AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

# FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 80 Friday,
No. 103 May 29, 2015

Pages 30605–30918

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402 is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, see *www.ofr.gov.*

**The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register** as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge at *www.fdsys.gov*, a service of the U.S. Government Publishing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6:00 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, 1 (January 2, 1994) forward. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800 or 866-512-1800 (toll free). E-mail, *gpocusthelp.com.*

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $749 plus postage, or $808, plus postage, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $165, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: U.S. Government Publishing Office—New Orders, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, see *bookstore.gpo.gov.*

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

**How To Cite This Publication:** Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 80 FR 12345.

**Postmaster:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

## SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

**PUBLIC**

**Subscriptions:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Paper or fiche | **202–512–1800** |
| Assistance with public subscriptions | **202–512–1806** |
| **General online information** | **202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498** |

**Single copies/back copies:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Paper or fiche | **202–512–1800** |
| Assistance with public single copies | **1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)** |

**FEDERAL AGENCIES**

**Subscriptions:**

Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions:

| | |
|---|---|
| Email | *FRSubscriptions@nara.gov* |
| Phone | **202–741–6000** |

Printed on recycled paper.

# Contents

**Federal Register**

Vol. 80, No. 103

Friday, May 29, 2015

**Agriculture Department**
*See* Food and Nutrition Service
*See* Forest Service
*See* National Agricultural Statistics Service
*See* National Institute of Food and Agriculture

**Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Bureau**
RULES
Importation of Arms, Ammunition and Defense Articles:
U.S. Munitions Import List; Removal of Defense Articles That No Longer Warrant Import Control under the Arms Export Control Act, 30615–30617
PROPOSED RULES
Separation Distances of Ammonium Nitrate and Blasting Agents from Explosives or Blasting Agents, 30633–30637

**Antitrust Division**
NOTICES
Proposed Final Judgments:
United States v. Verso Paper Corp. and NewPage Holdings Inc., 30726–30736

**Army Department**
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Record of Decision for the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site Training and Operations, 30662–30663

**Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line, 30724–30726

**Centers for Disease Control and Prevention**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30682–30683

**Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30683
Meetings:
Advisory Panel on Outreach and Education, Health Insurance Marketplace, Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Programs, 30684–30685

**Children and Families Administration**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30685–30686

**Civil Rights Commission**
NOTICES
Meetings:
Nevada Advisory Committee, 30654–30655

**Coast Guard**
RULES
Piping Systems and Appurtenances; CFR Correction, 30630
PROPOSED RULES
Safety Zones:
Fall River Grand Prix, Mt. Hope Bay and Taunton River, Fall River, MA, 30637–30640
NOTICES
Certificates of Alternative Compliance, 30691–30696

**Commerce Department**
*See* Foreign-Trade Zones Board
*See* International Trade Administration
*See* National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30655–30659

**Corporation for National and Community Service**
NOTICES
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 30662

**Defense Acquisition Regulations System**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30663–30664

**Defense Department**
*See* Army Department
*See* Defense Acquisition Regulations System
*See* Navy Department
RULES
Application of Labor Laws to Government Acquisitions; CFR Correction, 30631
PROPOSED RULES
Transporter Proof of Delivery, 30648–30650
NOTICES
Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration Amendment, 30664–30665
Meetings:
Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, 30666

**Denali Commission**
NOTICES
Fiscal Year 2015 Draft Work Plan, 30667–30669

**Education Department**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Application for U.S. Presidential Scholars Program, 30669–30670
Assessing the Role of Noncognitive and School Environmental Factors in Students' Transitions to High School in New Mexico, 30670–30671
Pell Grant Reporting under the Common Origination and Disbursement System, 30670
Privacy Act; Systems of Records, 30671–30676

**Environmental Protection Agency**
RULES
Acquisition Regulation; OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; CFR Correction, 30631
Pesticide Tolerances:
Mesotrione, 30625–30630

Metconazole, 30619–30625
PROPOSED RULES
Bees; Mitigating Exposure from Acutely Toxic Pesticide Products, 30644–30646
Pesticide Tolerances:
Banda de Lupinus albus doce BLAD, 30640–30644
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Air Pollution Regulations for Outer Continental Shelf Activities, 30678–30679
Aircraft Engines — Supplemental Information Related to Exhaust Emissions, 30678
Fuel Quality Regulations for Diesel Fuel Sold in 2001 and Later Years for Tax-Exempt (Dyed) Highway Diesel Fuel, etc., 30677–30678
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc., 30676

**Federal Aviation Administration**
RULES
Airworthiness Directives:
Airbus Airplanes, 30608–30612
The Boeing Company Airplanes, 30605–30608
Establishment of Class E Airspace:
Clark, SD, 30613–30614
Revocation of Class E Airspace:
Forrest City, AR, 30612–30613
PROPOSED RULES
Revocation of Class D Airspace:
Springfield, OH, 30632–30633
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program Evaluation Customer Feedback Report, 30756
Airmen other than Flight Crewmembers, Subpart C, Aircraft Dispatchers and App. A Aircraft Dispatcher Courses, 30753–30754
Certification of Airmen for the Operation of Light-Sport Aircraft, 30757
Certification of Repair Stations, 30758–30759
Procedures for Non-Federal Navigation Facilities, 30756–30757
Recording of Aircraft Conveyances and Security Documents, 30752–30753
Meetings:
RTCA Program Management Committee, 30753
Special Committee 230, 30754
Special Committee 231, 30757
Subcommittee 186, 30754–30755
Subcommittee 217, 30757–30758
Subcommittee 227, 30755–30756

**Federal Communications Commission**
RULES
Television Broadcasting Services:
Providence, RI, 30630–30631

**Federal Emergency Management Agency**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment — State Preparedness Report Unified Reporting Tool, 30696–30697
Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants, 30697–30698

**Federal Reserve System**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30680–30681
Changes in Bank Control:
Acquisitions of Shares of a Bank or Bank Holding Company, 30679–30680

**Food and Drug Administration**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Guidance for Industry on Postmarketing Adverse Event Reporting for Medical Products and Dietary Supplements During an Influenza Pandemic, 30689
Prescription Drug Product Labeling; Medication Guide Requirements, 30688–30689
Requirements on Content and Format of Labeling for Human Prescription Drug and Biological Products, 30686–30688
Meetings:
Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee and the Anesthetic and Analgesic Drug Products Advisory Committee, 30686

**Food and Nutrition Service**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, 30651–30652

**Foreign Assets Control Office**
NOTICES
Blocking or Unblocking of Persons and Properties, 30762–30763

**Foreign-Trade Zones Board**
NOTICES
Production Activities:
CNH Industrial America, LLC, Foreign-Trade Zone 41, Racine, WI, 30660–30661
Swarovski Lighting, Ltd., Foreign-Trade Zone 54, Clinton County, NY, 30659–30660
Reorganizations under Alternative Site Framework:
Foreign-Trade Zone 151, Findlay, OH, 30660

**Forest Service**
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Chequamegon–Nicolet National Forest, Wisconsin, Townsend Project, 30652–30653

**General Services Administration**
RULES
Application of Labor Laws to Government Acquisitions; CFR Correction, 30631
NOTICES
Meetings:
Request for Information on Business Due Diligence, 30681–30682

**Health and Human Services Department**
*See* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
*See* Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
*See* Children and Families Administration
*See* Food and Drug Administration

*See* Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Requests for Information:
Requirements for the Health Plan Identifier, 30646–30647

**Homeland Security Department**
*See* Coast Guard
*See* Federal Emergency Management Agency
*See* U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
*See* U.S. Customs and Border Protection

**Housing and Urban Development Department**
NOTICES
Federal Properties Suitable as Facilities to Assist the Homeless, 30699–30703

**Information Security Oversight Office**
NOTICES
Meetings:
National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee, 30737–30738

**Interior Department**
*See* Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement
*See* Land Management Bureau
*See* National Park Service

**International Trade Administration**
NOTICES
North American Free Trade Agreement Panel Reviews; Response to Request for Panel Review, 30661

**Justice Department**
*See* Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Bureau
*See* Antitrust Division
RULES
Authority of the Assistant Attorneys General to Compromise or Close Civil Claims, 30617–30619

**Labor Department**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Disclosures by Insurers to General Account Policyholders, 30736–30737

**Land Management Bureau**
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision, Cody and Worland Field Offices, WY, 30716–30718
Buffalo Resource Management Plan Revision, Buffalo Field Office, WY, 30709–30710
Great Basin Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments; Idaho, Southwestern Montana, Nevada, Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah, 30711–30714
HiLine District Proposed Resource Management Plan, Montana, 30718–30720
Miles City Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan, Miles City, MT, 30705–30707
Proposed Resource Management Plan, Pompeys Pillar National Monument Resource Management Plan Revision; Billings Field Office, MT, 30714–30716
Resource Management Plan; South Dakota Field Office, Montana, 30707–30709
Rocky Mountain Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments; Wyoming, Northwest Colorado, Lewistown, and North Dakota, 30703–30705

**Maritime Administration**
NOTICES
Recognition Awards for U.S.-flag Vessel Usage, 30759–30761

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration**
RULES
Application of Labor Laws to Government Acquisitions; CFR Correction, 30631

**National Agricultural Statistics Service**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30653

**National Archives and Records Administration**
*See* Information Security Oversight Office

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**
NOTICES
Importation Eligibility; Petitions:
Nonconforming Model Year 1991 BMW M3 Convertible Passenger Cars, 30761–30762

**National Institute of Food and Agriculture**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30654

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
RULES
Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries Regulations on Introduced Species; Effective Dates, 30614
NOTICES
Meetings:
Fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico; Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review, 30661–30662
Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, 30661

**National Park Service**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Programmatic Clearance for NPS-Sponsored Surveys, 30720–30721
United States Park Police Application Forms, 30721–30723
National Register of Historic Places:
Pending Nominations and Related Actions, 30723–30724

**National Science Foundation**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Science, Engineering, and Education for Sustainability Portfolio of Programs Survey, 30738–30739
Meetings:
Proposal Review, 30738

**Navy Department**
NOTICES
Exclusive Patent Licenses:
Point Semantics Corp., 30666–30667

**Nuclear Regulatory Commission**
NOTICES
Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness, 30739–30740

**Securities and Exchange Commission**
NOTICES
Applications:
KCAP Financial, Inc., 30746–30747
Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed Rule Changes:
Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., 30740–30746
New York Stock Exchange, LLC, 30747–30752

**State Department**
RULES
International Traffic in Arms:
Policy on Exports to the Republic of Fiji, 30614–30615

**Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration**
NOTICES
Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs:
Request for Information; Issues Related to Use of the Hair Specimen for Drug Testing, 30689–30691

**Surface Transportation Board**
NOTICES
Discontinuance of Service Exemptions:
New Hampshire Central Railroad, Inc., Between Littleton and Bethlehem, NH, 30762

**Transportation Department**
*See* Federal Aviation Administration
*See* Maritime Administration
*See* National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
*See* Surface Transportation Board

**Treasury Department**
*See* Foreign Assets Control Office
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 30763–30765

**U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services**
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals
Request for Fee Waiver, etc., 30698–30699

**U.S. Customs and Border Protection**
NOTICES
Distribution of Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset to Affected Domestic Producers, 30768–30917

**Separate Parts In This Issue**

**Part II**
Homeland Security Department, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 30768–30917

**Reader Aids**

Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this page for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, reminders, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV electronic mailing list, go to http://listserv.access.gpo.gov and select Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings); then follow the instructions.

## CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

**14 CFR**
39 (2 documents) .....30605, 30608
71 (2 documents) .....30612, 30613
**Proposed Rules:**
71.....30632
**15 CFR**
922.....30614
**22 CFR**
126.....30614
**27 CFR**
447.....30615
**Proposed Rules:**
555.....30633
**28 CFR**
0.....30617
**33 CFR**
**Proposed Rules:**
165.....30637
**40 CFR**
180 (2 documents) .....30619, 30625
**Proposed Rules:**
Ch. I.....30644
180.....30640
**45 CFR**
**Proposed Rules:**
162.....30646
**46 CFR**
56.....30630
**47 CFR**
73.....30630
**48 CFR**
22.....30631
1501.....30631
**Proposed Rules:**
5432.....30648

# Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 103
Friday, May 29, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. FAA–2014–0756; Directorate Identifier 2014–NM–103–AD; Amendment 39–18167; AD 2015–11–04]**

**RIN 2120–AA64**

## Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all The Boeing Company Model 707 airplanes, and Model 720 and 720B series airplanes. This AD was prompted by reports of cracked midspar fittings on the inboard and outboard nacelle struts. This AD requires repetitive inspections for cracking of the inboard and outboard midspar fittings of the nacelle struts and of the torque bulkhead, midspar chords, drag fitting, and front spar support, and doing applicable related investigative and corrective actions; replacing the midspar fittings; and doing other specified actions. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct cracking in the midspar fittings of the inboard and outboard nacelle struts, which could result in the loss of the structural integrity of the midspar fitting. This condition could cause an unsafe separation of the engine and consequent wing fire.

**DATES:** This AD is effective July 6, 2015.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of July 6, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H–65, Seattle, WA 98124–2207; telephone 206–544–5000, extension 1; fax 206–766–5680; Internet *https://www.myboeingfleet.com.* You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221. It is also available on the Internet at *http://regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2014–0756.

*Examining the AD Docket*

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2014–0756; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647–5527) is Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chandra Ramdoss, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, CA 90712–4137; phone: 562–627–5239; fax: 562–627–5210; email: *chandraduth.ramdoss@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to all The Boeing Company Model 707 airplanes, and Model 720 and 720B series airplanes. The NPRM published in the **Federal Register** on November 13, 2014 (79 FR 67379). The NPRM was prompted by reports of cracked midspar fittings on the inboard and outboard nacelle struts. The NPRM proposed to require repetitive inspections for cracking of the inboard and outboard midspar fittings of the nacelle struts and of the torque bulkhead, midspar chords, drag fitting, and front spar support, and doing applicable related investigative and corrective actions; replacing the midspar fittings; and doing other specified actions. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct cracking in the midspar fittings of the inboard and outboard nacelle struts, which could result in the loss of the structural integrity of the midspar fitting. This condition could cause an unsafe separation of the engine and consequent wing fire.

### Comments

We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. The following presents the comments received on the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) and the FAA's response to each comment.

### Request To Extend the Compliance Time

The Air Force Life Cycle Management Center (AFLCMC) at Robins Air Force Base, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory Flight Facility (LLFF), requested that the compliance time proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) be extended. AFLCMC asked that the grace period be extended from 18 months after the effective date of the AD to 24 months after the effective date of the AD. This commenter explained that its airplanes are scheduled for heavy maintenance visits every 24 months, and the 18-month grace period for the initial actions proposed in the NPRM would negatively impact airplane availability.

In addition, the AFLCMC stated that there is a low quantity of kits available to replace the inboard and outboard midspar fittings with new parts, as proposed in paragraphs (g) and (h) of the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014). This commenter also noted that the kits are expensive and have long lead times, which could impact operators' schedules. We infer that the commenter is requesting that the compliance time proposed in the NPRM be lengthened to accommodate parts availability.

LLFF's interpretation of the compliance time was that the compliance time was related to the date of the service bulletin. LLFF commented that operators would have a difficult time complying with the requirements proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014).

We do not agree with the commenters' requests to extend the compliance time.

In developing an appropriate compliance time for this action, we considered not only the degree of urgency associated with addressing the subject unsafe condition, but the manufacturer's recommendation for an appropriate compliance time, the availability of required parts, and the practical aspect of installing the required modification within an interval of time that corresponds to the typical scheduled maintenance for the majority of affected operators. The supplier of the parts kits reports that the lead time for kit delivery is 12 months from the date an operator places an order. This final rule provides operators with a grace period of 18 months from the effective date of this AD, which we deem adequate for acquiring the midspar fitting kits, performing the inspection, accomplishing any necessary corrective actions, and replacing the midspar fittings. However, under the provisions of paragraph (k) of this AD, we may approve requests for adjustments to the compliance time if data are submitted to substantiate that such an adjustment would provide an acceptable level of safety. We have not changed this final rule regarding this issue.

**Request To Clarify the Unsafe Condition**

Boeing requested that the unsafe condition statement in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) be revised. The NPRM stated ''This condition could cause an unsafe separation of the engine and consequent wing fire.'' Boeing commented that the word ''consequent'' implied that the end result would always be a wing fire. Boeing suggested that the wording be changed to ''This condition could cause an unsafe separation of the engine and potential fire.''

We do not agree to revise the unsafe condition statement in this final rule. Where the unsafe condition states ''could result'' it is recognized that the loss of structural integrity, unsafe separation of the engine, and wing fire are possible outcomes in a chain of events. Furthermore, we frequently use ''consequent'' in unsafe condition statements when we state the end-level effect of the unsafe condition on an airplane. We have not changed this AD regarding this issue.

**Request To Revise the Discussion Section of the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014)**

Boeing requested that the term limit of validity (LOV) in the first paragraph of the Discussion section of the preamble of the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) be removed because it is misleading. Boeing commented that the term LOV has implications associated with it which may not be intended. Boeing suggested that the term ''service objective'' be used instead of LOV.

We agree that the unsafe condition addressed by this final rule is not related to an airplane reaching its LOV. The actions in this final rule are necessary to prevent loss of the structural integrity of the midspar fitting as the result of stress corrosion and fatigue at the lug and fatigue at the tangs. These actions do not directly support an airplane reaching its LOV. The Discussion section from the preamble of an NPRM is not repeated in a final rule so no change is necessary. We have revised paragraph (e) of this AD by removing the statement ''This AD was prompted by certain mandated programs intended to support the airplane reaching its limit of validity (LOV) of the engineering data that support the established structural maintenance program.'' We replaced that statement with ''This AD was prompted by reports of cracked midspar fittings on the inboard and outboard nacelle struts.''

**Request To Clarify Replacement Requirements**

Rafael Veas stated that two midspar fittings had already been replaced on an airplane at his facility. This commenter asked if all four midspar fittings have to be replaced, or only the two remaining midspar fittings that have not yet been replaced.

We agree to clarify the replacement requirements of this final rule. Paragraph (f) of this AD states ''Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.'' The two midspar fittings that have already been replaced do not have to be replaced again if they have been replaced in accordance with the procedures mandated by this AD. For these two midspar fittings the repetitive inspection and replacement intervals should be calculated from the most recent midspar fitting replacement. We have not changed this final rule regarding this issue.

**Request To Revise the Cost Estimate**

The AFLCMC mentioned that the cost and labor estimates presented in the preamble of the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) are significantly lower than the actual costs. The commenter stated that accomplishment of the actions proposed in the NPRM would require a set of ready-for-installation engine pylons, removal of all four engines, inspections, and reassembly, and the estimated cost would be over $1,000,000 per airplane. We infer that the commenter requested that the estimated costs be revised.

After considering the data presented by the commenter, we agree that the cost and labor estimates referenced in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) are significantly lower than the actual costs. The cost estimate in the NPRM was for replacement of the midspar fitting for one engine, and the proposed requirement in the NPRM was for replacement of the midspar fitting for all four engines. The estimated cost information in this final rule has been revised to indicate this higher amount. We disagree, however, with the commenter's estimate that the cost will be over $1,000,000 per airplane. Our cost estimate includes the work hours and parts cost for the required midspar fitting replacements, but does not include costs associated with maintenance scheduling or a set of ready-for-installation engine pylons.

**Conclusion**

We reviewed the relevant data, considered the comments received, and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting this AD with the changes described previously and minor editorial changes. We have determined that these minor changes:

- Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014) for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 67379, November 13, 2014).

**Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51**

We reviewed Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014. The service information describes procedures for repetitive inspections for cracking of the inboard and outboard midspar fittings of the nacelle struts and of the torque bulkhead, midspar chords, drag fitting, and front spar support, and related investigative and corrective actions; replacing the midspar fittings; and doing other specified actions. This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section of this AD.

**Costs of Compliance**

We estimate that this AD affects 12 airplanes of U.S. registry.

We estimate the following costs to comply with this AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS

| Action | Labor cost | Parts cost | Cost per product | Cost on U.S. operators |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inspections | 214 work-hours × $85 per hour = $18,190 per pylon per inspection cycle. | $0 | $72,760 (4 pylons per inspection cycle) | $873,120 per inspection cycle. |
| Replacement of midspar fitting. | 18 work-hours × $85 per hour = $1,530 per pylon. | Up to $7,867 | Up to $37,588 (1 fitting per pylon, 4 pylons total). | Up to $451,056. |
| Mid-interval inspections. | 107 work-hours × $85 per hour = $9,095 per pylon per inspection cycle. | $0 | $36,380 (4 pylons per inspection cycle) | $436,560 per inspection cycle. |

We estimate the following costs to do any additional inspections that would be required based on the results of the inspections. We have no way of determining the number of aircraft that might need these inspections:

ON-CONDITION COSTS

| Action | Labor cost | Parts cost | Cost per product |
|---|---|---|---|
| Inspections | Up to 21 work-hours × $85 per hour = $1,785 | $0 | $1,785 |

We have received no definitive data that would enable us to provide cost estimates for the on-condition corrective actions specified in this AD.

**Authority for This Rulemaking**

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: ''General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

**Regulatory Findings**

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979),

(3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(4) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39**

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

**Adoption of the Amendment**

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

## PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

**§ 39.13 [Amended]**

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive (AD):

**2015–11–04 The Boeing Company:** Amendment 39–18167; Docket No. FAA–2014–0756; Directorate Identifier 2014–NM–103–AD.

**(a) Effective Date**

This AD is effective July 6, 2015.

**(b) Affected ADs**

None.

**(c) Applicability**

This AD applies to all The Boeing Company Model 707–100 long body, –200, –100B long body, and –100B short body series airplanes; Model 707–300, –300B, –300C, and –400 series airplanes; and Model 720 and 720B series airplanes; certificated in any category.

**(d) Subject**

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 54, Nacelles/Pylons.

**(e) Unsafe Condition**

This AD was prompted by reports of cracked midspar fittings on the inboard and outboard nacelle struts. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct cracking in the midspar fittings of the inboard and outboard nacelle struts, which could result in the loss of the structural integrity of the midspar fitting. This condition could cause an unsafe separation of the engine and consequent wing fire.

**(f) Compliance**

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

**(g) Inspections of Nacelle Struts and Surrounding Structure and Replacement of Inboard and Outboard Midspar Fittings**

At the applicable time specified in table 2 or table 3 of paragraph 1.E., ''Compliance,'' of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, except as required by paragraph (i)(1) of this AD: Do the inspections required by paragraphs (g)(1), (g)(2), and (g)(3) of this AD, in accordance with part 2 or part 3, as applicable, of the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, except as required by

paragraph (i)(2) of this AD. Before further flight, do all applicable related investigative and corrective actions, replace the inboard and outboard midspar fittings with new parts, and do other specified actions (including installing new bushings and oversize fasteners), in accordance with part 2 or part 3, as applicable, of the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, except as required by paragraph (i)(2) of this AD. Repeat the inspections required by paragraphs (g)(1), (g)(2), and (g)(3) of this AD thereafter at the applicable intervals specified in table 2 or table 3 of paragraph 1.E., ''Compliance,'' of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, except as required by paragraph (i)(1) of this AD.

(1) A detailed inspection and a high frequency eddy current inspection (HFEC) for cracks in the inboard and outboard midspar fittings of the nacelle struts.

(2) Open hole HFEC inspections for cracks in the torque bulkhead, midspar chords, drag fitting, and front spar support.

(3) A surface HFEC inspection of the front spar support for cracks.

**(h) Mid-Interval Inspections and Replacement of Nacelle Strut Midspar Fittings**

At the applicable time specified in table 4 or 5 of paragraph 1.E., ''Compliance,'' of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014: Do the inspections required by paragraphs (h)(1), (h)(2), and (h)(3) of this AD, in accordance with part 4 or part 5, as applicable, of the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, except as required by paragraph (i)(2) of this AD. Do all applicable related investigative, corrective, and other specified actions (including installing new bushings and oversize fasteners) before further flight. Repeat the inspections required by paragraphs (h)(1), (h)(2), and (h)(3) of this AD thereafter at the applicable intervals specified in table 4 or 5 of paragraph 1.E., ''Compliance,'' of Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014. The threshold for the repetitive inspections required by paragraphs (h)(1), (h)(2), and (h)(3) of this AD is 1,500 flight cycles or 48 months, whichever occurs first, since the most recent midspar fitting replacement.

(1) A detailed inspection and a surface HFEC inspection for cracks in the inboard and outboard midspar fittings of the nacelle struts.

(2) An open hole HFEC inspection for cracks in the drag fitting and front spar support.

(3) A surface HFEC inspection for cracks in the front spar support.

**(i) Exceptions to Service Information Specifications**

(1) Where Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, specifies a compliance time ''after the Revision 6 date of this service bulletin,'' this AD requires compliance within the specified compliance time after the effective date of this AD.

(2) Where Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014, specifies to contact Boeing for appropriate action: Do corrective actions before further flight using a method approved in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph (k) of this AD.

**(j) Special Flight Permit**

Special flight permits, as described in Section 21.197 and Section 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199), are not allowed.

**(k) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)**

(1) The Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the ACO, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (l) of this AD. Information may be emailed to: *9-ANM-LAACO-AMOC-Requests@faa.gov.*

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding district office.

(3) An AMOC that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used for any repair required by this AD if it is approved by the Boeing Commercial Airplanes Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) that has been authorized by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO, to make those findings. For a repair method to be approved, the repair must meet the certification basis of the airplane and the approval must specifically refer to this AD.

**(l) Related Information**

For more information about this AD, contact Chandra Ramdoss, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120L, FAA, Los Angeles ACO, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, CA 90712–4137; phone: 562–627–5239; fax: 562–627–5210; email: *chandraduth.ramdoss@faa.gov.*

**(m) Material Incorporated by Reference**

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference (IBR) of the service information listed in this paragraph under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) You must use this service information as applicable to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(i) Boeing 707 Alert Service Bulletin A3183, Revision 6, dated February 7, 2014.

(ii) Reserved.

(3) For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Data & Services Management, P.O. Box 3707, MC 2H–65, Seattle, WA 98124–2207; telephone 206–544–5000, extension 1; fax 206–766–5680; Internet *https://www.myboeingfleet.com.* You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

(4) You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

(5) You may view this service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

Issued in Renton, Washington, on May 20, 2015.

**John P. Piccola, Jr.,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12858 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Federal Aviation Administration

## 14 CFR Part 39

**[Docket No. FAA–2014–0584; Directorate Identifier 2014–NM–092–AD; Amendment 39–18158; AD 2015–10–03]**

**RIN 2120–AA64**

## Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** We are superseding Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2014–09–05, for certain Airbus Model A330–200 and –300 series airplanes, and Model A340–200 and –300 series airplanes. AD 2014–09–05 required repetitive inspections of certain sidestay upper cardan pins of the main landing gear (MLG) and associated nuts and retainer assemblies, and pin replacement if necessary. This AD was prompted by a determination that a previously optional measurement is necessary to address the identified unsafe condition. This new AD continues to require a detailed inspection for visible chrome of each affected MLG sidestay upper cardan pin, associated nuts, and retainer assembly, and pin replacement if needed, and adds new requirements for measuring cardan pin clearance dimensions (gap check), doing corrective actions, and reporting all findings. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct migration of the sidestay upper cardan pin, which could result in disconnection of the sidestay upper arm from the airplane structure, and could result in a landing

gear collapse and consequent damage to the airplane and injury to occupants.

**DATES:** This AD becomes effective July 6, 2015.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of May 14, 2014 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014).

**ADDRESSES:** You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=FAA-2014-0584;* or in person at the Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC.

For service information identified in this AD, contact Airbus SAS—Airworthiness Office—EAL, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 5 61 93 36 96; fax +33 5 61 93 45 80; email *airworthiness.A330-A340@airbus.com;* Internet *http://www.airbus.com.* You may view this referenced service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221. It is also available on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2014–0584.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Vladimir Ulyanov, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98057–3356; telephone 425–227–1138; fax 425–227–1149.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to supersede AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014). AD 2014–09–05 applied to certain Airbus Model A330–200 and –300 series airplanes, and Model A340–200 and –300 series airplanes. The NPRM published in the **Federal Register** on August 26, 2014 (79 FR 50863).

The European Aviation Safety Agency, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union, has issued EASA Airworthiness Directive 2014–0066, corrected March 20, 2014 (referred to after this as the Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information, or ''the MCAI''), to correct an unsafe condition on certain Airbus Model A330–200 and –300 series airplanes, and Model A340–200 and –300 series airplanes. The MCAI states:

> An A330 aeroplane equipped with Basic (main landing gear) MLG was rolling out after landing when it experienced a nose wheel steering fault (unrelated to the safety subject addressed by this [EASA] AD), which resulted in the crew stopping the aeroplane on the taxiway after vacating the runway.
>
> The subsequent investigation revealed that the right-hand MLG sidestay upper cardan pin had migrated out of position. The sidestay upper cardan nut and retainer were found in the landing gear bay detached from the upper cardan pin. The nut and the retainer were still bolted together.
>
> This condition, if not detected and corrected, could lead to a complete migration of the sidestay upper cardan pin and a disconnection of the sidestay upper arm from the aeroplane structure, possibly resulting in MLG collapse with consequent damage to the aeroplane and injury to occupants.
>
> To address this potential condition, Airbus published Alert Operators Transmission (AOT) A32L003–14, providing inspection instructions.
>
> For the reasons described above, this [EASA] AD requires accomplishment of repetitive [detailed inspections for visible chrome] of the MLG upper cardan pin, nut and retainer [and pin replacement if necessary]. This [EASA] AD also requires accomplishment of a gap check between wing rear spar fitting lugs and the bush flanges [and corrective actions if necessary. Corrective actions include repair or replacement of the cardan pin assembly].

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FAA-2014-0584-0003.*

## Comments

We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. The following presents the comments received on the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) and the FAA's response to each comment.

### Request To Match the Applicability of Terminating Action to Inspections

U.S. Airways requested that we revise the affected airplanes of paragraph (h) of the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) to match those of paragraph (g) of the NPRM. U.S. Airways stated that paragraph (g) of the NPRM limits the repetitive inspections to MLG that have exceeded 8 years since first overhaul but not yet had a second overhaul; whereas paragraph (h) of the NPRM provides a new terminating action to the repetitive inspections, but does not limit the applicability to MLG that have exceeded 8 years since first overhaul but not yet had a second overhaul.

We agree to revise the affected airplanes of paragraph (h) of this AD because the terminating action provisions of paragraph (h) of the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) was intended to apply to the same subset of affected airplanes identified in paragraph (g)(1) of the NPRM. We have changed the language in paragraph (h) of this AD by limiting the affected airplanes to those identified in paragraph (g)(1) of this AD.

### Request To Change Compliance Time of Sending Results of Gap Check

U.S. Airways requested that we revise the compliance time for sending the results of the inspection and gap check to Airbus from ''before further flight'' to ''within 30 days.'' U.S. Airways stated that paragraph (h)(2)(i) of the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) states to send inspection findings to Airbus ''before further flight,'' if the gap check result measures between 0.6 mm and 1.5 mm, and paragraph (h)(2)(ii) states to repair within 30 days. U.S. Airways stated that mechanics who inspect the cardan pin typically do not send data directly to Airbus and that since the repair is not required for 30 days after the inspection, communicating the inspection findings should not restrict aircraft flight.

We agree to revise the compliance time because the proposed compliance time for sending the results of the inspection and gap check does not affect the compliance time for accomplishment of the repair. We have changed the compliance time in paragraph (h)(2)(i) of this AD from before further flight, to 30 days. This difference has been coordinated with EASA.

### Request To Allow Replacement of Cardan Pin Assembly as Terminating Action

U.S. Airways requested that we allow the replacement of the cardan pin assembly to be considered as a terminating action. Paragraph (h)(1) of the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) would mandate the replacement of the cardan pin if the gap is found to be greater than 1.5mm. However paragraph (h)(2) of the NPRM would require an approved repair for smaller gaps. US Airways suggested that the AD also allow the replacement of the cardan pin assembly before further flight as an alternative to the actions specified in paragraphs (h)(2)(i) and (h)(2)(ii) of the NPRM.

We agree with the request to allow replacement of the cardan pin assembly as an alternative to small repairs because replacing the cardan pin assembly is terminating action regardless of the size of the gap. We have revised paragraph (h) of this AD to

provide for replacement of the cardan pin assembly as an option to doing a repair.

**Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51**

The manufacturer has issued Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014. The service information describes procedures for inspecting sidestay upper cardan pins of the MLG and associated nuts and retainer assemblies. This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section of this AD.

**Conclusion**

We reviewed the available data, including the comments received, and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting this AD with the changes described previously and minor editorial changes. We have determined that these changes:

- Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014) for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 50863, August 26, 2014).

**Costs of Compliance**

We estimate that this AD affects 83 airplanes of U.S. registry.

The actions required by AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014), and retained in this AD take about 1 work-hour per product, at an average labor rate of $85 per work-hour. Required parts cost $0 per product. Based on these figures, the estimated cost of the actions that were required by AD 2014–09–05 is $85 per product.

We also estimate that it will take about 1 work-hour per product to comply with the new basic requirements of this AD. The average labor rate is $85 per work-hour. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of this AD on U.S. operators to be $7,055, or $85 per product.

In addition, we estimate that any necessary follow-on actions will take about 4 work-hours and require parts costing $7,530, for a cost of $7,870 per product. We have no way of determining the number of aircraft that might need these actions.

**Paperwork Reduction Act**

A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB control number. The control number for the collection of information required by this AD is 2120–0056. The paperwork cost associated with this AD has been detailed in the Costs of Compliance section of this document and includes time for reviewing instructions, as well as completing and reviewing the collection of information. Therefore, all reporting associated with this AD is mandatory. Comments concerning the accuracy of this burden and suggestions for reducing the burden should be directed to the FAA at 800 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20591, ATTN: Information Collection Clearance Officer, AES–200.

**Authority for This Rulemaking**

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. ''Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs,'' describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in ''Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

**Regulatory Findings**

We determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

1. Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866;
2. Is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979);
3. Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska; and
4. Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

**Examining the AD Docket**

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=FAA-2014-0584;* or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received, and other information. The street address for the Docket Operations office (telephone 800–647–5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39**

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

**Adoption of the Amendment**

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

## PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

### § 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by removing Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014), and adding the following new AD:

**2015–10–03 Airbus:** Amendment 39–18158. Docket No. FAA–2014–0584; Directorate Identifier 2014–NM–092–AD.

**(a) Effective Date**

This AD becomes effective July 6, 2015.

**(b) Affected ADs**

This AD replaces AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014).

**(c) Applicability**

This AD applies to the airplanes identified in paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of this AD, certificated in any category.

(1) Airbus Model A330–201, –202, –203, –223, –243, –301, –302, –303, –321, –322, –323, –341, –342, and –343 airplanes, all manufacturer serial numbers (MSNs), equipped with basic (201252 series) main landing gear (MLG), or growth (201490 series) MLG.

(2) Airbus Model A340–211, –212, –213, –311, –312, and –313 airplanes, all MSNs, equipped with basic (201252 series) MLG or growth (201490 series) MLG.

**(d) Subject**

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 32, Landing Gear.

**(e) Reason**

This AD was prompted by a report of a sidestay upper cardan pin of the MLG migrating out of position. We are issuing this AD to detect and correct migration of the sidestay upper cardan pin, which could result in disconnection of the sidestay upper arm from the airplane structure, and could result in a landing gear collapse and consequent damage to the airplane and injury to occupants.

**(f) Compliance**

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

**(g) Retained Repetitive Detailed Inspections With No Changes**

This paragraph restates the requirements of paragraph (g) of AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014), with no changes.

(1) For airplanes identified in paragraphs (g)(1)(i) and (g)(1)(ii) of this AD on which the affected MLG has exceeded 8 years since first overhaul, as of May 14, 2014 (the effective date of AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014), except those MLG that have had a second overhaul: Within 30 days after May 14, 2014, accomplish a detailed inspection for visible chrome of each affected MLG sidestay upper cardan pin, and associated nut and retainer assembly, in accordance with the instructions of Airbus Alert Operators Transmission (AOT) A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

(i) Airplanes equipped with any MLG sidestay upper cardan pin subassembly part number (P/N) 201267202 (on 201252 series MLG).

(ii) Airplanes equipped with any MLG sidestay upper cardan pin subassembly P/N 201483202 (on 201490 series MLG).

(2) If, during any inspection required by paragraph (g)(1) of this AD, no pin chrome is visible inboard of the wing rear spar fitting lug, repeat the detailed inspection for visible chrome specified in paragraph (g)(1) of this AD thereafter at intervals not to exceed 10 days.

(3) If, during any inspection required by paragraphs (g)(1) or (g)(2) of this AD, a pin chrome is visible inboard of the wing rear spar fitting lug, before further flight, replace the affected cardan pin assembly, in accordance with the instructions of Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices). Replacement of the affected cardan pin assembly terminates the repetitive inspections required by paragraph (g)(2) of this AD.

Note 1 to paragraph (g) of this AD: MLG sidestay upper cardan pin subassembly P/N 201267202 (found in Airbus Illustrated Parts Catalogue (IPC) as item 32–11–18–01) includes the cardan pin P/N 201267600. MLG sidestay upper cardan pin subassembly P/N 201483202 (found in Airbus IPC as item 32–11–18–01) includes the cardan pin P/N 201483600.

**(h) New Terminating Action—Gap Check**

For airplanes identified in paragraphs (g)(1)(i) and (g)(1)(ii) of this AD on which the affected MLG has exceeded 8 years since first overhaul, as of May 14, 2014 (the effective date of AD 2014–09–05, Amendment 39–17840 (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014), except those MLG that have had a second overhaul: Within 4 months after the effective date of this AD: Measure the cardan pin clearance dimensions (gap check) and do the applicable corrective action specified in paragraph (h)(1) or (h)(2) of this AD. Measuring the gap check and doing the applicable corrective action specified in paragraph (h)(1) or (h)(2) of this AD, as applicable, terminates the inspections required by paragraphs (g)(1) and (g)(2) of this AD for that sidestay upper cardan pin, nut, and retainer only. The measurement must be done in accordance with Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

(1) If the total clearance dimension (gap check result) is equal to or greater than 1.5 mm, before further flight, replace the cardan pin assembly, in accordance with Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

(2) If the total clearance dimension (gap check) is less than 1.5 mm but greater than 0.6 mm, do the actions specified in paragraphs (h)(2)(i) or (h)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Do the actions specified in paragraphs (h)(2)(i)(A) and (h)(2)(i)(B) of this AD.

(A) Within 30 days after accomplishing the gap check, send the information (Appendix 2 proforma, photographs, and the movement traceability sheet) specified in paragraph 4.2.3, ''Findings,'' of Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices), to Airbus at the address specified in Appendix 2 (the issue date is not specified on this appendix) of Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014.

(B) Within 30 days after accomplishing the gap check, repair using a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA; or the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA); or Airbus's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(ii) Within 30 days after accomplishing the gap check, replace the cardan pin assembly, in accordance with Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

**(i) New Reporting of Inspection Results**

For airplanes on which a gap check specified in paragraph (h) of this AD has been done: Except as required by paragraph (h)(2)(i) of this AD, at the applicable time specified in paragraphs (i)(1) and (i)(2) of this AD, report all findings (including no findings) to Airbus, in accordance with Airbus AOT A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3, (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

(1) If the gap check was done on or after the effective date of this AD: Submit the report within 30 days after the gap check.

(2) If the gap check was done before the effective date of this AD: Submit the report within 30 days after the effective date of this AD.

**(j) Other FAA AD Provisions**

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the International Branch, send it to ATTN: Vladimir Ulyanov, Aerospace Engineer, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA 98057–3356; telephone 425–227–1138; fax 425–227–1149. Information may be emailed to: *9-ANM-116-AMOC-REQUESTS@faa.gov.* Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding district office. The AMOC approval letter must specifically reference this AD.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer, the action must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, Transport Airplane Directorate, FAA; or the EASA; or Airbus's EASA DOA. If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(3) *Reporting Requirements:* A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 2120–0056. Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to be approximately 5 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, completing and reviewing the collection of information. All responses to this collection of information are mandatory. Comments concerning the accuracy of this burden and suggestions for reducing the burden should be directed to the FAA at: 800 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20591, Attn: Information Collection Clearance Officer, AES–200.

**(k) Related Information**

Refer to Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information (MCAI) EASA

Airworthiness Directive 2014–0066 (Corrected March 20, 2014), for related information. You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=FAA-2014-0584.*

**(l) Material Incorporated by Reference**

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference (IBR) of the service information listed in this paragraph under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) You must use this service information as applicable to do the actions required by this AD, unless this AD specifies otherwise.

(3) The following service information was approved for IBR on May 14, 2014, (79 FR 23909, April 29, 2014).

(i) Airbus Alert Operators Transmission A32L003–14, dated March 10, 2014, including Appendices 1, 2, and 3 (the issue date is not specified on the appendices).

(ii) Reserved.

(4) For service information identified in this AD, contact Airbus SAS—Airworthiness Office—EAL, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France; telephone +33 5 61 93 36 96; fax +33 5 61 93 45 80; email *airworthiness.A330-A340@airbus.com;* Internet *http://www.airbus.com.*

(5) You may view this service information at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Renton, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 425–227–1221.

(6) You may view this service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: *http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html.*

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 30, 2015.

**Michael Kaszycki,**

*Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–11393 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 71

**[Docket No. FAA–2014–0879; Airspace Docket No. 14–ASW–7]**

## Revocation of Class E Airspace; Forrest City, AR

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action removes Class E airspace at Forrest City Municipal Airport, Forrest City, AR, due to the cancellation of Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations. The FAA is taking this action to enhance airspace management within the National Airspace System (NAS).

**DATES:** Effective 0901 UTC, August 20, 2015. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference action under title 1, Code of Federal Regulations, part 51, subject to the annual revision of FAA Order 7400.9 and publication of conforming amendments.

**ADDRESSES:** FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, and subsequent amendments can be viewed on line at *http://www.faa.gov/airtraffic/publications/.* The Order is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal-regulations/ibr_locations.html.*

FAA Order 7400.9, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, is published yearly and effective on September 15. For further information, you can contact the Airspace Policy and ATC Regulations Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 29591; telephone: 202–267–8783.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rebecca Shelby, Central Service Center, Operations Support Group, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76137; telephone: 817–321–7740.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### History

On December 3, 2014, the FAA published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to remove Class E airspace at Forrest City, AR (79 FR 71710). Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking effort by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments were received. Class E airspace designations are published in Paragraph 6005, of FAA Order 7400.9Y, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

### Availability and Summary of Documents for Incorporation by Reference

This document amends FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014. FAA Order 7400.9Y is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this final rule. FAA Order 7400.9Y lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

### The Rule

This action amends Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 by removing Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface at Forrest City Municipal Airport, Forrest City, AR. Controlled airspace is no longer needed due to cancellation of standard instrument approach procedures for IFR operations at the airport.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current, is non-controversial and unlikely to result in adverse or negative comments. It, therefore, (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that only affects air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The FAA's authority to issue rules regarding aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the United States Code. Subtitle I, Section 106 describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority. This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart I, Section 40103. Under that section, the FAA is charged with prescribing regulations to assign the use of airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace. This regulation is within the scope of that authority as it removes controlled airspace at Forrest City Municipal Airport, Forrest City, AR.

