substitutes available to the user that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health and are suitable to the crops and circumstances of the nomination.

(b) That production and consumption, if any, of methyl bromide for a critical use should be permitted only if:

(i) All technically and economically feasible steps have been taken to minimize the critical use and any associated emission of methyl bromide;

(ii) Methyl bromide is not available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide, also bearing in mind the developing countries' need for methyl bromide;

(iii) It is demonstrated that an appropriate effort is being made to evaluate, commercialize and secure national regulatory approval of alternatives and substitutes, taking into consideration the circumstances of the particular nomination. * * * Non-Article 5 Parties [*e.g.,* developed countries, including the U.S.] must demonstrate that research programs are in place to develop and deploy alternatives and substitutes. * * *

EPA has defined "critical use" in its regulations at 40 CFR 82.3 in a manner similar to Decision IX/6 paragraph (a).

III. How will the U.S. implement the critical use exemption in 2013 and beyond?

EPA regulations at 40 CFR 82.4 prohibit the production and import of methyl bromide in excess of the amount of unexpended critical use allowances held by the producer or importer, unless authorized under a separate exemption. Methyl bromide produced or imported by expending critical use allowances may be used only for the appropriate category of approved critical uses as listed in Appendix L to the regulations (40 CFR 82.4(p)(2)). The use of methyl bromide that was produced or imported through the expenditure of production or consumption allowances prior to 2005 is not confined to critical uses under EPA's phaseout regulations; however, other restrictions may apply.

A. What is the timing for applications for the 2013 control period?

There is both a domestic and international component to the critical use exemption process. The following outline projects a timeline for the process for the 2013 critical use exemption.

July 15, 2010: Solicit applications for the methyl bromide critical use exemption for 2013.

September 13, 2010: Deadline for submitting critical use exemption applications to EPA.

Fall 2010: U.S. Government (through EPA, Department of State, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and other interested Federal agencies) prepares U.S. Critical Use Nomination package.

January 24, 2011: Deadline for U.S. Government to submit U.S. nomination package to the Protocol Parties.

Early 2011: Technical and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) and Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) reviews Parties' nominations for critical use exemptions.

Mid 2011: Parties consider TEAP/MBTOC recommendations.

November 2011: Parties decide whether to authorize critical use exemptions for methyl bromide for production and consumption in 2013.

Mid 2012: EPA publishes proposed rule for allocating critical use exemptions in the U.S. for 2013.

Late 2012: EPA publishes final rule allocating critical use exemptions in the U.S. for 2013.

January 1, 2013: Critical use exemption permits the limited production and import of methyl bromide for specified uses for the 2013 control period.

B. How might EPA implement the critical use exemption after the 2013 control period?

U.S. consumption of methyl bromide in the U.S. has declined significantly over the last 20 years. Production and import was phased out in 2005 in the U.S. and all other developed countries under the Montreal Protocol. Since then, consumption by developed country Parties has been subject to limited annual exceptions for critical uses, which have declined steadily from year to year. In 1991, the baseline year, the U.S. consumption was approximately 25,500 metric tons of methyl bromide. In 2010, the amount authorized for critical uses declined to approximately 3,000 metric tons; for 2012, the U.S. nominated only approximately 1,200 metric tons. This transition from methyl bromide—formerly one of the most commonly used pesticides in the U.S.—to ozone-safe alternatives has been a remarkable achievement for U.S. agriculture.

The critical use exemption program has, thus far, provided U.S. manufacturers and growers six additional years (2005–2010) beyond the January 1, 2005, phaseout date to develop and market alternatives and implement practices that reduce the need for fumigants in general. The Parties have already approved a U.S. critical use amount for 2011, and the U.S. submitted a nomination for 2012 this January. EPA expects that the U.S. will submit a nomination for 2013 based on applications received in response to this notice. However, the international context for consideration of critical use exemption requests from developed country Parties is an important consideration for the program's future, since annual approval by the Parties is required for any additional production and consumption of otherwise banned ozone depleting substances. In 2006, there were 20 countries with approved CUEs. In 2010, that number has decreased to five: the United States, Australia, Canada, Israel, and Japan. Israel has announced that 2011 will be its last year of CUE methyl bromide use and Japan has indicated that 2013 will be the last year for which it will seek a critical use exemption authorization for soil fumigation. Australia and Canada each use only 1 percent of CUE MeBr.

Further, developing countries face their own phaseout deadline for methyl bromide under the Montreal Protocol in 2015. While the Protocol contains a provision allowing the Parties to permit critical use exemptions for developing countries, the extent to which developing countries will request such exemptions is not yet known. By 2008, the last year for which data are available, developing countries had already reduced methyl bromide consumption for soil and post-harvest uses by 66% relative to their baselines. Furthermore, of the 86 developing countries that have baselines, only 34 continued to use methyl bromide as of 2008.

Given this international context and that the critical use exemption process for a particular control period takes three years, as shown in the schedule in Section III.A above, EPA believes it is appropriate at this time to consider a year in which the U.S. Government will stop requesting applications for critical use exemptions. EPA is not making a final decision at this time whether to accept applications for subsequent control periods. EPA will seek comment on this issue in the proposed rule for the 2011 critical use exemption.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7414, 7601, 7671–7671q.

Dated: July 1, 2010.

Gina McCarthy,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 2010–17151 Filed 7–14–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Notices

DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, at 10 a.m.

