

For reasons discussed in the preamble, and under the authority at 20 U.S.C. 3474, 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3, Public Law 109–270, and Public Law 114–95, the Secretary amends Chapter II of title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 200—TITLE I—IMPROVING THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED

§ 200.89 [Amended]
12. In § 200.89, amend the section heading by removing the words “MEP allocations;” and by removing and reserving paragraph (a).

PART 237—[REMOVED AND RESERVED]

13. Remove and reserve part 237.

PART 299—GENERAL PROVISIONS

14. The authority citation for part 299 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3(a)(1), 6511(a), and 7373(b), unless otherwise noted.

Subpart B—[Removed and Reserved]

15. Remove and reserve subpart B, consisting of § 299.3.
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BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 261

Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is granting a petition submitted by Blanchard Refining Company LLC—(Blanchard) to exclude (or delist) the residual solids generated from the reclamation of oil bearing hazardous secondary materials (OBSMs) on-site at Blanchard’s Galveston Bay Refinery (GBR), located in Texas City, Texas from the lists of hazardous wastes. EPA used the Delisting Risk Assessment Software (DRAS) Version 3.0.35 in the evaluation of the impact of the petitioned waste on human health and the environment. The residual solids are listed as F037 (primary oil/water/solids separation sludge) when they are reclaimed from the OBSMs. After careful analysis and evaluation of comments submitted by the public, the EPA has concluded that the petitioned wastes are not hazardous waste when disposed of in Subtitle D landfills. This exclusion applies to the residuals solids generated at Blanchard’s Galveston Bay Refinery (GBR), located in Texas City, Texas facility. Accordingly, this final rule excludes the petitioned waste from the requirements of hazardous waste regulations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) when disposed of in Subtitle D landfills but imposes testing conditions to ensure that the future-generated wastes remain qualified for delisting.

DATES: Effective August 22, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R06–RCRA–2017–0556. All documents in the docket are listed on the http://www.regulations.gov website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through http://www.regulations.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical information regarding the Blanchard Refinery petition, contact Michelle Peace at 214–665–7430 or by email at peace.michelle@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The information in this section is organized as follows:

I. Overview Information

A. What action is EPA finalizing?
B. Why is EPA approving this delisting?
C. What are the limits of this exclusion?
D. How will Blanchard Refining manage the waste if it is delisted?
E. When is the final delisting exclusion effective?
F. How does this final rule affect states?

II. Background

A. What is a delisting?
B. What regulations allow facilities to delist a waste?
C. What information must the generator supply?

III. EPA’s Evaluation of the Waste Data

A. What waste and how much did Blanchard petition EPA to delist?
B. How did Blanchard sample and analyze the supply?

IV. EPA’s Evaluation of the Waste Data

A. What waste and how much did Blanchard petition EPA to delist?
B. What information must the generator supply?
C. What are the limits of this exclusion?
D. How will Blanchard Refining manage the waste if it is delisted?
E. When is the final delisting exclusion effective?
F. How does this final rule affect states?

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. What action is EPA finalizing?

The EPA is finalizing:

(1) the decision to grant GBR’s petition to have its surface impoundment basin solids excluded, or delisted, from the definition of a hazardous waste, subject to certain continued verification and monitoring conditions; and