### Environmental Review

The FAA has determined that this action qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, ''Environmental

Impacts: Policies and Procedures,'' paragraph 311a. This airspace action is not expected to cause any potentially significant environmental impacts, and no extraordinary circumstances exist that warrant preparation of an environmental assessment.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71**

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

**Adoption of the Amendment**

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

## PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014 is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace area extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

* * * * *

**ASW AR E5 Forrest City, AR [Removed]**

Issued in Fort Worth, TX, on May 20, 2015.

**Humberto Melendez,**

*Acting Manager, Operations Support Group, ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12964 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 71

**[Docket No. FAA–2014–0724; Airspace Docket No. 14–AGL–12]**

## Establishment of Class E Airspace; Clark, SD

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This action establishes Class E airspace at Clark, SD. Controlled airspace is necessary to accommodate new Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) at Clark County Airport. The FAA is taking this action to enhance the safety and management of Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations for SIAPs at the airport. This action also corrects the state to SD under the airport designation, and amends the geographic coordinates of the airport.

**DATES:** Effective 0901 UTC, August 20, 2015. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference action under title 1, Code of Federal Regulations, part 51, subject to the annual revision of FAA Order 7400.9 and publication of conforming amendments.

**ADDRESSES:** FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, and subsequent amendments can be viewed on line at *http://www.faa.gov/airtraffic/publications/.* The Order is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal-regulations/ibr_locations.html.*

FAA Order 7400.9, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, is published yearly and effective on September 15. For further information, you can contact the Airspace Policy and ATC Regulations Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 29591; telephone: 202–267–8783.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rebecca Shelby, Central Service Center, Operations Support Group, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76137; telephone: 817–321–7740.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**History**

On December 2, 2014, the FAA published in the **Federal Register** a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to establish Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface at Clark County Airport, Clark, SD (79 FR 71365). Interested parties were invited to participate in this rulemaking effort by submitting written comments on the proposal to the FAA. No comments were received. Subsequent to publication, the FAA found that the state identifier for the airport was incorrectly written as ND, instead of SD under the airport designation. This action corrects the error, and also makes a minor adjustment to the geographic coordinates of the airport.

Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9Y dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

**Availability and Summary of Documents for Incorporation by Reference**

This document amends FAA Order 7400.9Y, airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014. FAA Order 7400.9Y is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this final rule. FAA Order 7400.9Y lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

**The Rule**

This action amends Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 71 by establishing Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.5-mile radius of Clark County Airport, Clark, SD, to accommodate new Standard Instrument Approach Procedures at the airport. This action enhances the safety and management of IFR operations for SIAPs at the airport. Additionally, this action amends the state identifier from ND to SD, and adjusts the geographical coordinates from lat. 48°28′48″ N., long. 99°14′11″ W., to lat. 44°53′42″ N., long. 097°42′38″ W., to be in concert with the FAA aeronautical database.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this regulation: (1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that only affects air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, does not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The FAA's authority to issue rules regarding aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the U.S. Code. Subtitle 1, Section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more

detail the scope of the agency's authority. This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart I, Section 40103. Under that section, the FAA is charged with prescribing regulations to assign the use of airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace. This regulation is within the scope of that authority as it establishes controlled airspace at Clark County Airport, Clark, SD.

**Environmental Review**

The FAA has determined that this action qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, ''Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures'' paragraph 311a. This airspace action is not expected to cause any potentially significant environmental impacts, and no extraordinary circumstances exist that warrant preparation of an environmental assessment.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71**

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

**Adoption of the Amendment**

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

## PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g);, 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

* * * * *

**AGL SD E5 Clark, SD [New]**

Clark County Airport, SD

(Lat. 44°53′42″ N., long. 097°42′38″ W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.5-mile radius of Clark County Airport.

Issued in Fort Worth, TX, on May 14, 2015.

**Robert W. Beck,**

*Manager, Operations Support Group, ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12979 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

### 15 CFR Part 922

**RIN 0648–BC26**

### Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries Regulations on Introduced Species; Notification of Effective Date

**AGENCY:** Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

**ACTION:** Notification of effective date.

**SUMMARY:** NOAA published a final rule to prohibit the introduction of introduced species into the state waters of Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay national marine sanctuaries, and to revise the corresponding sanctuary terms of designation on February 19, 2015 (80 FR 8778). Pursuant to Section 304(b) of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1434(b)) the final regulations take effect after 45 days of continuous session of Congress beginning on February 19, 2015. Through this notification, NOAA is announcing the regulations became effective on May 15, 2015.

**DATES:** The regulations published on February 19, 2015 (80 FR 8778) are effective as of May 15, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dave Lott, Regional Operations Coordinator, West Coast Region, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 99 Pacific Street, STE 100F, Monterey, CA 93940. (831) 647–1920.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 19, 2015, NOAA finalized regulations that prohibit the introduction of introduced species into the state waters of Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay national marine sanctuaries (80 FR 8778). Those regulations became effective on May 15, 2015.

Dated: May 14, 2015.

**Christopher C. Cartwright,**

*Associate Assistant Administrator for Management and CFO/CAO, Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12186 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–NK–P

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

### 22 CFR Part 126

**[Public Notice: 9153]**

**RIN 1400–AD77**

### Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Policy on Exports to the Republic of Fiji

**AGENCY:** Department of State.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of State is revising the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) to rescind the previous policy of denying the export of defense articles and defense services to Fiji.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on May 29, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. C. Edward Peartree, Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Policy, Department of State, telephone (202) 663–2792; email *DDTCPublicComments@state.gov*. ATTN: Regulatory Change, Exports to Fiji.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of State is amending the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) to update the defense trade policy regarding Fiji. On September 17, 2014, Fiji's acting government followed through on its longstanding commitment to hold democratic elections. A Multinational Observer Group of over 90 international observers, representing 14 countries including the United States, characterized the election as credible and having represented the will of the people of Fiji. The Department has determined that is in the best interests of U.S. foreign policy, national security, and human rights concerns to rescind the previous policy of denying the export of defense articles and defense services to Fiji.

**Regulatory Analysis and Notices**

*Administrative Procedure Act*

The Department of State is of the opinion that controlling the import and export of defense articles and services is a foreign affairs function of the United States government and that rules

implementing this function are exempt from sections 553 (rulemaking) and 554 (adjudications) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1). Since the Department is of the opinion that this rule is exempt from 5 U.S.C 553, it is the view of the Department that the provisions of Section 553(d) do not apply to this rulemaking. Therefore, this rule is effective upon publication. The Department also finds that, given the national security issues surrounding U.S. policy toward Fiji, notice and public procedure on this rule would be impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest; for this reason, the rule is effective upon publication.

*Regulatory Flexibility Act*

Since the Department is of the opinion that this rule is exempt from the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, there is no requirement for an analysis under the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

*Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995*

This rulemaking does not involve a mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any year and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

*Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996*

This rulemaking has been found not to be a major rule within the meaning of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996.

*Executive Orders 12372 and 13132*

This rulemaking will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, it is determined that this rulemaking does not have sufficient federalism implications to require consultations or warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities do not apply to this rulemaking.

*Executive Order 12866*

The Department is of the opinion that controlling the import and export of defense articles and services is a foreign affairs function of the United States government and that rules governing the conduct of this function are exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 12866. However, the Department has reviewed the rule to ensure its consistency with the regulatory philosophy and principles set forth in the Executive Order.

*Executive Order 13563*

The Department of State has considered this rule in light of Executive Order 13563, dated January 18, 2011, and affirms that this regulation is consistent with the guidance therein.

*Executive Order 12988*

The Department of State has reviewed this rulemaking in light of sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 to eliminate ambiguity, minimize litigation, establish clear legal standards, and reduce burden.

*Executive Order 13175*

The Department of State has determined that this rulemaking will not have tribal implications, will not impose substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments, and will not pre-empt tribal law. Accordingly, the provisions of Executive Order 13175 do not apply to this rulemaking.

*Paperwork Reduction Act*

This rule does not impose any new reporting or recordkeeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

**List of Subjects in 22 CFR Part 126**

Arms and munitions, Exports.

For the reasons set forth above, 22 CFR part 126 is amended as follows:

## PART 126—GENERAL POLICIES AND PROVISIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 126 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Secs. 2, 38, 40, 42, and 71, Pub. L. 90–629, 90 Stat. 744 (22 U.S.C. 2752, 2778, 2780, 2791, and 2797); 22 U.S.C. 2651a; 22 U.S.C. 287c; E.O. 12918, 59 FR 28205; 3 CFR, 1994 Comp., p. 899; Sec. 1225, Pub. L. 108–375; Sec. 7089, Pub. L. 111–117; Pub. L. 111–266; Sections 7045 and 7046, Pub. L. 112–74; E.O. 13637, 78 FR 16129.

■ 2. Section 126.1 is amended by removing and reserving paragraph (p) to read as follows:

**§ 126.1 Prohibited exports, imports, and sales to or from certain countries.**

* * * * *

(p) [Reserved]

* * * * *

**Rose E. Gottemoeller,**

*Under Secretary, Arms Control and International Security, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13017 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–25–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

## 27 CFR Part 447

**[Docket No. ATF–25F; AG Order No. 3531–2015]**

**RIN 1140–AA45**

## Importation of Arms, Ammunition and Defense Articles—Removal of Certain Defense Articles Currently on the U.S. Munitions Import List That No Longer Warrant Import Control Under the Arms Export Control Act (2011R–25P)

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice is finalizing without change an amendment to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives regulations to remove those defense articles currently on the United States Munitions Import List that ATF by delegation has determined no longer warrant import control under the Arms Export Control Act.

**DATES:** This rule is effective June 29, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George M. Fodor, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Enforcement Programs and Services, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice, 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington, DC 20226; telephone: (202) 648–7070.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (AECA), 22 U.S.C. 2778, as amended, authorizes the President, in furtherance of world peace and the security and foreign policy of the United States, to control the import and the export of defense articles and defense services. 22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1). The AECA also authorizes the President to designate those items that shall be considered defense articles and defense services for the purposes of section 38, and to promulgate regulations for the

import and export of such articles and services. *Id.*

Through Executive Order 13637 of March 8, 2013, the President delegated his AECA authority to the Secretary of State with respect to the export and temporary import of defense articles and defense services. 78 FR 16129. The International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), 22 CFR part 120 *et seq.,* implement the Secretary of State's delegated authority and list the defense articles and defense services regulated for export, re-export, and temporary import by the Secretary of State. The items so designated constitute the State Department's regulatory United States Munitions List (USML) of the ITAR.

Also through Executive Order 13637, the President delegated to the Attorney General the authority under the AECA to control the permanent import of defense articles and defense services. In exercising that authority, the Attorney General ''shall be guided by the views of the Secretary of State on matters affecting world peace, and the external security and foreign policy of the United States.'' *Id.* at 1(n)(ii). Controlling the import of defense articles and defense services furthers United States foreign policy and national security interests and is a foreign affairs function of the U.S. Government. That executive order also requires that the Attorney General obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and provide notice to the Secretary of Commerce for designations, including changes in designations, of defense articles and defense services subject to permanent import control. *Id.*

To distinguish the regulatory list of defense articles and defense services controlled by the Attorney General for permanent import from the regulatory list of defense articles and defense services controlled by the Secretary of State for export and temporary import, the list of defense articles and defense services controlled by the Attorney General for permanent import is designated as the United States Munitions Import List (USMIL). The regulations governing this list appear at 27 CFR part 447.

The Attorney General delegated administration of the import provisions of the AECA to the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), subject to the direction of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General. 28 CFR 0.130(a). ATF promulgated regulations that implement the provisions of section 38 of the AECA in 27 CFR part 447. With guidance from the Department of State and concurrence from the Departments of State and Defense pursuant to Executive Order 13637, ATF administers the list of items subject to import control under the USMIL, at 27 CFR 447.21.

## II. The President's Export Control Reform Initiative

In August 2009, the President directed a broad-based interagency review of the United States export control system in part to identify additional ways to enhance national security, better focus resources on protecting items for export that need to be protected, and provide clarity to make it easier for exporters to comply with regulations and for the United States Government to administer and enforce the regulations. As the result of a comprehensive review of export controls, it was determined that certain defense articles and defense services listed on the USML no longer warrant control for export purposes by the Secretary of State pursuant to the AECA. Those defense articles are being transferred to the Department of Commerce's Commerce Control List for export control under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*

In effecting the President's export control reform initiative, the export control reform interagency task force determined that removing unnecessary items from the USMIL would improve the United States import control system and enhance national security by focusing resources on imports that need to be protected. Accordingly, the task force requested ATF to identify those defense articles that no longer warrant control on the USMIL.

## III. Interim Final Rule and Comment

On March 27, 2014, ATF published an interim final rule with a request for comments (79 FR 17024–17029) entitled ''Importation of Arms, Ammunition and Defense Articles—Removal of Certain Defense Articles Currently on the U.S. Munitions Import List That No Longer Warrant Import Control Under the Arms Export Control Act.''

In developing this interim final rule, ATF reviewed the USMIL in accordance with Executive Order 13563, ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review,'' and the export control reform interagency task force request. The interim final rule removed from the USMIL those defense articles that ATF by delegation determined no longer warrant import control under the AECA.

The comment period for the interim final rule closed on June 25, 2014. ATF received one comment in response to the interim final rule. The commenter states that the rule creates additional legal requirements without providing measures to prevent crime. The Department believes that the rule in fact has the opposite effect, decreasing legal requirements by removing defense articles from the USMIL while enhancing national security by focusing resources on imports that need to be protected.

## IV. Final Rule

Upon review, the Department is issuing this final rule to implement the amendments to the regulations at 27 CFR 447.21 that were provided in the interim final rule published on March 27, 2014 (79 FR 17024–17029).

Pursuant to Executive Order 13637, the Department of State and the Department of Defense have concurred on this final rule amending the USMIL.

## V. Statutory and Executive Order Review

### *A. Executive Order 12866*

Because the amendments to 27 CFR part 447 involve a foreign affairs function of the United States, Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review,'' does not apply.

### *B. Executive Order 13132*

This regulation will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13132, ''Federalism,'' the Attorney General has determined that this regulation does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

### *C. Executive Order 12988*

This regulation meets the applicable standards set forth in subsections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, ''Civil Justice Reform.''

### *D. Administrative Procedure Act*

As reflected in 27 CFR 447.54, amendments made to 27 CFR part 447 are exempt from the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 because this part involves a foreign affairs function of the United States. *See* 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1). Accordingly, it is not necessary to issue this rule using the notice and public procedure set forth in 5 U.S.C. 553(b), and the requirement of a delayed effective date in 5 U.S.C. 553(d) does not apply. The Department of Justice nevertheless provided the public with an opportunity to participate in the regulatory process and to provide feedback pursuant to

Executive Order 13563, ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review.'' Only one comment was received as a result of this outreach. The commenter generally believes that the rule creates additional legal requirements without providing measures to prevent crime. The Department believes that the rule in fact has the opposite effect, decreasing legal requirements by removing defense articles from the USMIL while enhancing national security by focusing resources on imports that need to be protected.

*E. Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act relating to an initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis are not applicable to this final rule because the Department was not required to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking under 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law. *See* 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*

*F. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996*

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. 5 U.S.C. 804. This rule is not likely to result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

*G. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995*

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. *See* 2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*

*H. Paperwork Reduction Act*

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, do not apply to this rule because there are no reporting or recordkeeping requirements.

**Disclosure**

Copies of the interim final rule and the comment received are available for public inspection through the Federal e-Government portal, *http://www.regulations.gov,* or by appointment during normal business hours at the ATF Reading Room, Room 1E–062, 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington, DC 20226; telephone: (202) 648–8740.

**Drafting Information**

The author of this document is George M. Fodor, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Enforcement Programs and Services, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

**List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 447**

Administrative practice and procedure, Arms and munitions, Chemicals, Customs duties and inspection, Imports, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Scientific equipment, Seizures and forfeitures.

## PART 447—IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION AND DEFENSE ARTICLES

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed in the preamble, the interim final rule amending part 447 of title 27 of the Code of Federal Regulations, which was published at 79 FR 17024 on March 27, 2014, is adopted as a final rule, without change.

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Loretta E. Lynch,**

*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12992 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of the Attorney General

### 28 CFR Part 0

**[Docket No. OAG 147; AG Order No. 3532–2015]**

### Authority of the Assistant Attorneys General To Compromise or Close Civil Claims

**AGENCY:** Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule amends the Department's regulations to increase the authority currently delegated to the Assistant Attorneys General to compromise or close civil claims and to make certain technical corrections.

**DATES:** Effective May 29, 2015

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** August E. Flentje, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530; (202) 514–3309.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The current delegations of authority to compromise or close civil claims are contained in 28 CFR part 0, subpart Y, §§ 0.160–0.169. *See* 60 FR 15675 (Mar. 27, 1995). This final rule increases the monetary thresholds for the exercise of this authority by the Assistant Attorneys General and increases the redelegation authority to the United States Attorneys with respect to accepting offers of compromise for affirmative claims.

This final rule amends 28 CFR 0.160(a)(1) to increase the authority of the Assistant Attorneys General to compromise a civil claim asserted by the United States where the proposed settlement is within $10 million or 15 percent of the original claim (up from the current threshold of $2 million or 15 percent of the original claim). As provided in § 0.164, this change to § 0.160(a)(1) also means that the Assistant Attorneys General will have authority to close affirmative civil matters within the same new limits.

The final rule adds a new paragraph § 0.160(a)(2) to allow the Assistant Attorneys General to accept compromises in affirmative civil cases independent of the $10 million cap in the limited circumstance where a qualified financial expert has reviewed the defendant's finances and has determined that the defendant likely does not have the ability to pay more than the proposed compromise offer. This would obviate the need to obtain higher level approval when claims are being compromised simply based on the defendant's financial condition rather than an analysis of the legal or factual merits of the claim. To clarify that new § 0.160(a)(2) applies to all cases within the authority of the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, including cases brought under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.,* the final rule also amends § 0.160(c)(2) by removing language similar to new § 0.160(a)(2).

In addition, the final rule also increases the authority for the Assistant Attorneys General to accept offers in compromise of claims asserted against the United States of up to $4 million (up from the current threshold of $2 million). *See* new § 0.160(a)(3) (currently § 0.160(a)(2)).

The final rule also amends § 0.168(d) to allow a delegation of authority to the United States Attorneys to compromise claims asserted by the United States for up to $10 million (up from a claim of $5 million where the settlement difference does not exceed $1 million). Citations to subsections of § 0.160 in §§ 0.162 and 0.168 also have been revised in light of the changes to § 0.160.

Finally, this final rule would update the agency reference in § 0.169(b) defining the term ''gross amount of the original claim'' for purposes of any civil claim brought under section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

**Regulatory Certifications**

*Administrative Procedure Act*

This rule relates to a matter of agency management or personnel and is a rule of agency organization, procedure, and practice. As such, this rule is exempt from the usual requirements of prior notice and comment and a 30-day delay in effective date. *See* 5 U.S.C. 553.

*Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Attorney General, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), has reviewed this rule, and by approving it, certifies that it will not have an impact on a substantial number of small entities because it pertains to personnel and administrative matters affecting the Department. Further, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required for this final rule because the Department was not required to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking for this matter.

*Executive Orders 12866 and 13563*

This rule has been drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review,'' section l(b), Principles of Regulation, and with Executive Order 13563, ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review.'' This final rule is ''limited to agency organization, management, or personnel matters'' and thus is not a ''rule'' as described by Executive Order 12866, section 3(d)(3) and, therefore, is not a ''regulation'' or ''rule'' as defined by that Executive Order.

*Executive Order 12988*

This regulation meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, ''Civil Justice Reform.''

*Executive Order 13132*

This rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, ''Federalism,'' the Department has determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

*Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995*

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more (adjusted for inflation) in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*

*Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996*

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. 804. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

*Congressional Review Act*

This action pertains to agency management, personnel, and organization and does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. Accordingly, it is not a ''rule'' for purposes of the reporting requirement of 5 U.S.C. 801.

**List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 0**

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Government employees, Organization and functions (Government agencies), Privacy, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Whistleblowing.

Accordingly, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Attorney General, including 5 U.S.C. 301 and 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, and for the reasons set forth in the preamble, part 0 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

## PART 0—ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 0 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 515–19.

■ 2. In § 0.160, revise paragraphs (a), (c) introductory text, and (c)(2) to read as follows:

**§ 0.160 Offers that may be accepted by Assistant Attorneys General.**

(a) Subject to the limitations set forth in paragraph (d) of this section, Assistant Attorneys General are authorized, with respect to matters assigned to their respective divisions, to:

(1) Accept offers in compromise of claims asserted by the United States in all cases in which the difference between the gross amount of the original claim and the proposed settlement does not exceed $10,000,000 or 15 percent of the original claim, whichever is greater;

(2) Accept offers in compromise of claims asserted by the United States in all cases in which a qualified financial expert has determined that the offer in compromise is likely the maximum that the offeror has the ability to pay;

(3) Accept offers in compromise of, or settle administratively, claims against the United States in all cases in which the principal amount of the proposed settlement does not exceed $4,000,000; and

(4) Accept offers in compromise in all nonmonetary cases.

* * * * *

(c) Subject to the limitations set forth in paragraph (d) of this section, the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, is further authorized to approve settlements under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.,* regardless of the amount of the proposed settlement, with:

* * * * *

(2) Parties whose responsibility can be equitably allocated and are paying at least the allocated amount.

* * * * *

**§ 0.162 [Amended]**

■ 3. Amend § 0.162 by removing the reference to ''§ 0.160(c)(2)'' and adding in its place ''§ 0.160(d)(2)''.

■ 4. Amend § 0.168:

■ a. In paragraph (a) by removing the reference to ''§§ 0.160(a) and (b)'' and adding in its place ''§§ 0.160(a), (b), and (c)''; and

■ b. By revising paragraphs (d) introductory text and (d)(1).

The revisions read as follows:

**§ 0.168 Redelegation by Assistant Attorneys General.**

* * * * *

(d) Subject to the limitations set forth in § 0.160(d) and paragraph (a) of this section, redelegations by the Assistant Attorneys General to United States Attorneys may include the authority to:

(1) Accept offers in compromise of claims asserted by the United States in all cases in which the gross amount of

the original claim does not exceed $10,000,000; and

* * * * *

**§ 0.169 [Amended]**

■ 5. Amend paragraph (b) of § 0.169 by removing the words ''Customs Service's'' and adding in their place the words ''United States Customs and Border Protection's''.

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Loretta E. Lynch,**

*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12991 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–12–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Part 180

**[EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0230; FRL–9927–11]**

## Metconazole; Pesticide Tolerances

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of metconazole in or on multiple commodities which are identified and discussed later in this document. Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR–4) requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). In addition, this regulation removes established tolerances for certain commodities/groups superseded by this action, and deletes expired tolerances.

**DATES:** This regulation is effective May 29, 2015. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before July 28, 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–2014–0230, 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 EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Publishing 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–2014–0230 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 July 28, 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–2014–0230, 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. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of May 23, 2014 (79 FR 29729) (FRL–9910–29), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 4E8244) by Interregional Research Project Number 4 (IR–4), 500 College Road East, Suite 201 W, Princeton, NJ 08540. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.617 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the fungicide metconazole, 5-[(4-chlorophenyl)methyl]-2,-2-dimethyl-1-(1*H*-1,2,4-triazol-1-ylmethyl)-cyclopentanol, in or on fruit, stone, group 12–12 at 0.2 parts per million (ppm); nut, tree, group 14–12 at 0.04 ppm; pea and bean, dried shelled, except soybean, subgroup 6C at 0.15 ppm; rapeseed subgroup 20A at 0.08 ppm; and sunflower subgroup 20B at 0.9 ppm. The petition also requested that current established tolerances for residues of the fungicide metconazole in or on canola seed at 0.04 ppm; fruit, stone, group 12 at 0.20 ppm; pistachio at 0.04 ppm; and nut, tree, group 14 at 0.04 ppm be removed once the proposed tolerances were approved. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Valent U.S.A Corporation, the registrant, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments were received on the notice of filing. EPA's

response to these comments is discussed in Unit IV.C.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA has determined the tolerance for the sunflower subgroup 20B should be 0.7 ppm. The reason for this change is explained in Unit IV.D.

## III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish 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. . . .''

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), 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 metconazole including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with metconazole follows.

### *A. Toxicological Profile*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its 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. Metconazole affects the liver, kidney, spleen, and various blood parameters at various dose levels across species. Specifically, in the mouse, rat, and dog, liver toxicity was seen after oral exposure in both subchronic and chronic exposures. Metconazole produces liver tumors in mice through a mitogenic mode of action (*i.e.,* non-genotoxic), and in the absence of a genotoxic mode of action, metconazole is classified as ''not likely to be carcinogenic to humans'' at levels that do not cause mitogenesis.

Oral studies revealed critical effects of metconazole on body weight and blood erythrocyte and/or platelet parameters in the mouse, rat, dog and/or rabbit. Hyperplasia and increased weight were observed in the spleen in the mouse, rat, and dog at dose levels where liver affects were also observed. Lenticular degeneration (cataracts) were observed at the highest dose tested 114 milligrams/kilogram/day (mg/kg/day) in dogs. In addition, there was evidence that at high dietary levels metconazole is a gastrointestinal irritant in the dog.

In rats and rabbits developmental studies displayed some evidence of developmental effects but largely at dose levels that are maternally toxic. There was no quantitative or qualitative susceptibility in rabbit fetuses after *in utero* exposure to metconazole. In prenatal developmental toxicity studies in rabbits there was an increase in post-implantation loss and reduced fetal body weights at the same dose level that caused maternal toxicity. In rats, the developmental study showed skeletal variations at the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) in the absence of maternal toxicity. The 2-generation reproduction studies revealed offspring and parental toxicity only at the highest tested dose. There is low concern for quantitative susceptibility (skeletal variations in the absence of maternal toxicity in the developmental study) because the endpoint and point of departure are based on the effects in the fetus, for which there is a clear NOAEL. Therefore, it is concluded that there are no residual uncertainties for pre- and/or post-natal toxicity.

Metconazole did not demonstrate neurotoxicity in the subchronic neurotoxicity study, or any of the other studies in the toxicity data base. The requirement for an acute neurotoxicity study has been waived because of the absence of neurotoxic signs throughout the database, even at the highest dose levels tested.

There was no evidence of immunotoxicity at dose levels that produced systemic toxicity. No immunotoxic effects are evident for metconazole at dose levels as high as 52 (mg/kg/day) in rats, which is 12 times higher than the chronic dietary point of departure (4.3 mg/kg/day).

EPA has classified metconazole as: ''Not Likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans'' based on convincing evidence demonstrating the following: (1) That a non-genotoxic mode of action for liver tumors was established in the mouse; (2) that the carcinogenic effects were not likely to occur below a defined dose that does not cause mitogenesis based on bioassays in the rat and the mouse; and (3) a lack of *in vitro* or *in vivo* mutagenicity. The established chronic RfD, which is below the level at which mitogenesis occurred in the rat and mouse, is deemed to be protective of mitogenesis/carcinogenesis, and no quantification is required.

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by metconazole as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the LOAEL from the toxicity studies can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in document at ''Metconazole. Human Health Risk Assessment for a Section 3 Registration of New Uses on Dry Shelled Pea and Beans (Except Soybean) Crop Subgroup 6C and Sunflower Crop Subgroup 20B; Crop Group Expansion to Rapeseed Subgroup 20A; and Crop Group Conversion to Fruit, Stone, Group 12–12; and Nut, Tree, Group 14–12'' in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0230.

### *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 no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL). 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.*

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF TOXICOLOGICAL DOSES AND ENDPOINTS FOR METCONAZOLE FOR USE IN HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

| Exposure/scenario | Point of departure and uncertainty/ safety factors | RfD, PAD, LOC for risk assessment | Study and toxicological effects |
|---|---|---|---|
| Acute dietary (Females 13–50 years of age). | NOAEL = 12 mg/kg/ day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF = 1x | Acute RfD = 0.12 mg/kg/day.<br>aPAD = 0.12 mg/kg/ day. | Developmental toxicity in rats:<br>LOAEL = 30 mg/kg/day based on increases in skeletal variations. At 75 mg/kg/day (the next higher dose level) increased incidence of post-implantation loss, hydrocephaly and visceral anomaliea (cranial hemorrhage, dilated renal pelvis, dilated ureters, and displaced testis) were reported. |
| Acute dietary (General population including infants and children). | An appropriate dose/endpoint attributable to a single dose was not observed in the available oral toxicity studies reviewed. | | |
| Chronic dietary (All populations) | NOAEL= 4.3 mg/kg/ day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF = 1x | Chronic RfD = 0.04 mg/kg/day.<br>cPAD = 0.04 mg/kg/ day. | Chronic oral toxicity study in rats:<br>LOAEL = 13.1 mg/kg/day based on increased liver (M) weights and associated hepatocellular lipid vacuolation (M) and centrilobular hypertrophy (M). Similar effects were observed in females at 54 mg/kg/day, plus increased spleen weight. |
| Incidental oral short-term (1 to 30 days). | NOAEL= 9.1 mg/kg/ day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF = 1x | Residential LOC for MOE = 100. | 28-Day oral toxicity study in rats:<br>LOAEL = 90.5 mg/kg/day based on decreased body weight (M), increased liver and kidney weight and hepatocellular hypertrophy and vacuolation (M/F). |
| Dermal short-term (1 to 30 days). | Quantification of dermal risk is not required due to lack of systemic or dermal toxicity at the Limit Dose in a 21-day dermal toxicity study in the rat, the lack of neurotoxicity, and the lack of developmental and/or reproductive toxicity in the absence of parental effects, which were not looked for in the dermal toxicity. | | |
| Inhalation short-term (1 to 30 days). | Inhalation (or oral) study NOAEL= 9.1 mg/kg/day (inhalation absorption rate = 100%).<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF = 10x ($UF_{DB}$) | Residential LOC for MOE = 1000. | 28-Day oral toxicity study in rats:<br>LOAEL = 90.5 mg/kg/day based on decreased body weight (M), increased liver and kidney weight and hepatocellular hypertrophy and vacuolation (M/F). |
| Cancer (Oral, dermal, inhalation). | Classification: "Not likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans". | | |

FQPA SF = Food Quality Protection Act Safety Factor. LOAEL = lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level. LOC = level of concern. mg/kg/day= milligram/kilogram/day. MOE = margin of exposure. NOAEL = no-observed-adverse-effect-level. PAD = population adjusted dose (a = acute, c = chronic). RfD = reference dose. UF = uncertainty factor. $UF_A$ = extrapolation from animal to human (interspecies). $UF_{DB}$ = to account for the absence of data or other data deficiency. $UF_H$ = potential variation in sensitivity among members of the human population (intraspecies).

*C. Exposure Assessment*

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to metconazole, EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing metconazole tolerances in 40 CFR 180.617. EPA assessed dietary exposures from metconazole in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1-day or single exposure.

No such effects were identified in the toxicological studies for metconazole for the general population including infants and children; therefore, a quantitative acute dietary exposure assessment is unnecessary for the general population.

Such effects were identified for metconazole for females 13–49 years old. In estimating acute dietary exposure, EPA used food consumption information from the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model with the Food Commodity Intake Database (DEEM–FCID). This software incorporates 2003–2008 food consumption data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA). As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed 100 percent crop treated (PCT) and tolerance-level residues for most crops. For cereal grains and livestock commodities, maximum residue levels of metabolites from field trials were added to the metconazole tolerance levels.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment, EPA used food consumption information from the DEEM–FCID. This software incorporates 2003–2008 food consumption data from the NHANES/WWEIA. As to residue levels in food, EPA assumed 100 PCT and tolerance-level residues for most crops. For cereal grains and livestock commodities, maximum residue levels of metabolites from field trials were added to the metconazole tolerance levels.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that metconazole does not pose a cancer risk to humans. Therefore, a dietary exposure assessment for the

purpose of assessing cancer risk is unnecessary.

iv. *Anticipated residue and percent crop treated (PCT) information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue and/or PCT information in the dietary assessment for metconazole. Tolerance-level and metabolite residues and/or 100 PCT were assumed for all food commodities.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening-level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for metconazole in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of metconazole. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at *http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/index.htm.*

Based on the Tier I Pesticide Root Zone Model-Ground Water (PRZM–GW), the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWC) of metconazole are estimated to be 51.8 parts per billion (ppb) for acute exposures and not applicable for chronic (non-cancer) exposures. Based on the Tier II Surface Water Concentration Calculator (SWCC) model, the EDWCs are estimated to be 49.6 ppb for acute exposures and 43.9 ppb for chronic (non-cancer) exposures.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model. For acute dietary risk assessment for females, the water concentration value of 51.8 ppb-was used to assess the contribution to drinking water. For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 43.9 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* for lawn and garden pest control, indoor pest control, termiticides, and flea and tick control on pets).

Metconazole is currently registered for the following uses that could result in residential exposures: Turf and ornamentals. EPA assessed residential exposure using the following assumptions: For residential handler exposure, the Agency assumed that residential use will result in short-term (1–30 days) dermal and inhalation exposures. Because there was no dermal endpoint chosen for metconazole, residential handler risk from exposure to metconazole was assessed for the inhalation route only.

The Agency assumed that post-application exposure in residential settings is short-term in duration only. No dermal endpoint was chosen for metconazole; therefore a dermal post-application risk assessment was not conducted for adults or children. Residential post-application inhalation exposure in outdoor settings is considered negligible. The scenarios evaluated were short-term post-application incidental oral exposure to children 1 to <2 years old from granular and water dispersible granular metconazole formulations.

In the previous tolerance action for metconazole which published in the **Federal Register** of August 17, 2011 (76 FR 50898) (FRL–8882–7), the Agency also assessed intermediate-term exposures. However, in 2012 the EPA revised the residential standard operating procedures (SOPs) and based on these revisions has determined that intermediate-exposures are not expected. Further information regarding EPA standard assumptions and generic inputs for residential exposures may be found at *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/science/residential-exposure-sop.html.*

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.''

Metconazole is a member of the triazole-containing class of pesticides, the conazoles. Although conazoles act similarly in plants by inhibiting ergosterol biosynthesis, there is not necessarily a relationship between their pesticidal activity and their mechanism of toxicity in mammals. Structural similarities do not constitute a common mechanism of toxicity. Evidence is needed to establish that the chemicals operate by the same, or essentially the same, sequence of major biochemical events (EPA, 2002). In conazoles, however, a variable pattern of toxicological responses is found; some are hepatotoxic and hepatocarcinogenic in mice. Some induce thyroid tumors in rats. Some induce developmental, reproductive, and neurological effects in rodents. Furthermore, the conazoles produce a diverse range of biochemical events, including altered cholesterol levels, stress responses, and altered DNA methylation. It is not clearly understood whether these biochemical events are directly connected to their toxicological outcomes. Thus, there is currently no conclusive data to indicate that conazoles share common mechanisms of toxicity and EPA is not following a cumulative risk approach based on a common mechanism of toxicity for the conazoles. For information regarding EPA's procedures for cumulating effects from substances found to have a common mechanism of toxicity, see EPA's Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative.*

Metconazole is a triazole-derived pesticide. This class of compounds can form the common metabolite 1,2,4-triazole and two triazole conjugates (triazolylalanine and triazolylacetic acid). To support existing tolerances and to establish new tolerances for triazole-derivative pesticides, including metconazole, EPA conducted a human health risk assessment for exposure to 1,2,4-triazole, triazolylalanine, and triazolylacetic acid resulting from the use of all current and pending uses of any triazole-derived fungicide. The risk assessment is a highly conservative, screening-level evaluation in terms of hazards associated with common metabolites (*e.g.,* use of a maximum combination of uncertainty factors) and potential dietary and non-dietary exposures (*i.e.,* high end estimates of both dietary and non-dietary exposures). In addition, the Agency retained the additional 10X FQPA safety factor for the protection of infants and children. The assessment includes evaluations of risks for various subgroups, including those comprised of infants and children. The Agency's complete risk assessment is found in the propiconazole reregistration docket at *http://www.regulations.gov,* Docket Identification (ID) Number EPA–HQ–OPP–2005–0497.

An updated dietary exposure and risk analysis for the common triazole metabolites 1,2,4-triazole (T), triazolylalanine (TA), triazolylacetic acid (TAA), and triazolylpyruvic acid (TP) was conducted in October 2013, in association with a registration request for several other triazole fungicides. That analysis concluded that risk estimates were below the Agency's level of concern for all population groups. The proposed new uses of metconazole did not result in an increase in the dietary exposure estimates for free triazole or conjugated triazoles. Therefore, this last dietary exposure analysis for free triazole or conjugated triazoles did not need to be updated. A copy of this assessment may be found in the docket for this action at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

*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 FQPA Safety Factor (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.* For analyzing the developmental and reproductive impact and toxicity of metconazole, two developmental studies in the rat, two developmental studies in the rabbit, and one multi-generation reproduction study were used. There was evidence of quantitative susceptibility in one developmental rat study, but not in the four other studies. Concern is for susceptibility low since susceptibility was not corroborated by the other studies; concern is low also because the NOAELs are well defined, and the dose/endpoint is used for acute dietary risk assessment for the sensitive population.

3. *Conclusion.* 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, except for inhalation exposure scenarios for which the Agency is retaining the 10X. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for metconazole is complete, except for the subchronic inhalation study. A 10x uncertainty factor has been retained for purposes of determining the inhalation endpoint to account for the absence of this data. However, only adult handlers are expected to be exposed via the inhalation route.

ii. There is no indication that metconazole is a neurotoxic chemical and there is no need for a developmental neurotoxicity study or additional UFs to account for neurotoxicity.

iii. Although one developmental rat study showed indications of quantitative susceptibility, EPA has determined that additional safety factors are not necessary to account for any potential risk because that susceptibility was not corroborated by the other developmental and reproduction studies and the developmental NOAEL for the study that showed quantitative susceptibility is well defined. Moreover, the dose/endpoint identified in the rat developmental study is being used for acute dietary risk assessment for the sensitive population.

iv. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100 PCT and tolerance-level residues for most crops. For cereal grains and livestock commodities, maximum residue levels of metabolites from field trials were added to the metconazole tolerance levels. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to metconazole in drinking water. EPA used similarly conservative assumptions to assess post application exposure of children as well as incidental oral exposure of children 1 to <2 years old. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by metconazole.

*E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety*

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.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary exposure from food and water to metconazole will occupy 4.6% of the aPAD for females 13 to 49 years old, the only population subgroup of potential concern.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to metconazole from food and water will utilize 14% of the cPAD for children 1–2 years old the population group receiving the greatest exposure. Based on the explanation in Unit III.C.3., regarding residential use patterns, chronic residential exposure to residues of metconazole 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). Metconazole is currently 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 metconazole.

Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for short-term exposures, EPA has concluded the combined short-term food, water, and residential exposures result in an aggregate MOEs of 630 for children 1 to <2 years old, which is not of concern. For adults, oral dietary and inhalation risk estimates were combined using the total aggregated risk index (ARI) methodology since the levels of concern (LOC) for oral dietary exposure (LOC = 100) and inhalation exposure (LOC = 1,000) are different. The short-term aggregate ARI for adults is 5.3, which is greater than 1 and is therefore not of concern.

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). An intermediate-term adverse effect was identified; however, metconazole is not registered for any use patterns that would result in intermediate-term residential exposure. Intermediate-term risk is assessed based on intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic dietary exposure. Because there is no intermediate-term residential exposure and chronic dietary exposure has already been assessed under the appropriately protective cPAD (which is at least as protective as the POD used to assess intermediate-term risk), no further assessment of intermediate-term risk is necessary, and EPA relies on the chronic dietary risk assessment for evaluating intermediate-term risk for metconazole.

5. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* As discussed in Unit III.A., metconazole 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 metconazole residues.

## IV. Other Considerations

*A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology*

Adequate enforcement methodology (Nitrogen-Phosphorus-Detection (GC/NPD) method, Valent Method RM–41C–1–1) is available to enforce the tolerance expression.

The method may be requested from: Chief, Analytical Chemistry Branch, Environmental Science Center, 701 Mapes Rd., Ft. Meade, MD 20755–5350; telephone number: (410) 305–2905;

email address: *residuemethods@epa.gov.*

*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 Nations 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 metconazole.

*C. Response to Comments*

EPA received two comments to the Notice of Filling. One comment concerned a chemical other than metconazole and therefore is not relevant to this action. The other was a request to reconsider ''loosening tolerances'' for several pesticide petitions, including for metconazole. The commenter points to an American Academy of Pediatrics Policy statement regarding pesticide exposure in children, a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report on human exposure to environmental chemicals, and a President's Cancer Panel regarding reducing environmental cancer risks in supporting the request to reconsider the tolerance amendments proposed for metconazole.

The Agency understands the commenter's concerns and recognizes that some individuals believe that certain pesticide chemicals should not be permitted in our food, or that pesticide tolerances should be ''significantly tightened'' as the commenter notes. However, the existing legal framework provided by section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) states that tolerances may be set when EPA determines that aggregate exposure to that pesticide is safe, *i.e.,* that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. When making this determination, EPA considers the toxicity, including any potential carcinogenicity, of the pesticide and all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information. EPA also gives special consideration to the potential susceptibility and exposures of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue when making this determination. For metconazole, the Agency has considered all the available data, including all available data concerning the potential for carcinogenicity of metconazole and its metabolites, and concluded after conducting a risk assessment, that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate human exposure to metconazole and that, accordingly, the metconazole tolerances are safe.

*D. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances*

The petitioner requested a tolerance on the sunflower subgroup 20B at 0.9 ppm. EPA is establishing a tolerance for that subgroup at 0.7 ppm based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) tolerance calculation procedures.

## V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of metconazole, 5-[(4-chlorophenyl)-methyl]-2,-2-dimethyl-1-(1H–1,2,4-triazol-1-ylmethyl)-cyclopentanol, in or on fruit, stone, group 12–12 at 0.2 ppm; nut, tree, group 14–12 at 0.04 ppm; pea and bean, dried shelled, except soybean, subgroup 6C at 0.15 ppm; rapeseed subgroup 20A at 0.08 ppm; and sunflower subgroup 20B at 0.7 ppm. Additionally, the existing tolerances for canola seed; fruit, stone, group 12; nut, tree, group 14; and pistachio are being removed since they are superseded by this action.

## VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes tolerances 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 tolerances 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).

## VII. 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: May 19, 2015.

**Daniel J. Rosenblatt,**

*Acting 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 § 180.617:

■ a. Remove the entries in the table in paragraph (a) for ''Canola seed,'' ''Fruit, stone, group 12,'' ''Nut, tree, group 14,'' and ''Pistachio;''

■ b. Add alphabetically the entries for ''Fruit, stone, group 12–12'', ''Nut, tree, group 14–12'', ''Pea and bean, dried shelled, except soybean, subgroup 6C'', ''Rapeseed subgroup 20A'', and ''Sunflower subgroup 20B'' to the table in paragraph (a).

■ c. Revise paragraph (b).