PLACE: 999 E Street, NW., Washington, DC.

STATUS: This meeting will be closed to the public.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: Compliance matters pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437g. Audits conducted pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437g, 438(b), and Title 26, U.S.C. Matters concerning participation in civil actions or proceedings or arbitration. Internal personnel rules and procedures or matters affecting a particular employee.

* * * * *

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, July 15, 2010, at 10 a.m.

PLACE: 999 E Street, NW., Washington, DC (ninth floor).

STATUS: This meeting will be open to the public.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: Correction and Approval of Minutes.

Draft Advisory Opinion 2010–09: Club for Growth, by its counsel, Carol A. Laham, Esq., and D. Mark Renaud, Esq., of Wiley Rein LLP.

Draft Advisory Opinion 2010–10: National Right to Life Political Action Committee, by its counsel, Barry A. Bostrom, Esq., James Bopp, Jr., Esq., and Zachary S. Kester, Esq., of Bopp, Coleson & Bostrom.

Draft Advisory Opinion 2010–11: Commonsense Ten, by its counsel, Marc E. Elias, Esq., and Ezra Reese, Esq., of Perkins Coie LLP.

Management and Administrative Matters.

Individuals who plan to attend and require special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact Darlene Harris, Deputy Commission Secretary, at (202) 694–1040, at least 72 hours prior to the hearing date.

PERSON TO CONTACT FOR INFORMATION: Judith Ingram, Press Officer; Telephone: (202) 694–1220.

Shawn Woodhead Werth,

Secretary and Clerk of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–17052 Filed 7–14–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6715–01–M

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

[No. 2010–N–10]

Notice of Order: Revisions to Enterprise Public Use Database

AGENCY: Federal Housing Finance Agency.

ACTION: Notice of order.

SUMMARY: Section 1323(a)(1) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (Safety and Soundness Act), as amended, requires the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) to make available to the public the non-proprietary single-family and multifamily loan-level mortgage data elements submitted to FHFA by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) (collectively, the Enterprises) in their mortgage reports required under their charter acts. This responsibility to maintain a public use database (PUDB) for such mortgage data was transferred to FHFA from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) pursuant to sections 1122, 1126 and 1127 of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA), and was expanded to include data elements required to be reported under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (HMDA).

Specifically, section 1126 of HERA amended section 1323 of the Safety and Soundness Act by requiring that the Enterprises' mortgage reports include the data elements required to be reported under HMDA at the census tract level, and that such data elements be disclosed to the public. In addition, section 1127 of HERA amended section 1326 of the Safety and Soundness Act by requiring that, subject to privacy considerations as described in section 304(j) of HMDA, the Director of FHFA shall, by regulation or order, provide that certain information relating to single-family mortgage data of the Enterprises shall be disclosed to the public in order to make available to the public—(1) the same data from the Enterprises that is required of insured depository institutions under HMDA; and (2) information collected by the Director of FHFA under section 1324(b)(6) of the Safety and Soundness Act, as amended, for the purpose of comparing the characteristics of high-cost securitized loans.

FHFA provided each Enterprise with an opportunity to review and comment on FHFA's proposed revisions to the single-family and multifamily PUDB matrices which describe the data fields provided in the PUDB. FHFA has taken the Enterprises' comments into consideration, and has adopted an Order that implements certain changes required by HERA to the Enterprises' mortgage loan data reporting and the disclosure of such data in the PUDB. The Order also makes technical changes to the single-family and multifamily data matrices of the PUDB to conform the data fields to long-standing PUDB data reporting practice, to provide greater clarity, or to conform to the new statutory requirements. The Notice of Order sets forth FHFA's Order with accompanying Appendix containing the revised matrices, and describes the changes made to the data fields in the matrices. Changes to the PUDB matrices required by HERA relating to high-cost securitized loans, as well as the Enterprise housing goals for 2010 and beyond, will be implemented by the issuance of subsequent Orders.

DATES: *Effective Date of the Order:* The Order with accompanying Appendix is effective on July 1, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on data or methodology, contact Paul Manchester, Principal Economist, Office of Housing Mission and Goals, Quantitative Analysis and Goals, 1625 Eye Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006, (202) 408–2946, *Paul.Manchester@fhfa.gov*; or Ian Keith, Program Analyst, 1625 Eye Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006, (202) 408–2949, *Ian.Keith@fhfa.gov*. For legal questions, contact Sharon Like, Associate General Counsel, OGC–Housing Mission and Goals, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 414–8950, *Sharon.Like@fhfa.gov*. (These are not toll-free numbers.) The telephone number for the Telecommunications Device for the Hearing Impaired is (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Establishment of FHFA

Effective July 30, 2008, Division A of HERA, Public Law 110–289, 122 Stat. 2654 (2008), amended the Safety and Soundness Act and created FHFA as an independent agency of the Federal Government. HERA transferred the safety and soundness supervisory and oversight responsibilities over the Enterprises, the Federal Home Loan Banks (Banks), and the Office of Finance from the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) and the Federal Housing Finance Board, respectively, to FHFA. HERA also transferred the charter compliance authority, the responsibility to establish, monitor and enforce the affordable housing goals, the responsibility to maintain the PUDB, and the responsibility to oversee Enterprise data reporting, from HUD to FHFA.

FHFA is responsible for ensuring that the Enterprises operate in a safe and sound manner, including maintenance of adequate capital and internal controls, that their operations and activities foster liquid, efficient,