The additions and revision read as follows:

**§ 180.617 Metconazole; tolerance for residues.**

(a) * * *

| Commodity | Parts per million |
|---|---|
| * * * * * | |
| Fruit, stone, group 12–12 ..... | 0.2 |
| * * * * * | |
| Nut, tree, group 14–12 ..... | 0.04 |
| * * * * * | |
| Pea and bean, dried shelled, except soybean, subgroup 6C ..... | 0.15 |
| * * * * * | |
| Rapeseed subgroup 20A ..... | 0.08 |
| * * * * * | |
| Sunflower subgroup 20B ..... | 0.7 |
| * * * * * | |

(b) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* [Reserved]

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2015–12936 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Part 180

**[EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0303; FRL–9927–75]**

## Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerances

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of mesotrione in or on almond, hulls, fruit, citrus, group 10–10; fruit, pome, group 11–10; fruit, stone, group 12–12; and nut, tree, group 14–12. Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** This regulation is effective May 29, 2015. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before July 28, 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–2014–0303, 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 EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Publishing 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–2014–0303 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 July 28, 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–2014–0303, 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. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of September 2, 2014 (79 FR 44729) (FRL–9911–67), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP 4F8240) by Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC, P.O. Box 18300, Greensboro, NC 27419. The petition requested that 40 CFR part 180.571 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the herbicide, mesotrione, in or on citrus fruit, crop group 10–10 at 0.01 parts per million (ppm); pome fruit, crop group 11–10 at 0.01 ppm; stone fruit, crop group 12–12 at 0.01 ppm; tree nuts, crop group 14–12 at 0.01 ppm; and almond hulls at 0.015 ppm. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC the registrant, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments were received in response to the notice of filing. EPA's response to these comments is discussed in Unit IV.C.

Based upon review of the data supporting the petition, EPA has revised the tolerance for residues of mesotrione in or on fruit, citrus, group 10–10 at 0.01 ppm; fruit, pome, group 11–10 at 0.01 ppm; fruit, stone, group 12–12 at 0.01 ppm; nut, tree, group 14–12 at 0.01 ppm; and almond, hulls at 0.02 ppm. The reason for these changes are explained in Unit IV.D.

## III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish 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. . . .''

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), 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 mesotrione including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with mesotrione follows.

### *A. Toxicological Profile*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its 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.

In subchronic and chronic oral studies in the rat, mouse, and dog, mesotrione produced ocular (ocular discharge and corneal abnormalities and lesions), kidney (increased organ weights), and liver effects (increased organ weights and hepatocyte fat vacuolation), which are consistent with the mammalian toxicity profile for hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase (HPPD) inhibitors caused by high tyrosine levels in the blood. Body-weight decrements and decreased food consumption were also noted in mice and rats in multiple studies. Even though the rat was found to be the most sensitive species for these effects, the mouse was identified as a more appropriate model for assessing human risk due to similar activity in mice and humans of an enzyme involved in tyrosine catabolism. There was evidence of increased quantitative susceptibility of rats and mice in the developmental and reproduction toxicity studies. Offspring effects in the developmental toxicity studies were evidenced by delayed ossification and ancillary ribs and vertebrae at doses below or in the absence of maternal toxicity in both species. In the reproduction toxicity studies, tyrosinemia and ocular discharge were observed in offspring at doses below those for parental toxicity, which was evidenced by increased organ weights (liver in the rat and kidney in the mouse) and tyrosinemia.

Mesotrione was classified as having low acute toxicity via the oral, dermal, and inhalation routes (Toxicity Categories III or IV). It is classified as a mild eye irritant, but it is not a dermal sensitizer or dermal irritant.

There was no evidence of neurotoxicity, mutagenicity, carcinogenic potential, or immunotoxicity in relevant studies. Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by mesotrione as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in document titled, ''Mesotrione. Human Health Risk Assessment in Support of the Section 3 Request for Use of Mesotrione on Pome Fruit, Stone Fruit, Citrus, and Tree Nuts'', on page 26–29 in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0303.

### *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 no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL). 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.*

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for mesotrione used for human risk assessment is shown in Table 1 of this unit.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF TOXICOLOGICAL DOSES AND ENDPOINTS FOR MESOTRIONE FOR USE IN HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

| Exposure/scenario | Point of departure and uncertainty/safety factors | RfD, PAD, LOC for risk assessment | Study and toxicological effects |
|---|---|---|---|
| Acute dietary (all populations) .. | Not applicable ..... | Not applicable ..... | No adverse effects attributable to a single dose were observed. As a result, no hazard was identified and an endpoint was not selected. |
| Chronic dietary (all populations) | LOAEL = 2.1 mg/kg/day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF/$UF_L$ = 3x | Chronic RfD = 0.007 mg/kg/day.<br>cPAD = 0.007 mg/kg/day. | Reproduction study (mouse)<br>LOAEL = 2.1/2.4 mg/kg/day (M/F) based on tyrosinemia and ocular discharge. NOAEL not established. |
| Incidental oral short-term (1 to 30 days) and intermediate-term (1 to 6 months). | LOAEL = 2.1 mg/kg/day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF/$UF_L$ = 3x | LOC for MOE = 300 | Reproduction study (mouse)<br>LOAEL = 2.1/2.4 mg/kg/day (M/F) based on tyrosinemia and ocular discharge. NOAEL not established. |
| Dermal short-term (1 to 30 days), intermediate-term (1 to six months), and long-term (>6 months). | LOAEL = 2.1 mg/kg/day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF/$UF_L$ = 3x | LOC for MOE = 300 | Reproduction study (mouse)<br>LOAEL = 2.1/2.4 mg/kg/day (M/F) based on tyrosinemia and ocular discharge. NOAEL not established. |
| Inhalation short-term (1 to 30 days), intermediate-term (1 to 6 months), and long-term (>6 months). | LOAEL = 2.1 mg/kg/day.<br>$UF_A$ = 10x<br>$UF_H$ = 10x<br>FQPA SF/$UF_L$ = 3x | LOC for MOE = 300 | Reproduction study (mouse)<br>LOAEL = 2.1/2.4 mg/kg/day (M/F) based on tyrosinemia and ocular discharge. NOAEL not established. |
| Cancer (oral, dermal, inhalation). | Classified as "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans" based upon lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in rats and mice. | | |

FQPA SF = Food Quality Protection Act Safety Factor. LOAEL = lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level. LOC = level of concern. mg/kg/day = milligram/kilogram/day. MOE = margin of exposure. NOAEL = no-observed-adverse-effect-level. PAD = population adjusted dose (a = acute, c = chronic). $UF_A$ = extrapolation from animal to human (interspecies). $UF_H$ = potential variation in sensitivity among members of the human population (intraspecies). $UF_L$ = use of a LOAEL to extrapolate a NOAEL.

*C. Exposure Assessment*

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to mesotrione, EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing mesotrione tolerances in 40 CFR 180.571. EPA assessed dietary exposures from mesotrione in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1-day or single exposure.

No such effects were identified in the toxicological studies for mesotrione; therefore, a quantitative acute dietary exposure assessment is unnecessary.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the food consumption data from the USDA National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America 2003–2008. The chronic analysis assumed 100% crop treated (CT), Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (DEEM 7.81) default processing factors, and tolerance-level residues for all foods. Drinking water was incorporated directly into the dietary assessment using the groundwater concentration and the PRZM–GW model. The chronic dietary risk assessment shows that the chronic dietary risk estimates are not of concern (*i.e.,* <100% chronic population-adjusted dose (cPAD)). The chronic dietary risk estimate for the highest exposed population subgroup, all infants (<1 year old), is 17% of the cPAD.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that mesotrione does not pose a cancer risk to humans. Therefore, a dietary exposure assessment for the purpose of assessing cancer risk is unnecessary.

iv. *Anticipated residue and percent crop treated (PCT) information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue and/or PCT information in the dietary assessment for mesotrione. Tolerance level residues and/or 100% CT were assumed for all food commodities.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for mesotrione in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of mesotrione. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at *http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/index.htm.*

Based on the Pesticide Root Zone Model/Exposure Analysis Modeling System (PRZM/EXAMS) for surface

water and with Screening Concentration in Ground Water (SCI–GROW) and Pesticide Root Zone Model Ground Water (PRZM GW) for ground water, the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of mesiotrione for chronic exposures for non-cancer assessments are estimated to be 5.1 ppb (1—10 year average) and 2.2 (30-year average) for surface water and 18.4 ppb for ground water.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model.

For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 18.4 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* for lawn and garden pest control, indoor pest control, termiticides, and flea and tick control on pets).

Mesotrione is currently registered for the following uses that could result in residential exposures: Golf course turf, home lawns, and recreational turf. Both liquid and granular formulations are registered, resulting in potential residential handler (dermal and inhalation) and post-application (dermal and incidental oral) exposures. Residential handler (dermal plus inhalation) exposures were assessed for adults using various handheld equipment. Post-application dermal exposure was assessed for adults, as well as children 11 to <16 years old, children 6 to <11 years old, and children 1 to <2 years old performing various activities on turf. For children 1 to <2 years old, incidental oral (hand-to-mouth) post-application exposure was also assessed. These uses were assessed using the revised 2012 Residential Standard Operating Procedures. Further information regarding EPA standard assumptions and generic inputs for residential exposures may be found at *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/trac/science/trac6a05.pdf.*

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.''

There are marked differences among species in the ocular toxicity associated with inhibition of HPPD. Ocular effects following treatment with HPPD inhibitor herbicides are seen in the rat but not in the mouse. Monkeys also seem to be recalcitrant to the ocular toxicity induced by HPPD inhibition. One explanation for this species-specific response in ocular opacity may be related to species differences in the clearance of tyrosine. A metabolic pathway exists to remove tyrosine from the blood that involves the liver enzyme TAT. In contrast to rats where ocular toxicity is observed following exposure to HPPD-inhibiting herbicides, mice and humans are unlikely to achieve the levels of plasma tyrosine necessary to produce ocular opacities because the activity of TAT in these species is much greater compared to rats.

HPPD inhibitors (*e.g.,* nitisinone) are used as an effective therapeutic agent to treat patients suffering from rare genetic diseases of tyrosine catabolism. Treatment starts in childhood but is often sustained throughout patient's lifetime. The human experience indicates that a therapeutic dose (1 mg/kg/day dose) of nitisinone has an excellent safety record in infants, children, and adults and that serious adverse health outcomes have not been observed in a population followed for approximately a decade. Rarely, ocular effects are seen in patients with high plasma tyrosine levels; however, these effects are transient and can be readily reversed upon adherence to a restricted protein diet. This observation indicates that an HPPD inhibitor in it and of itself cannot easily overwhelm the tyrosine-clearance mechanism in humans.

Therefore, exposures to environmental residues of HPPD-inhibiting herbicides are unlikely to result in the high blood levels of tyrosine and ocular toxicity in humans due to an efficient metabolic process to handle excess tyrosine. The Agency continues to study the complex relationships between elevated tyrosine levels and biological effects in various species. In the future, assessments of HPPD-inhibiting herbicides may consider more appropriate models and cross species extrapolation methods. Therefore, EPA has not conducted cumulative risk assessment with other HPPD inhibitors.

### *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 FQPA Safety Factor (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.* There was evidence of increased quantitative susceptibility of rats and mice in the developmental and reproduction toxicity studies. Offspring effects in the developmental toxicity studies were evidenced by delayed ossification and ancillary ribs and vertebrae at doses below or in the absence of maternal toxicity in both species. In the reproduction toxicity studies, tyrosinemia and ocular discharge were observed in offspring at doses below those for parental toxicity, which was evidenced by increased organ weights (liver in the rat and kidney in the mouse) and tyrosinemia.

3. *Conclusion.* EPA has determined that reliable data show the safety of infants and children would be adequately protected if the FQPA SF were reduced to 3x for use of a LOAEL from the reproduction toxicity study. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for mesotrione is adequate for FQPA assessment.

ii. There is no indication that mesotrione is a neurotoxic chemical and there is no need for a developmental neurotoxicity study or additional UFs to account for neurotoxicity.

iii. The ocular discharge seen in the reproduction toxicity study in mice provided a highly conservative endpoint. The LOAEL for this study is currently the lowest dose tested. The incidence of ocular discharge lacked a clear dose response, but an effect was evident at the highest dose tested indicating that the choice of LOAEL in this study may also be conservative.

iv. There is low concern for susceptibility seen in the developmental and reproduction toxicity studies because the doses and endpoints selected are protective of effects seen in these studies. The doses and endpoints are also protective of developmental effects observed in the rat and rabbit developmental toxicity studies.

v. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100% CT and tolerance-level residues. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to mesotrione in drinking water. The residential exposure assessments are based upon

the Residential SOPs, which are based upon reasonable worst-case assumptions. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by mesotrione.

*E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety*

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, mesotrione 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 mesotrione from food and water will utilize 17% of the cPAD for infants (<1 year old) the population group receiving the greatest exposure. Chronic aggregate risk consists only of food and water and does not include residential post-application exposure. Chronic residential exposure is not expected based on the residential use pattern of mesotrione.

3. *Short- and intermediate-term risk.* The short- and intermediate-term toxicological PODs for mesotrione are the same for each route of exposure. Therefore, for residential exposure scenarios, only short-term exposures were assessed, and are considered to be protective of intermediate-term exposure and risk.

Short- and intermediate-term aggregate risk is made up of dietary and non-dietary sources of exposure. Since mesotrione has residential uses on turf, including golf courses, commercial, and residential sites, handler and post-application residential exposure is expected. Short- and intermediate-term aggregate risk is made up of average dietary exposures from food and drinking water sources, dermal, inhalation and oral (children only) residential exposures.

Dietary (food + drinking water) exposure estimates are based on a conservative, unrefined chronic dietary exposure assessment. Residential exposure estimates are conservative estimates due to the standard assumptions that were built into the calculations. For adults, dermal plus inhalation exposures from handler activities were factored into the aggregate risk calculations. For children (6 to <11 years old) and children (11 to <16 years old, post-application dermal exposure from activities on treated turf were factored into the aggregate risk calculations. For children (1 to <2 years old), both dermal and incidental oral exposures were factored into the short- and intermediate-term aggregate risk calculations as incidental oral exposure is possible for this population. All short- and intermediate-term aggregate MOEs are not of concern (children 1 to <2 years, MOE = 1,400; children 6 to <11 years, MOE = 4,500; children 11 to <16 years, MOE = 5,800; and adults, MOE = 3,200).

4. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* An aggregate cancer risk was not calculated because mesotrione was classified as ''not likely to be carcinogenic to humans''.

5. *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 mesotrione residues.

## IV. Other Considerations

*A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology*

Adequate enforcement methodology (high-performance liquid chromatography method with fluorescence detection) is available to enforce the tolerance expression.

*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 Nations 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 mesotrione.

*C. Response to Comments*

On September 2, 2014, EPA published a notice of filing in the **Federal Register** and two comments were received. The commenters noted that pesticides and mesotrione pose a risk to pollinators and human health. The Agency has determined that mesotrione poses no acute contact risk to adult honey bees and there are no risk estimates of concern for human health.

*D. Revisions to Petitioned-For Tolerances*

The petitioned-for tolerance commodity definition for citrus, pome fruit, stone fruit, and tree nuts are being revised to conform with EPA preferred terms. In addition, based on the method LOQ of 0.01 ppm, EPA is revising the petitioned-for tolerance in/on almond hull of 0.02 ppm rather than 0.015 ppm.

## V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues mesotrione in or on almond, hulls at 0.02 ppm; fruit, citrus, group 10–10 at 0.01 ppm; fruit, pome, group 11–10 at 0.01 ppm; fruit, stone, group 12–12 at 0.01 ppm; and nut, tree, group 14–12 at 0.01 ppm.

## VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes tolerances 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).

### VII. 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: May 18, 2015.

**Daniel J. Rosenblatt,**

*Acting 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 § 180.571, add in alphabetical order entries for ''Almond, hulls'', ''Fruit, citrus, group 10–10'', ''Fruit, pome, group 11–10'', ''Fruit, stone, group 12–12'', and ''Nut, tree, group 14–12'' to the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

**§ 180.571 Mesotrione; tolerances for residues.**

(a) * * *

| Commodity | Parts per million |
|---|---|
| Almond, hulls | 0.02 |
| * * * * * | |
| Fruit, citrus, group 10–10 | 0.01 |
| Fruit, pome, group 11–10 | 0.01 |
| Fruit, stone, group 12–12 | 0.01 |
| * * * * * | |
| Nut, tree, group 14–12 | 0.01 |
| * * * * * | |

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2015–12938 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## Coast Guard

## 46 CFR Part 56

## Piping Systems and Appurtenances

*CFR Correction*

■ In Title 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 41 to 69, revised as of October 1, 2014, on page 229, in § 56.70–15, the heading for paragraph (b) is reinstated before paragraph (1) to read: ''(b) *Girth butt welds.*''

[FR Doc. 2015–13052 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

## 47 CFR Part 73

**[MB Docket No. 15–98; RM–11748; DA 15–621]**

## Television Broadcasting Services; Providence, Rhode Island

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission has before it a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking issued in response to a petition for rulemaking filed by WJAR Licensee, LLC (the Licensee), the licensee of WJAR(TV), channel 51, Providence, Rhode Island, requesting the substitution of channel 50 for channel 51 at Providence. The licensee filed comments reaffirming its interest in the proposed channel substitution and stated that if the proposal is granted, it will promptly file an application for the facilities specified in its rulemaking petition and construct the station. The licensee asserts that adopting the proposed channel substitution would serve the public interest because it would remove any potential interference with a wireless licensee in the Lower 700 MHz A Block located adjacent to channel 51 in Providence, Rhode Island-New Bedford, Massachusetts and Boston, Massachusetts television markets.

**DATES:** This rule is effective May 29, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeremy Miller, *Jeremy.Miller@fcc.gov,* Media Bureau, (202) 418–1507.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order,* MB Docket No. 15–98, adopted May 22, 2015, and released May 22, 2015. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Information Center at Portals II, CY–A257, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. This document will also be available via ECFS (*http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/*). 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 & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice), 202–418–0432 (tty).

This document does not contain information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any

information collection burden ''for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,'' pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4). Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

The Commission will send a copy of this *Report and Order* in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional review Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Television.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Barbara A. Kreisman,**

*Chief, Video Division, Media Bureau.*

**Final Rule**

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission amends 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

## PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334, 336, and 339.

**§ 73.622 [Amended]**

■ 2. Section 73.622(i), the Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments under Rhode Island, is amended by removing channel 51 at Providence and adding channel 50 at Providence.

[FR Doc. 2015–13099 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

## 48 CFR Part 22

## Application of Labor Laws to Government Acquisitions

*CFR Correction*

■ In Title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 1, Parts 1 to 51, revised as of October 1, 2014, on page 490, in section 22.403–4, at the end of paragraph (a), remove the phrase ''The Department of Labor regulations include—''.

[FR Doc. 2015–13057 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 48 CFR Part 1501

## Acquisition Regulation; OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

*CFR Correction*

■ In Title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapters 15 to 28, revised as of October 1, 2014, on page 6, in section 1501.370, in the table, for the first entry, remove ''through'' and add ''and'' in its place.

[FR Doc. 2015–13058 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

# Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 103
Friday, May 29, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### 14 CFR Part 71

**[Docket No. FAA–2014–1071; Airspace Docket No. 14–AGL–15]**

## Proposed Revocation of Class D Airspace; Springfield, OH

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This action proposes to remove Class D airspace at Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport, Springfield, OH. The closure of the air traffic control tower has necessitated the need to remove the Class D airspace area at the airport.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 13, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments on this proposal to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590; telephone (202) 366–9826. You must identify FAA Docket No. FAA–2014–1071; Airspace Docket No. 14–AGL–15, at the beginning of your comments. You may also submit comments through the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person in the Dockets Office between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The Docket Office (telephone 1–800–647–5527), is on the ground floor of the building at the above address.

FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, and subsequent amendments can be viewed online at *http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/.* The Order is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this proposed incorporation by reference material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to *http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal-regulations/ibr_locations.html.*

FAA Order 7400.9, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, is published yearly and effective on September 15. For further information, you can contact the Airspace Policy and Regulations Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, 20591; telephone: 202–267–8783.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rebecca Shelby, Federal Aviation Administration, Operations Support Group, Central Service Center, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76137; telephone (817) 321–7740.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal.

Communications should identify both docket numbers (FAA Docket No. FAA 2014–1071 and Airspace Docket No. 14–AGL–15) and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to FAA Docket No. FAA–2014–1071 and Airspace Docket No. 14–AGL–15''. The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter.

### Availability of NPRM's

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded through the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* Recently published rulemaking documents can also be accessed through the FAA's Web page at *http://www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic/air_traffic/publications/airspace_amendments/.*

You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person in the Dockets Office (see the **ADDRESSES** section for the address and phone number) between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Central Service Center, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, TX 76137.

Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRMs should contact the FAA's Office of Rulemaking, (202) 267–9677, for a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11–2A, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedure.

### Availability and Summary of Documents Proposed for Incorporation by Reference

This document proposes to amend FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014. FAA Order 7400.9Y is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this proposed rule. FAA Order 7400.9Y lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

### The Proposal

The FAA is proposing an amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 71 by removing Class D airspace at Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport, Springfield, OH. The closing of the air traffic control tower at Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport has made this action necessary for the efficient use of airspace within the National Airspace System.

Class D airspace areas are published in paragraph 5000, of FAA Order 7400.9Y, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1. The Class D airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

The FAA has determined this proposed regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this proposed regulation; (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action''

under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this proposed rule, when promulgated, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The FAA's authority to issue rules regarding aviation safety is found in Title 49 of the U.S. Code. Subtitle 1, Section 106, describes the authority for the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the agency's authority. This rulemaking is promulgated under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart I, Section 40103. Under that section, the FAA is charged with prescribing regulations to assign the use of the airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace. This regulation is within the scope of that authority as it would remove controlled airspace at Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport, Springfield, OH.

**Environmental Review**

This proposal will be subject to an environmental analysis in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E, ''Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures'' prior to any FAA final regulatory action.

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71**

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

**The Proposed Amendment**

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

## PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR part 71.1 of the FAA Order 7400.9Y, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 6, 2014, and effective September 15, 2014 is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 5000 Class D airspace areas extending upward from the surface of the earth.*

* * * * *

**AGL OH D Springfield, OH [Removed]**

Issued in Fort Worth, TX, on May 20, 2015.

**Humberto Melendez,**

*Acting Manager, Operations Support Group, ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12966 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

## 27 CFR Part 555

**[Docket No. ATF 2002R–226P; AG Order No. 3530–2015]**

**RIN 1140–AA27**

## Separation Distances of Ammonium Nitrate and Blasting Agents From Explosives or Blasting Agents

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice proposes amending Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) regulations to remove the reference to an outdated guidance document in an explanatory note following the table of separation distances of ammonium nitrate and blasting agents from explosives or blasting agents. The Department also proposes amending that note to clarify that those separation distance requirements apply to all ammonium nitrate.

**DATES:** Written comments must be postmarked and electronic comments must be submitted on or before August 27, 2015. Commenters should be aware that the electronic Federal Docket Management system will not accept comments after midnight Eastern Standard Time on the last day of the comment period.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by docket number (ATF 2002R–226P), by any of the following methods—

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* (202) 648–9741.
- *Mail:* Denise Brown, Room 6N–602, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Enforcement Programs and Services, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice, 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington, DC, 20226; *ATTN: ATF 2002R–226P.*

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to the Federal eRulemaking portal, *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the ''Public Participation'' heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Denise Brown, Enforcement Programs and Services, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice, 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington, DC 20226; telephone: (202) 648–7105.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

Title XI of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Public Law 91–452, added chapter 40 (''Importation, Manufacture, Distribution and Storage of Explosive Materials'') to title 18 of the United States Code (U.S.C.). One purpose of title XI is to reduce the ''hazard to persons and property arising from misuse and unsafe or insecure storage of explosive materials.'' Public Law 91–452, sec. 1101, 84 Stat. 922, 952 (1970).

The Attorney General is responsible for implementing title XI. *See* 18 U.S.C. 847. The Attorney General has delegated that responsibility to the Director of the ATF subject to the direction of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General. *See* 28 CFR 0.130. Regulations in 27 CFR part 555 implement title XI.

The regulations at 27 CFR 555.220 set forth a table of separation distances of ammonium nitrate and blasting agents from explosives or blasting agents (the § 555.220 Table of Distances) followed by six explanatory notes. In this table, the term ''separation distance'' means the minimum distance that must be maintained between stores of certain materials, such as high explosives, and blasting agents. The third note states that the distances specified in the § 555.220 Table of Distances ''apply to ammonium nitrate that passes the

insensitivity test prescribed in the definition of ammonium nitrate fertilizer issued by the Fertilizer Institute'' in its ''Definition and Test Procedures for Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer.''

The Fertilizer Institute (TFI) is a voluntary, non-profit trade association that currently has more than 175 members. *See* Membership List, The Fertilizer Institute, *http://www.tfi.org/about/membership-list* (last visited August 19, 2014). Members include importers, wholesalers, retailers, and others involved in the fertilizer industry. *Id.* Many of TFI's members handle and store ammonium nitrate fertilizer and may be affected by the regulations at § 555.220.

The Agricultural Nitrogen Institute, a predecessor organization of TFI, first developed the ''Definition and Test Procedures for Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer'' guidance document. *See* The Fertilizer Institute, Definition and Test Procedures for Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer (Aug. 1984), *available at https://www.atf.gov/files/publications/download/hist/definition-and-test-procedures-for-ammonium-nitrate.pdf.* In May 1984, TFI assembled a task force of industry and government representatives who were ''experts on the physical and chemical characteristics of ammonium nitrate fertilizer'' to review and update the document. *Id.* ''Based on that review and the technical expertise and experience of the task force members, TFI published'' a revised guidance document in August 1984 (the August 1984 guidance). *Id.* The August 1984 guidance defines ammonium nitrate fertilizer as ''solid ammonium nitrate containing a minimum of 33.0% nitrogen, having a minimum pH of 4.0 in a 10% aqueous solution, 0.20% maximum carbon, 0.010% maximum elemental sulfur, 0.150% maximum chloride as Cl, or particulated elemental metals sufficient to release 4.60 ml, maximum, of hydrogen from 50.0 gram sample and which will pass the detonation resistance test in Section 2.0 and the burning test in Section 4.0.'' *Id.* at 1.

*A. The Fertilizer Institute Petition*

On March 19, 2002, TFI filed a petition with ATF requesting that ATF amend the explosives regulations at § 555.220 to remove the reference to the August 1984 guidance. TFI explained that the document is outdated because TFI last published it in 1984, will not review or update it, and cannot ensure that its procedures are still valid. TFI recognized that ATF may require an alternate method of determining the insensitivity of ammonium nitrate fertilizer and suggested that ATF reference certain Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations.

The DOT regulations include several definitions and two hazardous classifications (Class 5.1 and Class 9) for ammonium nitrate based fertilizers based on the amount of combustible material included in the fertilizer. *See* 49 CFR 172.101. Class 5.1 ammonium nitrate fertilizer is defined as a uniform mixture with ammonium nitrate as the main ingredient within the following composition limits: (1) Not less than 90 percent ammonium nitrate with not more than 0.2 percent total combustible, organic material calculated as carbon, and with added matter, if any, that is inorganic and inert when in contact with ammonium nitrate; or (2) more than 70 percent but less than 90 percent ammonium nitrate with other inorganic materials, or more than 80 percent but less than 90 percent ammonium nitrate mixed with calcium carbonate or dolomite or mineral calcium sulphate, and not more than 0.4 percent total combustible, organic material calculated as carbon; or (3) ammonium nitrate-based fertilizers containing mixtures of ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulphate with more than 45 percent but less than 70 percent ammonium nitrate, and not more than 0.4 percent total combustible, organic material calculated as carbon such that the sum of the percentage of compositions of ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulphate exceeds 70 percent. *See* 49 CFR 172.101, 172.102(c)(1) code/special provisions 52, 150. Class 9 ammonium nitrate fertilizer is defined as a uniform, ammonium nitrate-based fertilizer mixture containing nitrogen, phosphate, or potash with not more than 70 percent ammonium nitrate and not more than 0.4 percent total combustible, organic material calculated as carbon or with not more than 45 percent ammonium nitrate and unrestricted combustible material. *See* 49 CFR 172.101, 172.102(c)(1) code/special provision 132. To determine whether a material falls within Class 5, Division 5.1, DOT requires regulated parties to conduct tests in accordance with international standards in the United Nations (UN) Manual of Tests and Criteria. *See* 49 CFR 173.127(a).

*B. Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*

Based upon TFI's petition, ATF published in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 2010, an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (Notice No. ATF 26A, 75 FR 56489). ATF requested information from explosives industry members, trade associations, consumers, and all other interested parties to determine whether a replacement reference for the August 1984 guidance is necessary, and, if so, whether there are any alternate methods available to determine the insensitivity of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. ATF solicited comments on 10 specific questions as well as any relevant information on the subject. The comment period for Notice No. ATF 26A closed on December 15, 2010.

## II. Analysis of Comments

*A. Comments Received*

ATF received three comments in response to the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking. Two of the commenters are explosive and fertilizer trade associations, and one commenter is an associate member of an explosive and fertilizer trade association. All of the commenters support removing the reference to the August 1984 guidance and adopting DOT regulations for classifying ammonium nitrate fertilizer in accordance with the UN Manual of Tests and Criteria.

The first commenter, the Institute of Makers of Explosives (IME), believes that ATF should amend note three following the § 555.220 Table of Distances to be consistent with the source document, Appendix A of IME Safety Library Publication 2,[1] and Table 9.4.2.2(b) of the National Fire Protection Association's (NFPA) NFPA 495: Explosive Materials Code.[2] IME noted that these two internationally recognized standards referenced the August 1984 guidance and replaced it with the following: ''The distances in the Table apply to ammonium nitrate and ammonium nitrate based materials that show a 'negative' (−) result in the UN Test Series 2 Gap Test and show a 'positive' (+) result in the UN Test Series 1 Gap Test. Ammonium nitrate and ammonium nitrate based materials that are DOT hazard Class 1 sensitive shall be stored at separation distances determined by the American Table of Distances.'' IME noted that DOT test procedures are ''suitable and internationally recognized at the United Nations'' and believes that ATF should harmonize its standards with those of DOT.

[1] Institute of Makers of Explosives, *Safety Library Publication 2: The American Table of Distances* 16–17 (1991), *available at http://www.ime.org/ecommerce/products.php?category_id=13.*

[2] National Fire Protection Association, *NFPA 495: Explosive Materials Code* 31 (2010), *available at http://www.nfpa.org/codes-and-standards/document-information-pages?mode=code&code=495.*

The petitioner, TFI, submitted the second comment. Like IME, TFI noted that IME removed references to the August 1984 guidance from its Safety Library Publication 2, the American Table of Distances, and that the NFPA adopted the same test as IME in NFPA 495. TFI also commented that ATF references NFPA and IME in its Table of Distances. TFI, therefore, supports IME's position concerning the use of the UN Test Series 1 and 2 Gap Tests.

The third commenter, an IME member company, fully supports IME's comments.

*B. Department Response*

The Department does not agree that it should replace the current reference to the August 1984 guidance document with a reference to the UN Test Series 1 and 2 Gap Tests. The Department acknowledges that the United Nations has developed criteria, test methods, and procedures that are generally sufficient for competent authorities to use for the classification of dangerous goods during transport. *See* U. N. Econ. & Soc. Council, *Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods: Manual of Tests and Criteria* U.N. Doc. ST/SG/AC.10/11/Rev.5 (2009), *available at http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/danger/publi/manual/Rev5/English/ST-SG-AC10-11-Rev5-EN.pdf.* However, these recommended test methods do not address all the hazards encountered during processes involving dangerous goods, such as storage. Existing literature indicates that fertilizer and technical grade ammonium nitrate prill can detonate under certain circumstances and that various factors—such as particle size, prill density, degree of confinement, temperature, and moisture content—can affect the detonability of ammonium nitrate prill.[3] Those factors may develop during transport, handling, and storage, after the UN test criteria have been applied.

In addition, ATF is unaware of any commercially-produced ammonium nitrate manufactured for use with, and stored in the proximity of, explosives that would not fall under the § 555.220 Table of Distances, using the UN Test Series 1 and 2 Gap Tests under the commenters' proposed amendments. Because the UN tests would lead to all ammonium nitrate being subject to the § 555.220 Table of Distances, the costs of imposing the extra step of those tests would outweigh any benefits.

The Department thus proposes amending the third note following the § 555.220 Table of Distances to delete the reference to the August 1984 guidance and to state that all ammonium nitrate stored near high explosives and blasting agents is subject to the § 555.220 Table of Distances. The Department believes this proposal will not negatively affect the explosives industry because most ammonium nitrate currently located near stores of high explosives and blasting agents are already subject to the § 555.220 Table of Distances. Moreover, it is ATF's understanding that entities who store ammonium nitrate located near high explosives and blasting agents do not use the outdated August 1984 guidance referenced in the existing regulations and instead comply with the § 555.220 Table of Distances for all ammonium nitrate. This proposed removal of the reference to the outdated test does not address ammonium nitrate blends containing fuels. Generally, ammonium nitrate blends are subject to ATF's criteria for high explosives in § 555.202(a) or blasting agent in § 555.11. Ammonium nitrate blends that meet the criteria are ammonium nitrate explosive mixtures and designated as such in ATF's List of Explosive Materials, which is published annually pursuant to 27 CFR 555.23.

This proposed amendment will provide industry members with clear guidance on the application of these regulations governing the storage of explosive materials. Section 555.206(c)(2) states that all ammonium nitrate is subject to the separation distances requirements in § 555.220. The revision of the reference to the outdated August 1984 guidance in note three following the § 555.220 Table of Distances will make clear the application of the Table of Distances in relationship to all ammonium nitrate. All ammonium nitrate will be subject to the § 555.220 Table of Distances when stored within the sympathetic detonation distances of high explosives and blasting agents. Ammonium nitrate explosive mixtures that are high explosives pursuant to § 555.202(a) or are defined as a blasting agent pursuant to § 555.11, will be subject both to the table of distances for storage of explosive materials in § 555.218 and to the § 555.220 Table of Distances. In this way, the proposed amendment will continue to protect public safety by ensuring that all stores of ammonium nitrate located within the sympathetic detonation distances to high explosives or blasting agents meet minimum distances to inhabited buildings, highways, and passenger railways.

## III. Proposed Amendments to 27 CFR Part 555

This proposed rule would amend the regulations of ATF governing the separation of distances of ammonium nitrate and blasting agents from explosives or blasting agents. The proposed rule would revise note three following the Table of Distances in 27 CFR 555.220 by removing the reference to the August 1984 guidance. The proposed rule would clarify that all ammonium nitrate is subject to 27 CFR 555.206(c)(2) and 555.220.

## IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

*A. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563*

This proposed rule has been drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review,'' section 1(b), The Principles of Regulation and in accordance with Executive Order 13563, ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review,'' section 1, General Principles of Regulation, and section 6, Retrospective Analyses of Existing Rules.

Both Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. The Department has assessed the costs and benefits of this regulation and believes that the regulatory approach selected maximizes net benefits.

This proposed rule will not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, nor will it adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity,

[3] Ronald J. A. Kersten et al., *Detonation Characteristics of Ammonium Nitrate Products* (2006) (unpublished manuscript) (on file with ATF); Allan King & Alan Bauer, *A Critical Review of the EEC Detonability Test* (1977) (unpublished manuscript) (on file with ATF); Brian Melof et al., Dep't of Energy, Sandia Nat'l Labs., SAND2008–2078, *Detonability Study Of Fertilizer Grade Ammonium Nitrate* (2009); Henri-Noël Presles et al., *Experimental Study of the Detonation of Technical Grade Ammonium Nitrate,* 337 Comptes Rendus Mécanique 755 (2009); Albert C. van der Steen et al., *Detonation Velocities of the Non-Ideal Explosive Ammonium Nitrate,* 15 Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics 58 (1990); Robert W. Van Dolah et al., U.S. Dep't of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Report of Investigation 6903, *Further Studies on Sympathetic Detonation* (1966); Robert W. Van Dolah et al., U.S. Dep't of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Report of Investigation 6746, *Sympathetic Detonation of Ammonium Nitrate and Ammonium Nitrate Fuel Oil* (1966); C. H. Winning, *Detonation Characteristics of Prilled Ammonium Nitrate,* 1 Fire Tech. 23 (1965).

competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal government or communities. Similarly, it does not create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency, materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof, or raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this proposed rule is not a ''significant regulatory action'' as defined in Executive Order 12866.

Section 6 of Executive Order 13563, directs agencies to develop a plan to review existing significant rules that may be ''outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome,'' and to make appropriate changes where warranted. The Department selected and reviewed this rule under the criteria set forth in its Plan for Retrospective Analysis of Existing Rules, and determined that this proposed rule removes a reference to an outdated guidance document, clarifies the existing regulations, and continues to protect public safety. ATF welcomes public comment on its analysis of the proposed rule's likely effects.

*B. Executive Order 13132*

This proposed rule will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13132, ''Federalism,'' the Attorney General has determined that this proposed rule will not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

*C. Executive Order 12988*

This proposed rule meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, ''Civil Justice Reform.''

*D. Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)) requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions. The Attorney General has reviewed this rule and, by approving it, certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule updates the affected regulations by removing a reference to an outdated guidance document. The changes proposed in this rule are administrative and do not add any new requirements that would have any impact on the economy because: (1) The referenced test in explanatory note three was last published in 1984, is obsolete, and is not used by the explosives industry; and (2) the explosives industry already ensures their stores of ammonium nitrate are stored in accordance with the § 555.220 Table of Distances.

*E. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996*

This proposed rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. 804. This proposed rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

*F. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995*

This proposed rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100 million or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

*G. Paperwork Reduction Act*

This proposed rule does not impose any new reporting or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

## V. Public Participation

*A. Comments Sought*

ATF is requesting additional comments on this proposed rule from all interested persons. ATF is also specifically requesting comments on the clarity of this proposed rule and how it may be made easier to understand.

All comments must reference this document docket number (ATF 2002R–226P), be legible, and include the commenter's name and mailing address. ATF will treat all comments as originals and it will not acknowledge receipt of comments.

Comments received on or before the closing date will be carefully considered. Comments received after that date will be given the same consideration if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except as to comments received on or before the closing date.

*B. Confidentiality*

Comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper format, will be made available for public viewing at ATF, and on the Internet as part of the eRulemaking initiative, and are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Commenters who do not want their name or other personal identifying information posted on the Internet should submit their comments by mail or facsimile, along with a separate cover sheet that contains their personal identifying information. Both the cover sheet and comment must reference this docket number. Information contained in the cover sheet will not be posted on the Internet. Any personal identifying information that appears within the comment will be posted on the Internet and will not be redacted by ATF.

Any material that the commenter considers to be inappropriate for disclosure to the public should not be included in the comment. Any person submitting a comment shall specifically designate that portion (if any) of his comment that contains material that is confidential under law (*e.g.,* trade secrets, processes, etc.). Any portion of a comment that is confidential under law shall be set forth on pages separate from the balance of the comment and shall be prominently marked ''confidential'' at the top of each page. Confidential information will be included in the rulemaking record but will not be disclosed to the public. Any comments containing material that is not confidential under law may be disclosed to the public. In any event, the name of the person submitting a comment is not exempt from disclosure.

*C. Submitting Comments*

Comments may be submitted in any of three ways:

- *Mail:* Send written comments to the address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. Written comments must appear in a minimum 12 point size of type (.17 inches), include the commenter's mailing address, be signed, and may be of any length.
- *Fax:* Submit comments by fax to (202) 648–9741. Faxed comments must:

(1) Be legible and appear in a minimum 12 point size of type (.17 inches);

(2) Be on 8½″ x 11″ paper;

(3) Contain a legible, written signature; and

(4) Be no more than five pages long. ATF will not accept faxed comments that exceed five pages.

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* To submit comments to ATF via the Federal eRulemaking portal, visit *http://www.regulations.gov,* and follow the instructions for submitting comments.

**Disclosure**

Copies of the petition, this notice, and the comments received will be available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at: ATF Reading Room, Room 1E–063, 99 New York Avenue NE., Washington, DC 20226; telephone: (202) 648–7080.

**Drafting Information**

The author of this document is Denise Brown, Enforcement Programs and Services, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

**List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 555**

Administrative practice and procedure, Authority delegations, Customs duties and inspection, Explosives, Hazardous materials, Imports, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Safety, Security measures, Seizures and forfeitures, Transportation, and Warehouses.

Authority and Issuance

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed in the preamble, 27 CFR part 555 is proposed to be amended as follows:

## PART 555—COMMERCE IN EXPLOSIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for 27 CFR part 555 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 18 U.S.C. 847.

■ 2. In § 555.220, revise paragraph (3) in the notes following the table, to read as follows:

**§ 555.220 Table of separation distances of ammonium nitrate and blasting agents from explosives or blasting agents.**

* * * * *

(3) These distances apply to all ammonium nitrate with respect to their separation from stores of high explosives and blasting agents. Ammonium nitrate explosive mixtures that are high explosives pursuant to § 555.202(a) or are defined as a blasting agent pursuant to § 555.11 are subject to the table of distances for storage of explosive materials in § 555.218 and to the table of separation distances of ammonium nitrate and blasting agents from explosives or blasting agents in § 555.220.

* * * * *

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Loretta E. Lynch,**

*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12990 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–FY–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## Coast Guard

## 33 CFR Part 165

**[Docket No. USCG–2015–0286]**

**RIN 1625–AA00**

## Safety Zone, Fall River Grand Prix, Mt. Hope Bay and Taunton River, Fall River, MA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone in the navigable waters of Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA, during the Fall River Grand Prix marine event from August 14–16, 2015. This safety zone is intended to safeguard mariners from the hazards associated with high-speed, high-performance motorboats competing in the event. Vessels will be prohibited from entering into, transiting through, mooring, or anchoring within this safety zone during periods of enforcement unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP), Southeastern New England or the COTP's designated representative.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before June 29, 2015. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before June 19, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2015–0286 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal e-Rulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.*

(2) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

(3) *Mail or Delivery:* Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Deliveries accepted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

See the ''Public Participation and Request for Comments'' portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for further instructions on submitting comments. To avoid duplication, please use only one of these three methods.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, contact Mr. Edward G. LeBlanc, Waterways Management Division at Coast Guard Sector Southeastern New England, telephone 401–435–2351, email *Edward.G.LeBlanc@uscg.mil.* If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Acronyms**

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

**A. Public Participation and Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov* and will include any personal information you have provided.

*1. Submitting Comments*

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2015–0286), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (via *http://www.regulations.gov*) or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via *http://www.regulations.gov,* it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a telephone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to *http://www.regulations.gov,* type the docket number [USCG–2015–0286] in the ''SEARCH'' box and click ''SEARCH.'' Click on ''Submit a Comment'' on the line associated with this rulemaking.

If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

*2. Viewing Comments and Documents*

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to *http://www.regulations.gov,* type the docket number (USCG–2015–0286) in the ''SEARCH'' box and click ''SEARCH.'' Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

*3. Privacy Act*

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

*4. Public Meeting*

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one, using one of the methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why you believe a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

**B. Regulatory History and Information**

The Coast Guard has not promulgated a rule for past iterations of this event.

**C. Basis and Purpose**

The legal basis for the proposed rule is 33 U.S.C., 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5 Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to establish regulatory safety zones.

This rule is necessary to provide for the safety of life and navigation, for both participants and spectators involved with the Fall River Grand Prix in Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA.

**D. Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The initial Fall River Grand Prix is a three-day event where high-speed, high-performance motorboats participate in controlled races within a well-defined water area. The safety zone proposed in this NPRM will encompass the racing area and will include a buffer between the racing motorboats and spectator craft to provide a margin of safety. As these races are part of a national series of events, governed by a national racing and safety organization (the U.S. Offshore Powerboat Association), and operated by experienced high-speed motorboat crews and support teams, they are expected to generate local and regional media coverage, and attract spectators on a number of recreational and excursion vessels.

The Coast Guard is establishing this safety zone, in conjunction with the Fall River Grand Prix, to ensure the protection of the maritime public and event participants from the hazards associated with high-speed, high-performance motorboat racing. The Coast Guard anticipates little concern with the proposed safety zone by mariners, as there is little major commercial vessel activity in Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA, and most recreational vessels are not restricted to the deep draft channel and can easily transit via alternate routes. Also, the safety zone will be enforced only during periods of actual racing, which will be limited to only a few hours on each of the three days of the event.

Regardless, in the unlikely situation where a commercial or recreational vessel may still need to transit Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA, for any number of reasons including destination, familiarity with the waterway, tide restrictions, etc., these vessels may be able to continue transits through Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River, even during enforcement of the safety zone, as there will be sufficient room for most recreational vessels, and some commercial vessels, to pass to the west of the safety zone. Also, the Coast Guard routinely works with the local marine pilot organization and shipping agents to coordinate vessel transits during marine events, and will continue to do so for the entire event to avoid major interruptions to shipping schedules.

The Coast Guard proposes to add a temporary safety zone under 33 CFR T165.0286. The safety zone will encompass the navigation channel from approximately Mt. Hope Bay buoy R10 southwest of Brayton Point channel, and will extend approximately two miles to the northeast up to and including Mt. Hope Bay buoy C17 north of the I–195/Braga Bridge. The safety zone will be enforced only during times of actual vessel racing.

**E. Regulatory Analyses**

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes or executive orders.

*1. Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563*

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order.

We expect the adverse economic impact of this proposed rule to be minimal. Although this regulation may have some adverse impact on the public, the potential impact will be minimized for the following reasons: The safety zone will be in effect for only a few hours each day for three consecutive days, and vessels will only be restricted from the zone in Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA during those limited periods when the races are actually ongoing; during periods when there is no actual racing (*e.g.,* racing vessels are transiting from the pier to the racing site; downtime between races, etc.) vessels may be allowed to transit through the safety zone; there is an alternate route available for recreational vessels to the west of the safety zone that does not add substantial transit time and is already routinely used by mariners; many vessels, especially recreational vessels, may transit in all portions of the affected waterway except for those areas covered by the proposed

safety zone; and vessels may enter or pass through the affected waterway with the permission of the COTP or the COTP's representative.

Notification of the Fall River Grand Prix and the associated safety zone will be made to mariners through the Rhode Island Port Safety Forum, local Notice to Mariners, event sponsors, and local media well in advance of the event.

*2. Impact on Small Entities*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term ''small entities'' comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: owners or operators of vessels intending to transit in Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River in the vicinity of Fall River, MA, during the Fall River Grand Prix marine event.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (*see* **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

*3. Assistance for Small Entities*

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

*4. Collection of Information*

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

*5. Federalism*

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

*6. Protest Activities*

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

*7. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

*8. Taking of Private Property*

This proposed rule would not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

*9. Civil Justice Reform*

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

*10. Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

*11. Indian Tribal Governments*

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

*12. Energy Effects*

This proposed rule is not a ''significant energy action'' under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

*13. Technical Standards*

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

*14. Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action appears to be one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment.

A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. This proposed rule involves the establishment of a temporary safety zone in conjunction with the Fall River Grand Prix event, a high-speed, high-performance motorboat racing event. It appears that this action will qualify for Coast Guard Categorical Exclusion (34)(g), as described in figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction.

We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

**List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165**

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

## PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add a new § 165.T0286 to read as follows:

**§ 165.T0286 Safety Zone for the Fall River Grand Prix, Mt. Hope Bay and Taunton River, Fall River, MA.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: Mt. Hope Bay and the Taunton River navigation channel from approximately Mt. Hope Bay buoy R10 southwest of Brayton Point channel, and extending approximately two miles to the northeast up to and including Mt. Hope Bay buoy C17 north of the Braga Bridge. The safety zone is encompassed by the following coordinates:

| Corner | Latitude | Longitude |
|---|---|---|
| SW ..... | 41°41.40′ N. | 71°11.15′ W. |
| NW ..... | 41°41.48′ N. | 71°11.15′ W. |
| SE ..... | 41°42.33′ N. | 71°09.40′ W. |
| NE ..... | 41°42.42′ N. | 71°09.47′ W. |

(b) *Enforcement Period.* Vessels will be prohibited from entering this safety zone, when enforced, during the Fall River Grand Prix marine event between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. from Friday, August 14, 2015 to Sunday, August 16, 2015.

(c) *Definitions.* The following definitions apply to this section:

(1) *Designated Representative.* A ''designated representative'' is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer of the U.S. Coast Guard who has been designated by the Captain of the Port, Sector Southeastern New England (COTP), to act on his or her behalf. The designated representative may be on an official patrol vessel or may be on shore and will communicate with vessels via VHF–FM radio or loudhailer. In addition, members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary may be present to inform vessel operators of this regulation.

(2) *Official Patrol Vessels.* Official patrol vessels may consist of any Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, state, or local law enforcement vessels assigned or approved by the COTP.

(3) *Patrol Commander.* The Coast Guard may patrol each safety zone under the direction of a designated Coast Guard Patrol Commander. The Patrol Commander may be contacted on Channel 16 VHF–FM (156.8 MHz) by the call sign ''PATCOM.''

(4) *Spectators.* All persons and vessels not registered with the event sponsor as participants or official patrol vessels.

(d) *Regulations.* (1) The general regulations contained in 33 CFR 165.23 as well as the following regulations apply to the safety zone established in conjunction with the Fall River Grand Prix, Taunton River, vicinity of Fall River, MA. These regulations may be enforced for the duration of the event.

(2) No later than 8 a.m. each day of the event, the Coast Guard will announce via Safety Marine Information Broadcasts and local media the times and duration of each race scheduled for that day, and the precise area(s) of the safety zone that will be enforced.

(3) Vessels may not transit through or within the safety zone during periods of enforcement without Patrol Commander approval. Vessels permitted to transit must operate at a no-wake speed, in a manner which will not endanger participants or other crafts in the event.

(4) Spectators or other vessels shall not anchor, block, loiter, or impede the movement of event participants or official patrol vessels in the safety zone unless authorized by an official patrol vessel.

(5) The Patrol Commander may control the movement of all vessels in the safety zone. When hailed or signaled by an official patrol vessel, a vessel shall come to an immediate stop and comply with the lawful directions issued. Failure to comply with a lawful direction may result in expulsion from the area, citation for failure to comply, or both.

(6) The Patrol Commander may delay or terminate the Fall River Grand Prix at any time to ensure safety. Such action may be justified as a result of weather, traffic density, spectator operation or participant behavior.

Dated: May 8, 2015.

**J.T. Kondratowicz,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Southeastern New England.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12736 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

**[EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0230; FRL–9927–02]**

**RIN 2070–ZA16**

### Banda de Lupinus albus doce BLAD; Proposed Pesticide Tolerance

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to revoke the current exemption from the requirement for a tolerance for residues of banda de *Lupinus albus* doce (BLAD) in or on all food commodities. In its place, EPA proposes to establish a tolerance limiting residues of BLAD to 0.005 parts per million (ppm) in or on almonds, grapes, strawberries and tomatoes. The Agency is undertaking this action under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0230, 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 Confidential Business Information (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.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert McNally, Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7511P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: *BPPDFRNotices@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. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?*

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through regulations.gov or email. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information on a disk or CD–ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition, to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for preparing your comments.* When preparing and submitting your comments, see the commenting tips at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/comments.html*.

## II. This Proposal

*A. What is the authority for this action?*

EPA is taking this action under section 408(e) the FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. 346a(e), which allows EPA to initiate a tolerance action under FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a *et seq.* FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is ''safe.'' FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) 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.

FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) 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 . . .''

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(ii) contains the same safety standard for establishing or leaving in effect an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) requires the Agency to modify or revoke an exemption if the Agency determines it is not safe.

EPA performs a number of analyses to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide residues. For further discussion of the regulatory requirements of FFDCA section 408 and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see *http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/regulating/tolerances.htm*.

*B. What action is the Agency taking?*

EPA, on its own initiative under FFDCA section 408(c)(1)(B), is proposing to revoke the existing exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of the fungicide BLAD in or on all food commodities as established in the **Federal Register** of March 22, 2013 (78 FR 17600) (FRL–9380–6). In addition, EPA is proposing to establish a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(e) for residues of the fungicide BLAD, in or on almonds, grapes, strawberries, and tomatoes at the level of detection of 0.005 ppm.

EPA is taking this action in response to concerns that were raised by the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) about the potential allergenicity of BLAD for peanut-sensitive individuals following EPA's promulgation of the tolerance exemption of BLAD on all food commodities. Based on the potential uncertainty raised by those concerns, EPA sought additional data from the petitioner and reexamined the safety of the BLAD tolerance exemption. Following an assessment of the additional data that was provided, EPA has concluded that the available data supports establishing a more limited tolerance at the level of detection on specific commodities.

## III. Regulatory Background

In the **Federal Register** of March 22, 2013, EPA established a tolerance exemption for residues of BLAD in or on all food commodities when applied as a fungicide and used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices. EPA established this tolerance exemption following the receipt of a petition from Consumo Em Verde S.A, Biotecnologia De Plantas, Parque Technologico de Cantanhede (CEV) in 2012. All of the data requirements to support the exemption from the requirement of a tolerance were fulfilled, and following an assessment of all available data, EPA concluded that there was a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of BLAD.

Following EPA's establishment of a tolerance exemption for residues of BLAD on all food commodities, FDA raised concerns about the potential allergenicity of the BLAD protein for peanut-sensitive individuals. EPA's original review of the data in support of the establishment of a tolerance exemption had considered BLAD's potential allergenicity and concluded that the use of BLAD as pesticide would not result in any meaningful exposure to human health and the environment based on the following considerations. First, because lupines are commonly used in human and animal nutrition as a food and feed, EPA concluded that any dietary contribution from use of BLAD as a pesticide would be relatively limited. Second, the weight of evidence regarding the BLAD protein suggested low risk for allergenicity concerns upon application of the criteria set by the Codex Alimentarius (2003) and the Food and Agricultural Organizations of the United Nations/World Health Organization (FAO/WHO) (2001):

• Amino acid homology: Having an amino acid residue similarity of greater than 35% over a sequence of 80 amino acids of a known allergenic protein (*Ara h 1*). Residues 5 to 169 in BLAD exhibit a 58% sequence homology when compared to residues 148 to 312 in *Ara h 1,* which is similar to other legume seed storage proteins;

• Having one or more sets of more than 6 contiguous amino acid residues that are identical to amino acids of a known allergenic protein. BLAD contains only one stretch of contiguous amino acid residues identical to *Ara h 1;* as a comparison there are 2 in lupine and bean vicilin, 3 in pea and broad bean vicilin, and 5 in soybeans. This observation suggests a more likely presence of IgE recognition epitopes on the vicilins rather than on BLAD;

• Serum cross-reactivity to known allergens: Moneret-Vautrin *et al.,* 1999 found that although peanut-lupine cross-reactivity allergenic potential is high, it presumably corresponds to lupine γ-conglutin and not to lupine β-conglutin, the precursor of BLAD;

• Pepsin resistance: BLAD is readily degraded by proteolytic enzymes and

• Expression levels: Using immunological methods, residual levels of BLAD were not detectable 18 hours after application to tomatoes, relative to controls.

This information was used by the EPA to conclude that BLAD is not likely to be an allergen.

Nonetheless, FDA expressed concerns about the potential allergenicity of BLAD because lupine is known to incite food allergy in sensitive individuals and because of reports of cross-reactivity to lupine protein in peanut sensitive

individuals. In response to these newly raised concerns, EPA decided to investigate further the issues raised by FDA and seek additional data, including a skin prick (*in vivo*) test on *Ara h 1* peanut/lupine sensitive individuals and an *in vitro* immunological testing on serum from *Ara h 1* peanut/lupine sensitive individuals. The focus on *Ara h 1* sensitive individuals is due to the similarity of the β-conglutin parent molecule of BLAD to the *Ara h 1* allergen and reports of cross reactivity in peanut-sensitive individuals to lupine protein.

In addition, EPA required residue chemistry field trials conducted on crops listed on the proposed pesticide label using PROBLAD PLUS, the end-use pesticide containing the BLAD protein, at label rates and exaggerated application rates (5X) to establish a rate of decline and residue levels of BLAD on crops tested. Upon receipt of all the new information, EPA reexamined the safety of BLAD.

## IV. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

### *A. EPA's Safety Determination*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity and exposure data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability, as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. Based upon that evaluation, 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 BLAD residues under the tolerance proposed in this action.

EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with BLAD is discussed in this unit of the document.

### *B. Toxicological Profile*

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its 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.

BLAD is a naturally occurring 20 kilo Dalton (kDa) polypeptide fragment of β-conglutin, a main storage protein in the flowering plant sweet lupines (*Lupinus albus*). BLAD protein is produced by breakdown of β-conglutin during day 4 to 12 of the germination process of the sweet lupines. Data submitted and reviewed by the Agency demonstrate that BLAD operates in a non-toxic manner. BLAD, which is used as a fungicide, degrades chitin by catalyzing and successfully removing the N-acetyl-D-glucosamine terminal monomers, resulting in the destruction of the fungal cells. There is a history of safe use in human and livestock consumption; however, there may be a potential for allergenicity with some sensitive populations.

All of the toxicity data requirements have been fulfilled. EPA has concluded that the data are acceptable and no additional data are required. Data on the end-use product, PROBLAD PLUS, containing BLAD as its active ingredient, did not indicate toxicity endpoints. The toxicological information showed that PROBLAD PLUS has a low toxicity profile as noted in the test results for the following studies: Acute Oral Lowest Dose $(LD)_{50}$ > 5,000 milligram/kilogram (mg/kg); Acute Dermal $LD_{50}$ > 2,000 mg/kg; Acute Inhalation $LC_{50}$ > 5.34 milligram/Liter (mg/L); Primary Eye Irritation was slight; Primary Dermal Irritation was mild to slight; and PROBLAD PLUS is not a contact dermal sensitizer. Moreover, there are no known effects on endocrine systems via oral, dermal, or inhalation exposure. Therefore, the Agency concludes that there are no toxicity risks with BLAD.

As noted in Unit III., EPA re-examined the potential allergenicity of BLAD because of the concern raised about potential sensitivity of peanut-sensitive individuals. The following observations raised new questions about the potential for BLAD to pose an allergenicity concern:

1. BLAD comprises an internal segment of β-conglutin;
2. β-conglutin exhibits a relatively strong homology to the other members of the vicillin family, including well-known allergens contained in peanuts and soybeans (specifically *Ara h 1*); and
3. There are a considerable number of studies concerning the allergenicity of lupine-derived products.

EPA then evaluated the reactivity to BLAD in sensitive individuals.

A Skin Prick Test (SPT) with lupine or peanut extracts in order to establish a sampling population that was sensitive to lupines and/or peanuts was submitted to the Agency. The serum from a sensitive population that tested positive to lupine/peanut exposure through a SPT was used to evaluate the capacity of cross-reactivity to BLAD in these sensitive individuals. Negative results to BLAD in IgE-specific *in vitro* immunoblot (ELISA) testing on serum from sensitive individuals, suggest that the compound is non-allergenic to lupine and/or peanut-sensitive individuals.

Allergenicity relates to both a sensitizing exposure (sensitization leading to allergy cannot occur to a protein without a prior exposure) and a subsequent acute effect if allergy develops (a single exposure in a sensitive individual will cause a response). The difficulty with assessing allergenicity relates to determining a threshold level of exposure below which there is no reasonable expectation of eliciting a reaction in a sensitive individual. Although the new allergenicity data suggest that BLAD is not an allergen, the existing exemption from the requirement of a tolerance allows any amount of residue that might result from reasonably foreseeable uses of BLAD as a fungicide. In light of the similarity of BLAD to peanut allergens and documented allergies to lupines in the literature, the Agency believes the safety of BLAD also depends on demonstrating no detectable residues, in the absence of a demonstrated threshold level.

Specific information on the studies received and EPA's assessment of them can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0230.

### *C. Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern*

Based on the available toxicity and allergenicity data, the Agency did not identify any toxicological points of departure or levels of concern. Nevertheless, due the potential for allergenicity that might arise under the current exemption due to potentially unlimited exposure to residues of BLAD, the Agency is relying on data supporting a lack of exposure to BLAD residues on certain crops. Therefore, the Agency is conducting a qualitative assessment based on a lack of residues.

### *D. Exposure Assessment*

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* The dietary exposure to residues of BLAD via pesticidal use is expected to be negligible as, based on available residue data, the residues are below the level of detection.

Due to the potential for allergenicity, field trials using PROBLAD PLUS at the product-labeled application rate and an exaggerated application rate (5X) were submitted in order to determine levels of potential exposure and the rate of BLAD residue degradation. Those studies, conducted on grapes, tomatoes and strawberries, showed that even with multiple consecutive applications at exaggerated application rates, the residue levels of BLAD will be negligible or non-existent. Both studies (involving label and exaggerated

application rates) showed similar residue measurements and a similar pattern with a half-life of about 2 days.

At label application rates, grape and strawberry samples showed no detectable residues (< limit of detection (LOD), 0.005 ppm) of BLAD on day zero; tomato samples showed BLAD residues < limit of quantitation (LOQ) (0.0062 ppm) on day zero but declined to < LOD levels one day after application. To ensure the reduction of any available residues, a one-day pre-harvest interval on PROBLAD PLUS labeling is being required.

Additionally, due to the presence of an almond husk and the subsequent processing of almond nut meats, the pre-harvest use of BLAD on almonds following good agricultural practices does not represent any reasonable possibility of resulting in detectable residues on the edible nut.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* Pesticide residues in drinking water are not expected because BLAD residues degrade rapidly in the environment. Specific information on the studies received and EPA's assessment of them can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0230.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* for lawn and garden pest control, indoor pest control, termiticides, and flea and tick control on pets). BLAD is not registered for any specific use patterns that would result in residential exposure.

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 BLAD to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and BLAD does not appear to degrade into any toxic metabolite or other substance of concern. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that BLAD 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*

FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) provides that, in considering the establishment of a tolerance or tolerance exemption for a pesticide chemical residue, 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 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 are available to support the choice of a different safety factor.

As part of its qualitative assessment, the Agency did not use safety factors for assessing risk; therefore, no additional safety factor is needed for assessing risk to infants and children. The available data indicate that BLAD has minimal or no toxicity and is not an allergen, especially in combination with the data demonstrating a lack of exposure from application as a pesticide. EPA therefore concludes that there are no threshold effects of concern to infants, children, or adults when BLAD is applied as a fungicide and used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices.

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

Taking into consideration all available information on BLAD, EPA concludes that the potential for allergenicity of BLAD introduces a reasonable uncertainty concerning the potential for harm to peanut-sensitive individuals in light of the possibility for unlimited exposure to BLAD that might be permitted under an unlimited exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. To address that potential uncertainty, EPA is proposing to revoke the current tolerance exemption for BLAD in 40 CFR 180.1319. In its place, and in consideration of these potential concerns, EPA is proposing to establish a more limited tolerance of 0.005 ppm for residues of BLAD in or on almonds, grapes, strawberries, and tomatoes. This is based on crop-specific residue data on grapes, strawberries, and tomatoes that demonstrates a lack of residues on those specific crops. Additionally, due to the presence of an almond husk and the subsequent processing of almond nut meats, the pre-harvest use of BLAD on almonds following good agricultural practices does not represent any reasonable possibility of resulting in detectable residues on the edible nut.

Therefore, under this more limited scenario, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to the residues of BLAD when it is applied as fungicide to the specifically noted crops and used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices. Such exposure includes all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information. Based on this information, EPA expects that, when used according to the proposed label directions, the tolerance for residues of BLAD on the listed commodities is safe, and no adverse effects such as allergenic reactions are expected to occur.

## V. Other Considerations

### *A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology*

Adequate enforcement methodology (Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA: EASI Method No: RA029 and RA031) is available to enforce the tolerance expression.

The method may be requested from: Chief, Analytical Chemistry Branch, Environmental Science Center, 701 Mapes Rd., Ft. Meade, MD 20755–5350; telephone number: (410) 305–2905; email address: *residuemethods@epa.gov*.

### *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 Nations 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 BLAD.

*C. Trade Considerations*

The revocation of the existing tolerance exemption and establishment of tolerances for four commodities is a reduction in allowable residues of BLAD on food. Therefore, EPA intends to provide notice to the World Trade Organization (WTO) of this proposal in accordance with its obligations under the WTO's Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement.

## VI. Conclusion

EPA proposes to revoke the existing tolerance exemption for residues of BLAD in or on all food commodities as established in the **Federal Register** of March 22, 2013 under section 408 of the FFDCA due to potential allergenicity concerns. In its stead, the Agency proposes to establish a tolerance for residues of BLAD in or on almonds, grapes, strawberries, and tomatoes at the level of detection of 0.005 ppm based on BLAD's low toxicity profile, testing that indicated that BLAD is non-allergenic, and residue data that demonstrated a rapid decline of BLAD following application at an exaggerated rate. Therefore, EPA is proposing to establish a tolerance level at the limit of detection for the analytical method to prevent any exposure to sensitive individuals from potential residues of BLAD on the treated crops.

## VII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This proposed action would revoke an existing exemption from the requirement of a tolerance and establish new tolerances under FFDCA section 408(e). The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted tolerance actions from review under Executive Orders 12866, entitled *Regulatory Planning and Review* (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), and 13563, entitled *Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review* (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011). As a result, 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). Nor does it require OMB review or any Agency action under 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.*); 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); and 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).

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, but it does not regulate State or tribal governments. Nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). Therefore, the Agency has determined that Executive Orders 13132, entitled *Federalism* (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and 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, contain any unfunded mandate, or otherwise significantly or uniquely affect small governments as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), I certify that this action will not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In making this determination, the impact of concern is any significant adverse economic impact on small entities. An agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the action will not impose any requirements on small entities. There are not a substantial number of small entities affected by this rule. BLAD, which is currently manufactured only by CEV, is not being used as a pesticide on food at this time. Therefore, this action will not impose any requirements or have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. We have therefore concluded that this action will not impact small entities.

## List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 13, 2015.

**Jack Housenger,**

*Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR chapter I be 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.

■ 3. Section 180.683 is added to read as follows:

### § 180.683 Banda de Lupinus albus doce; tolerances for residues.

(a) *General.* Tolerances are established for residues of the fungicide banda de *Lupinus albus* doce (BLAD), including its metabolites and degradates, in or on the commodities in the table below as a result of the application of BLAD. Compliance with the tolerance levels specified below is to be determined by measuring only BLAD in or on the following commodities.

| Commodity | Parts per million |
|---|---|
| Almonds | 0.005 |
| Grapes | 0.005 |
| Strawberries | 0.005 |
| Tomatoes | 0.005 |

(a) *Section 18 emergency exemptions.* [Reserved]

(b) *Tolerances with regional registrations.* [Reserved]

(c) *Indirect or inadvertent residues.* [Reserved]

### § 180.1319 [Removed and Reserved]

■ 3. Remove and reserve § 180.1319.

[FR Doc. 2015–12530 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Chapter I

**[EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0818; FRL–9927–36]**

## Proposal To Mitigate Exposure to Bees From Acutely Toxic Pesticide Products; Notice of Availability

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is seeking comment on a proposal to adopt mandatory pesticide label restrictions to protect managed bees under contract pollination services from foliar application of pesticides that are acutely toxic to bees on a contact exposure basis. These label restrictions would prohibit applications of pesticide products, which are acutely toxic to bees, during bloom when bees are known to be present under contract. EPA is also seeking comment on a proposal to rely on efforts made by states and tribes to reduce pesticide

exposures through development of locally-based measures, specifically through managed pollinator protection plans. These plans would include local and customizable mitigation measures to address certain scenarios that can result in exposure to pollinators. EPA intends to monitor the success of these plans in deciding whether further label restrictions are warranted.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0818, 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 Confidential Business Information (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.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael Goodis, Pesticide Re-evaluation Division (7508P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 308–8157; email address: *goodis.michael@epa.gov,* or

Marietta Echeverria, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; telephone number: (703) 305–8578; email address: *echeverria.marietta@epa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. General Information

### *A. Does this action apply to me?*

You may be potentially affected by this action if you produce an agricultural crop that is attractive to pollinators, if you are a beekeeper, or if you manufacture pesticides. In addition, state and tribal governments may be potentially affected by this action. 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:

- Pesticide and Other Agricultural Chemical Manufacturing (NAICS code 325320), *e.g.,* Insecticide and Herbicide Manufacturers
- Apiculture (NAICS code 112910)
- Crop Production (NAICS code 111)
- Regulation of Agricultural Marketing and Commodities (NAICS code 926140), *e.g.,* Pest control programs, agriculture, government

### *B. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?*

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through regulations.gov or email. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD–ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for preparing your comments.* When preparing and submitting your comments, see the commenting tips at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/comments.html.*

### *C. How can I get copies of this document and other related information?*

A copy of EPA's Proposal to Mitigate Exposure to Bees from Acutely Toxic Pesticide Products is available in the docket under docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0818.

## II. What action is the agency taking?

EPA is proposing mandatory pesticide label restrictions to protect contracted managed bees, *e.g.,* honey bee colonies that are under contract to provide pollination services, from foliar applications of pesticides that are acutely toxic to bees on a contact exposure basis, *i.e.,* those pesticides with an acutely lethal dose to 50% of the bees tested of less than 11 micrograms per bee, based on acute contact toxicity testing. Contracted pollination services result in a heightened risk potential where a large number of honey bee colonies are intentionally placed at a use site, and application of a toxic pesticide in this scenario is nearly certain to result in direct exposure to pollinators. Although the likely outcomes are counter-productive for both the beekeeper (loss of honey bee stock) and the grower (diminished pollination services), many beekeepers and growers seem not to have found ways to avoid such outcomes. Consequently, EPA believes that strong regulatory measures should be in place for the contracted service scenario to mitigate these potential problems. Therefore, EPA proposes to prohibit the foliar application of acutely toxic products during bloom for sites with bees on-site under contract, unless the application is made in accordance with a government-declared public health response. There would be no other exceptions to the bloom prohibition in the contracted-services scenario. Current neonicotinoid product labels include a 48-hr notification exception to the bloom prohibition. However, as part of this mitigation proposal, the 48-hr notification exception for crops under contracted pollination services during bloom for all neonicotinoid product labels would be removed. These restrictions are expected to reduce the likelihood of acute exposure and mortality to managed bees under contract.

EPA believes that managed bees not under contracted services (and other unmanaged bees) may also be exposed to acutely toxic pesticides when they are within forage range of the application site. While pesticide exposure under this scenario is possible, it is less certain than in situations where a pesticide is applied to a site when large numbers of managed bees have intentionally been positioned at the site for the purposes of providing pollination services. EPA believes that the lower likelihood of exposure for large numbers of managed bees in this scenario may warrant a more flexible approach toward mitigation such as that afforded by state or tribal Managed Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3s). Accordingly, EPA intends to encourage states and tribes to develop MP3s that are effective in reducing the likelihood of bees being present in the treatment area at the time a pesticide application is to be made. EPA would monitor success of these MP3s in mitigating risk to bees from acutely toxic pesticides on an ongoing basis and determine whether additional EPA action is warranted. Therefore, for managed bees not under contract pollination services, EPA is not proposing to require any new language

for pesticide labels. This does not alter EPA's previous requirement for more specific restrictions on neonicotinoid pesticides for which EPA required language to address risks to bees not under contract for pollination services.

EPA is seeking comment on both the approach of label restrictions on products used for bees under contract for pollinator services, and for the approach to rely on state and tribal pollinator protection plans to bees that are not under contract for pollination services.

These actions are consistent with the Presidential directive issued in June 2014 to reduce the effect of factors that have been associated with pollinator declines in general as well as the mandate to engage state and tribal partners in the development of pollinator protection plans. While the proposed mitigation focuses on managed bees, EPA believes that in protecting managed bees, these measures will also protect native solitary and social bees that are in and around treatment areas. The proposed mitigation is based on an acute toxicity threshold and is not intended to supersede more restrictive product-specific use prohibitions. EPA will continue to conduct chemical-specific risk assessments for bees and will consider additional product-specific mitigation as needed in the Office of Pesticide Program's (OPP) registration and registration review programs.

## III. Areas of Feedback

EPA is seeking comments on the proposed approach to mitigate exposure to bees from acutely toxic pesticide products under contract and non-contract pollination scenarios. In addition, EPA is specifically seeking comment on several issues described in the policy paper.

### *A. Label Language for Applications to Sites With Bees Present Under Contracted Services*

EPA is proposing to prohibit the foliar application of acutely toxic products during bloom for sites with bees on-site under contract, unless the application is made in accordance with a government-declared public health response. EPA encourages growers and beekeepers to include provisions in pollination service contracts that take into account the increased likelihood of bee colony exposure and ensure that colonies will be protected and pollination services secured. If EPA receives evidence during the public comment period and/or through outreach at stakeholder meetings that such contract provisions are common or that there are other effective and mutually agreed upon stakeholder (*i.e.,* beekeeper-to-grower) practices indicating that application of acutely toxic pesticides is not of risk concern for bees under contract, then EPA will consider this evidence in determining whether this scenario needs the mitigation indicated in the proposed language. Please comment on any factors that may allow EPA to reconsider the mitigation for this scenario, for example, if risks to bees are addressed through existing, and widely used, contract language.

### *B. State and Tribal Managed Pollinator Protection Plans*

For sites not under contracted services, EPA believes that pollinator protection plans serve as examples of effective collaboration between stakeholders at the local level that can lead to reduced pesticide exposure and protection of managed bees while maintaining the flexibility needed by growers to protect crops. Based on feedback provided to EPA by state lead agencies that have developed such plans, beekeeper-to-grower communication has been enhanced and fewer bee kill incidents have been reported as a result of the plans. Across these diverse plans, the common element has been effective stakeholder engagement, and anecdotal reports from the stakeholder groups suggest that the plans are effective at increasing communication and cooperation. The development of pollinator protection plans is a voluntary way for states and tribes to address acute pesticide exposure to pollinators. EPA believes that a key factor for states and tribes to determine the effectiveness of managed pollinator protection plans will be to include mechanisms to measure the effectiveness and a process to periodically review and modify each plan. Please comment on EPA's proposal to address risk to non-contract bees through reliance on state and tribal plans. Also, given the uncertainties with incident data, what kind of measures should be used to demonstrate that state and tribal pollinator protection plans are effective?

### *C. Uncertainties*

EPA recognizes that there are a number of uncertainties that remain regarding chemicals and exposure scenarios that may not fall within the domain of the proposal. EPA is also interested in receiving feedback on these uncertainties, which are described in the proposal.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 136a.

Dated: May 19, 2015.

**Jack E. Housenger,**

*Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12989 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

## Office of the Secretary

## 45 CFR Part 162

**[CMS–0026–NC]**

## Request for Information Regarding the Requirements for the Health Plan Identifier

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary (HHS).

**ACTION:** Request for information.

**SUMMARY:** This request for information seeks public comment regarding the health plan identifier (HPID) including the requirements regarding health plan enumeration and the requirement, to use the HPID in electronic health care transactions.

**DATES:** To be assured consideration, written or electronic comments must be received at one of the addresses provided below, no later than 5 p.m. on July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** In commenting, refer to file code CMS–0026–NC. Because of staff and resource limitations, we cannot accept comments by facsimile (FAX) transmission.

You may submit comments in one of four ways (please choose only one of the ways listed):

1. *Electronically.* You may submit electronic comments on this regulation to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the ''Submit a comment'' instructions.

2. *By regular mail.* You may mail written comments to the following address ONLY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Attention: CMS–0026–NC, P.O. Box 8013, Baltimore, MD 21244–8013.

Please allow sufficient time for mailed comments to be received before the close of the comment period.

3. *By express or overnight mail.* You may send written comments to the following address ONLY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Attention: CMS–0026–NC, Mail Stop C4–26–05, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21244–1850.

4. *By hand or courier.* Alternatively, you may deliver (by hand or courier) your written comments ONLY to the following addresses: a. For delivery in

Washington, DC—Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Room 445–G, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20201.

(Because access to the interior of the Hubert H. Humphrey Building is not readily available to persons without Federal government identification, commenters are encouraged to leave their comments in the CMS drop slots located in the main lobby of the building. A stamp-in clock is available for persons wishing to retain a proof of filing by stamping in and retaining an extra copy of the comments being filed.)

b. For delivery in Baltimore, MD—Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21244–1850.

If you intend to deliver your comments to the Baltimore address, call telephone number (410) 786–9994 in advance to schedule your arrival with one of our staff members.

Comments erroneously mailed to the addresses indicated as appropriate for hand or courier delivery may be delayed and received after the comment period.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Geanelle G. Herring, (410) 786–4466. Chevell Thomas, (410) 786–1387.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** *Inspection of Public Comments:* All comments received before the close of the comment period are available for viewing by the public, including any personally identifiable or confidential business information that is included in a comment. We post all comments received before the close of the comment period on the following Web site as soon as possible after they have been received: *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow the search instructions on that Web site to view public comments.

Comments received timely will also be available for public inspection as they are received, generally beginning approximately 3 weeks after publication of a document, at the headquarters of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21244, Monday through Friday of each week from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. To schedule an appointment to view public comments, phone 1–800–743–3951.

## I. Background

Section 262 of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Public Law 104–191, added section 1173 to the Social Security Act (the Act) and required, among other things, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) (the Secretary) to adopt standards providing for a standard unique health identifier for each health plan. The Congress renewed that requirement in 2010 in section 1104 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. L. 111–148), as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–152) (collectively known as the Affordable Care Act), requiring the Secretary to promulgate a final rule to establish a unique health plan identifier based on the input of the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, with such rulemaking to be effective not later than October 1, 2012.

In the September 5, 2012 **Federal Register** (77 FR 54664), the Secretary issued the Administrative Simplification: Adoption of a Standard for a Unique Health Plan Identifier; Addition to the National Provider Identifier Requirements; and a Change to the Compliance Date for the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Edition (ICD–CM and ICD–10–PCS) Medical Data Code Sets final rule (hereinafter referred to as the ''HPID final rule'') adopting a standard for a unique health plan identifier (HPID) and established requirements for its implementation. The final rule was effective November 5, 2012. With the exception of small health plans, plans were required to obtain an HPID by November 5, 2014 (small plans have until November 5, 2015). In recognition of the fact that health plans have many different business structures and arrangements, the HPID final rule created an enumeration structure that distinguishes between controlling health plans (CHPs) and subhealth plans (SHPs) and enables health plans to obtain HPIDs to reflect those arrangements and be identified appropriately in HIPAA transactions. CHPs are required to obtain HPIDs while SHPs are not. The HPID final rule also created an optional other entity identifier (OEID) to facilitate the identification in HIPAA transactions of entities that are not health plans, health care providers, or individuals, yet need to be identified in such transactions.

The HPID final rule does not require covered entities to identify a health plan in a HIPAA transaction. But, where a covered entity does identify a health plan in a HIPAA transaction, the final rule specifies that, on or after November 7, 2016, it must use an HPID to do so.

In early 2014, the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics (NCVHS) conducted a number of hearings regarding the HPID. Those hearings yielded testimony from various segments of the industry expressing concerns about the HPID and the need for additional clarification and led the NCVHS, on September 23, 2014, to recommend that the Secretary specify that the HPID not be used in HIPAA transactions and clarify the HPID's use. On October 31, 2014, HHS exercised enforcement discretion and advised the public of a delay, until further notice, in enforcement of 45 CFR 162, Subpart E (the regulations pertaining to HPID enumeration and use) so that HHS could review the NCVHS's recommendations and consider next steps. (See *http://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/HIPAA-Administrative-Simplification/Affordable-Care-Act/Health-Plan-Identifier.html*).

## II. Solicitation of Comments

We are soliciting public input to assess the NCVHS's recommendations to determine whether policy changes may be warranted. We also note that, since the publication of the HPID final rule, the nation's health care system has experienced sweeping changes, including implementation of the Affordable Care Act's marketplaces. Therefore, we are requesting information regarding the following:

- The HPID enumeration structure outlined in the HPID final rule, including the use of the CHP/SHP and OEID concepts.
- The use of the HPID in HIPAA transactions in conjunction with the Payer ID.
- Whether changes to the nation's health care system, since the issuance of the HPID final rule published September 5, 2012, have altered your perspectives about the function of the HPID.

## III. Response to Comments

Because of the large number of public comments we normally receive on **Federal Register** documents, we are not able to acknowledge or respond to them individually. We will consider all comments we receive by the date and time specified in the **DATES** section of this preamble; and, when we issue a subsequent document, we will respond to the comments in the preamble to that document.

Approved May 25, 2015.

**Sylvia M. Burwell,**

*Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13047 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**Office of the Secretary**

**48 CFR Part 5432**

**[DOD–2008–DARS–0006]**

**RIN 0790–AI05**

## Transporter Proof of Delivery

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This rule establishes a clause allowing the Government to require that contractors provide Transporter Proof of Delivery (TPD) when requested. As used in this rule, TPD means a commercial document that is generated by the contractor or the contractor's transporter of supplies and is signed by the Government customer in order to document delivery of supplies under a contract or order.

**DATES:** Consideration will be given to all comments received on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by docket number and or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) number and title, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Department of Defense, Office of the Deputy Chief Management Officer, Directorate of Oversight and Compliance, Regulatory and Audit Matters Office, 9010 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–9010.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or RIN for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christine Bond Jawish, (703) 767–8451.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Executive Summary

### I. Purpose of This Regulatory Action

Not all Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) customers provide acknowledgement of receipt, which can lead to payment problems and negatively impact auditability. The TPD clause provides a mechanism for procuring proof of delivery from affected contractors, if the receiving activity has not acknowledged receipt of material. TPD documentation will be used as evidential matter in support of the receipt and acceptance functions, which will facilitate the payment process and support timely payment, thus decreasing Prompt Payment Act interest charges against the Government. It is estimated that on an annual basis, DLA pays approximately $800,000 in interest due to late payment.

The legal authority for the regulatory action is 41 U.S.C. 1303, the general authority for Federal Acquisition Regulations system rule making.

### II. Summary of the Major Provisions of This Regulatory Action

This regulatory action provides for issuance of a TPD clause that requires contractors to submit TPD information when requested. The clause will be applicable to solicitations and awards for acquisitions for supplies issued by DLA Aviation, DLA Land and Maritime, and DLA Troop Support when contract deliveries will be made directly to DLA customers, with the following exceptions: Acquisitions requiring DCMA Inspection and Acceptance, shipments for overseas destinations or to containerization consolidation points, and acquisitions conducted under the Subsistence Total Order and Receipt Electronic System (STORES), Defense Medical Logistics Standard Support (DMLSS), Industrial Prime Vendor (IPV), or Integrated Logistics Partner (ILP) programs.

TPD will normally be requested from a contractor only when it is known or appears likely, based on current or past experience, that a customer receiving supplies under the applicable contract or order will not provide material receipt acknowledgment (MRA) in a timely manner so as to support payment in accordance with Prompt Payment Act requirements.

The clause states that when the Government requests TPD, the request and response will be made using electronic mail and requires the contractor to submit the requested TPD documentation in a prescribed digital format. It is anticipated that contractors will either have or will easily be able to collect the TPD documentation in the normal course of business.

### III. Cost and Benefits of This Regulatory Action

It is anticipated that costs related to use of the clause will not be significant. The information to be submitted under the clause is expected to be required only on an exception basis, is expected to be readily available to the contractors subject to the clause, and will normally be provided using electronic means (digital attachments to electronic mail).

Use of the clause will facilitate the contract payment process in instances where the normal system for receipt and acceptance is not functioning in a timely manner. It is anticipated that facilitation of the contract payment process will result in a decrease in Prompt Payment Act interest accrual and resulting payments to contractors by the Defense Logistics Agency.

### Regulatory Analysis

*Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review'' and Executive Order 13563, ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review''*

It has been determined that 48 CFR part 5432 is a significant regulatory action and has been reviewed by OMB.

*Section 202, Public Law 104–4, ''Unfunded Mandates Reform Act''*

It has been certified that this rule does not contain a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year.

*Public Law 96–354, ''Regulatory Flexibility Act'' (5 U.S.C. 601)*

It has been certified that this rule is not subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601) because it would not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The implementation of this rule will facilitate the receipt documentation process and enhance the accountability of DLA-provided goods, as well as provide a basis for more efficient and expeditious payments to affected contractors.

*Public Law 96–511, ''Paperwork Reduction Act'' (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)*

Section 5432.2 of this proposed rule contains information collection requirements. DoD has submitted the following proposal to OMB under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DoD, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated

collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

*Title:* Transporter Proof of Delivery.

*Type of Request:* Existing collection in use without an OMB Control Number.

*Number of Respondents:* 158,307.

*Responses per Respondent:* 1.

*Annual Responses:* 158,307.

*Average Burden per Response:* 10 minutes.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 26,385 hours.

*Needs and Uses:* Transporter Proof of Delivery documentation will be requested from a contractor when it is known or appears likely, based on current or past experience that a customer receiving supplies under the applicable contractor or order will not provide material receipt acknowledgment in a timely manner so as to support payment in accordance with Prompt Payment requirements.

*Affected Public:* Businesses or other for-profits.

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Jasmeet Seehra.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Ms. Jasmeet Seehra at the Office of Management and Budget, DoD Desk Officer, Room 10102, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503, with a copy to the Defense Logistics Agency, ATTN: J71, Suite 3122, 8725 John Kingman Road, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060. Comments can be received from 30 to 60 days after the date of this notice, but comments to OMB will be most useful if received by OMB within 30 days after the date of this notice.

You may also submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by the following method:

* *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the Defense Logistics Agency, ATTN: J71, Suite 3122, 8725 John Kingman Road, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060. POC is Christine Bond Jawish, 703–767–8451.

*Executive Order 13132, ''Federalism''*

It has been certified that this rule does not have federalism implications, as set forth in Executive Order 13132. This rule does not have substantial direct effects on:

(1) The States;

(2) The relationship between the National Government and the States; or

(3) The distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

**List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 5432**

Contract delivery receipt process.

Accordingly, title 48 CFR Chapter 54, is proposed to be amended to add part 5432 to read as follows:

## PART 5432—TRANSPORTER PROOF OF DELIVERY

Sec.
5432.1 Payment documentation process.
5432.2 Transporter proof of delivery.

**Authority:** 41 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*

### § 5432.1 Payment documentation process.

(a) *General.* (1) *Transporter proof of delivery* (TPD). (i) TPD is a commercial document generated by the contractor or the transporter of supplies and signed by the Government customer at time of delivery. TPD, in combination with adequate contractor documentation cross-referencing the TPD to the specific supplies provided, demonstrates customer receipt. This documentation allows the Government to initiate the acceptance and payment process.

(ii) TPD is not a substitute for any other receipt and acceptance documentation, such as the material receipt acknowledgement (MRA) or the Wide Area Workflow receiving report (RR) required from the DoD customer, but is a supplement to such documentation, and may be used to document receipt and as the basis for Government acceptance to pay the contractor's invoice in the absence of an MRA or RR. The exceptions to the requirement for contractors to submit payment requests and receiving reports in electronic form are listed at DFARS 232.7002, to include cases in which DoD is unable to receive payment requests or provide acceptance in electronic form.

(2) [Reserved].

(b) *Content of invoices.* (1) *TPD.* (i) DLA may accept supplies based on submission by the contractor of satisfactory documentation to demonstrate customer receipt of supplies (correct items(s) and correct quantities) under a specific contract or order in accordance with paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(ii) If the customer has submitted a supply discrepancy report (SDR) or MRA discrepancy indicator, payment shall not be made until the discrepancy is resolved. If payment is made before the purchasing organization receives the SDR or MRA discrepancy indicator, the Government may pursue appropriate remedies, including those provided by § 5432.2.

(2) Reserved.

(c) *Authorization to pay.* (1) *TPD.* (i) *Application.* Contracting officers at DLA Aviation, DLA Land and Maritime, and DLA Troop Support shall insert the clause at § 5432.2, TPD, in solicitations and awards for supplies when contract deliveries will be made directly to DLA customers. The following exceptions apply:

(A) DCMA Inspection and Acceptance

(B) Shipments to overseas destinations or to containerization consolidation points; and

(C) Acquisitions conducted under the Subsistence Total Order and Receipt Electronic System (STORES), Defense Medical Logistics Standard Support (DMLSS), Industrial Prime Vendor (IPV), or Integrated Logistics Partner (ILP) programs.

(ii) Transporter proof of delivery procedural guidance: TPD will normally be requested from a contractor only when it is known or appears likely, based on current or past experience, that a customer receiving supplies under the applicable contract or order will not provide material receipt acknowledgement (MRA) in a timely manner so as to support payment in accordance with Prompt Payment requirements. The customer is still required to submit the MRA, and supply chains shall continue to ensure that follow up action is taken by appropriate personnel to obtain the MRA from the customer when it is not provided.

(2) Reserved.

### § 5432.2 Transporter proof of delivery.

Insert the Transporter Proof of Delivery clause in this section, when applicable in accordance with § 5432.1(a)(1)(i) and when either the clause at 48 CFR 52.232–25, Prompt Payment, or the clause at 48 CFR 52.212–4, Contract Terms and Conditions—Commercial Items, is used.

(Beginning of Clause)

**TRANSPORTER PROOF OF DELIVERY (TPD) (DATE)**

(a) *Definition.* As used in this clause, transporter proof of delivery (TPD) means a commercial document that is generated by the Contractor or the Contractor's transporter of supplies and that is signed by the Government

customer in order to document delivery of supplies under this contract/order. Examples of TPD are United Parcel Service (UPS) or Federal Express (FEDEX) delivery tracking reports. TPD documentation must include a Government customer signature and, if practicable, clearly state the name of the Government customer who signed.

(b) When this clause is included in the contract or order, the Government may use TPD, in combination with adequate Contractor documentation cross-referencing the TPD to the specific supplies provided, as a basis for accepting the supplies. TPD with adequate supporting documentation satisfies the receipt report requirement and in non-fast payment contracts and orders allows the Government to initiate the payment process, if all other applicable payment conditions are satisfied.

(c) To facilitate the payment process, the Government may initiate a request for the Contractor to provide TPD. The Contractor shall provide TPD upon request by the Government. The Contractor shall provide TPD within 10 calendar days following request. The request and response will be made using electronic mail. The Contractor shall immediately notify the Government if TPD is not available. The TPD documentation shall be a clear, readable, and accurate copy of the original and be provided in standard Portable Document File (PDF) or Joint Photographic Experts Group (JPEG) digital format, and must include the following:

(1) Government customer signature and, if practicable, clearly state the name of the Government customer who signed;

(2) Contract number and, if applicable, order number;

(3) Contract line item number(s) (CLIN(s));

(4) Quantity of items;

(5) National stock number (NSN);

(6) Delivery date;

(7) Recipient organization's name and address; and

(8) Location where the carrier made delivery (activity name, building number, city, state).

(d) In addition to the above information which is required, the TPD should contain as much of the following information as possible:

(1) Unit price;

(2) Extended Price;

(3) Receiving activity Department of Defense activity address code (DoDAAC)

(4) Requisition document number (and suffix, when applicable);

(5) Shipment number; and,

(6) Invoice number.

(e) Responsibility for supplies for which TPD is requested.

(1) Title to the supplies passes to the Government when the Government accepts the supplies.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of the contract, order, or blanket purchase agreement, the Contractor shall:

(i) Assume all responsibility and risk of loss for supplies not received at destination, damaged in transit, or not conforming to purchase requirements; and

(ii) Replace, repair, or correct those supplies promptly at the Contractor's expense, if instructed to do so by the Contracting Officer within 180 days from the date title to the supplies vests in the Government.

(End of Clause)

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13002 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**

# Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 103
Friday, May 29, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Food and Nutrition Service

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D–SNAP)

**AGENCY:** Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice invites the general public and other public agencies to comment on the proposed collection. This is a revision of a currently approved collection. The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 provides the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to develop a Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D–SNAP) to address the needs of families temporarily in need of food assistance after a disaster. The information collection under this notice is required for the establishment and operation of a D–SNAP.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments may be sent to Sasha Gersten-Paal, Chief, Certification Policy Branch, Program Development Division, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 812, Alexandria, VA 22302. Comments may also be faxed to the attention of Ms. Gersten-Paal at (703) 305–2507 or via email to *Sasha.Gersten-Paal@fns.usda.gov*.

Comments will also be accepted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for submitting comments electronically.

All written comments will be open for public inspection at the office of FNS during regular business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday) located at 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 800, Alexandria, Virginia, 22302.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will be a matter of public record.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information should be directed to Ms. Gersten-Paal at (703) 305–2507.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D–SNAP).

*OMB Number:* 0584–0336.

*Expiration Date:* 10/31/2015.

*Type of Request:* Revision previously approved collection.

*Abstract:* Pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 100–707, and Section 5(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, 7 U.S.C. 2014(h), the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to develop a Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D–SNAP) to address the temporary food needs of people following a disaster. The information collected under this notice is required from State agencies in order to receive approval from the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to operate a D–SNAP.

D–SNAP is a program that is separate from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and is conducted for a specific period of time. In order for a State to request to operate a D–SNAP, an affected area in the State must have received a Presidential declaration of ''Major Disaster'' with Individual Assistance. Once the declaration is in place, the State submits a request to operate a D–SNAP to FNS. FNS reviews the request to ensure that all the necessary requirements to conduct D–SNAP are met. Upon approval of a D–SNAP, FNS provides the State support in their D–SNAP efforts through policy guidance, training and technical assistance. Since each disaster demands a separate D–SNAP program, a State can submit multiple requests to FNS to operate multiple D–SNAPs.

The number of disasters that occur annually and the average number of households affected by the disasters cannot be predicted. During the period from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2014, the number of State requests for disaster programs ranged from 3 to 23 requests per year. The information collection under this reporting burden is limited to the burden experienced by State agencies in preparing and submitting their requests to operate D–SNAPs to FNS. FNS does not have a standardized form for D–SNAP requests at this time, due to the dynamic nature of emergency situations and the need to quickly respond to the requesting State agency; therefore, State agencies are required to submit their request to operate D–SNAPs to FNS via email or fax. The burden associated with the actual operation of D–SNAPs, including the processing of applications from households affected by disasters, is included under OMB information collection 0584–0064, titled 'SNAP Forms: Applications, Periodic Reporting, Notices' (expiration date 04/30/2016), which includes all information collection activities associated with the certification of participating and applicant households. The D–SNAP participation and issuance form FNS–292–B, Report of Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Benefit Issuance, is covered under the OMB information collection 0584–0037 (expiration date: 08/31/2017) and will not be reflected in this submission.

FNS estimates that approximately 10 hours of State personnel time are required to prepare D–SNAP application requests. The burden associated with preparing requests to operate a D–SNAP does not vary significantly from disaster to disaster and is relatively independent of the scope of the disaster. Major disasters require little additional

document preparation time than relatively minor disasters. FNS estimates an average of 9 State agencies will submit 1 D–SNAP application per year to operate D–SNAPs for a total annual request of 9 applications per year (this is a decrease from an average of 14 applications per year). We further estimate it will take approximately 10 hours of State agency personnel time to prepare each application, for a total annual burden estimate average of 90 burden hours per year. These revised estimates reflect a slight decrease since the last OMB approval.

Summary of Burden Hours

*Affected Public:* State agencies and local governments.

*Estimated Total Annual Number of Respondents:* 9.

*Estimated Frequency of Responses per Respondents:* 1.

*Estimated Total Annual Responses:* 9.

*Estimated Total Hours per Response:* 10.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 90.

| OMB No. 0584–0336 Affected public | Estimated total annual number of respondents | Estimated frequency of responses per respondents | Estimated total annual responses | Estimated total hours per response | Estimated total annual burden hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reporting Burden State Agencies | 9 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 90 |
| Total Annual Burden Estimate | 9 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 90 |

Dated: May 19, 2015.

**Jeffrey J. Tribiano,**

*Acting Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13024 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–30–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

### Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, Wisconsin, Townsend Project

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to document the analysis and disclose the environmental impacts of proposed land management activities and corresponding alternatives within the Townsend Project. The purpose of the Townsend Project is to implement land management activities that are consistent with direction in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest 2004 Land and Resources Management Plan (forest plan) and respond to the specific needs identified in the project area. The project-specific needs include: species diversity, wildlife habitat, stream bank improvement, forest age, forest composition, and stocking.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis must be received by June 29, 2015 in order to have standing for objection. The draft environmental impact statement is expected on January 2016 and the final environmental impact statement is expected on April 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Marilee Houtler, ATTN: Townsend Project, Lakewood-Laona Ranger District, 15085 State Road 32, Lakewood, WI 54138. Comments may also be sent via email to *comments-eastern-chequamegon-nicolet-lakewood@fs.fed.us,* or via facsimile to 715–276–3594.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the public record for the proposed action. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered; however, anonymous comments will not provide the Agency with the ability to provide the respondent with subsequent environmental documents.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marilee Houtler, NEPA Coordinator at the above address or by phone at 715–276–6333.

Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The infromation presented in this notice is included to help the reviewer determine if they are interested in or potentially affected by the proposed land management activities. The infromation presented in the notice is summarized. Those who wish to provide comments or are otherwise interested in or affected by the projects are encouraged to obtain additional infromation from the contact listed above.

#### Purpose and Need for Action

The current conditions of many stands in the project area varies from desired conditions in the forest plan. Our information shows some of the more notable gaps between the existing and desired conditions by management area. Of primary importance is the need for change in: wildlife habitat, stream improvement, species age structure, species composition, and stocking densities.

#### Proposed Action

Projected project implementation would be fall 2016. The Townsend Project is located on National Forest System lands, administered by the Lakewood-Laona Ranger District, west of Townsend. The legal description of the project is Townships 32–34 North and Ranges 14 and 15 East. The Forest Service proposes to improve wildlife habitat, remove short-lived species along streams, and use timber harvest (selection, thin, clearcut, and shelterwood) to move the area toward the desired conditions.

#### Responsible Official

The responsible official for this project is Lakewood-Laona Distict Ranger, Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest.

#### Nature of Decision To Be Made

Decision making will be limited to specific activities relating to the proposed actions. The primary decision to be made will be whether or not to implement the proposed action, no action, another alternative, or parts of alternatives that respond to the projects purpose and need. This decision would be documented in a record of decision.

#### Scoping Process

This notice of intent initiates the scoping process, which guides the development of the EIS. The 45 day comment period will start after the publication in the **Federal Register** of the Notice of Availabilty for the Townsend Project Draft EIS.

It is important that reviewers provide their comments at such times and in such manner that they are useful to the agency's preparation of the

environmental impact statement. Therefore, comments should be provided prior to the close of the comment period and should clearly articulate the reviewer's concerns and contentions.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be part of the public record for this proposed action. However, comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered.

Dated: May 11, 2015.

**Paul I. V. Strong,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13015 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–11–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### National Agricultural Statistics Service

### Notice of Intent To Request Revision and Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Agricultural Statistics Service, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, this notice announces the intention of the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) to request revision and extension of a currently approved information collection, the Floriculture Survey. Revision to burden hours will be needed due to changes in the size of the target population, sampling design, and/or questionnaire length.

**DATES:** Comments on this notice must be received by July 28, 2015 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by docket number 0535–0093, by any of the following methods:

- *Email: omboffcer@nass.usda.gov.* Include docket number above in the subject line of the message.
- *E-Fax:* (855) 838–6382.
- *Mail:* Mail any paper, disk, or CD–ROM submissions to: David Hancock, NASS Clearance Officer, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 5336 South Building, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250–2024.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Hand deliver to: David Hancock, NASS Clearance Officer, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 5336 South Building, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250–2024.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** R. Renee Picanso, Associate Administrator, National Agricultural Statistics Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, (202) 720–4333. Copies of this information collection and related instructions can be obtained without charge from David Hancock, NASS–OMB Clearance Officer, at (202) 690–2388 or at *omboffcer@nass.usda.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** *Title:* Floriculture Survey.

*OMB Control Number:* 0535–0093.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* January 31, 2016.

*Type of Request:* Intent to Seek Approval to Revise and Extend an Information Collection for 3 years.

*Abstract:* The primary objective of the National Agricultural Statistics Service is to prepare and issue State and national estimates of crop and livestock production, prices, and disposition. The Floriculture Survey is currently conducted in 15 States (California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington) and obtains basic agricultural statistics on production and value of floriculture products. The target population for this survey is all operations with production and sales of at least $10,000 of floriculture products. New floriculture operations that are discovered during the 2015 Census of Horticulture or the 2017 Census of Agriculture will be added to the list of potential respondents. The retail and wholesale quantity and value of sales are collected for fresh cut flowers, potted flowering plants, foliage plants, annual bedding/garden plants, herbaceous perennials, cut cultivated florist greens, propagative floriculture material, and unfinished plants. Additional detail on area in production, operation value of sales, and agricultural workers is included. Content changes are minimal year to year, with the goal of avoiding significant changes to the length and burden associated with each questionnaire. The only program change anticipated will be the discontinuation of the Poinsettia and Export Sales Surveys in Hawaii that are approved in the current PRA, expiring on January 31, 2016. These statistics are used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help administer programs and by growers and marketers in making production and marketing decisions.

*Authority:* These data will be collected under the authority of 7 U.S.C. 2204(a). Individually identifiable data collected under this authority are governed by Section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2276, which requires USDA to afford strict confidentiality to non-aggregated data provided by respondents. This Notice is submitted in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*), and Office of Management and Budget regulations at 5 CFR part 1320.

NASS also complies with OMB Implementation Guidance, ''Implementation Guidance for Title V of the E-Government Act, Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (CIPSEA),'' **Federal Register**, Vol. 72, No. 115, June 15, 2007, p. 33362.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average between 10 and 60 minutes per respondent. In all states except Hawaii, operations with less than $100,000 in sales of floriculture products respond to a reduced number of questions related to operation characteristics while operations with sales greater than $100,000 complete the entire questionnaire. In Hawaii, all operations with sales of at least $10,000 will complete the full questionnaire.

*Respondents:* Farms and businesses.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 6,900.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 3,900 hours.

*Comments:* Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, technological, or other forms of information technology collection techniques.

All responses to this notice will become a matter of public record and be summarized in the request for OMB approval.

Signed at Washington, DC, May 18, 2015.

**R. Renee Picanso,**

*Associate Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13013 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–20–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### National Institute of Food and Agriculture

### Notice of Intent To Extend a Currently Approved Information Collection

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Food and Agriculture, USDA.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at (5 CFR part 1320), this notice announces the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) intention to request approval for an extension of the currently approved information collection for the NIFA proposal review process.

**DATES:** Written comments on this notice must be received by July 28, 2015, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments concerning this notice and requests for copies of the information collection may be submitted by any of the following methods: Email: *rmartin.usda.gov;* Fax: 202–720–0857; Mail: Office of Information Technology (OIT), NIFA, USDA, STOP 2216, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20250–2216.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Martin, eGovernment Program Leader; Email: *rmartin@nifa.usda.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* NIFA Proposal Review Process.

*OMB Number:* 0524–0041.

*Expiration Date of Current Approval:* 05/31/2015

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved information collection for three years.

*Abstract:* The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is responsible for performing a review of proposals submitted to NIFA competitive award programs in accordance with section 103(a) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, 7 U.S.C. 7613(a). Reviews are undertaken to ensure that projects supported by NIFA are of high quality, and are consistent with the goals and requirements of the funding program.

Proposals submitted to NIFA undergo a programmatic evaluation to determine worthiness of Federal support. The evaluations consist of a peer panel review and may also entail an assessment by Federal employees and electronically submitted (ad-hoc) reviews in the Peer Review System.

*Need and Use of the Information:* The information collected from the evaluations is used to support NIFA grant programs. NIFA uses the results of the proposal evaluation to determine whether a proposal should be declined or recommended for award. When NIFA has rendered a decision, copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers, and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, are provided to the submitting Project Director.

Given the highly technical nature of many of these proposals, the quality of the peer review greatly depends on the appropriate matching of the subject matter of the proposal with the technical expertise of the potential reviewer. In order to obtain this information, an electronic questionnaire is used to collect information about potential panel and ad-hoc reviewers. If the reviewer is already in our database, the questionnaire asks potential reviewers to update their basic biographical information including address, contact information, professional expertise, and their availability to review for NIFA in the future. If the reviewer is new they are prompted to complete the questionnaire. The information collected from reviewers has been invaluable in the NIFA review process, which has been recognized by the grantee and grantor community for its quality.

The applications and associated materials made available to reviewers, as well as the discussions that take place during panel review meetings are strictly confidential and are not to be disclosed to or discussed with anyone who has not been officially designated to participate in the review process. While each panelist certifies at the time of preparing a review they do not have a conflict-of-interest with a particular application and will maintain its confidentiality in the Peer Review System, a certification of their intent at the time of the panel review proceedings is collected to emphasize and reinforce confidentiality not only of applications and reviews but also panel discussions. On the Conflict-of-Interest and Confidentiality Certification Form, the panelist affirms they understand the conflict-of-interest guidelines and will not be involved in the review of the application(s) where a conflict exists. The panelist also affirms their intent to maintain the confidentiality of the panel process and not disclose to another individual any information related to the peer review or use any information for personal benefit.

*Estimate of Burden:* NIFA estimates that anywhere from one hour to twenty hours may be required to review a proposal. It is estimated that approximately five hours are required to review an average proposal. Each proposal receives an average of four reviews, accounting for an annual burden of 20 hours. NIFA estimates it receives 4,600 competitive applications each year. The total annual burden on reviewers is 92,000 hours. NIFA estimates that the potential reviewer questionnaire takes an estimated 10 minutes to complete. The database consists of approximately 50,000 reviewers. The total annual burden of questionnaire is 8,330 hours. NIFA estimates that the potential Conflict-of-Interest and Confidentiality Certification Form takes an estimated 10 minutes to complete. The agency has approximately 1,000 panelists each year. The total annual burden of the certification form is 167 hours. The total annual burden of the component of the entire review process is 100,497 hours.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request to OMB for approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 19th day of May, 2015.

**Catherine E. Woteki,**

*Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13011 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–22–P

## COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

### Notice of Public Meeting of the Nevada Advisory Committee To Discuss and Approve Its Report on Police Militarization

**AGENCY:** U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

**ACTION:** Announcement of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) that a meeting of the Nevada Advisory Committee (Committee) to the Commission will be held on Friday, June 19, 2015, for the purpose of discussing and voting upon the committee report on the militarization of police. The meeting will be held at Nevada Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation (NDETR), 2800 East St. Louis Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89104. A second videoconference location for the meeting is NDETR, 1325 Corporate Blvd., Reno, NV 89502. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 1:30 p.m. and adjourn at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Members of the public are entitled to make comments during the open period at the end of the meeting. Members of the public may also submit written comments. The comments must be received in the Western Regional Office of the Commission by July 17, 2015. The address is Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 300 N. Los Angeles Street, Suite 2010, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Persons wishing to email their comments may do so by sending them to Angelica Trevino, Civil Rights Analyst, Western Regional Office, at *atrevino@usccr.gov.* Persons who desire additional information should contact the Western Regional Office, at (213) 894–3437, (or for hearing impaired TDD 913–551–1414), or by email to *atrevino@usccr.gov.* Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

Records and documents discussed during the meeting will be available for public viewing prior to and after the meeting at *http://facadatabase.gov/committee/meetings.aspx?cid=261* and clicking on the ''Meeting Details'' and ''Documents'' links. Records generated from this meeting may also be inspected and reproduced at the Western Regional Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's Web site, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Western Regional Office at the above email or street address.

*Agenda:* Call to order; Discussion and vote on police militarization report; Open comment; Adjournment.

**DATES:** Friday, June 19, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** NDETR, 2800 East St. Louis Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89104.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Peter Minarik, DFO, at (213) 894–3437 or *pminarik@usccr.gov*

Dated: May 22, 2015

**David Mussatt,**

*Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12978 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6335–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

**Note:** This notice supplements FR Doc. 2015–09741 with new information, and extends the comment period to June 28, 2015.

*Agency:* U.S. Census Bureau.

*Title:* American Community Survey.

*OMB Control Number:* 0607–0810.

*Form Number(s):* ACS–1, ACS–1(SP), ACS–1(PR), ACS–1(PR)SP, ACS–1(GQ), ACS–1(PR)(GQ), GQFQ, ACS CATI (HU), ACS CAPI (HU), ACS RI (HU), and AGQ QI, AGQ RI.

*Type of Request:* Regular Submission.

*Number of Respondents:* 3,760,000.

*Average Hours Per Response:* 40 minutes for the average household questionnaire.

*Burden Hours:* The estimate is an annual average of 2,455,868 burden hours.

*Needs and Uses:* The U.S. Census Bureau requests authorization from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for revisions to the American Community Survey (ACS). This notice updates **Federal Register** notice 80 FR 23501, which proposed only changes to the content of the proposed 2016 ACS questionnaire and data collection instruments for both Housing Unit and Group Quarters operations that were proposed as a result of the 2014 ACS Content Review. This notice proposes additional changes to the content of the proposed 2016 ACS questionnaire and data collection instruments for both Housing Unit and Group Quarters operations that were proposed as a result of (a) recently completed cognitive testing on the computer usage and internet questions; (b) research suggesting that the flush toilet component of the plumbing facilities question can be removed; and (c) recent field testing of changes to the ACS mailing strategy to further reduce respondent concerns.

The American Community Survey (ACS) is one of the Department of Commerce's most valuable data products, used extensively by businesses, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local governments, and many federal agencies. In conducting this survey, the Census Bureau's top priority is respecting the time and privacy of the people providing information while preserving its value to the public. The 2016 survey content changes are the initial step in a multi-faceted approach to reducing respondent burden. The Census Bureau is currently carrying out this program of research, which includes several components as discussed briefly below.

One of the areas with strong potential to reduce respondent burden is to reuse information already supplied to the federal government in lieu of directly collecting it again through particular questions on the ACS. The Census Bureau is conducting groundbreaking work aimed at understanding the extent to which existing government data can reduce redundancy and improve efficiency. The tests we are conducting in the next two years will tell us whether existing government records can provide substitute data for households that have not responded to the ACS.

In addition, we continue to look into the possibility of asking some questions less often beginning with initial efforts on the marital history series of questions. For example, asking a question every other year, every third year, or asking a question of a subset of the respondents each year. We also want to examine ways we can better phrase our questions to reduce respondent concern, especially for those who may be sensitive to providing information.

The outcome of these future steps will be a more efficient survey that minimizes respondent burden while continuing to provide quality data products for the nation. We expect to make great progress during fiscal 2015 on this front, and will be reporting our progress to the Secretary of Commerce at the end of the fiscal year.

Since the founding of the nation, the U.S. Census has mediated between the demands of a growing country for information about its economy and people, and the people's privacy and respondent burden. Beginning with the 1810 Census, Congress added questions to support a range of public concerns and uses, and over the course of a century questions were added about

agriculture, industry, and commerce, as well as occupation, ancestry, marital status, disabilities, and other topics. In 1940, the U.S. Census Bureau introduced the long form and since then only the more detailed questions were asked of a sample of the public.

The ACS, launched in 2005, is the current embodiment of the long form of the census, and is asked each year of a sample of the U.S. population in order to provide current data needed more often than once every ten years. In December of 2010, five years after its launch, the ACS program accomplished its primary objective with the release of its first set of estimates for every area of the United States. The Census Bureau concluded it was an appropriate time to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the ACS program. This program assessment focused on strengthening programmatic, technical, and methodological aspects of the survey to assure that the Census Bureau conducts the ACS efficiently and effectively.

In August 2012, the OMB and the Census Bureau chartered the Interagency Council on Statistical Policy (ICSP) Subcommittee on the ACS to ''provide advice to the Director of the Census Bureau and the Chief Statistician at OMB on how the ACS can best fulfill its role in the portfolio of Federal household surveys and provide the most useful information with the least amount of burden.'' The Subcommittee charter also states that the Subcommittee would be expected to ''conduct regular, periodic reviews of the ACS content. . .designed to ensure that there is clear and specific authority and justification for each question to be on the ACS, the ACS is the appropriate vehicle for collecting the information, respondent burden is being minimized, and the quality of the data from ACS is appropriate for its intended use.''

**Changes in 2016 ACS Content Resulting From the Content Review**

The formation of the ICSP Subcommittee on the ACS and the aforementioned assessment of the ACS program also provided an opportunity to examine and confirm the value of each question on the ACS, which resulted in the 2014 ACS Content Review. This review, which was an initial step in a multi-faceted approach of a much larger content review process, included examination of all 72 questions contained on the 2014 ACS questionnaire, including 24 housing-related questions and 48 person-related questions.

The Census Bureau proposed the two analysis factors—benefit as defined by the level of usefulness and cost as defined by the level of respondent burden or difficulty in obtaining the data, which were accepted by the ICSP Subcommittee. Based on a methodology pre-defined by the Census Bureau with the input and concurrence of the ICSP Subcommittee on the ACS, each question received a total number of points between 0 and 100 based on its benefits, and 0 and 100 points based on its costs. These points were then used as the basis for creating four categories: High Benefit and Low Cost; High Benefit and High Cost; Low Benefit and Low Cost; or Low Benefit and High Cost. For this analysis, any question that was designated as either Low Benefit and Low Cost or Low Benefit and High Cost and was NOT designated as Mandatory (*i.e.,* statutory) by the Department of Commerce Office of General Counsel (OGC) or NOT Required (*i.e.,* regulatory) with a sub-state use, was identified as a potential candidate for removal. The Department of Commerce OGC worked with its counterparts across the federal government to determine mandatory, required, or programmatic status, as defined below:

- *Mandatory*—a federal law explicitly calls for use of decennial census or ACS data on that question.
- *Required*—a federal law (or implementing regulation) explicitly requires the use of data and the decennial census or the ACS is the historical source; or the data are needed for case law requirements imposed by the U.S. federal court system.
- *Programmatic*—the data are needed for program planning, implementation, or evaluation and there is no explicit mandate or requirement.

Based on the analysis, the following questions were initially proposed for removal:

- *Housing Question No. 6—Business/Medical Office on Property*
- *Person Question No. 12—Undergraduate Field of Degree*
- *Person Question No. 21—(In the Past 12 mos, did this person) Get Married, Widowed, Divorced*
- Person Question No. 22—Times Married
- Person Question No. 23—Year Last Married

For reports that provide a full description of the overall 2014 ACS Content Review methods and results, see ''Final Report—American Community Survey FY14 Content Review Results'' and additional reports about the 2014 ACS Content Review available at *http://www.census.gov/acs/www/about_the_survey/methods_and_results_report/*

Regarding the business/medical office on property question, the Census Bureau received 41 comments from researchers, and individuals. Most of these comments came from researchers who felt that the Census Bureau should keep all of the proposed questions in order to keep the survey content consistent over time, or felt that modifications to the question could potentially make it more useful. Housing Question No. 6—Business/Medical Office on Property is currently not published by the Census Bureau in any data tables. The only known use of the question is to produce a variable for the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), a recode for the Specified Owner (SVAL) variable that allows users to compare other datasets. The Content Review did not reveal any uses by federal agencies, and the comments to the **Federal Register** notice did not reveal any non-federal uses. Additionally, there were no uses uncovered in meetings with stakeholders, data user feedback forms, or other methods employed to understand the uses of ACS data. Lastly, independent research conducted on behalf of the Census Bureau did not uncover any further uses. Though the question has a low cost, it has no benefit to federal agencies, the federal statistical system, or the nation. The Census Bureau plans to remove this question, beginning with the 2016 ACS content.

Regarding the field of degree question, the Census Bureau received 625 comments from researchers, professors and administrators at many universities, professional associations that represent science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) careers and industries, members of Congress, the National Science Foundation, and many individuals interested in retaining this question. A number of commenters (92) cited the importance of these estimates for research that analyzes the effect of field of degree choice on economic outcomes, including earnings, education, occupation, industry, and employment. University administrators (37) commented that this information allows for analysis of postsecondary outcomes, and allows them to benchmark their graduates' relative success in different fields as well as to plan degree offerings. While some commenters used the estimates to understand fields such as humanities or philosophy (56), the majority of these comments (125) addressed the value of knowing about the outcomes of people who pursued degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. These commenters felt that knowing more about the people currently earning STEM degrees and the

people currently working in STEM fields would enable universities, advocacy groups, and policy makers to encourage more people to pursue STEM careers, and to encourage diversity within STEM careers.

The initial analysis of Person Question No. 12—Undergraduate Field of Degree did not uncover any evidence that the question was Mandatory or Required. However, comments to the **Federal Register** notice uncovered the existence of a relationship between the Census Bureau and the National Science Foundation, dating back to 1960. Over the course of this established relationship, long-form decennial census data was used as a sampling frame for surveys that provided important information about scientists and engineers. These comments demonstrated that the Field of Degree question on the ACS continues this historical use of decennial long-form and ACS data for this purpose, and makes this process more efficient. Many commenters (58) also cited the necessity of the National Survey of College Graduates (NSCG), and recommended retaining the question because it is needed as a sampling frame for the NSCG. Though commenters theorized that the NSCG might still be able to produce STEM estimates without the ACS, a number of commenters (16) thought that doing so would be very expensive, costing as much as $17 million more (1).

Additionally, many comments also indicated uses of this question to understand the economic outcomes of college graduates at local geographic levels, especially those with STEM degrees. These commenters included professional, academic, congressional, and policy-making stakeholders who expressed concerns that the absence of statistical information about STEM degrees would harm the ability to understand characteristics of small populations attaining STEM degrees. Given the importance of this small population group to the economy, the federal statistical system and the nation, bolstered by the new knowledge of historical precedent brought to light by commenters to the **Federal Register** notice, the Census Bureau therefore plans to retain this question on the 2016 ACS.

Regarding the marital history questions, the Census Bureau received 1,361 comments from researchers and professors, professional associations that represent marriage and family therapists, the Social Security Administration (SSA), and many individuals interested in retaining these questions. SSA commented that it uses the marital history questions to estimate future populations by marital status as part of the Board of Trustees annual report on the actuarial status (including future income and disbursements) of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) and Disability Insurance (DI) Trust Funds. The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) also uses these questions to distinguish households in which a grandparent has primary responsibility for a grandchild or grandchildren, as well as to provide family formation and stability measures for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.

The focus of the proposed elimination is on the marital history questions only with no change to collection of marital status. Over 400 additional comments to the **Federal Register** notice cited concerns that the proposed elimination of the marital history questions was an indication of whether the government views information about marriage as somehow less valuable than other ACS question topics that were not proposed for removal. While the Census Bureau had always planned to continue collecting information about the ''marital status'' for each person in a household (Person Question No. 20) and their relationships to each other (Person Question No. 2), the Census Bureau remains sensitive to these criticisms

More than 100 supporters of retaining the marital history questions mentioned their utility for research into marital status changes over time and they correctly noted that there is currently no other national source of the marital history information. As a result, many commenters felt they would not be able to compare marriage characteristics and patterns with other nations in the same depth that is possible today. Similarly, without these questions, the commenters felt that the analysis of changes in marriage events (especially those due to changing societal values and pressures or policy changes) would be less robust. In particular, comments focused on 6 research areas that would be more difficult to analyze without the marital history questions:

- Family formation and stability (23)
- Patterns/trends of marriage and divorce (168)
- Marital effects on earnings, education and employment (45)
- Marital effects on child wellbeing (6)
- Same-sex marriages, civil unions and partnerships (70)
- New government policy effects on marriage (9)

Because the initial analysis of Person Question Nos. 21–23 on marital history did not uncover any evidence that data from these questions were ''Required'' for federal use at sub-state geographies, those questions received a lower benefit score than many other ACS questions. However, in deference to the very large number (1,367) of comments received on the Census Bureau proposal to eliminate those questions, the Census Bureau plans to retain those questions on the 2016 ACS.

The Census Bureau takes very seriously respondent concerns and recognizes that the Content Review and the resulting, proposed question changes discussed above are only initial steps to addressing them. The Census Bureau has implemented an extensive action plan on addressing respondent burden and concerns. The work completed, and the comments received, on the 2014 Content Review provide a foundation for ongoing and future efforts to reduce burden and concerns. In addition to the immediate content changes (proposed above), the Census Bureau is also currently testing the language on the survey materials that may cause concern such as reminding people that their responses are required by law. In order to be responsive to these concerns about the prominence of the mandatory message on the envelopes, we are conducting research with a subset of ACS respondents in May 2015. Over the summer, we will work with external methodological experts to test other revisions of the ACS mail materials to check respondent perceptions of the softened references to the mandatory nature of participation in the ACS. The preliminary results of those tests will be available in the fall, and the Census Bureau will make changes to the 2016 ACS mail materials based on those results.

Concurrently we also are identifying additional questions that we may only need to ask intermittently, rather than each month or year. The current ACS sample design asks all of the survey questions from all selected households in order to produce estimates each year for small geographies and small populations. However, during the Content Review we learned about over 300 data needs that federal agencies require to implement their missions. We see several potential opportunities to either include some questions periodically, or ask a smaller subset of ACS respondents in cases where those agencies do not need certain data annually. The Census Bureau plans to engage the federal agencies and external experts on this topic during 2015. In addition, we need to assess the operational and statistical issues associated with alternate designs. The alternate designs will result in a

reduction in the number of questions asked of individual households.

We are also conducting research on substituting the direct collection of information with the use of information already provided to the government. It is possible that the Census Bureau could use administrative records from federal and commercial sources in lieu of asking particular questions on the ACS.

Lastly, we are examining our approaches to field collection to reduce the number of in-person contact attempts while preserving data quality. For example, based on research conducted in 2012, we implemented changes in 2013 which led to an estimated reduction of approximately 1.2 million call attempts per year, while sustaining the 97 percent response rate for the survey overall. For the person visit operation, we are researching a reduction in the number of contact attempts. We plan to field test this change in August 2015. If successful we would implement nationwide in spring 2016.

We will continue to look for other opportunities to reduce respondent burden while maintaining survey quality. Taken together, these measures will make a significant impact on reducing respondent burden in the ACS. In fact, as we have been accelerating our research program in parallel with the content review, we are proposing several additional immediate changes to the 2016 ACS.

**Changes in 2016 ACS Content Resulting From Cognitive Testing on Computer Usage and Internet Questions**

In early 2013 the Census Bureau began to reach out to Federal agency stakeholders through the forum provided by the OMB Interagency Committee for the ACS to identify possible question changes to be considered for the 2016 ACS Content Test. The ICSP Subcommittee on the ACS conducted an initial review of the proposals received from these Federal agencies, and identified a set of topics that would be approved for the formation of topical subcommittees. These topical subcommittees worked with the Census Bureau to develop proposed wording that was evaluated through multiple rounds of cognitive testing in 2014 and 2015 to refine the proposed question wording changes.

During the course of the preparations for the 2016 ACS Content Test, attention was given to the computer usage and Internet series of questions (questions 9 through 11 on the ACS–1(HU) questionnaire). When this series of questions was added to the production ACS questionnaire in 2013, it was clear that the quickly evolving nature of the types of computing devices available and the ways individuals access the Internet would cause this series of questions to quickly become out-of-date. Cognitive testing of these questions in 2014 brought to light difficulties respondents face when answering the current versions of these questions that were corroborated by the metrics collected during the ACS Content Review. Specifically, technical terms and types of devices and Internet services referenced in the current questions are not easily reconciled with the devices and Internet services used by households today. Additionally, there is evidence in the production data being collected that respondents are misreporting their usage of tablets, since there is not a clear category that references tablet computers. Proposed changes to these questions to bring the wording more in sync with current devices and Internet services were shown to be effectively understood during the cognitive testing process. Therefore, in order to improve the quality of the ACS data, and to reduce the difficulty respondents experience when answering these questions, the Census Bureau is proposing revising these questions. Given the timing of the receipt of the results of cognitive testing, the proposal to revise these questions in the 2016 ACS was not included in the October 31st notice in the **Federal Register**.

In order to ensure that question changes are effective at collecting high quality data, the current policy requires that proposed revisions to questions must first be cognitively tested, and then, if successful, the results of the cognitive testing will be used as input to a field test that utilizes multiple ACS modes of collection. However, the current concerns with the computer use and Internet questions suggest the need in some instances for the ACS program to be more nimble in making changes than our current process for cognitive and field testing will allow. Therefore, we are evaluating on a pilot basis incorporating the following criteria into the pretesting requirements of the ICSP Subcommittee on the ACS to determine when to implement changes without field testing:

- The external environment related to the topic being measured has changed in a way that there is evidence of significant measurement error in the absence of a question change.
- Cognitive testing has been conducted on versions of the question accounting for multiple modes of administration (such as self-response and interviewer-administered) and the results have led to clear recommendations on the specific changes to make.
- There is evidence that implementing changes to the production versions of the question should be done on a timeline that makes field testing unfeasible, OR the Census Bureau has not received sufficient funding to conduct field testing.

If each of these criteria are met, then a change to ACS question wording could be considered without field testing. Regular reviews and analysis would continue to evaluate any questions changed under this policy, allowing the Census Bureau to preserve the quality of the ACS data and be more responsive in making question wording changes that reflect the changing environment.

**Changes in 2016 ACS Content Concerning the Flush Toilet Section of the Plumbing Facilities Question**

Traditionally the means of determining substandard housing has involved identifying housing that lacks complete plumbing facilities or complete kitchen facilities. Until 2008, the Census Bureau asked one question to determine complete plumbing facilities, ''Does the house, apartment or mobile home have COMPLETE plumbing facilities; that is, (1) hot and cold running water, (2) flush toilet, and (3) bathtub or shower?'' Similarly, the Census Bureau used one question to determine complete kitchen facilities (sink with a faucet, stove or range, and a refrigerator). In 2008, in conjunction with our stakeholders, we broke the plumbing and kitchen facilities questions into six sub-parts in order ask about each component separately. Having data available for each sub-part has enabled us to better understand the impact of asking each one, including the flush toilet component. As we have accelerated our research into this topic, we have learned that there are very few instances where flush toilets alone determine the existence of substandard housing. After consultation with some of our key stakeholders, the Census Bureau believes that the flush toilet question places unnecessary burden on the American public relative to the value of the information gained from it, and recommends that it be removed in the 2016 ACS, though we will continue to work with stakeholders to explore how this information can be collected apart from the ACS.

**Changes in 2016 ACS Mailing Procedures**

Based on the results of testing conducted in 2015, the Census Bureau is proposing to modify the mail out

strategy for the ACS as described in the steps below. The testing has shown that the change increases response to the online questionnaire, and reduces the total number of mailings sent to households by eliminating one entire mailing and replacing a postcard with a letter.

For households eligible to receive survey materials by mail, the first contact includes a letter and instruction card explaining how to complete the survey online. Also included are a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) brochure and a brochure that provides basic information about the survey in English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Korean, and provides a phone number to call for assistance in each language. The instruction card provides the information on how to respond in English and Spanish. The letter explains that if the respondent is unable to complete the survey online, a paper questionnaire will be sent later. The Internet version of the questionnaire is available in English and Spanish and includes questions about the housing unit and the people living in the housing unit. The Internet questionnaire has space to collect detailed information for twenty people in the household.

The second mailing is a letter that reminds respondents to complete the survey online, thanks them if they have already done so, and informs them that a paper form will be sent later if we do not receive their response. This letter includes clear instructions to log in, including an explicit reference to the user identification number.

In a third mailing, the ACS housing unit questionnaire package is sent only to those sample addresses that have not completed the online questionnaire within two weeks. The content includes a follow up letter, a paper copy of the questionnaire, an instruction guide for completing the paper form, an instruction card for completing the survey online, a FAQ brochure, and a return envelope. The cover letter with this questionnaire package reminds the household of the importance of the ACS, and asks them to respond soon either by completing the survey online or by returning a completed paper questionnaire.

The fourth mailing is a postcard that reminds respondents that ''now is the time to complete the survey,'' informs them that an interviewer may contact them if they do not complete the survey, and reminds them of the importance of the ACS.

A fifth mailing is sent to respondents who have not completed the survey within five weeks and are not eligible for telephone follow-up because we do not have a telephone number for the household. This postcard reminds these respondents to return their questionnaires and thanks them if they have already done so.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Frequency:* Response to the ACS is on a one-time basis.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Mandatory.

*Legal Authority:* Title 13, United States Code, Sections 141, 193, and 221.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to (202)395–5806.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482–0336, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *jjessup@doc.gov*).

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Sarah Brabson,**

*NOAA PRA Clearance Officer, submitting for Department of Commerce.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13061 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

**[B–35–2015]**

## Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 54—Clinton County, New York; Notification of Proposed Production Activity; Swarovski Lighting, Ltd. (Lighting Fixtures and Parts); Plattsburgh, New York

The Clinton County Area Development Corporation, grantee of FTZ 54, submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the FTZ Board on behalf of Swarovski Lighting, Ltd. (Swarovski), located in Plattsburgh, New York. The notification conforming to the requirements of the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR 400.22) was received on May 15, 2015.

The Swarovski facility is located within Site 1 of FTZ 54. The facility is used to make custom lighting fixtures and related parts. Pursuant to 15 CFR 400.14(b), FTZ activity would be limited to the specific foreign-status materials and components and specific finished products described in the submitted notification (as described below) and subsequently authorized by the FTZ Board.

Production under FTZ procedures could exempt Swarovski from customs duty payments on the foreign-status components used in export production. On its domestic sales, Swarovski would be able to choose the duty rates during customs entry procedures that apply to wall sconces; chandeliers; suspended chandeliers; pendant lamps; electric household lamps; electric table lamps; electric candelabras; electric floor standing lamps; wall mount light fixtures; high intensity discharge lamp fixtures; halogen lamp fixtures; candle candelabras; candle lamp fixtures; light-emitting diode (LED) illuminated paneling; LED illuminated wall mounts; lamp illuminated paneling; lamp illuminated wall mounts; lighted signs; fixture extensions; and, parts of lamps—scrolls, arms, covers, extenders, sconce plates, brass bodies, bases, finials, bobeches, connectors, hangers, cups, rings, and shafts (duty rates range from 3.9% to 6%) for the foreign status inputs noted below. Customs duties also could possibly be deferred or reduced on foreign-status production equipment.

The components and materials sourced from abroad include: Lacquer; UV-curing glues; anaerobic sealants; plastic crates/cavity trays/bags/o-rings/molded washers/labels; plywood insert packing materials; packing material boxes; brown paper; labels, brown kraft paper; corrugated cardboard strips; reinforced tape; gift bags; cardboard boxes; pocket folders; paperboard; marketing brochures; booklets; instruction manuals/sheets; decals; window stickers; printed cards; consumer brochures; product catalogs; advertising cards; pricelists; tags for color samples; netting; glass mirrors; amethyst balls and drops; fluorite balls and drops; rose quartz drops; rock crystal balls, bases, bobeches, cubes, cylinders, drops, kites, octagons, rosettes, sink bowls, spikes and square bases; smokey quartz pears; gold powder; steel flat bars; hex nuts; steel thumbnuts; brass ball nuts, brass hex nuts; brass hickeys; glass drills; instructional DVDs; dimmer switches; electrical plugs; protection caps; silicon sleeves; chrome connection jacks/connection rings; wire nuts; electrical harness assemblies; porcelain lampholders; lampholders with brackets; rivet sockets; ceramic sockets; stainless steel sockets; socket holders; lampholder connectors; monorail connectors; power adapters; terminal blocks; connection boxes; junction boxes; cable lug connectors; cable clutches; ring wire locking with screw; brackets for European arm sockets; halogen lamps; incandescent lamps;

LED remote controls; wire; cord sets < 1000 volts; electrical wiring ≤ 80 volts; quick connectors; electrical insulators; ring fittings; tube fittings; wall sconces; chandeliers; suspended chandeliers; pendant lamps; fixture wall sconces; electric household lamps; electric table lamps; electric candelabras; electric floor standing lamps; wall mount light fixtures; high intensity discharge lamp fixtures; halogen lamp fixtures; candle candelabras; candle lamp fixtures; LED illuminated paneling; LED illuminated wall mounts; lamp illuminated paneling; lamp illuminated wall mounts; lighted signs; lead crystals; glass globes; hurricane shades; glass; glass parts of chandeliers and wall sconces (beads, bobeches, ball sticks, drops, pendants, ovals, candle cups, bowls, bulb covers, columns, scallops, dishes, disks, finials, glass arms, rods, cubes, cylinders, scrolls, sickles, spikes, tulips, prisms, rosettes, lenses, leafs, and electrical housings); glass parts of table, floor and desk lamps (beads, trimsets, bobeches, ball sticks, drops, pendants, ovals, candle cups, bowls, bulb covers, columns, scallops, dishes and disks, finials, glass arms, rods, cubes, cylinders, scrolls, sickles, spikes, tulips, trumpets, prisms, rosettes, lenses, and leafs); plastic lamp parts (sleeves, trays, covers, trumpets, electrical housing, silicone shades, and silicone end caps); brass lamp parts (scrolls, arms, covers, extenders, sconce plates, bodies, bases, finials, bobeches, connectors, hangers, and cups); chrome ferrules and screw sets; other parts of lamps (scrolls, arms, covers, extenders, sconce plates, brass body, bases, finials, bobeches, connectors, hangers, cups, rings, and shafts); fixture extensions; décor disk rings; LED repair kits; and, aluminum reflectors (duty rates range from free to 14.9%). The request indicates that foreign textile material (including netting classified within HTSUS Subheading 5408.10) will be admitted to the zone in privileged foreign status (19 CFR 146.41), thereby precluding inverted tariff benefits on this material.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the FTZ Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is July 8, 2015.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the ''Reading Room'' section of the FTZ Board's Web site, which is accessible via *www.trade.gov/ftz.*

For further information, contact Diane Finver at *Diane.Finver@trade.gov* or (202) 482–1367.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Elizabeth Whiteman,**

*Acting Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13035 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

**[B–33–2015]**

### Foreign-Trade Zone 151—Findlay, Ohio; Application for Reorganization: (Expansion of Service Area) Under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board by the Findlay Hancock County Chamber of Commerce, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 151, requesting authority to reorganize the zone to expand its service area under the alternative site framework (ASF) adopted by the FTZ Board (15 CFR Sec. 400.2(c)). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new subzones or ''usage-driven'' FTZ sites for operators/users located within a grantee's ''service area'' in the context of the FTZ Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a zone. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally docketed on May 21, 2015.

FTZ 151 was approved by the Board on July 6, 1988 (Board Order 389, 53 FR 27058, 7/18/1988) and reorganized under the ASF on August 29, 2012 (Board Order 1855, 77 FR 55182–55183, 9/7/2012). The zone currently has a service area that includes Hardin, Putnam, Seneca, Allen and Hancock Counties, Ohio.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand the service area of the zone to include Van Wert County, as described in the application. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the expanded service area based on companies' needs for FTZ designation. The proposed expanded service area is adjacent to the Toledo-Sandusky Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry

In accordance with the FTZ Board's regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the FTZ Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the FTZ Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is July 28, 2015. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to August 12, 2015.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the ''Reading Room'' section of the FTZ Board's Web site, which is accessible via *www.trade.gov/ftz.* For further information, contact Elizabeth Whiteman at *Elizabeth.Whiteman@trade.gov* or (202) 482–0473.

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Andrew McGilvray,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13034 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Foreign-Trade Zones Board

**[B–05–2015]**

### Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 41—Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Authorization of Production Activity: CNH Industrial America, LLC; Subzone 41I (4-Wheel Drive Axle Subassemblies), Racine, Wisconsin

On January 20, 2015, CNH Industrial America, LLC, submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board for its facility within Subzone 41I, in Racine, Wisconsin.

The notification was processed in accordance with the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR part 400), including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (80 FR 6040, 02–04–2015). The FTZ Board has determined that no further review of the activity is warranted at this time. The production activity described in the notification is authorized, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.14.

Dated: May 20, 2015.

**Andrew McGilvray,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13033 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

### North American Free Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; Response to Request for Panel Review

**AGENCY:** NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Panel Review Precluded.

**SUMMARY:** Notice of the Department of Commerce's final determination regarding steel concrete reinforcing bar from Mexico was published in the **Federal Register** on September 15, 2014 (79 FR 54967) (final determination). On October 16, 2014, Grupo Simec, Orge S.A. DE C.V., and Orge S.A. DE C.V. (Simec) made a request for panel review of the final determination with the United States Section of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Secretariat. A Notice of First Request for Panel Review was published in the **Federal Register** on October 24, 2014 (79 FR 63600). Pursuant to Article 1904 of the NAFTA, a panel was not established and Simec subsequently withdrew its request for panel review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat on May 19, 2015. Based on the facts stated above, the Notice of First Request for Panel Review (79 FR 63600) is rendered moot.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul E. Morris, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 2061, Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–5438.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Paul E. Morris,**

*United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12981 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XD966

### Western Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings and hearings.

**SUMMARY:** The Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold a meeting of its Hawaii Archipelago Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) Advisory Panels (AP) to discuss and make recommendations on fishery management issues in the Western Pacific Region.

**DATES:** The Hawaii Archipelago FEP AP will meet on Friday, June 12, 2015, between 12 noon and 1:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** All meetings will be held by teleconference and webconference. The teleconference will be conducted by telephone and by web. The teleconference numbers are: U.S. toll-free: 1–888–482–3560 or International Access: +1 647 723–3959, and Access Code: 5228220; The webconference can be accessed at *https://wprfmc.webex.com/join/info.wpcouncilnoaa.gov*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kitty M. Simonds, Executive Director; telephone: (808) 522–8220.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Public comment periods will be provided in the agenda. The order in which agenda items are addressed may change. The meetings will run as late as necessary to complete scheduled business.

#### Schedule and Agenda for the Hawaii Archipelago FEP AP Meeting

*12 noon–1:30 p.m., Friday, June 12, 2015*

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review and Approval of the Agenda
3. Issues to be discussed at 163rd Council Meeting
   A. Upcoming Council Action Items
   i. Cooperative Research Priorities
   ii. Five-year Research Priorities
   iii. Specification of Annual Catch Limits for Main Hawaiian Islands Deep-seven Bottomfish
   B. Hawaii Archipelago FEP Community Activities
4. Hawaii Archipelago FEP Issues
5. Public Comment
6. Discussion and Recommendations
7. Other Business

#### Special Accommodations

The meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Kitty M. Simonds, (808) 522–8220 (voice) or (808) 522–8226 (fax), at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Tracey L. Thompson,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12959 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XD967

### Fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico; Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR); Public Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of SEDAR 43 assessment webinar for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish.

**SUMMARY:** The SEDAR assessment of the Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish will consist of one in-person workshop and a series of webinars. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

**DATES:** The SEDAR Assessment webinar II will be held June 15, 2015 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. Eastern Time. The established time may be adjusted as necessary to accommodate the timely completion of discussion relevant to the assessment process. Such adjustments may result in the meeting being extended from, or completed prior to the time established by this notice.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held via webinar. The webinar is open to members of the public. Those interested in participating should contact Julie A. Neer at SEDAR (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**) to request an invitation providing webinar access information. Please request webinar invitations at least 24 hours in advance of each webinar.

*SEDAR address:* 4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201, North Charleston, SC 29405.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julie A. Neer, SEDAR Coordinator; phone: (843) 571–4366; email: *Julie.neer@safmc.net.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

The Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils, in conjunction with NOAA Fisheries and the Atlantic and Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commissions have implemented the Southeast Data, Assessment and Review (SEDAR) process, a multi-step method for

determining the status of fish stocks in the Southeast Region. SEDAR is a multi-step process including: (1) Data/Assessment Workshop, and (2) a series of webinars. The product of the Data/Assessment Workshop is a report which compiles and evaluates potential datasets and recommends which datasets are appropriate for assessment analyses, and describes the fisheries, evaluates the status of the stock, estimates biological benchmarks, projects future population conditions, and recommends research and monitoring needs. Participants for SEDAR Workshops are appointed by the Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils and NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office, HMS Management Division, and Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Participants include data collectors and database managers; stock assessment scientists, biologists, and researchers; constituency representatives including fishermen, environmentalists, and NGO's; International experts; and staff of Councils, Commissions, and state and federal agencies.

The items of discussion in the Assessment Process webinars are as follows:

1. Using datasets and initial assessment analysis recommended from the In-person Workshop, panelists will employ assessment models to evaluate stock status, estimate population benchmarks and management criteria, and project future conditions.
2. Panelists will recommend the most appropriate methods and configurations for determining stock status and estimating population parameters.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before this group for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the intent to take final action to address the emergency.

**Special Accommodations**

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to the Council office (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 10 business days prior to each workshop.

**Note:** The times and sequence specified in this agenda are subject to change.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Tracey L. Thompson,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12958 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–P**

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

The National Civilian Community Corps Advisory Board gives notice of the following meeting:

**DATE AND TIME:** Thursday, June 25, 2015, 2 p.m.–3 p.m. (CT).

**PLACE:** NCCC Campus located at 1004 G Ave., Vinton, IA 52349.

**CALL-IN INFORMATION:** This meeting is available to the public through the following toll-free call-in number: 800–369–1873 conference call access code number 9921244. Pete McRoberts will be the lead on the call. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. Callers can expect to incur charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, and the Corporation will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Replays are generally available one hour after a call ends. The toll-free phone number for the replay is 866–421–5878, replay passcode 95221. The end replay date: July 29, 2015, 11:59 p.m. (CT).

**STATUS:** Open.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

I. Meeting Convenes
- Call to Order, Welcome, and Preview of Today's Meeting Agenda
- Introduction & Acknowledgements

II. Director's Report

III. Program Reports
- Projects and Partnerships
- Policy and Operations
- Recruitment, Selection and Placement

IV. Public Comment

**ACCOMMODATIONS:** Anyone who needs an interpreter or other accommodations should notify the Corporation's contact person by 5 p.m. Friday, June 19, 2015.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Erma Hodge, NCCC, Corporation for National and Community Service, 9th Floor, Room 9802B, 1201 New York Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20525. Phone 202–606–6696. Fax 202–606–3459. TTY: 800–833–3722. Email address: *ehodge@cns.gov.*

Dated: May 5, 2015.

**Jeremy Joseph,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13124 Filed 5–27–15; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6050–28–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

### Record of Decision for the Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site Training and Operations Final Environmental Impact Statement

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army and Fort Carson announce the decision to conduct training using new tactics, equipment, infrastructure improvements, and management methods at Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site (PCMS), CO. The action was the preferred alternative identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for proposed training and operations at PCMS. PCMS is the maneuver site for Fort Carson and is located near Trinidad, CO, approximately 150 miles southeast of Fort Carson. The Record of Decision (ROD) explains the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with the selected action, which is to conduct realistic, coordinated, large-scale training that integrates the ground and air resources of Fort Carson's mechanized, infantry, support, and combat aviation units. The selected alternative provides the proper balance of initiatives for the protection of environmental and mission-essential actions. The ROD also adopts mitigation that will reduce or eliminate adverse impacts.

The selected action will establish new brigade-level training intensity measures, update brigade training and equipment requirements, enable the Stryker family of vehicles to train at PCMS, and add enhanced readiness training, to include new activities and infrastructure at PCMS. The action does not include, nor would it require, land expansion of PCMS.

**ADDRESSES:** The ROD can be obtained at *http://www.carson.army.mil/DPW/nepa.html.* Written requests to obtain a copy of the ROD may be sent by email to *usarmy.carson.imcom-central.list.dpw-ed-nepa@mail.mil* or by postal service to the Fort Carson NEPA Program Manager, Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division, 1626 Evans Street, Building 1219, Fort Carson, CO 80913–4362.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The Fort Carson Public Affairs Office at (719) 526–7525, Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. MST; or by email to: *usarmy.carson.hqda-ocpa.list.pao-officer@mail.mil.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Final EIS examined the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts from implementing the proposed establishment and use of brigade-level training intensity measures, as well as the proposed readiness training using new tactics, equipment, and infrastructure improvements at PCMS. The selected action best meets the Army's need to conduct realistic and coordinated large-scale training that integrates the ground and air resources of assigned and visiting units including mechanized, infantry, support, and combat aviation assets.

The selected action establishes new brigade-level training intensity measures and limits such training to 4.7 months per year to allow for sufficient time for training land to sustainably recover from training events. The action updates brigade training period equipment compositions and training methods, and enables the Stryker family of vehicles to train at PCMS. The action also introduces new training activities and training infrastructure changes at PCMS. Training activities include electronic jamming systems, laser target sighting, tactical demolition, unmanned and unarmed aerial reconnaissance systems, and light unmanned ground vehicle training. In terms of training infrastructure, PCMS will establish two new drop-zones, and restricted airspace directly over PCMS for use during periods when training activity poses a hazard to non-participating aircraft. Soldier training will be entirely within the existing boundaries of PCMS, except for limited air and convoy operations. The decision does not include, nor would it require, any land expansion of PCMS. No additional land will be sought or acquired as a result of this action.

The ROD incorporates analysis contained in the Final EIS for PCMS training and operations, including comments provided during formal comment and review periods. The ROD also considered all comments and new reference citations provided during the waiting period, a period that was initiated when the Notice of Availability for the Final EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on March 13, 2015 (80 FR 13352). The Army took this material into account in making its decision, but determined that it did not constitute significant new information relevant to environmental concerns that would require supplementation of the FEIS. Comments received and the Army responses are summarized in the ROD.

Implementation of this decision is expected to result in direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, to include potentially significant impacts to soils, vegetation, wildlife, and water resources. To minimize the potential adverse impacts from implementation of the preferred alternative, the Army will mitigate these effects through a variety of strategies, as described in the ROD.

**Brenda S. Bowen,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13045 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710–08–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Defense Acquisition Regulation System

**[Docket Number 2015–0007]**

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Acquisition Regulations System has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

**DATES:** Consideration will be given to all comments received by June 29, 2015.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title, Associated Forms, and OMB Number:* Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) part 245, Government Property, and the following related clauses and forms: DFARS 252.245–7003, Contractor Property Management System Administration; 252.245–7004, Reporting, Reutilization, and Disposal; DD Form 1348–1A, DoD Single Line item Release/Receipt Document; DD Form 1639, Disposal Determination/Approval; OMB Control Number 0704–0246.

*Type of Request:* Extension.

*Number of Respondents:* 1,840.

*Responses per Respondent:* 14.9, approximately.

*Annual Responses:* 27,404.

*Average Burden per Response:* 1 hour, approximately.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 28,283.

*Needs and Uses:* This requirement provides for the collection of information related to providing Government property to contractors; contractor use and management of Government property; and reporting, redistribution, and disposal of property.

a. DFARS 245.302(1)(i): DFARS 245.302 concerns contracts with foreign governments or international organizations. Paragraph (1)(i) requires contractors to request and obtain contracting officer approval before using Government property on work for foreign governments and international organizations.

b. DFARS 245.604–3(b) and (d): DFARS 245.604–3 concerns the sale of surplus Government property. Under paragraph (b), a contractor may be directed by the plant clearance officer to issue informal invitations for bids. Under paragraph (d), a contractor may be authorized by the plant clearance officer to purchase or retain Government property at less than cost if the plant clearance officer determines this method is essential for expeditious plant clearance.

c. DFARS 252.245–7003: This clause entitled, Contractor Property Management System Administration, and DFARS 245.105, Contractor's Property Management System Compliance, address the requirement for contractors to respond in writing to initial and final determinations from the administrative contracting officer that identifies deficiencies in the contractor's property management system. The burden for this reporting requirement was previously approved under OMB 0704–0480 and is being incorporated into 0704–0246 in order to consolidate all DFARS part 245 requirements under one OMB clearance.

d. DD Form 1348–1A, DoD Single Line Item Release/Receipt Document, is prescribed at DFARS 245.7001–3 and the form is used when authorized by the plant clearance officer.

e. DD Form 1639, Scrap Warranty, is prescribed in the clause at DFARS 252.245–7004, Reporting, Reutilization, and Disposal. When scrap is sold by the contractor, after Government approval, the purchaser of the scrap material(s) may be required to certify, by signature on the DD Form 1639, that (i) the purchased material will be used only as scrap and (ii), if sold by the purchaser, the purchaser will obtain an identical warranty from the individual buying the scrap from the initial purchaser. The warranty contained in the DD Form 1639 expires by its terms five years from the date of the sale.

*Affected Public:* Businesses or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Ms. Jasmeet Seehra.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Ms. Seehra at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

You may also submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by the following method:

*Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number, and title for the **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other public submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information provided. To confirm receipt of your comment(s), please check *http://www.regulations.gov* approximately two to three days after submission to verify posting (except allow 30 days for posting of comments submitted by mail).

*DoD Public Collections Clearance Officer:* Mr. Frederick C. Licari.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Licari at: Publication Collections Program, WHS/ESD Information Management Division, 4800 Mark Center Drive, 2nd Floor, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350–3100.

**Amy G. Williams,**

*Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations System.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12897 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

### Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration Amendment

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice of amendments to the comprehensive demonstration project for all Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), including the tiered-model of ABA, for all TRICARE beneficiaries with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

**SUMMARY:** This notice is to advise interested parties of amendments to a Military Health System (MHS) demonstration project entitled Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration (ACD). The purpose of the ACD is to further analyze and evaluate the appropriateness of the ABA delivery model under TRICARE in light of current and anticipated guidelines and best practices from the Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BACB) and other resources. The demonstration seeks to determine the appropriate provider qualifications for the proper diagnosis of ASD and the provision of ABA, refine the beneficiary cost-sharing requirements and provider reimbursement rates for the treatment of ASD, determine the appropriate patient safety and fraud prevention measures to implement regarding coverage of ABA for ASD, and develop more efficient and appropriate means of increasing access and delivering ABA services under TRICARE while creating a viable economic model and maintaining administrative simplicity.

First, the Department will align all ACD cost-shares with existing TRICARE Basic Program cost-share requirements under Standard/Extra and Prime to include allowing all ABA services under the ACD to accrue to the annual catastrophic cap. In addition, under the ACD the removal of the $36,000 annual limit on the amount the government may cost-share will continue. This will establish cost-share parity for the ACD by aligning it with existing TRICARE Basic program requirements generally, while remaining consistent with the requirement set forth in 32 CFR 199.4(f) that Active Duty benefits must be greater than benefits for non-Active Duty beneficiaries. As a result of this adjustment, all TRICARE beneficiaries receiving ABA for ASD under the ACD will now be protected from excessive out of pocket costs by the applicable catastrophic cap based on their sponsor's status and TRICARE plan under which covered. Second, the Department will also adjust all ABA reimbursement rates under the ACD by implementing adjustments based on Geographic Practice Cost Indices (GPCI). This will align the ACD reimbursement rates with the method used to determine many current CHAMPUS Maximum Allowable Charge (CMAC) rates (which are adjusted by local wage indices or geographic regions), and with the rates of other payers (which vary by location nationwide).

**DATES:** These changes will be effective October 1, 2015. The demonstration will continue through December 31, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Defense Health Agency, Health Plan Operations, 7700 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 5101, Falls Church, Virginia 22042.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For questions or comments pertaining to this demonstration project, please contact Mr. Richard Hart at (703) 681–0047.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### A. Background Regarding the ACD Amendments

In June 2014, the Department published the ACD Notice in the **Federal Register** (FR) (79 FR 34291–34296, June 16, 2014) upon Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval and in compliance with 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 199.1(o) and Department of Defense (DoD) Administrative Instruction -102 that govern TRICARE demonstrations. The ACD incorporates the previous temporary ABA policies into a single program based on limited demonstration authority to ensure continued ABA coverage for all TRICARE beneficiaries—including Active Duty Family Members (ADFMs) and non-Active Duty Family Members (non-ADFMs)—diagnosed with ASD.

The Department conducted two ACD round table events for parents, advocacy groups, and other stakeholders on October 15, 2014 and December 3, 2014. The round tables were well attended and senior Department officials listened to concerns, answered questions, and took matters for further analysis and action. The Department received constructive feedback from these round tables and directly from interested stakeholders. The Department greatly appreciates the participation of all interested parties, and through this process has gained additional insights about how to design and implement an optimum care delivery and reimbursement system for beneficiaries diagnosed with ASD. Among a number of issues raised by stakeholders, two fundamental concerns emerged from the round table meetings that require immediate adjustments under the ACD. The first was that the beneficiary cost-sharing provisions under the ACD may have an adverse financial impact on beneficiaries as the one-on-one ABA therapy does not accrue to the catastrophic cap and thus may put ABA ''out of reach'' for some families. The second concern was that TRICARE reduced the reimbursement rate of $125/hour for ABA one-on-one therapy for Board Certified Behavior Analysts (BCBA) to $68/hour and this reportedly would cause providers to disengage TRICARE beneficiaries leading to decreased access. The Department will amend the ACD as outlined below in order to address these critical concerns.

**B. Cost-Sharing Amendment**

Under the TRICARE program, cost-sharing by beneficiaries is required by law. It serves a number of purposes, including the means for obtaining a beneficiary's individual investment and commitment to the care sought, discouraging unnecessary use and overutilization of limited health care resources, and controlling overall TRICARE program costs to ensure sustainability of the benefits.

TRICARE has kept the various cost-shares related to ABA under the ACD the same as cost-shares and co-payments previously established under the Extended Care Health Option (ECHO) Autism Demonstration for ADFMs, the ABA Pilot for non-ADFMs, and ABA under the Basic Program. Under the ACD, all ABA services provided by a master's level or above Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA/BCBA-doctoral) (initial ABA assessment and treatment plan, ABA reassessments and treatment plan updates, direct one-on-one ABA, and parent/caregiver guidance in ABA) count toward the medical benefit catastrophic cap under the TRICARE Basic benefit. TRICARE covers 100% of charges for BCBA/BCBA–D services after a family's out-of-pocket costs reach an annual cap of $1,000.00 for Active Duty and TRICARE Reserve Select families, and $3,000.00 for retirees and their families.

However, tiered model ABA services provided by supervised Board Certified Assistant Behavior Analysts (BCaBAs) and Behavior Technicians (BTs) were based on tiered model ABA services previously provided under ECHO and the ABA Pilot. Many families receive a bulk of their care under the tiered service delivery model. These ABA services include supervision and intensive one-on-one ABA which may take place for many hours over an extended period of time, and do not currently apply towards the benefit catastrophic cap. For ABA provided by supervised BCaBAs and BTs, ADFMs pay the same monthly fee amount based on the sponsor's pay grade. Non-ADFMs pay the same out of pocket costs under the ACD (as they did under the ABA Pilot)—10% of the allowed charge for these services. Because these tiered model ABA services do not accrue to the annual catastrophic cap and out of pocket costs are not limited, there have been concerns expressed by beneficiaries and advocates that this policy may have an adverse financial impact on some families and put tiered model ABA services ''out of reach'' for those families.

To address this concern, the Department will apply all beneficiary cost-shares for ABA services under the ACD, including tiered model services (ABA provided by supervised BCaBAs and BTs), toward the catastrophic cap in the same manner as TRICARE Basic program benefits generally. The Department will implement this amendment to the beneficiary cost-share requirements by aligning cost-shares for all ABA services under the ACD with existing TRICARE program cost-sharing requirements. TRICARE Standard program deductible and cost share amounts are defined in 32 CFR 199.4. TRICARE Extra program deductible and cost-share amounts are defined in 32 CFR 199.17. TRICARE Prime program enrollment fees and copayments are defined under the Uniform Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) Benefit Schedule of Charges in 32 CFR 199.18. For information on fees for Prime enrollees choosing to receive care under the Point of Service (POS) option, refer to 32 CFR 199.17.

**C. ABA Provider Reimbursement Amendment**

The ACD, as a demonstration, has flexibility in creating reimbursement methodologies, rather than being constrained by otherwise existing TRICARE program provider reimbursement requirements. The Defense Health Agency has broad discretion to evaluate alternative methods of payment and the appropriate reimbursement rates for ABA under the TRICARE demonstration authority. Although care available under the TRICARE program must generally be reimbursed using the reimbursement requirements of 10 U.S.C. 1079(h) and 32 CFR 199.14(j) to ''to the extent practicable'', or (in the absence of a practicable Medicare rate) to use the prevailing rate, the ACD has no obligation to comply with this provision. As a result, the ABA reimbursement rates under the ACD may be established through different mechanisms.

When TRICARE reimburses individual professional providers, they are reimbursed at the rate known as the CHAMPUS Maximum Allowable Charge (CMAC). In general, the CMAC rates mirror the Medicare rates. The CMAC rates are adjusted by geographic locality by using the Medicare Geographic Price Cost Index (GPCI). The geographic locality adjustments are in place for approximately 70 areas in the United States.

With the publication of the ACD policy in September, 2014, the Department came under intense criticism from providers that the rate reduction for one-on-one ABA by BCBAs from $125 to $68 was too drastic and out of line with existing market rates. Some providers indicated that they would disengage TRICARE beneficiaries as a result of the proposed rate reduction. The Department responded by placing the rate reduction in abeyance pending a complete analysis of the ACD reimbursement rates by the RAND Corporation and further evaluation and a determination of appropriate rates by the Department.

Extensive analysis of ABA reimbursement rates in effect for both commercial insurers and Medicaid, including data collected by RAND, indicate that the reimbursement rate of $125/hour for one-on-one ABA for BCBAs that TRICARE is currently paying is above the prevailing rate in most locations. In many instances, TRICARE is either the highest or one of the highest payers. As a result of this extensive analysis, the Department will adjust ABA reimbursement rates under the ACD to be more consistent with other payers and implement geographic adjustments based on GPCI. Once national rates for all of the ABA CPT codes are determined, then adjustments for local wage indices or geographic localities will be applied on an annual basis. In addition to alignment with geographic rates, adjustments will be made for provider type (Ph.D. level, master's level, bachelor's level, and technician). National rates will be established via an independent Government analysis using all available data, including but not limited to the results of the independent RAND ABA study. Although the general 15% limitation on reduction of TRICARE reimbursement rates set forth in 10 U.S.C. 1079(h)(2) does not apply to rate determinations for demonstrations established under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 1092, the Department will nonetheless gradually reduce rates (if needed based on the results of the independent analysis) by no more than 15% per year until alignment with the prevailing geographic rate based on provider type is reached.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13001 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

### Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS); Notice of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense is publishing this notice to announce that the following Federal Advisory Committee meeting of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) will take place. This meeting is open to the public.

**DATES:** Wednesday, June 17, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.; Thursday, June 18, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Hilton Alexandria—Mark Center, 5000 Seminary Road, Alexandria, VA 22311.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Robert Bowling or DACOWITS Staff at 4800 Mark Center Drive, Suite 04J25–01, Alexandria, Virginia 22350–9000. *Robert.d.bowling1.civ@mail.mil.* Telephone (703) 697–2122. Fax (703) 614–6233. Any updates to the agenda or any additional information can be found at *http://dacowits.defense.gov/.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C. Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b), and Section 10(a), Public Law 92–463, as amended, notice is hereby given of a forthcoming meeting of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS).

The purpose of the meeting is for the Committee to receive briefings and updates relating to their current work. The Designated Federal Officer will give a status update on the Committee's requests for information. The Committee will receive briefings on increasing female accessions, USSOCOM studies, and the USMC will give an update on the Infantry Officer Course and presentation on their Personal Protective Gear. Additionally, the Committee will receive a briefing from OSD Health Affairs and a briefing from DoD SAPRO and ODMEO on gender discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual assault. Insight Policy Research will provide a briefing on the Committee's installation visits and focus group findings. The Services will provide briefings on their pregnancy and postpartum policies. There will also be a public comment period.

Pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.140, and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, interested persons may submit a written statement for consideration by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. Individuals submitting a written statement must submit their statement to the point of contact listed at the address in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** no later than 5 p.m., Monday, June 15, 2015. If a written statement is not received by Monday, June 15, 2015, prior to the meeting, which is the subject of this notice, then it may not be provided to or considered by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services until its next open meeting. The Designated Federal Officer will review all timely submissions with the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services Chair and ensure they are provided to the members of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services. If members of the public are interested in making an oral statement, a written statement should be submitted. After reviewing the written comments, the Chair and the Designated Federal Officer will determine who of the requesting persons will be able to make an oral presentation of their issue during an open portion of this meeting or at a future meeting. Pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.140(d), determination of who will be making an oral presentation is at the sole discretion of the Committee Chair and the Designated Federal Officer and will depend on time available and if the topics are relevant to the Committee's activities. Two minutes will be allotted to persons desiring to make an oral presentation. Oral presentations by members of the public will be permitted only on Thursday, June 18, 2015 from 12:15 p.m. to 12:30 p.m. in front of the full Committee. The number of oral presentations to be made will depend on the number of requests received from members of the public.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b and 41 CFR 102–3.140 through 102–3.165, this meeting is open to the public, subject to the availability of space.

**Meeting Agenda**

*Wednesday, June 17, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.*

—Welcome, Introductions, Announcements
—Request for Information Status Update
—Briefing—Increasing Female Accessions
—Briefing—USSOCOM Studies Update
—USMC Infantry Officer Course Update
—USMC Personal Protective Gear Presentation
—Briefing—OSD Health Affairs
—Briefing—Gender Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Assault
—Briefing—Review of Installation Visits and Focus Group Findings

*Thursday, June 18, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*

—Welcome and Announcements
—Briefings—Services' Pregnancy and Postpartum Policies Review
—Public Comment Period

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13006 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

### Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive Patent License; Point Semantics Corporation

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Navy hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to Point Semantics Corporation a revocable, nonassignable, exclusive license to practice in the field of use of Scientific and Engineering Instrumentation which shall mean measurement, monitoring and testing of materials for scientific and engineering purposes in the laboratory or in the field; and in the field of use of Industrial Structure and Materials Market which shall mean measurement monitoring and control systems used in industrial production and in infrastructure monitoring and control, including particularly supervisory control systems and distributed control systems used in manufacturing, mining and utilities (NAIC Sectors 21–23 and 31–33) in the United States, the Government-owned inventions described in U.S. Patent No. 8,600,147 entitled ''System and Method for Remote Measurement of Displacement and Strain Fields'', Navy Case No. 099,829; U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2013–0063570 entitled ''System and Method for Remote Full Field Three-Dimensional Displacement and Strain Measurements'', Navy Case No. 101,258; and U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2014–0037217 entitled ''Method and Direct Strain Imaging'', Navy Case No. 101,954 and any continuations, divisionals or re-issues thereof.

**DATES:** Anyone wishing to object to the grant of this license must file written

objections along with supporting evidence, if any, not later than June 15, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Written objections are to be filed with the Naval Research Laboratory, Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20375–5320.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rita Manak, Head, Technology Transfer Office, NRL Code 1004, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20375–5320, telephone 202–767–3083. Due to U.S. Postal delays, please fax 202–404–7920, email: *rita.manak@nrl.navy.mil* or use courier delivery to expedite response.

**Authority:** 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR part 404.

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**N.A. Hagerty-Ford,**

*Commander, Judge Advocate General General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13007 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

## DENALI COMMISSION

### Denali Commission Fiscal Year 2015 Draft Work Plan

**AGENCY:** Denali Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Denali Commission (Commission) is an independent federal agency based on an innovative federal-state partnership designed to provide critical utilities, infrastructure and support for economic development and training in Alaska by delivering federal services in the most cost-effective manner possible. The Commission was created in 1998 with passage of the October 21, 1998 Denali Commission Act (Act) (Title III of Pub. L. 105–277, 42 U.S.C. 3121). The Act requires that the Commission develop proposed work plans for future spending and that the annual Work Plan be published in the **Federal Register**, providing an opportunity for a 30-day period of public review and written comment. This **Federal Register** notice serves to announce the 30-day opportunity for public comment on the Denali Commission Draft Work Plan for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 (FY 2015).

**DATES:** Comments and related material to be received by July 1, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments to the Denali Commission, Attention: Sabrina Cabana, 510 L Street, Suite 410, Anchorage, AK 99501.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Sabrina Cabana, Denali Commission, 510 L Street, Suite 410, Anchorage, AK 99501. Telephone: (907) 271–1414. Email: *scabana@denali.gov*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Background:* The Denali Commission (Commission) is an independent federal agency based on an innovative federal-state partnership designed to provide critical utilities, infrastructure and support for economic development and training in Alaska by delivering federal services in the most cost-effective manner possible. The Commission was created in 1998 with passage of the October 21, 1998, Denali Commission Act (Act) (Title III of Pub. L. 105–277, 42 U.S.C. 3121).

The Commission's mission is to partner with tribal, federal, state, and local governments and collaborate with all Alaskans to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government services, to develop a well-trained labor force employed in a diversified and sustainable economy, and to build and ensure the operation and maintenance of Alaska's basic infrastructure.

By creating the Commission, Congress mandated that all parties involved partner together to find new and innovative solutions to the unique infrastructure and economic development challenges in America's most remote communities.

Pursuant to the Act, the Commission determines its own basic operating principles and funding criteria on an annual federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30) basis. The Commission outlines these priorities and funding recommendations in an annual Work Plan. The Work Plan is adopted on an annual basis in the following manner, which occurs sequentially as listed:

- Project proposals are solicited from local government and other entities.
- Commissioners forward a draft version of the Work Plan to the Federal Co-Chair.
- The Federal Co-Chair approves the draft Work Plan for publication in the **Federal Register** providing an opportunity for a 30-day period of public review and written comment. During this time, the draft Work Plan is also disseminated widely to Commission program partners including, but not limited to, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Economic Development Administration (EDA), and the United States Department of Agriculture—Rural Development (USDA–RD).
- Public comment concludes and Commission staff provides the Federal Co-Chair with a summary of public comment and recommendations, if any, associated with the draft Work Plan.
- If no revisions are made to the draft, the Federal Co-Chair provides notice of approval of the Work Plan to the Commissioners, and forwards the Work Plan to the Secretary of Commerce for approval; or, if there are revisions the Federal Co-Chair provides notice of modifications to the Commissioners for their consideration and approval, and upon receipt of approval from Commissioners, forwards the Work Plan to the Secretary of Commerce for approval.
- The Secretary of Commerce approves the Work Plan.
- The Federal Co-Chair then approves grants and contracts based upon the approved Work Plan.

**FY 2015 Appropriations Summary**

The Commission has historically received federal funding from several sources. These fund sources are governed by the following general principles:

- In FY 2015 no project specific direction was provided by Congress.
- The Energy and Water Appropriation (*i.e.* discretionary funding) is eligible for use in all programs.
- Certain appropriations are restricted in their usage. Where restrictions apply, the funds may be used only for specific program purposes.
- Final appropriation funds received may be reduced due to Congressional action, rescissions by the Office of Management and Budget, and other federal agency action.
- All Energy and Water Appropriation funds, including operating funds, designated as ''up to'' may be reassigned to other programs, if they are not fully expended in a program component area or a specific project.
- Total FY 2015 Budgetary Resources provided:

These are the figures that appear in the rows entitled ''FY 2015 Appropriation'' and are the original appropriations amounts which do not include Commission operating funds. These funds are identified by their source name (*i.e.,* Energy and Water Appropriation, TAPL, etc.). The grand total for all appropriations appears at the end of the FY 2015 Funding Table.

- Total FY 2015 Program Available Funding:

These are the figures that appear in the rows entitled ''FY 2015 Appropriations—Program Available'' and are the amounts of funding available for program(s) activities after Commission operating funds have been deducted. The FY 2015 appropriations bill contains language that the

Commission may utilize more than five percent for operating costs, *Notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998*.

However only, five percent of Trans Alaska Pipeline Liability (TAPL) Trust Funds are used for agency operating purposes. The grand total for all program available funds appears at the end of the FY 2015 Funding Table.

• Program Funding:

These are the figures that appear in the rows entitled with the specific Program and Sub-Program area, and are the amounts of funding the Draft FY 2015 Work Plan recommends, within each program fund source for program components.

• Subtotal of Program Funding:

These are the figures that appear in rows entitled ''subtotal'' and are the subtotals of all program funding within a given fund source. The subtotal must always equal the Total FY 2015 Program Available Funding.

| Denali Commission FY 2015 funding table | Totals |
|---|---|
| FY 2015 Energy & Water Appropriation | $10,000,000. |
| FY 2015 Energy & Water Appropriation—Operating Funds | $3,000,000. |
| FY 2015 Energy & Water Appropriation—Program Available | $7,000,000. |
| Energy: | |
| • Bulk Fuel Tank Replacements (to be funded in full with TAPL funding) | $0. |
| • Rural Power System Upgrades * | $7,000,000. |
| Total Energy Projects | $7,000,000. |
| Sub-total, FY 2015 Energy & Water—Program Available | Not to exceed $7,000,000. |

* Funding for the two initiatives, programs and projects are listed as an upper amount and it is possible that several of these initiatives may require less funds than listed in the table. Under these circumstances, the remaining Energy and Water appropriations will be used for Rural Power System Upgrades.

| | |
|---|---|
| FY 2015 TAPL Trust | $4,000,000 |
| FY 2015 TAPL—Program Available (less 5% operating funds) | 3,800,000 |
| *Bulk Fuel Planning, Design & Construction* | 3,800,000 |
| Sub-total | 3,800,000 |
| TOTAL FY 2015 PROGRAM AVAILABLE | 10,800,000 |

**FY 2015 Program Details and General Information**

The following section provides narrative discussion for each of the Commission Programs identified for funding in the FY 2015 funding table above.

**Energy Program**

*Basic Rural Energy Infrastructure*

The Energy Program is the Commission's original program and focuses on bulk fuel facilities and rural power system upgrades/power generation (RPSU) across rural Alaska. About 94% of electricity in rural communities is produced by diesel generators and about half of the fuel storage in most villages is used for these power plants. The majority of the Commission's work in the energy program is carried out by two of our long-standing partners: Alaska Energy Authority (AEA), an agency of the State of Alaska, and the Alaska Village Electric Cooperative (AVEC), a non-profit member Organization serving 56 communities.

Since inception of the agency, the Commission has partnered with AEA on rural energy investments, and shortly thereafter, AVEC also became a program partner to address deficiencies in fuel storage and generation in the cooperative's communities. In recent years, a single combined list of energy projects has been compiled for both bulk fuel and RPSU programs. AEA maintains documents on their Web site that identify the universe of need for each of the programs and provides project status updates (see following links): *http://www.akenergyauthority.org/Content/Programs/RPSU/Documents/RPSUStatusDec2014.pdf*, *http://www.akenergyauthority.org/Content/Programs/RPSU/Documents/RPSUStatusDec2014.pdf.*

*FY 2015 Project Selection Process*

Bulk Fuel and RPSU Projects

The legacy projects prioritized for FY 2015 funding are listed below within the two energy program themes: Bulk fuel and RPSU. The selected projects in the table below exceed FY 2015 funding levels (both TAPL and Energy and Water Appropriation), with the understanding that projects may proceed out of order due to factors such as the extended period of time between project selections, draft Work Plan development, and grant execution; match funding availability; and due diligence requirements.

Beginning in FY 2012, Energy and Water Appropriations were subject to a statutory cost share requirement for construction activities of 20% for distressed communities and 50% for non-distressed communities. That cost share match requirement has since been applied to all energy program funding sources. All projects prioritized for FY 2015 funding, with the exception of Shungnak bulk fuel upgrade, are in distressed communities and will include at least a 20% project cost share match.

In FY 2015, the Commission, AEA, and AVEC will investigate opportunities with existing bulk fuel storage facilities to refurbish the infrastructure resulting in code compliance and significant extension of the life of the facilities at a reduced cost versus complete replacement. The Commission provided funding to AEA to update the statewide bulk fuel inventory assessment, which will help inform all parties of the potential for refurbishment of facilities. The updated assessment is scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2015 and therefore applied to FY 2016 investments if applicable. The refurbishment approach was considered for the AVEC projects listed in the bulk fuel project table.

| Bulk fuel projects | Total project cost | Cost share | DC funding | Program partner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pilot Station Community Tanks ** | $4,456,000 | $891,200 | $3,564,800 | AVEC. |
| Chalkyitsik | 2,600,000 | 520,000 | 2,080,000 | AEA. |

| Bulk fuel projects | Total project cost | Cost share | DC funding | Program partner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Togiak AVEC Tanks | 4,656,000 | 931,200 | 3,724,800 | AVEC. |
| Togiak Community Tanks | 6,045,000 | 1,209,000 | 4,836,000 | AVEC. |
| Beaver | 2,300,000 | 460,000 | 1,840,000 | AEA. |
| Shungnak | 1,100,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 | AVEC. |
| Venetie | 2,100,000 | 420,000 | 1,680,000 | AEA. |

** There is a recent dispute between the City of Pilot Station and the current vendor for gasoline products (Pilot Station, Incorporated). The City desires to enter into direct completion with the vendor for gasoline sales. This is a concern for the Denali Commission as this outcome would mean that the Commission funded bulk fuel improvements would result in direct competition with the private sector, Commission staff are working with community stakeholders on this matter. If a solution cannot be reached the Pilot Station project will be passed over for the next prioritized project.

| RPSU projects ** | Total project cost | Cost share | DC funding | Program partner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Togiak | $7,409,000 | $1,481,800 | $5,927,000 | AVEC. |
| Koliganek | 2,900,000 | 580,000 | 2,320,000 | AEA. |
| Clark's Point | 2,600,000 | 520,000 | 2,080,000 | AEA. |

| Project management | Total project cost | Cost share | DC funding | Program partner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AEA/AVEC Project Management | $10,800,000 | N/A | *** $932,688 | AEA/ AVEC. |

*** Project management costs have been estimated pending final project selection.

**Joel Neimeyer,**

*Federal Co-Chair.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13010 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3300–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**[Docket No.: ED–2015–ICCD–0029]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Application for the U.S. Presidential Scholars Program

**AGENCY:** Office of Communication and Outreach (OCO), Department of Education (ED).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 *et seq.*), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting Docket ID number ED–2015–ICCD–0029 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the regulations.gov site is not available to the public for any reason, ED will temporarily accept comments at *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted; ED will ONLY accept comments during the comment period in this mailbox when the regulations.gov site is not available.* Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Mailstop L–OM–2–2E319, Room 2E105, Washington, DC 20202.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Simone Olson, 202–205–8719.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

*Title of Collection:* Application for the U.S. Presidential Scholars Program.

*OMB Control Number:* 1860–0504.

*Type of Review:* An extension of an existing information collection.

*Respondents/Affected Public:* Individuals or Households.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 2,900.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 46,400.

*Abstract:* The United States Presidential Scholars Program is a national recognition program to honor outstanding graduating high school seniors. Candidates are invited to apply based on academic achievements on the SAT or ACT assessments, or on artistic merits based on participation in a national talent program. This program was established by Presidential Executive Orders 11155 and 12158.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Stephanie Valentine,**

*Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Management.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13021 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**[Docket No.: ED–2015–ICCD–0032]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and approval; Comment Request; Pell Grant Reporting Under the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) System

**AGENCY:** Department of Education (ED), Federal Student Aid (FSA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 *et seq.*), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting Docket ID number ED–2015–ICCD–0032 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the regulations.gov site is not available to the public for any reason, ED will temporarily accept comments at *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted; ED will ONLY accept comments during the comment period in this mailbox when the regulations.gov site is not available.* Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Mailstop L–OM–2–2E319, Room 2E103, Washington, DC 20202.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Beth Grebeldinger, 202–377–4018.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

*Title of Collection:* Pell Grant Reporting under the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) System.

*OMB Control Number:* 1845–0039.

*Type of Review:* An extension of an existing information collection.

*Respondents/Affected Public:* Private Sector, State, Local and Tribal Governments.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 8,488,843.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 594,219.

*Abstract:* The Federal Pell Grant program is a student financial assistance program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA). The program provides grant assistance to an eligible student attending an institution of higher education. The institution determines the student's award and disburses program funds on behalf of the Department of Education (ED).

Institutions are still required to report student Pell Grant payment information to ED electronically. Electronic reporting is conducted through the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system. The COD system is used by institutions to request, report, and reconcile grant funds received from the Pell Grant program.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Kate Mullan,**

*Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Management.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12963 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**[Docket No.: ED–2015–ICCD–0067]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Assessing the Role of Noncognitive and School Environmental Factors in Students' Transitions to High School in New Mexico

**AGENCY:** Department of Education (ED), Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 *et seq.*), ED is proposing a new information collection.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting Docket ID number ED–2015–ICCD–0067 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the regulations.gov site is not available to the public for any reason, ED will temporarily accept comments at *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov.* Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted; ED will only accept comments during the comment period in this mailbox when the regulations.gov site is not available. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Mailstop L–OM–2–2E319, Room 2E105, Washington, DC 20202.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Christopher Boccanfuso, (202) 219–1674.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of

information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

*Title of Collection:* Assessing the Role of Noncognitive and School Environmental Factors in Students' Transitions to High School in New Mexico.

*OMB Control Number:* 1850–NEW.

*Type of Review:* A new information collection.

*Respondents/Affected Public:* State, Local, and Tribal Governments.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 2,591.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 773.

*Abstract:* The study will examine relationships between non-cognitive factors (*e.g.,* growth mindset, learning strategies, and self-efficacy) and school environment and contextual factors (*e.g.,* perceptions of school safety, supportive teachers and counselors, usefulness of academic work) and three measures of successful 9th grade transitions—overall freshman GPA, number of 9th grade course failures, and freshman year attendance for three districts in New Mexico. It will also examine whether non-cognitive and school environment factors contribute to the prediction of successful 9th grade transitions after academic factors have been taken into account. The study will use data that will be collected via a survey that was created with assistance from members of the New Mexico Achievement Gap Alliance. The survey data will be used in combination with extant student-level academic and demographic data that will be obtained from the New Mexico Public Education Department. This study will also include comparisons between Hispanic, Native American and white students.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Stephanie Valentine,**

*Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Office of the Chief Privacy Officer, Office of Management.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13022 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000–01–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Privacy Act of 1974; System of Records

**AGENCY:** Office of the Chief Information Officer, Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice of altered and deleted systems of records under the Privacy Act of 1974.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, as amended (Privacy Act), the Department of Education (Department) publishes this notice proposing an altered system of records entitled ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Tracking System.'' The Department also deletes the system of records entitled ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Case Files'' (18–04–01) from its existing inventory of systems of records subject to the Privacy Act.

For the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act (PA) Tracking System, this notice updates the system location and system of records notice (SORN) number, categories of individuals covered by the system, categories of records in the system, system managers and addresses, and routine uses.

The Department identifies the system of records, Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Case Files (18–04–01), as published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 1999 (64 FR 72384, 72385–72387) to be deleted because it has been consolidated and merged into the FOIA and PA Tracking System (18–05–20).

**DATES:** The Department seeks comments on the altered and deleted systems of records described in this notice, in accordance with the requirements of the Privacy Act. We must receive your comments on the proposed changes to the FOIA and PA Tracking System of records included in this notice on or before June 29, 2015.

The Department filed a report describing the alterations to the FOIA and PA Tracking System of records with the Chair of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Chair of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on May 14, 2015. The alterations to the FOIA and PA Tracking System of records will become effective at the later date of: (1) The expiration of the 40-day period for OMB review on June 23, 2015, unless OMB waives 10 days of the 40-day review period for compelling reasons shown by the Department; or (2) June 29, 2015, unless the altered FOIA and PA Tracking system of records needs to be changed as a result of public comment or OMB review. The Department will publish any changes to the altered system of records notice that result from public comment or OMB review.

**ADDRESSES:** Address all comments about the FOIA and PA Tracking System to Freedom of Information Act Service Center Director, Office of Management, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave. SW., LBJ 2E305, Washington, DC 20202–4536. If you prefer to send your comments by email, use the following address: *comments@ed.gov.*

You must include the phrase ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Tracking System'' in the subject line of your email.

During and after the comment period, you may inspect all public comments about this notice in Room 502D, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, DC, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday of each week except Federal holidays.

*Assistance to Individuals with Disabilities in Reviewing the Rulemaking Record:* On request we will supply an appropriate aid to an individual with a disability who needs assistance to review the comments or other documents in the public rulemaking record for this notice. If you want to schedule an appointment for this type of accommodation or auxiliary aid, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Freedom of Information Act Service Center Director, Office of Management, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave. SW., Room LBJ 2E305, Washington, DC 20202–4536. Telephone: (202) 453–6362.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative

format (*e.g.,* braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the above paragraph.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Introduction

The Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4) and (11)) requires the Department to publish in the **Federal Register** this notice of an altered system of records. The Department's regulations implementing the Privacy Act are contained in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in 34 CFR part 5b.

The Privacy Act applies to any record about an individual that is maintained in a system of records from which individually identifying information is retrieved by a unique identifier associated with each individual, such as a name or social security number (SSN). The information about each individual is called a ''record,'' and the system, whether manual or computer-based, is called a ''system of records.''

The Privacy Act requires each agency to publish notices of systems of records in the **Federal Register** and to prepare and send reports to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB whenever the agency publishes a new or altered system of records. Each agency is also required to send copies of the report to the Chair of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Chair of the House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. These reports are included to permit an evaluation of the probable effect of the proposal on the privacy rights of individuals.

Since the last publication of the FOIA and PA Tracking System of records in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 1999 (64 FR 30106, 30119–22), a number of changes have been identified that are needed to update and accurately depict the current state of the system of records.

The changes in the attached notice for the FOIA and PA Tracking System are numerous.

First, the system location has been updated to reflect the relocation of the Department's data center; to change its numbering from 18–04–02 to 18–05–20, and change the system location from the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to the Office of Management (OM).

Second, the paragraph in the notice describing the categories of individuals covered by the system is being updated to include individuals who have submitted requests for FOIA administrative appeals; individuals whose requests for records have been referred to the Department by other agencies; individuals who are the subject of such requests, appeals; and/or personnel assigned to handle such requests and appeals.

Third, the paragraph in the notice describing the categories of records contained in the system originally stated that copies of requested records were not maintained in the system. This notice is updating the categories of records in the system to state that copies of requested records are maintained in the system. In addition, the categories of records in the system have been updated to include the following records and related correspondence on individuals: requester's name, address, telephone number, email address, amount of fees paid and payment delinquencies, if any; the original requests and administrative appeals, responses to such requests and appeals, all related memoranda, correspondence, notes, and other related or supporting documentation, summary of log, and in some instances, copies of requested records and records under administrative appeal.

Fourth, the routine uses of records maintained in the system have been updated and two new routine uses will be added.

The Department proposes to revise routine use (3)(a)(iii) ''Litigation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Disclosures'' to permit the Department to disclose certain records from this system to the parties described in routine use paragraphs (3)(b) ''Disclosure to the Department of Justice (DOJ),'' (3)(c) ''Administrative Disclosures,'' and (3)(d) ''Parties, Counsel, Representatives, and Witnesses'' for any Department employee in his or her individual capacity if the DOJ has been requested to provide or arrange for representation of the employee. This proposed routine use is compatible with this system of records because it will allow the Department to disclose records from this system of records as needed to obtain legal representation for Department employees.

The Department proposes to revise routine use (6) ''Labor Organization Disclosure'' to permit the Department to disclose records from this system to an arbitrator to resolve disputes under a negotiated grievance procedure or to officials of labor organizations recognized under 5 U.S.C. chapter 71 when relevant and necessary to their duties of exclusive representation. This proposed routine use is compatible with this system of records because it will permit the Department to fulfill its statutory obligation to allow a labor organization to perform its duties of exclusive representation and it will permit the disclosure of records to arbitrators as needed to resolve disputes pursuant to negotiated grievance procedures.

The Department also proposes to revise routine use (7) ''Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act Advice Disclosure'' to permit the Department to disclose records from this system to the Department of Justice and OMB if the Department concludes that disclosure is desirable or necessary in determining whether particular records are required to be disclosed under the FOIA or the Privacy Act. This proposed routine use is compatible with the purposes of this system because it will permit the Department to obtain counsel necessary to ensure that individual privacy rights are protected and FOIA requirements are met and followed.

The Department proposes to add a new, routine use (13) ''Disclosure in the Course of Responding to a Breach of Data'' to permit the Department to disclose records from this system to appropriate agencies, entities, and persons when: (a) The Department suspects or has confirmed that the security or confidentiality of information in the system of records has been compromised; (b) the Department has determined that as a result for the suspected or confirmed compromise there is a risk of harm to economic or property interests, identity theft or fraud, or harm to the security or integrity of this system or other systems or programs (whether maintained by the Department or another agency or entity) that rely upon the compromised information; and (c) the disclosure made to such agencies, entities, and persons is reasonably necessary to assist in connection with the Department's efforts to respond to the suspected or confirmed compromise and prevent, minimize, or remedy such harm. This proposed routine use is compatible with the purposes of the system because it will permit the Department to take appropriate steps in response to a breach of personally identifiable information that is maintained in this system and to abide by the requirements relating to a breach of personally identifiable information that are set forth in OMB Memorandum 07–16 ''Safeguarding Against and Responding to the Breach of Personally Identifiable Information.''

The Department proposes to add a new, routine use (14) ''Disclosure to National Archives Records Administration, Office of Government Information Services (OGIS),'' to the extent necessary to fulfill its responsibilities in 5 U.S.C. 552(h), to

review administrative agency policies, procedures and compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and to facilitate OGIS' offering of mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making FOIA requests and administrative agencies.

Fifth, the policies and practices for storing, retrieving, accessing, retaining, and disposing of records in the system have been updated to include storage of data in a computer database, because the original FOIA and PA Tracking System notice omitted this. Further, the retention and disposal policy has been updated to comply with the General Records Schedule (GRS) approved by NARA.

Sixth, the description of safeguards has been updated to include additional security measures that have been put in place.

Finally, the Department updated the description of the system managers and their addresses to reflect minor changes in addresses.

**Electronic Access to This Document**

The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: *www.gpo.gov/fdsys.* At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at: *www.federalregister.gov.* Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Andrew Jackson,**

*Assistant Secretary for Management.*

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) publishes a notice of deleted and altered systems of records to read as follows:

**DELETED SYSTEMS**

The Department identifies the system of records entitled the ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Case Files'' (18–04–01), as published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 1999 (64 FR 72384, 72385–72387), to be deleted. It has been consolidated and merged into the ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Tracking System'' (18–05–20).

**ALTERED SYSTEM NUMBER:**

18–05–20

**ALTERED SYSTEM NAME:**

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Tracking System.

**SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:**

None.

**SYSTEM LOCATION:**

Electronic Data Records: Plano Technology Center, 2300 West Plano Parkway, Plano, TX 75075.

See Appendix for additional system locations.

**CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:**

This system contains records on individuals or their representatives who have submitted Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) or Privacy Act (PA) requests for records and/or FOIA administrative appeals with the Department; individuals whose requests for records have been referred to the Department by other agencies; individuals who are the subject of such requests, appeals; and/or the Department personnel assigned to handle such requests and appeals.

**CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:**

This system consists of records created or compiled in response to FOIA requests, PA requests or both FOIA/PA requests for records or subsequent administrative appeals to include: The requester's name, address, telephone number, email address; amount of fees paid, and payment delinquencies, if any; the original requests and administrative appeals; responses to such requests and appeals; all related memoranda, correspondence, notes, and other related or supporting documentation, summary of log, and in some instances copies of requested records and records under administrative appeal.

**Note:** Since these FOIA/PA case records contain inquiries and requests regarding the Department's other systems of records subject to the Privacy Act, information about individuals from any of these other systems may become part of this FOIA and PA Tracking System.

**AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM:**

The Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, as amended; The Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, as amended.

**PURPOSE(S):**

This system is used to document and track the status of requests made under both FOIA and the Privacy Act. This system is also used to generate the annual report to the Department of Justice (DOJ) as required by the Freedom of Information Act and the biennial report to the OMB and Congress as required by the Privacy Act.

**ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:**

The Department may disclose information contained in a record in this system of records under the routine uses listed in this system of records without the consent of the individual if the disclosure is compatible with a purpose for which the record was collected. These disclosures are made on a case-by-case basis or, if the Department has complied with the computer matching requirements of the Privacy Act, under a computer matching agreement.

(1) *Disclosure for Use by Other Law Enforcement Agencies.* The Department may disclose information to any Federal, State, local, or foreign agency or other public authority responsible for enforcing, investigating, or prosecuting violations of administrative, civil, or criminal law or regulation if that information is relevant to any enforcement, regulatory, investigative, or prosecutorial responsibility within the receiving entity's jurisdiction.

(2) *Enforcement Disclosure.* In the event that information in this system of records indicates, either on its face or in connection with other information, a violation or potential violation of any applicable statute, regulation, or order of a competent authority, the Department may disclose the relevant records to the appropriate agency, whether foreign, Federal, State, Tribal, or local, charged with the responsibility of investigating or prosecuting that violation or charged with enforcing or implementing the statute, Executive order, rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(3) *Litigation and ADR Disclosures.*

(a) *Introduction.* In the event that one of the parties listed below is involved in litigation or ADR, or has an interest in litigation ADR, the Department may disclose certain records to the parties described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this routine use under the conditions specified in those paragraphs:

(i) The Department, or any of its components; or

(ii) Any Department employee in his or her official capacity; or

(iii) Any Department employee in his or her individual capacity if the Department of Justice (DOJ) has agreed to or has been requested to provide or

arrange for representation of the employee;

(iv) Any Department employee in his or her individual capacity where the Department has agreed to represent the employee; or

(v) The United States where the Department determines that the litigation is likely to affect the Department or any of its components.

(b) *Disclosure to the DOJ.* If the Department determines that disclosure of certain records to the DOJ is relevant and necessary to litigation or ADR, the Department may disclose those records as a routine use to the DOJ.

(c) *Adjudicative Disclosures.* If the Department determines that disclosure of certain records to an adjudicative body before which the Department is authorized to appear, an individual or entity designated by the Department or otherwise empowered to resolve or mediate disputes is relevant and necessary to the litigation or ADR, the Department may disclose those records as a routine use to the adjudicative body, individual, or entity.

(d) *Parties, Counsel, Representatives, and Witnesses.* If the Department determines that disclosure of certain records to a party, counsel, representative, or witness is relevant and necessary to the litigation or ADR, the Department may disclose those records as a routine use to the party, counsel, representative, or witness.

(4) *Employment, Benefit, and Contracting Disclosure.*

(a) *For Decisions by the Department.* The Department may disclose a record to a Federal, State, or local agency maintaining civil, criminal, or other relevant enforcement or other pertinent records, or to another public authority or professional organization, if necessary to obtain information relevant to a Department decision concerning the hiring or retention of an employee or other personnel action, the issuance of a security clearance, the letting of a contract, or the issuance of a license, grant, or other benefit.

(b) *For Decisions by Other Public Agencies and Professional Organizations.* The Department may disclose a record to a Federal, State, local, or foreign agency or other public authority or professional organization, in connection with the hiring or retention of an employee or other personnel action, the issuance of a security clearance, the reporting of an investigation of an employee, the letting of a contract, or the issuance of a license, grant, or other benefit, to the extent that the record is relevant and necessary to the receiving entity's decision on the matter.

(5) *Employee Grievance, Complaint or Conduct Disclosure.* The Department may disclose a record in this system of records to another agency of the Federal Government if the record is relevant to one of the following proceedings regarding a present or former employee of the Department: A complaint, a grievance, or a disciplinary or competence determination proceeding. The disclosure may only be made during the course of the proceeding.

(6) *Labor Organization Disclosure.* The Department may disclose records from this system to an arbitrator to resolve disputes under a negotiated grievance procedure or to officials of labor organizations recognized under 5 U.S.C. chapter 71 when relevant and necessary to their duties of exclusive representation.

(7) *Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act Advice Disclosure.* The Department may disclose records to the DOJ and the Office of Management and Budget if the Department concludes that disclosure is desirable or necessary in determining whether particular records are required to be disclosed under the FOIA or the Privacy Act.

(8) *Disclosure to the DOJ.* The Department may disclose records to the DOJ to the extent necessary for obtaining DOJ advice on any matter relevant to an audit, inspection, or other inquiry related to the programs covered by this system.

(9) *Contract Disclosure.* If the Department contracts with an entity for the purposes of performing any function that requires disclosure of records in this system to employees of the contractor, the Department may disclose the records to those employees. Before entering into such a contract, the Department shall require the contractor to maintain Privacy Act safeguards as required under subsection (m) of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a(m)) with respect to the records in the system.

(10) *Research Disclosure.* The Department may disclose records to a researcher if an appropriate official of the Department determines that the individual or organization to which the disclosure would be made is qualified to carry out specific research related to functions or purposes of this system of records. The official may disclose records from this system of records to that researcher solely for the purpose of carrying out that research related to the functions or purposes of this system of records. The researcher shall be required to maintain Privacy Act safeguards with respect to the disclosed records.

(11) *Congressional Member Disclosure.* The Department may disclose records to a member of Congress from the record of an individual in response to an inquiry from the member made at the written request of that individual. The member's right to the information is no greater than the right of the individual who requested it.

(12) *Disclosure to the OMB for Credit Reform Act (CRA) Support.* The Department may disclose records to OMB as necessary to fulfill CRA requirements.

(13) *Disclosure in the Course of Responding to a Breach of Data.* The Department may disclose records from this system to appropriate agencies, entities, and persons when: (a) The Department suspects or has confirmed that the security or confidentiality of information in the system of records has been compromised; (b) the Department has determined that as a result for the suspected or confirmed compromise there is a risk of harm to economic or property interests, identity theft or fraud, or harm to the security or integrity of this system or other systems or programs (whether maintained by the Department or another agency or entity) that rely upon the compromised information; and (c) the disclosure made to such agencies, entities, and persons is reasonably necessary to assist in connection with the Department's efforts to respond to the suspected or confirmed compromise and prevent, minimize, or remedy such harm.

(14) *Disclosure to National Archives Records Administration, Office of Government Information Services (OGIS).* The Department may disclose records to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), to the extent necessary to fulfill its responsibilities in 5 U.S.C. 552(h), to review administrative agency policies, procedures and compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and to facilitate OGIS' offering of mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making FOIA requests and administrative agencies.

**DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES:**

Not applicable to this notice.

**POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:**

**STORAGE:**

Paper records are kept in file folders in locked file cabinets. Electronic records are kept in a computer database

and on a web-based portal maintained by the Department.

**RETRIEVABILITY:**

Records are retrieved by the name of the individual or the control tracking number.

**SAFEGUARDS:**

All physical access to the sites of the Department and the Department's contractors where this system of records are maintained is controlled and monitored by security personnel who check each individual entering the building for his or her employee badge. Paper files are kept in locked file cabinets. Immediate access to these records is restricted to authorized staff. Direct access to the computer system employed by the Department is restricted to authorized Department staff performing official duties. Authorized staff members are assigned passwords that must be used for access to computerized data. Also, an additional password is necessary to gain access to the system. The system-access password is changed frequently. The Department's information system's security posture has been certified and accredited in accordance with applicable Federal standards. The computer database maintained by Privacy Information & Records Management Services, Office of Management, is accessible only to authorized persons and is password-protected and utilizes security hardware and software. Additionally, the web-based portal is accessible only to authorized persons and is password-protected.

In accordance with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA), the Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Tracking System must receive a signed Authority to Operate (ATO) from a designated Education official. The ATO process includes an assessment of security controls, a plan of action and milestones to remediate any identified deficiencies, and a continuous monitoring program.

FISMA controls implemented by the Department include a combination of management, operational, and technical controls, and include the following control families: Access control, awareness and training, audit and accountability, security assessment and authorization, configuration management, contingency planning, identification and authentication, incident response, maintenance, media protection, physical and environmental protection, planning, personnel security, privacy, risk assessment, system and services acquisition, system and communications protection, system and information integrity, and program management.

**RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:**

Records relating to FOIA and PA Tracking System are retained in accordance with General Records Schedule (GRS 14):

FOIA Requests Files—GRS 14, Item 11a (Ed Schedule No.: 151)

FOIA Appeals Files—GRS 14, Item 12.a–c (Ed Schedule No.: 152)

FOIA Control Files —GRS 14, Item 13.a–c (Ed Schedule No.: 153)

FOIAXpress—ED 086 Information Systems Supporting Materials for System Software

**SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:**

Freedom of Information Act Service Center Director, Room LBJ 2E305, 400 Maryland Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20202.

**NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:**

If an individual wishes to gain access to a record in this system of records, he or she should contact the system manager at the appropriate office or region where the original FOIA or Privacy Act requests were sent, or from where the response was received. A request to amend a record must meet the requirements of the Department's Privacy Act regulations in 34 CFR 5b.5, including proof of identity.

**RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:**

If an individual wishes to gain access to a record in this system of records, he or she should contact the system manager at the appropriate office or region where the original FOIA or Privacy Act requests were sent, or from where the response was received. A request to amend a record must meet the requirements of the Department's Privacy Act regulations in 34 CFR 5b.5, including proof of identity.

**CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:**

If an individual wishes to contest the content of a record pertaining to him or herself that is contained in the system of records, he or she should contact the system manager at the appropriate office or region where the original FOIA or Privacy Act requests were sent (see appendix), or from where the response was received. A request to amend a record must meet the requirements of the Department's Privacy Act regulations in 34 CFR 5b.7.

**RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:**

Information in this system of records is obtained from the individual who submitted the request, officials of the Department, and official Department documents.

**EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:**

None.

## Appendix to 18–05–20

**FOIA PROGRAM OFFICES**

Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 7C122, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of the Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 7E313, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of the Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 7W316, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of the Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Department of Education, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street SW., Room 6105, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Chief Information Officer, U.S. Department of Education, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street SW., Room 9111, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street SW., Room 5064, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street SW., Room 11129, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 6E333, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Management, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 2E209, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Education, Potomac Center Plaza, 550 12th Street SW., Room 8086, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 3W253, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Student Financial Assistance Programs, U.S. Department of Education, Union Center Plaza, 830 1st Street NE., Room 22D2, Washington, DC 20202.

Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 4C151, Washington, DC 20202.

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Capital Place, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW., Room 627B, Washington, DC 20208.

Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street NW., Room 7147, Washington, DC 20006.

Office of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 6W352, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Communication & Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 5E225, Washington, DC 20202.

Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 5E319, Washington, DC 20202.

National Assessment Governing Board, 800 North Capitol Street NW., Room 825, Washington, DC 20002.

**REGIONAL FOIA OFFICES**

Region I: Regional Director, OCR, 5 Post Office Square, 8th Floor, Boston, MA 02109–3921.

Region II: Regional Director, OCR, 32 Old Slip, 26th Floor, New York, NY 10005–2500.

Region III: Regional Director, OCR, The Wanamaker Building, 100 Penn Square East, Suite 515, Philadelphia, PA 19107–3323.

Region IV: Regional Director, OCR, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Suite 19T10, Atlanta, GA 30303–8927.

Region V: Regional Director, OCR Citigroup Center, 500 W. Madison Street, Suite 1475, Chicago, IL 60661

Region VI: Regional Director, OCR, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 1620, Dallas, TX 75201–6810.

Region VII: Regional Director, OCR, One Petticoat Lane, 1010 Walnut Street, Suite 320, 3rd Floor, Kansas City, MO 64106.

Region VIII: Regional Director, OCR, Cesar E. Chavez Memorial Building, 1244 Speer Boulevard, Suite 310, Denver, CO 80204–3582.

Region IX: Regional Director, OCR 50 Beale Street, Suite 7200, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Region X: Regional Director, OCR, 915 Second Avenue, Room 3310, Seattle, WA 98174–1099.

Region XI: Regional Director, OCR, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20202–1745.

Region XV: Regional Director, OCR, 1350 Euclid Avenue, Suite 325, Cleveland, OH 44115.

[FR Doc. 2015–13048 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000–01–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[ER–FRL–9021–2]**

## Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

*Responsible Agency:* Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7146 or *http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/*.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed 05/18/2015 Through 05/22/2015

Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

### Notice

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EISs are available at: *https://cdxnodengn.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-public/action/eis/search*.

*EIS No. 20150137, Final, USACE, CA,* Southport Sacramento River Early Implementation Project, Review Period Ends: 07/06/2015, Contact: Tanis Toland 916–557–6717.

*EIS No. 20150138, Final, BLM, MT,* HiLine District Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Brian Hockett 406–262–2837.

*EIS No. 20150139, Final, BLM, WY,* Buffalo Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Thomas Bills 307–684–1133.

*EIS No. 20150140, Final, BLM, MT,* Miles City Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Mary Bloom 406–233–2800.

*EIS No. 20150141, Final, BLM, SD,* South Dakota Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Mitch Iverson 605–892–7008.

*EIS No. 20150142, Final, BLM, MT,* Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Carolyn Sherve-Bybee 406–896–5234.

*EIS No. 20150143, Final, BLM, ND,* North Dakota Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Ruth Miller 406–896–5023.

*EIS No. 20150144, Final, BLM, MT,* Lewistown Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Adam Carr 406–538–1913.

*EIS No. 20150145, Final, BLM, ID,* Idaho and Southwestern Montana Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Jonathan Beck 208–373–4070.

*EIS No. 20150146, Final, BLM, CO,* Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Erin Jones 970–244–3008.

*EIS No. 20150147, Final, BLM, WY,* Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: William West 307–352–0259.

*EIS No. 20150148, Final, BLM, NV,* Nevada and Northeastern California Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Lauren Mermejo 775–861–6580.

*EIS No. 20150149, Final, BLM, UT,* Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Quincy Bahr 801–539–4122.

*EIS No. 20150150, Final, BLM, WY,* Bighorn Basin Proposed Resource Management Plan, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Holly Elliott 307–347–5193.

*EIS No. 20150151, Draft, USFS, CO,* Spruce Beetle Epidemic and Aspen Decline Management Response, Comment Period Ends: 07/14/2015, Contact: Scott Williams 760–382–7371.

*EIS No. 20150152, Final, BLM, OR,* Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments, Review Period Ends: 06/29/2015, Contact: Joan Suther 541–573–4445.

*EIS No. 20150153, Final, STB, UT,* Six County Association of Governments Construction and Operation between Levan and Salina, Review Period Ends: 06/28/2015, Contact: Philllis Johnson-Ball 202 245–0304.

*EIS No. 20150154, Draft Supplement, USACE, CA,* Delta Wetlands Project, Comment Period Ends: 07/13/2015, Contact: Marc A. Fugler 916–557–5255.

*EIS No. 20150155, Draft, FEMA, OR,* Southern Flow Corridor Project, Comment Period Ends: 07/13/2015, Contact: Mark Eberlein 425–487–4735.

### Amended Notices

*EIS No. 20150059, Draft, NMFS, WA,* The Makah Tribe Request to Hunt Gray Whales, Comment Period Ends: 07/31/2015, Contact: Steve Stone 503–231–2317. Revision to the FR Notice Published 03/13/2015; Extending Comment Period from 06/11/2015 to 07/31/2015.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Cliff Rader,**

*Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13037 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[EPA–HQ–OAR–2007–1121; FRL–9928–37–OAR]**

## Proposed Information Collection Request; Comment Request; Fuel Quality Regulations for Diesel Fuel Sold in 2001 and Later Years; for Tax-Exempt (Dyed) Highway Diesel Fuel; & Non-Road Locomotive & Marine Diesel Fuel (Renewal)

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency is planning to submit an information collection request (ICR), ''Fuel Quality Regulations for Diesel Fuel Sold in 2001 & Later Years; for Tax-Exempt (Dyed) Highway Diesel Fuel; & Non-Road Locomotive & Marine Diesel Fuel'' (EPA ICR No 1718.10., OMB Control No. 2060–0308 to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). Before doing so, EPA is soliciting public comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below. This is a renewal of the ICR, which is currently approved through January 31, 2016. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, referencing Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2007–1121, online using *www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes profanity, threats, information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Geanetta Heard, Fuels Compliance Center, 6406J, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 202–343–9017; fax number: 202–565–2085; email address: *heard.geanetta@epa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that the EPA will be collecting are available in the public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* or in person at the EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202–566–1744. For additional information about EPA's public docket, visit *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA is soliciting comments and information to enable it to: (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses. EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB.

*Abstract:* This ICR renewal is related to EPA's diesel fuel regulations under 40 CFR part 80, subpart I, applicable to highway (''motor vehicle'' or ''MV'') diesel fuel and non-road, locomotive and marine diesel fuel (NRLM) and heating oil (HO). Most of the information collected under this ICR is used to evaluate compliance with the requirements of the regulations. Since virtually all MV diesel fuel was required to meet a 15 part per million (ppm) standard as of June 1, 2010, very little reporting related to MV diesel fuel remains. However, reporting related to NRLM and HO will continue throughout the course of this proposed ICR renewal. The activities associated with this ICR include: Registration (all parties have registered; updates to existing registrations are still possible); compliance reports (mostly covering NRLM and HO; updates to prior compliance reports for MV diesel are still possible); research and development (R&D) exemptions; generation and retention of quality assurance (QA) records and foreign refiner recordkeeping and reporting. This ICR renewal contains provisions related to qualification of laboratories on performance-based test methods.

*Form Numbers:* 12.

DSF0100 Form: Diesel Fuel Sulfur Credit Banking and Generation Report—5900–351
DSF0200 Form: Diesel Fuel Sulfur Credit Transfer Report—5900–333
DSF Form: ECA Marine Fuel Precision Demonstration—5900–352
DSF0302 Form: Diesel Fuel Facility Report—5900–323
DSF0401 Form: Diesel Fuel Sulfur Batch Report—5900–324
DSF0504 Forms: Designated and Track Handoff Report—5900–325
DSF0601 Designate and Track Total Volume Report—5900–326
DSF0700 Designate Track Facility Compliance Report—5900–327
DSE0700 Form: Designate and Track Entity Compliance Report—5900–328
DSE0900 Form: Motor Vehicle Diesel Sulfur Pre-Compliance Report—5900–329
DSF0951 Form: NRLM Diesel Sulfur Pre-Compliance Report—5900–350
DLQ001 Form: (Used for lab test method)—EPA–420–B–14–066a

*Respondents/affected entities: Private businesses selling diesel fuel.*

*Respondent's obligation to respond:* mandatory.

*Estimated number of respondents: 6,806* (total).

*Frequency of response:* quarterly, annually, on occasion.

*Total estimated burden:* 11,078 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b).

*Total estimated cost:* $1,122,716 (per year), includes $0 annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

*Changes in Estimates:* For this renewal, we estimated a total annual respondent burden of 25,553 reports, a decrease of 239,853 reports from the last ICR approved by OMB. The number of hours decreased from 18,950 hours to 11,078 hours, a difference of 7,902 hours per year. The annual reporting and hourly burden decreased due to an expiring yellow 124 provision no longer required for diesel fuel. In this renewal, the Agency is also adding the electronic ECA Marine Fuel Precision Demonstration form. A contributing factor to the lowering of the industry cost was the salaries quoted in the ''Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2013 National Industry-Specific Occupational

Employment and Wage Estimates, mean wages.'' The salaries that assisted in calculating the labor mix had slightly declined. This change has caused a decrease in the cost per report in this collection from $110 per report to $101 per report. The total estimated cost to industry is $1,122,716 a year, a difference of $ 961,784 calculated from the prior collection approved by OMB. For future approvals, we project that the cost to report will decrease significantly. The burden related to MV diesel reporting will phase out and virtually all laboratory qualification applications for test methods will be completed, decreasing total industry burden.

Dated: May 20, 2015.

**Byron Bunker,**

*Director, Compliance Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13028 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0742; FRL–9928–48–OEI]**

## Proposed Information Collection Request; Comment Request; Aircraft Engines—Supplemental Information Related to Exhaust Emissions (Renewal)

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency is planning to submit an information collection request (ICR), ''Aircraft Engines—Supplemental Information Related to Exhaust Emissions'' (EPA ICR No. 2427.03, OMB Control No. 2060–0680) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). Before doing so, EPA is soliciting public comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below. This is a proposed extension of the ICR. An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, referencing the Docket ID Number above, online using *www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes profanity, threats, information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alan Stout, Office of Air and Radiation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; telephone number: 734–214–4805; email address: *stout.alan@epa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that the EPA will be collecting are available in the public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* or in person at the EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202–566–1744. For additional information about EPA's public docket, visit *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA is soliciting comments and information to enable it to: (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses. EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB.

*Abstract:* Clean Air Act section 231 (42 U.S.C. 7571) authorizes EPA to adopt emission standards for aircraft engines. The Clean Air Act additionally provides broad authority for EPA to collect information related to the regulations we adopt for aircraft and other emission sources (42 U.S.C. 7414(a)(1)). EPA is accordingly adopting a new set of emission standards for aircraft gas turbine engines and adding a requirement for manufacturers to submit information related to compliance with the emission standards.

*Respondents/affected entities:* Manufacturers.

*Respondent's obligation to respond:* Mandatory.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 10 (total).

*Frequency of response:* Annual.

*Currently approved estimated burden:* 60 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b).

*Currently approved estimated cost:* No annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

*Changes in estimates:* The final ICR submitted to OMB will contain revised burden estimates that reflect any changes to the collection over the past three years and any public comments received.

**Courtney Kerwin,**

*Acting Director, Collections Strategies Division.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12942 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0742; FRL–9928–47–OEI]**

## Proposed Information Collection Request; Comment Request; Air Pollution Regulations for Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Activities (Renewal)

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency is planning to submit an information collection request (ICR), ''Air Pollution Regulations for Outer Continental Shelf'' (EPA ICR No. 1601.09, OMB Control No. 2060–0249) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). Before doing so, EPA is soliciting public comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below. This is a proposed extension of the ICR. An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not

required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, referencing the Docket ID Number above, online using *www.regulations.gov* (our preferred method), or by mail to: EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes profanity, threats, information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Painter, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Policy Division (C504–03), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–5515; fax number: (919) 541–5509; email address: *painter.david@epa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Supporting documents which explain in detail the information that the EPA will be collecting are available in the public docket for this ICR. The docket can be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* or in person at the EPA Docket Center, WJC West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The telephone number for the Docket Center is 202–566–1744. For additional information about EPA's public docket, visit *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

Pursuant to section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, EPA is soliciting comments and information to enable it to: (i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (iii) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses. EPA will consider the comments received and amend the ICR as appropriate. The final ICR package will then be submitted to OMB for review and approval. At that time, EPA will issue another **Federal Register** notice to announce the submission of the ICR to OMB and the opportunity to submit additional comments to OMB.

*Abstract:* Section 328 of the Clean Air Act gives EPA responsibility for regulating air pollution from outer continental shelf (OCS) sources located offshore of the states along the Pacific, Arctic and Atlantic Coasts, and along the eastern Gulf of Mexico coast (off the coast of Florida). In general, these OCS sources must obtain preconstruction permits (usually Prevention of Significant Deterioration or ''PSD'' permits) and title V operating permits, and then maintain ongoing compliance with their permit conditions. Industry respondents include owners or operators of existing and new or modified OCS sources. These respondents must prepare permit applications and, after receiving their permits, conduct testing, monitoring, recordkeeping and reporting as required by their permits. The recordkeeping and reporting requirements are necessary so that EPA can determine whether these sources are meeting all the requirements that apply to them. EPA has delegated the authority to implement and enforce the OCS regulations for sources located off the coast of California to four local air pollution control agencies. These agency respondents must review sources' permit applications and reports, issue permits, observe performance tests and conduct inspections to ensure that the sources are meeting all the requirements that apply to them. Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*) requires that all federal actions conform with the State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to attain and maintain the NAAQS. Depending on the type of action, the federal entities must collect information themselves, hire consultants to collect the information or require applicants/sponsors of the federal action to provide the information.

The type and quantity of information required will depend on the circumstances surrounding the action. First, the entity must make an applicability determination. If the source is located within 25 miles of the state's seaward boundaries as established in the regulations, the requirements are the same as those that would be applicable if the source were located in the corresponding onshore area. State and local air pollution control agencies are usually requested to provide information concerning regulation of offshore sources and are provided opportunities to comment on the proposed determinations. The public is also provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed determinations.

*Respondents/affected entities:* State governments.

*Respondent's obligation to respond:* Mandatory.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 42 (total).

*Frequency of response:* Annual.

*Currently approved estimated burden:* 28,174 hours (per year). Burden is defined at 5 CFR 1320.03(b).

*Currently approved estimated cost:* $2,532,887, which includes no annualized capital or operation & maintenance costs.

*Changes in estimates:* The final ICR submitted to OMB will contain revised burden estimates that reflect any changes to the collection over the past three years and any public comments received.

**Courtney Kerwin,**

*Acting Director, Collections Strategies Division.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12944 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of a Bank or Bank Holding Company

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire shares of a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than June 11, 2015.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Chapelle Davis, Assistant Vice President) 1000 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309:

1. *Infinity Trust, and it co-trustees Bryan Cohen, Cumming, Georgia;*

*Suleka Neelagaru, both of Atlanta, Georgia; and Bradley Day,* Norcross, Georgia; to acquire voting shares of Quantum Capital Corporation, and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of Quantum National Bank, both in Suwanee, Georgia.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (Colette A. Fried, Assistant Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690–1414:

1. *Mary L. Staudenmaier, individually and as trustee of the Mary L. Staudenmaier Revocable Trust, and the Mary L. Staudenmaier Revocable Trust, all of Marinette, Wisconsin; together with L.William Staudenmaier, Jr., as trustee of the L. William Staudenmaier and Kathleen M. Staudenmaier Living Trust and the L. William Staudenmaier and Kathleen M. Staudenmaier Living Trust, all of Wauwatosa, Wisconsin; Ann Marie Staudenmaier, Tomas Perez and Amalia Mercedez Perez, all of Takoma Park, Maryland; L. William Staudenmaier III and Heidi L. McNeil, as trustees of the L. WM Staudenmaier III and Heidi L. McNeil Revocable Trust, the L. WM Staudenmaier III and Heidi L. McNeil Revocable Trust, all of Phoenix, Arizona; L. William Staudenmaier III and Kathleen Louise McNeil Staudenmaier, all of Phoenix, Arizona; Michael J. Staudenmaier and Anne Carlson, both of Chicago, Illinois; Peter Staudenmaier, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Suzanne Staudenmaier and Kelly McGee, both of Minneapolis, Minnesota; Therese Louise Staudenmaier, Daniel McCarthy, and Gabriel Liam McCarthy, all of Baltimore, Maryland; James T. Breeden Jr. and Gloria Lee, both of Oakland, California; Teresa Breeden Whatley, James T. Breeden, Margaret A. Breeden, all of Carson City, Nevada; Stephenson National Bank & Trust and Mary L. Staudenmaier as co trustees of the Mary L. Staudenmaier Revocable Trust; and certain minor Staudenmaier children,* all as a group acting in concert, and to become members of the Staudenmaier Control Group; to retain voting shares of Stephenson National Bancorp, Inc., and thereby indirectly retain voting shares of Stephenson National Bank and Trust, both in Marinette, Wisconsin.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 22, 2015.

**Michael J. Lewandowski,**

*Associate Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12946 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6210–01–P**

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Announcement of Board Approval Under Delegated Authority and Submission to OMB

**AGENCY:** Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the final approval of proposed information collections by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) under OMB delegated authority. Board-approved collections of information are incorporated into the official OMB inventory of currently approved collections of information. Copies of the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission, supporting statements and approved collection of information instrument(s) are placed into OMB's public docket files. The Federal Reserve may not conduct or sponsor, and the respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection that has been extended, revised, or implemented on or after October 1, 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Federal Reserve Board Acting Clearance Officer—Mark Tokarski—Office of the Chief Data Officer, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551 (202) 452–3829. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) users may contact (202) 263–4869, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.

OMB Desk Officer—Shagufta Ahmed—Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Final approval under OMB delegated authority of the extension for three years, with revision, of the following report(s):

1. *Report title:* Quarterly Report of Assets and Liabilities of Large Foreign Offices of U.S. Banks.

*Agency form number:* FR 2502q.

*OMB control number:* 7100–0079.

*Frequency:* Quarterly.

*Reporters:* Major foreign branches and banking subsidiaries of U.S. depository institutions that are located in the Caribbean or the United Kingdom.

*Estimated annual reporting hours:* 124 hours.

*Estimated average hours per response:* 1 hour.

*Number of respondents:* 31.

*General description of report:* This information collection is required (12 U.S.C. 248(a)(2), 461, 602, and 625).

*Abstract:* U.S. commercial banks, bank holding companies, including financial holding companies, and banking Edge and agreement corporations (U.S. banks) are required to file this reporting form for their large branches and banking subsidiaries that are located in the United Kingdom or the Caribbean. The FR 2502q collects, for each reporting office, claims on and liabilities to residents of individual countries as of each quarter-end. The data are used to construct a piece of the flow of funds data that are compiled by the Federal Reserve.

*Current Actions:* On March 12, 2015 the Federal Reserve published a notice in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 13001) requesting public comment for 60 days on the extension, with revision, of the Quarterly Report of Assets and Liabilities of Large Foreign Offices of U.S. Banks. The comment period for this notice expired on May 11, 2015. The Federal Reserve received one comment supporting the revisions. The revisions will be implemented as proposed, effective with the September 30, 2015 report date.

2. *Report title:* Quarterly Report of Interest Rates on Selected Direct Consumer Installment Loans and Quarterly Report of Credit Card Plans.[1]

*Agency form number:* FR 2835; FR 2835a.

*OMB control number:* 7100–0085.

*Frequency:* Quarterly.

*Reporters:* Commercial banks.

*Estimated annual reporting hours:* FR 2835: 176 hours; FR 2835a: 100 hours.

*Estimated average hours per response:* FR 2835: 0.29 hours; FR 2835a: 0.50 hours.

*Number of respondents:* FR 2835: 150; FR 2835a: 50.

*General description of report:* These information collections are authorized by Sections 2A, 11, and 12A of the Federal Reserve Act and are voluntary (12 U.S.C. 225a, 248(a)(2), 263, 348a and 353–359). Information requested on the FR 2835 is not confidential and respondents are made aware that information reported is made available to the public. Aggregate information collected on the FR 2835a is not considered confidential; however, individual respondent data is considered confidential under section (b)(4) of the Freedom of Information Act. (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4)).

*Abstract:* The FR 2835 collects information from a sample of

[1] This family of reports also contains the voluntary Automobile Finance Company Report (FR 2512), which has fewer than 10 respondents and does not require an OMB control number. The Federal Reserve also proposes to discontinue the FR 2512.

commercial banks on interest rates charged on loans for new vehicles and loans for other consumer goods and personal expenses. The data are used for the analysis of household financial conditions.

The FR 2835a collects information on two measures of credit card interest rates from a sample of commercial banks with $1 billion or more in credit card receivables and a representative group of smaller issuers. The data are used to analyze the credit card market and draw implications for the household sector.

*Current Actions:* On March 12, 2015 the Federal Reserve published a notice in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 13001) requesting public comment for 60 days on the extension, with revision, of the Quarterly Report of Interest Rates on Selected Direct Consumer Installment Loans and Quarterly Report of Credit Card Plans. The comment period for this notice expired on May 11, 2015. The Federal Reserve received one comment supporting the revisions. The revisions will be implemented as proposed.

3. *Report title:* Census of Finance Companies.

*Agency form number:* FR 3033p.

*OMB control number:* 7100–0277.

*Frequency:* Every five years.

*Reporters:* Domestic finance companies.

*Estimated annual reporting hours:* 8,000 hours.

*Estimated average hours per response:* 0.5 hours.

*Number of respondents:* 16,000.

*General description of report:* This information collection is authorized by law (12 U.S.C. 225a, 263, 348a, and 353–359) and is voluntary. Individual responses are exempt from disclosure pursuant to section (b)(4) of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

*Abstract:* The Census of Finance Companies is a simple screening survey, which would be sent in June 2015 to all companies that meet criteria developed to identify the potential universe of domestic finance companies. An accurate census is required to form a representative sample of finance companies, to which the more detailed Survey of Finance Companies would be sent. The census would gather limited information including total assets, areas of specialization, and information on the corporate structure of the companies. The Federal Reserve has identified approximately 40,000 firms to which the census would be sent.

*Current Actions:* On March 12, 2015, the Federal Reserve published a notice in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 13001) requesting public comment for 60 days on the extension, with revision, of the FR 3033p. The comment period for this notice expired on May 11, 2015. The Federal Reserve did not receive any comments. The revisions will be implemented as proposed.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 26, 2015.

**Robert deV. Frierson,**

*Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13005 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6210–01–P**

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

**[Notice–ME–2015–01; Docket No: 2015–0002; Sequence No. 15]**

## Notice of Public Meeting Concerning the General Services Administration's Request for Information on Business Due Diligence

**AGENCY:** Office of Information Integrity, and Access; Office of Government-wide Policy; General Services Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The purpose of this public meeting is to present information related to the government's analysis of responses to the General Services Administration's (GSA) Request for Information (RFI) on Business Due Diligence for Acquisition Involving Government Information or Information Systems, dated December 12, 2014. The meeting will focus on the problem of supply chain security, potential solution(s), and a path forward to initializing operation of the solution(s).

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 2, 2015 from 11:30 a.m. to 3 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, during the Software Supply Chain Assurance (SSCA) Working Groups (WGs) at MITRE. Online registration for the SSCA WGs is at *https://register.mitre.org/ssca/.* Comments are due no later than Friday, May 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** *Meeting Location:* MITRE–1, 7525 Colshire Drive, McLean, VA 22102. If interested in speaking at the meeting, please submit a request to speak (for a maximum of five minutes during the public session) and cite Notice-ME–2015–01, in all correspondence related to this case. Submit comments in response to Notice—ME–2015–01 by any of the following methods:

- *Regulations.gov: http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal by searching for ''Notice-ME–2015–01''. Select the link ''Comment Now'' that corresponds with ''Notice—ME–2015–01'' and follow the instructions provided on the screen. Please include your name, company name (if any), and ''Notice—ME–2015–01'' on your attached document.
- *Mail:* General Services Administration, Office of Government-Wide Policy (ME), ATTN: Ms. Rowan Ha/Notice—ME–2015–01, 1800 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20405–0001.

*Instructions:* Please submit comments only and cite Notice—ME–2015–01 in all correspondence related to this case. All comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal and/or business confidential information provided.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rowan Ha, Cybersecurity Specialist, GSA Office of Government-wide Policy, at 202–219–1270, or *rowan.ha@gsa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Federal Agencies continue to express concerns about potential risks in the products, services, and solutions they purchase. These concerns extend to all purchased items that connect in any way to a government information system and/or which contain, transmit, or process information provided by or generated for the government to support the operations and assets of a Federal agency.

Federal Agencies need better visibility into, and understanding of, how the products, services, and solutions they buy are developed, integrated, and deployed. Agencies are also interested in strengthening confidence in the processes, procedures, and practices used to improve the integrity, security, resilience, and quality of those products and services.

GSA is collaborating with its customer agencies and other stakeholders to establish a common set of risk indicators that can be used as the baseline for business due diligence research. This common core of risk indicators and risk research methodologies will be complementary to, and not a replacement for, existing government supply chain risk management activities.

Following a period of research and development to analyze and validate risk assessment processes, GSA intends to use a consensus set of common risk indicators from government and industry to enhance its current risk assessment processes. It is anticipated that the business due diligence information obtained will be used by the Federal acquisition, grant, and oversight communities to support

government risk assessments. Selection of contractors about which information may be collected during the assessment process will be a risk-based decision made at the discretion of a participating agency.

*Definition:* Information system in this notice means a discrete set of information resources organized expressly for the collection, processing, maintenance, use, sharing, dissemination, or disposition of information. Information systems also include specialized systems such as industrial or process controls systems, telephone switching or private branch exchange (PBX) systems, and environmental control systems (see, National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53 Rev. 4). Links to relevant documents can be found at: Business Due Diligence RFI: *https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=230732591f542b7da9b9fc3e6c167eec&tab=core&_cview=0;* Executive Order 13636, Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity: *http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/176547.*

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Giancarlo Brizzi,**

*Acting Associate Administrator, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13016 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6820–14–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**[30Day–15–1019]**

### Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The notice for the proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address any of the following: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses; and (e) Assess information collection costs.

To request additional information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the information collection plan and instruments, call (404) 639–7570 or send an email to *omb@cdc.gov.* Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice should be directed to the Attention: CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

**Proposed Project**

Integrating Community Pharmacists and Clinical Sites for Patient-Centered HIV Care (OMB No. 0920–1019, Expires 05/31/2017)—[Revision]—National Center for HIV, Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

*Background and Brief Description*

Revisions to this information collection include the addition of an Interviewer data collection worksheet, Key Informant Interviewer script, Staff communication questionnaire, Clinic cost form and Pharmacy cost form. These additions are needed in order to determine changes to clinic and pharmacy work systems, processes and outcomes in relation to the model project and how and if the model program improves patient outcomes through improved communication and collaboration between patients' clinical providers and pharmacists. In order to determine the general feasibility of the model program, the time required conducting program activities and the associated cost of program activities must be determined. Collection of data from the previously approved Initial patient information forms, Quarterly patient information forms, Pharmacy record abstraction forms, Project clinic characteristics forms, and Project pharmacy characteristics forms is ongoing. Clinic staff will use the initial information Sheet to explain the project to patients.

CDC has entered into a partnership with Walgreen Company (a.k.a. Walgreens pharmacies, a national retail pharmacy chain) and the University of North Texas Health Science Center to develop and implement a model of HIV care that integrates community pharmacists with primary medical providers for patient-centered HIV care. The model program will be implemented at ten sites and will provide patient-centered HIV care for approximately 1,000 persons.

The patient-centered HIV care model includes the core elements of pharmacist provided Medication Therapy Management (MTM) as well as additional pharmacist services such as individualized medication adherence counseling, active monitoring of prescription refills and active collaboration between pharmacists and medical clinic providers to identify and resolve medication related treatment problems such as treatment effectiveness, adverse events and poor adherence. The expected outcomes of the model program are increased retention in HIV care, adherence to HIV medication therapy and HIV viral load suppression.

Pharmacy, laboratory and medical data are collected through abstraction of participant clients' pharmacy and medical records. These data are needed to monitor retention in care, adherence to therapy, viral load suppression and other health outcomes. Program specific data, such as the number of MTM elements completed per project site and project sites' characteristics, will be collected by project sites.

This information collection will allow CDC to conduct continuous program performance monitoring which includes identification of barriers to program implementation, solutions to those barriers, and documentation of client health outcomes. Performance monitoring will allow the model program to be adjusted, as needed, in order to develop a final implementation model that is self-sustaining and which can be used to establish similar collaborations in a variety of clinical settings. Collection of cost data will allow for the cost of the program to be estimated. There is no cost to participants other than their time. The total estimated annualized burden hours are 6,043.

ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

| Type of respondent | Form name | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Average burden per response (in hours) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Clinic Data Manager | Project clinic characteristics form | 10 | 3 | 30/60 |
| Pharmacist | Project pharmacy characteristics form | 10 | 3 | 30/60 |
| Clinic Data Manager | Patient Demographic Information form | 10 | 100 | 5/60 |
| Clinic Data Manager | Initial patient information form | 10 | 100 | 1 |
| Clinic Data Manager | Quarterly patient information form | 10 | 400 | 30/60 |
| Pharmacist | Pharmacy record abstraction form | 10 | 400 | 30/60 |
| Key informants | Interviewer data collection worksheet | 60 | 2 | 30/60 |
| Project pharmacists and clinic staff | Staff communication questionnaire | 70 | 2 | 15/60 |
| Clinic staff | Clinic cost form | 20 | 2 | 10 |
| Pharmacy staff | Pharmacy cost form | 20 | 2 | 10 |

**Leroy A. Richardson,**

*Chief, Information Collection Review Office, Office of Scientific Integrity, Office of the Associate Director for Science, Office of the Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12996 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4163–18–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

**[Document Identifier: CMS–10102]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) is announcing an opportunity for the public to comment on CMS' intention to collect information from the public. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension or reinstatement of an existing collection of information, and to allow a second opportunity for public comment on the notice. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including any of the following subjects: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

**DATES:** Comments on the collection(s) of information must be received by the OMB desk officer by June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** When commenting on the proposed information collections, please reference the document identifier or OMB control number. To be assured consideration, comments and recommendations must be received by the OMB desk officer via one of the following transmissions: OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: CMS Desk Officer, Fax Number: (202) 395–5806 *OR,* Email: *OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov* .

To obtain copies of a supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed collection(s) summarized in this notice, you may make your request using one of following:

1. Access CMS' Web site address at *http://www.cms.hhs.gov/PaperworkReductionActof1995.*
2. Email your request, including your address, phone number, OMB number, and CMS document identifier, to *Paperwork@cms.hhs.gov.*
3. Call the Reports Clearance Office at (410) 786–1326.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Reports Clearance Office at (410) 786–1326.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. The term ''collection of information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and includes agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)) requires federal agencies to publish a 30-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension or reinstatement of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, CMS is publishing this notice that summarizes the following proposed collection(s) of information for public comment:

1. *Type of Information Collection Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection; *Title of Information Collection:* National Implementation of the Hospital CAHPS Survey; *Use:* The HCAHPS (Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems) Survey, also known as the CAHPS® Hospital Survey or Hospital CAHPS®, is a standardized survey instrument and data collection methodology that has been in use since 2006 to measure patients' perspectives of hospital care. While many hospitals collect information on patient satisfaction, HCAHPS created a national standard for collecting and public reporting information that enables valid comparisons to be made across all hospitals to support consumer choice. *Form Number:* CMS–10102 (OMB control number 0938–0981); *Frequency:* Occasionally; *Affected Public:* Private sector (Business or other for-profits and Not-for-profit institutions); *Number of Respondents:* 4,200; *Total Annual Responses:* 3,100,000; *Total Annual Hours:* 413,230. (For policy questions regarding this collection contact William Lehrman at 410–786–1037.)

Dated: May 23, 2015.

**William N. Parham, III,**

*Director, Paperwork Reduction Staff, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12993 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4120–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

**[CMS–7037–N]**

### Health Insurance Marketplace, Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Programs; Meeting of the Advisory Panel on Outreach and Education (APOE), June 25, 2015

**AGENCY:** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a meeting of the Advisory Panel on Outreach and Education (APOE) (the Panel) in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The Panel advises and makes recommendations to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) on opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of consumer education strategies concerning the Health Insurance Marketplace, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). This meeting is open to the public.

**DATES:** *Meeting Date:* Thursday, June 25, 2015, 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. eastern daylight time (e.d.t).

*Deadline for Meeting Registration, Presentations and Comments:* Thursday, June 11, 2015, 5:00 p.m., e.d.t.

*Deadline for Requesting Special Accommodations:* Thursday, June 11, 2015, 5:00 p.m., e.d.t.

**ADDRESSES:** *Meeting Location:* U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue SW., Room 738 G, Conference Room, Washington, DC 20201.

*Presentations and Written Comments:* Presentations and written comments should be submitted to the DFO as listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice.

*Registration:* The meeting is open to the public, but attendance is limited to the space available. Persons wishing to attend this meeting must register at the Web site *https://www.regonline.com/apoejune2015meeting* or by contacting the DFO as listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice by the date listed in the **DATES** section of this notice. Individuals requiring sign language interpretation or other special accommodations should also contact the DFO as listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice by the date listed in the **DATES** section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Abigail Huffman, Designated Federal Official (DFO), Office of Communications, CMS, 7500 Security Boulevard, Mail Stop S1–05–06, Baltimore, MD 21244, 410–786–0897, email *Abigail.Huffman1@cms.hhs.gov.* Additional information about the APOE is available on the Internet at: *http://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/FACA/APOE.html.* Press inquiries are handled through the CMS Press Office at (202) 690–6145.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Background

The Advisory Panel for Outreach and Education (APOE) (the Panel) is governed by the provisions of Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), which sets forth standards for the formation and use of federal advisory committees. The Panel is authorized by section 1114(f) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1314(f)) and section 222 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 217a).

The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) (the Secretary) signed the charter establishing the Citizen's Advisory Panel on Medicare Education [1] (the predecessor to the APOE) on January 21, 1999 (64 FR 7899, February 17, 1999) to advise and make recommendations to the Secretary and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) on the effective implementation of national Medicare education programs, including with respect to the Medicare+Choice (M+C) program added by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Pub. L. 105–33).

The Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) (Pub. L. 108–173) expanded the existing health plan options and benefits available under the M+C program and renamed it the Medicare Advantage (MA) program. We have had substantial responsibilities to provide information to Medicare beneficiaries about the range of health plan options available and better tools to evaluate these options. The successful MA program implementation required CMS to consider the views and policy input from a variety of private sector constituents and to develop a broad range of public-private partnerships.

In addition, Title I of the MMA authorized the Secretary and the Administrator of CMS (by delegation) to establish the Medicare prescription drug benefit. The drug benefit allows beneficiaries to obtain qualified prescription drug coverage. In order to effectively administer the MA program and the Medicare prescription drug benefit, we have substantial responsibilities to provide information to Medicare beneficiaries about the range of health plan options and benefits available, and to develop better tools to evaluate these plans and benefits.

The Affordable Care Act (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Public Law 111–148, and Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Public Law 111–152) expanded the availability of other options for health care coverage and enacted a number of changes to Medicare as well as to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Qualified individuals and qualified employers are now able to purchase private health insurance coverage through competitive marketplace, called Affordable Insurance Exchange (also called Health Insurance Marketplace, and ''Marketplace''). In order to effectively implement and administer these changes, we must provide information to consumers, providers, and other stakeholders through education and outreach programs regarding how existing programs will change and the expanded range of health coverage options available, including private health insurance coverage through the Marketplace. The APOE (the Panel) allows us to consider a broad range of views and information from interested audiences in connection with this effort and to identify opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of education strategies concerning the Affordable Care Act.

The scope of this panel also includes advising on issues pertaining to the education of providers and stakeholders with respect to the Affordable Care Act and certain provisions of the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act enacted as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

On January 21, 2011, the Panel's charter was renewed and the Panel was renamed the Advisory Panel for Outreach and Education. The Panel's charter was most recently renewed on January 21, 2015, and will terminate on January 21, 2017 unless renewed by appropriate action.

[1] We note that the Citizen's Advisory Panel on Medicare Education is also referred to as the Advisory Panel on Medicare Education (65 FR 4617). The name was updated in the Second Amended Charter approved on July 24, 2000.

Under the current charter, the APOE will advise the Secretary and the Administrator on optimal strategies for the following:

- Developing and implementing education and outreach programs for individuals enrolled in, or eligible for, Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), or coverage available through the Health Insurance Marketplace.
- Enhancing the federal government's effectiveness in informing Health Insurance Marketplace, Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP consumers, issuers, providers, and stakeholders, through education and outreach programs, on issues regarding these programs, including the appropriate use of public-private partnerships to leverage the resources of the private sector in educating beneficiaries, providers, and stakeholders.
- Expanding outreach to vulnerable and underserved communities, including racial and ethnic minorities, in the context of Health Insurance Marketplace, Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP education programs.
- Assembling and sharing an information base of ''best practices'' for helping consumers evaluate health coverage options.
- Building and leveraging existing community infrastructures for information, counseling, and assistance.
- Drawing the program link between outreach and education, promoting consumer understanding of health care coverage choices, and facilitating consumer selection/enrollment, which in turn support the overarching goal of improved access to quality care, including prevention services, envisioned under the Affordable Care Act.

The current members of the Panel are: Samantha Artiga, Principal Policy Analyst, Kaiser Family Foundation; Joseph Baker, President, Medicare Rights Center; Kellan Baker, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress; Philip Bergquist, Manager, Health Center Operations, Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (CHIPRA) Outreach & Enrollment Project and Director, Michigan Primary Care Association; Marjorie Cadogan, Executive Deputy Commissioner, Department of Social Services; Barbara Ferrer, Chief Strategy Officer, W. K. Kellogg Foundation; Shelby Gonzales, Senior Health Outreach Associate, Center on Budget & Policy Priorities; Jan Henning, Benefits Counseling & Special Projects Coordinator, North Central Texas Council of Governments' Area Agency on Aging; Louise Knight, Director, The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins; Miriam Mobley-Smith, Dean, Chicago State University, College of Pharmacy; Ana Natale-Pereira, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine, Rutgers-New Jersey Medical School; Roanne Osborne-Gaskin, M.D., Associate Medical Director, Neighborhood Health Plan of Rhode Island; Megan Padden, Vice President, Sentara Health Plans; Jeanne Ryer, Director, New Hampshire Citizens Health Initiative, University of New Hampshire; Carla Smith, Executive Vice President, Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS); Winston Wong, Medical Director, Community Benefit Director, Kaiser Permanente and Darlene Yee-Melichar, Professor & Coordinator, San Francisco State University.

## II. Provisions of This Notice

In accordance with section 10(a) of the FACA, this notice announces a meeting of the APOE. The agenda for the June 25, 2015 meeting will include the following:

- Welcome and listening session with CMS leadership
- Recap of the previous (March 19, 2015) meeting
- Affordable Care Act initiatives
- An opportunity for public comment
- Meeting summary, review of recommendations, and next steps

Individuals or organizations that wish to make a 5-minute oral presentation on an agenda topic should submit a written copy of the oral presentation to the DFO at the address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice by the date listed in the **DATES** section of this notice. The number of oral presentations may be limited by the time available. Individuals not wishing to make an oral presentation may submit written comments to the DFO at the address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice by the date listed in the **DATES** section of this notice.

**Authority:** Sec. 222 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 217a) and sec. 10(a) of Pub. L. 92–463 (5 U.S.C. App. 2, sec. 10(a) and 41 CFR 102–3).

Dated: May 19, 2015.

**Andrew M. Slavitt,**

*Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13046 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Administration for Children and Families

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

*Title:* 45 CFR part 1301 Head Start Grant Administration

*OMB No.:* 0970–0423

*Description:* The Office of Head Start is proposing to renew without changes authority to collect information pursuant to 45 CFR part 1301. These provisions are applicable to program administration and grants administration under the Head Start Act, as amended. The provisions specify the requirements for grantee agencies for insurance and bonding, the submission of audits, matching of federal funds, accounting systems certifications and other provisions applicable to personnel management.

*Respondents:* Head Start and Early Head Start program grant recipients

ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES

| Instrument | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Average burden hours per response | Total burden hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45 CFR 1301 | 2,700 | 1 | 2 | 5,400 |

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 5,400.

*Additional Information:*

Copies of the proposed collection may be obtained by writing to the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, 370 L'Enfant Promenade SW., Washington, DC 20447, Attn: ACF Reports Clearance Officer. All requests should be identified by the title of the information collection. Email address: *infocollection@acf.hhs.gov.*

*OMB Comment:*

OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information between 30 and 60 days after

publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication. Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent directly to the following: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, Fax: 202–395–7285, Email: *OIRA_SUBMISSION@OMB.EOP.GOV, Attn:* Desk Officer for the Administration for Children and Families.

**Robert Sargis,**

*Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13009 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4184–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

**[Docket No. FDA–2015–N–0001]**

### Joint Meeting of the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee and the Anesthetic and Analgesic Drug Products Advisory Committee; Notice of Meeting

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a forthcoming meeting of public advisory committees of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The meeting will be open to the public.

*Name of Committees:* Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee and the Anesthetic and Analgesic Drug Products Advisory Committee.

*General Function of the Committees:* To provide advice and recommendations to the Agency on FDA's regulatory issues.

**DATES:** *Date and Time:* The meeting will be held on July 7, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and July 8, 2015, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** *Location:* FDA White Oak Campus, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Building 31 Conference Center, the Great Room (Rm. 1503), Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002. Answers to commonly asked questions including information regarding special accommodations due to a disability, visitor parking, and transportation may be accessed at *http://www.fda.gov/AdvisoryCommittees/AboutAdvisoryCommittees/ucm408555.htm.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** *Contact Person:* Stephanie L. Begansky, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave. Bldg. 31, Rm. 2417, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 301–796–9001, FAX: 301–847–8533, *AADPAC@fda.hhs.gov,* or FDA Advisory Committee Information Line, 1–800–741–8138 (301–443–0572 in the Washington, DC area). A notice in the **Federal Register** about last minute modifications that impact a previously announced advisory committee meeting cannot always be published quickly enough to provide timely notice. Therefore, you should always check the Agency's Web site at *http://www.fda.gov/AdvisoryCommittees/default.htm* and scroll down to the appropriate advisory committee meeting link, or call the advisory committee information line to learn about possible modifications before coming to the meeting.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Agenda:* The committees will discuss the results of post-marketing studies evaluating the misuse and/or abuse of reformulated OXYCONTIN (oxycodone hydrochloride) extended-release tablets, supplemental new drug application (sNDA) 022272, manufactured by Purdue Pharma L.P. The committees will discuss whether these studies have demonstrated that the reformulated OXYCONTIN product has had a meaningful impact on abuse of OXYCONTIN.

FDA intends to make background material available to the public no later than 2 business days before the meeting. If FDA is unable to post the background material on its Web site prior to the meeting, the background material will be made publicly available at the location of the advisory committee meeting, and the background material will be posted on FDA's Web site after the meeting. Background material is available at *http://www.fda.gov/AdvisoryCommittees/Calendar/default.htm.* Scroll down to the appropriate advisory committee meeting link.

*Procedure:* Interested persons may present data, information, or views, orally or in writing, on issues pending before the committee. Written submissions may be made to the contact person on or before June 22, 2015. Oral presentations from the public will be scheduled between approximately 8:30 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. on July 8, 2015. Those individuals interested in making formal oral presentations should notify the contact person and submit a brief statement of the general nature of the evidence or arguments they wish to present, the names and addresses of proposed participants, and an indication of the approximate time requested to make their presentation on or before June 12, 2015. Time allotted for each presentation may be limited. If the number of registrants requesting to speak is greater than can be reasonably accommodated during the scheduled open public hearing session, FDA may conduct a lottery to determine the speakers for the scheduled open public hearing session. The contact person will notify interested persons regarding their request to speak by June 15, 2015.

Persons attending FDA's advisory committee meetings are advised that the Agency is not responsible for providing access to electrical outlets.

FDA welcomes the attendance of the public at its advisory committee meetings and will make every effort to accommodate persons with physical disabilities or special needs. If you require special accommodations due to a disability, please contact Stephanie L. Begansky at least 7 days in advance of the meeting.

FDA is committed to the orderly conduct of its advisory committee meetings. Please visit our Web site at *http://www.fda.gov/AdvisoryCommittees/AboutAdvisoryCommittees/ucm111462.htm* for procedures on public conduct during advisory committee meetings.

Notice of this meeting is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app. 2).

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Jill Hartzler Warner,**

*Associate Commissioner for Special Medical Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13004 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4164–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

**[Docket No. FDA–2008–N–0500]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for Office of Management and Budget Review; Comment Request; Requirements on Content and Format of Labeling for Human Prescription Drug and Biological Products

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing that a proposed collection of information has been submitted to the

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Fax written comments on the collection of information by June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** To ensure that comments on the information collection are received, OMB recommends that written comments be faxed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, Attn: FDA Desk Officer, FAX: 202–395–7285, or emailed to *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov.* All comments should be identified with the OMB control number 0910–0572. Also include the FDA docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** FDA PRA Staff, Office of Operations, Food and Drug Administration, 8455 Colesville Rd., COLE–14526, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, *PRAStaff@fda.hhs.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In compliance with 44 U.S.C. 3507, FDA has submitted the following proposed collection of information to OMB for review and clearance.

## Requirements on Content and Format of Labeling for Human Prescription Drug and Biological Products

*OMB Control Number 0910–0572—Extension*

FDA's regulations governing the format and content of labeling for human prescription drug and biological products were revised in the **Federal Register** of January 24, 2006 (71 FR 3922), to require that the labeling of new and recently approved products contain highlights of prescribing information, a table of contents for prescribing information, reordering of certain sections, minor content changes, and minimum graphical requirements. These revisions were intended to make it easier for health care practitioners to access, read, and use information in prescription drug labeling; to enhance the safe and effective use of prescription drug products; and to reduce the number of adverse reactions resulting from medication errors due to misunderstood or incorrectly applied drug information.

Currently, § 201.56 (21 CFR 201.56) requires that prescription drug labeling contain certain information in the format specified in either § 201.57 (21 CFR 201.57) or § 201.80 (21 CFR 201.80), depending on when the drug was approved for marketing. Section 201.56(a) sets forth general labeling requirements applicable to all prescription drugs. Section 201.56(b) specifies the categories of new and more recently approved prescription drugs subject to the revised content and format requirements in §§ 201.56(d) and 201.57. Section 201.56(c) sets forth the schedule for implementing these revised content and format requirements. Section 201.56(e) specifies the sections and subsections, required and optional, for the labeling of older prescription drugs not subject to the revised format and content requirements.

Section 201.57(a) requires that prescription drug labeling for new and more recently approved prescription drug products include ''Highlights of Prescribing Information.'' ''Highlights'' provides a concise extract of the most important information required under § 201.57(c) (the Full Prescribing Information (FPI)), as well as certain additional information important to prescribers. Section 201.57(b) requires a table of contents to prescribing information, entitled ''Full Prescribing Information: Contents,'' consisting of a list of each heading and subheading along with its identifying number to facilitate health care practitioners' use of labeling information. Section 201.57(c) specifies the contents of the FPI. Section 201.57(d) mandates the minimum specifications for the format of prescription drug labeling and establishes minimum requirements for key graphic elements such as bold type, bullet points, type size, and spacing.

Older drugs not subject to the revised labeling content and format requirements in § 201.57 are subject to labeling requirements at § 201.80. Section 201.80(f)(2) requires that within 1 year, any FDA-approved patient labeling be referenced in the ''Precautions'' section of the labeling of older products and either accompany or be reprinted immediately following the labeling.

In the **Federal Register** of January 21, 2015 (80 FR 2943), FDA published a 60-day notice requesting public comment on the proposed collection of information. FDA received two comments, however, these comments did not address the information collection.

*Annual Burden for Prescription Drug Labeling Design, Testing, and Submitting to FDA for New Drug Applications (NDAs) and Biologics License Applications (BLAs) (§§ 201.56 and 201.57).*

New drug product applicants must: (1) Design and create prescription drug labeling containing ''Highlights'', ''Contents'', and FPI; (2) test the designed labeling (*e.g.,* to ensure that the designed labeling fits into carton-enclosed products); and (3) submit it to FDA for approval. Based on the projected data used in the January 24, 2006, final rule, FDA estimates that it takes applicants approximately 3,349 hours to design, test, and submit prescription drug labeling to FDA as part of an NDA or a BLA under the revised regulations. Currently, approximately 131 applicants submit approximately 196 new applications (NDAs and BLAs) to FDA annually, totaling 656,404 hours.

FDA estimates the burden of this collection of information as follows:

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN [1]

| 21 CFR Part | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Total annual responses | Average burden per response | Total hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Labeling Requirements in §§ 201.56 and 201.57 ..... | 131 | 1.5 | 196 | 3,349 | 656,404 |

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12957 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4164–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

**[Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0902]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Prescription Drug Product Labeling; Medication Guide Requirements

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed collection of certain information by the Agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (the PRA), Federal Agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment in response to the notice. This notice solicits comments on regulations requiring the distribution of patient labeling, called Medication Guides, for certain products that pose a serious and significant public health concern requiring distribution of FDA-approved patient medication.

**DATES:** Submit either electronic or written comments on the collection of information by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit electronic comments on the collection of information to: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit written comments on the collection of information to Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. All comments should be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** FDA PRA Staff, Office of Operations, Food and Drug Administration, 8455 Colesville Rd., COLE–14526, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, *PRAStaff@fda.hhs.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), Federal Agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. ''Collection of information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and includes Agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)) requires Federal Agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collections of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, FDA is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information listed below.

With respect to the following collection of information, FDA invites comments on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of FDA's functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of FDA's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumption used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology.

### Prescription Drug Product Labeling; Medication Guide Requirements

*OMB Control Number 0910–0393—Extension*

FDA regulations require the distribution of patient labeling, called Medication Guides, for certain prescription human drug and biological products used primarily on an outpatient basis that pose a serious and significant public health concern requiring distribution of FDA-approved patient medication information. These Medication Guides inform patients about the most important information they should know about these products in order to use them safely and effectively. Included is information such as the drug's approved uses, contraindications, adverse drug reactions, and cautions for specific populations, with a focus on why the particular product requires a Medication Guide. These regulations are intended to improve the public health by providing information necessary for patients to use certain medication safely and effectively.

The regulations contain the following reporting requirements that are subject to the PRA:

- 21 CFR 208.20—Applicants must submit draft Medication Guides for FDA approval according to the prescribed content and format.
- 21 CFR 314.70(b)(3)(ii) and 21 CFR 601.12(f)—Application holders must submit changes to Medication Guides to FDA for prior approval as supplements to their applications.
- 21 CFR 208.24(c)—Each distributor or packer that receives Medication Guides, or the means to produce Medication Guides, from a manufacturer under paragraph (b) of this section shall provide those Medication Guides to each authorized dispenser to whom it ships a container of drug product.
- 21 CFR 208.24(e)—Each authorized dispenser of a prescription drug product for which a Medication Guide is required, when dispensing the product to a patient or to a patient's agent, must provide a Medication Guide directly to each patient unless an exemption applies under 21 CFR 208.26.
- 21 CFR 208.26(a)—Requests may be submitted for exemption or deferral from particular Medication Guide content or format requirements.

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN [1]

| 21 CFR Section | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Total annual responses | Average burden per response | Total hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Content and Format of a Medication Guide—208.20 | 57 | 1 | 57 | 320 | 18,240 |
| Supplements and Other Changes to an Approved Application—314.70 (b)(3)(ii), 601.12(f) | 108 | 1 | 108 | 72 | 7,776 |
| Exemptions and Deferrals—208.26(a) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 |

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN [1]—Continued

| 21 CFR Section | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Total annual responses | Average burden per response | Total hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | | | | | 26,020 |

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED ANNUAL THIRD-PARTY DISCLOSURE BURDEN [1]

| 21 CFR Section | Number of respondents | Number of disclosures per respondent | Total annual disclosures | Average burden per disclosure | Total hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 208.24(c) | 191 | 9,000 | 1,719,000 | 1.25 | 2,148,750 |
| Distributing and Dispensing a Medication Guide—208.24(e) | 88,736 | 5,000 | 443,680,000 | 0.05 (3 minutes). | 22,184,000 |
| Total | | | | | 24,332,750 |

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12976 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

**[Docket No. FDA–2014–N–1081]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Announcement of Office of Management and Budget Approval; Guidance for Industry on Postmarketing Adverse Event Reporting for Medical Products and Dietary Supplements During an Influenza Pandemic

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing that a collection of information entitled, ''Guidance for Industry on Postmarketing Adverse Event Reporting for Medical Products and Dietary Supplements During an Influenza Pandemic'' has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** FDA PRA Staff, Office of Operations, Food and Drug Administration, 8455 Colesville Rd., COLE–14526, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, *PRAStaff@fda.hhs.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On January 8, 2015, the Agency submitted a proposed collection of information entitled, ''Guidance for Industry on Postmarketing Adverse Event Reporting for Medical Products and Dietary Supplements During an Influenza Pandemic'' to OMB for review and clearance under 44 U.S.C. 3507. An Agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. OMB has now approved the information collection and has assigned OMB control number 0910–0701. The approval expires on April 30, 2018. A copy of the supporting statement for this information collection is available on the Internet at *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain*.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Leslie Kux,**

*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12977 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

### Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs; Request for Information Regarding Specific Issues Related to the Use of the Hair Specimen for Drug Testing

**AGENCY:** Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

**ACTION:** Request for Information.

**SUMMARY:** This document is a request for information regarding specific aspects of the regulatory policies and standards that may be applied to the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs (hair specimen).

**DATES:** *Comment Close Date:* To be assured consideration, comments must be received at one of the addresses provided below on or before June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Because of staff and resource limitations, we cannot accept comments by facsimile (FAX) transmission. You may submit comments in one of four ways (please choose only one of the ways listed):

*Electronically:* You may submit electronic comments to *http://www.regulations.gov*. Follow ''Submit a comment'' instructions.

*By regular mail:* You may mail written comments to the following address only: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Attention: Division of Workplace Programs, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Room 7–1029, Rockville, MD 20857. Please allow sufficient time for mailed comments to be received before the close of the comment period.

*By express or overnight mail:* You may send written comments to the following address only: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Attention: Division of Workplace Programs, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Room 7–1029, Rockville, MD 20850.

*By hand or courier:* Alternatively, you may deliver (by hand or courier) your written comments only to the following address prior to the close of the comment period:

*For delivery in Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Attention:* Division of Workplace Programs, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Room 7–1029, Rockville, MD 20850. To deliver your

comments to the Rockville address, call telephone number (240) 276–2600 in advance to schedule your delivery with one of our staff members. Because access to the interior of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Building is not readily available to persons without federal government identification, commenters are encouraged to either schedule your drop off or leave your comments with the security guard in the main lobby of the building.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean Belouin, Division of Workplace Programs, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), SAMHSA, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Room 7–1029, Rockville, Maryland 20857, (240) 276–2716 (phone), (240) 276–2610 (Fax), or email at *sean.belouin@samhsa.hhs.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Inspection of Public Comments: All comments received before the close of the comment period are available for viewing by the public, including any personally identifiable or confidential business information that is included in a comment. We post all comments received before the close of the comment period on the following Web site as soon as possible after they have been received: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the search instructions on that Web site to view public comments. Comments received by the deadline will also be available for public inspection at the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Division of Workplace Programs, 1 Choke Cherry Road, Rockville, MD 20850, Monday through Friday of each week from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. To schedule an appointment to view public comments, phone (240) 276–2716.

## I. Background

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) establishes the standards for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs under the authority of Section 503 of Public Law 100–71, 5 U.S.C. 7301, and Executive Order No. 12564. As required, HHS published the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs (Guidelines) in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 1988 [53 FR 11979]. SAMHSA subsequently revised the Guidelines on June 9, 1994 [59 FR 29908], September 30, 1997 [62 FR 51118], November 13, 1998 [63 FR 63483], April 13, 2004 [69 FR 19644], and on November 25, 2008 [73 FR 71858]. On May 15, 2015, HHS published a notice of proposed revisions to the mandatory guidelines which would provide federal executive branch agencies with the option of collecting and testing an oral fluid specimen in addition to urine specimen. The comment period concludes on July 14, 2015.

Section 503 of Public Law 100–71, 5 U.S.C. 7301 note, required the Department to establish scientific and technical guidelines and amendments in accordance with Executive Order 12564 and to publish Mandatory Guidelines which establish comprehensive standards for all aspects of laboratory drug testing and procedures, including standards that require the use of the best available technology for ensuring the full reliability and accuracy of drug tests and strict procedures governing the chain of custody of specimens collected for drug testing. These revisions to the Mandatory Guidelines promote and establish standards that use the best available technology for ensuring the full reliability and accuracy of drug tests, while reflecting the ongoing process of review and evaluation of legal, scientific, and societal concerns.

SAMHSA's chartered CSAP Drug Testing Advisory Board (DTAB) is the vehicle to provide recommendations to the SAMHSA Administrator for proposed changes to the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs. The DTAB process involves evaluating the scientific supportability of any considered change. To assist the DTAB, we are soliciting written comments and statements from the general public and industry stakeholders regarding a variety of issues related to hair specimen drug testing, including the hair specimen, its collection, specimen preparation, analytes/cutoffs, specimen validity, and initial and confirmatory testing.

## II. Solicitation of Comments

We are seeking additional information to inform potential use of hair specimens for drug testing, specifically on the following questions:

*Hair Specimen:*

- What are the acceptable body locations from which to collect hair for workplace drug testing? What should be done if head hair is not available for collection?
- What hair treatments (*i.e.,* shampoo, conditioning, perm, relaxers, coloring, bleaching, straightening, hair transplant) influence drug concentration in hair and to what degree?
- What are the acceptable reasons for hair testing (*i.e.,* pre-employment, random, reasonable suspicion, post-accident, other (fitness for duty, return to duty, etc.))?

*Collection:*

- What training should a collector receive prior to collecting the hair specimen?
- What is the best protocol to collect the hair specimen?
- Should the hair collection protocol be standardized, including specific instructions on how close to cut the hair specimen to the skin, how to determine the authenticity of the hair specimen, what cutting instruments to use, how to ensure the cutting instruments are decontaminated, and whether the use of collection kits should be required?
- What is the minimum amount of hair that should be collected?

*Specimen Preparation:*

- What are acceptable protocols for hair specimen preparation, such as cutting/powdering, initial washing, decontamination, and pre-extraction (*i.e.,* digestion, micro pulverization, etc.)?
- Should the washing and decontamination procedures be analyte specific?
- What criteria should be used to determine the acceptability of a specific wash and decontamination procedure? Are there published research studies, with experimental data included, that demonstrate that a particular wash procedure is effective at removing external contaminants while not significantly affecting the amount of incorporated drug related to drug use?
- If washing steps are used for decontamination, should adjustments be made for drug concentrations detected in the wash fluids? What calculations are recommended for these adjustments?

*Analytes/Cutoffs:*

- What analytes should be measured in hair by the initial and confirmatory tests?
- What initial and confirmation cutoffs should be used for the various hair drug testing analytes?
- For each analyte/drug, what criteria (cutoff) should be used to distinguish external contamination from drug use?
- What unique metabolites or other biomarkers exist to confirm use and to distinguish drug use from external contamination for which the drugs are currently tested?

*Specimen Validity:*

- Are biomarkers or tests needed to verify that the specimen is authentic human hair?
- Are there appropriate biomarkers or tests for the hair specimen that would reveal adulteration and/or substitution? What are the acceptability criteria for these biomarkers or tests?
- Is the ''invalid'' result category reasonable for hair testing? If so, what criteria are acceptable to classify a specimen result as invalid?

*Testing:*

• What technologies are available to perform initial and confirmatory testing on hair specimens?

• What is the best sample for valid quality control/proficiency testing material? How should this quality control/proficiency testing material be prepared? What is the best method to prepare a contaminated hair sample versus a sample that represents drug use?

**Janine Cook,**

*Chemist, Division of Workplace Programs, Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention, SAMHSA.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12743 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4162–20–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## Coast Guard

**[Docket No. USCG–2015–0455]**

## Certificates of Alternative Compliance

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard announces that the Coast Guard District Prevention Divisions have issued certificates of alternative compliance to vessels of special construction or purpose that cannot fully comply with the light, shape, and sound signal provisions of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (72 COLREGS) and/or Inland Navigation Rules without interfering with their special function. This notice promotes the Coast Guard's maritime safety and stewardship missions.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information about this document call or email LCDR Megan Cull, Coast Guard Navigation Standards Division; telephone (202) 372–1565, email *megan.l.cull@uscg.mil.* For information about viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826, toll free 1–800–647–5527.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Discussion

The special construction or purpose of some vessels makes them unable to comply with the light, shape, and sound signal provisions of the 72 COLREGS and/or Inland Navigation Rules. Under 72 COLREGS, statutory law and Coast Guard regulations, a vessel may instead meet alternative requirements and the vessel's owner, builder, operator, or agent may apply for a certificate of alternative compliance (COAC). The Chief of the Inspections and Investigations Branch in each Coast Guard District office determines whether the vessel for which the COAC is sought complies as closely as possible with the 72 COLREGS and/or Inland Navigation Rules, and decides whether to issue the COAC. Once issued, a COAC remains valid until information supplied in the application for the COAC, or the terms of the COAC becomes inapplicable to the vessel. Under the governing statute [1] and regulation,[2] the Coast Guard must publish notice of each COAC.

The Coast Guard issued COACs to the following vessels between 2010 and 2014:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2010 ..... | ALLISON CROSBY ..... | Sidelights on the outboard edges of the superstructure 6′ 8″ from the centerline. Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights may be installed 1 foot below each masthead light on either side of mast. |
| 2010 ..... | BEE HIVE ..... | Forward masthead light 38′ 2¼″ above main deck; aft masthead light 18′ 10⁹⁄₁₆″ aft of forward masthead light; aft anchor light 25′ 1⁵⁄₁₆″ off center to starboard side, just forward of the stern; sidelights on the side of the pilothouse 12′ 4¼″ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2010 ..... | BETTY PFANKUCH ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above pilothouse, 20′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | BETTY PFANKUCH ..... | Duplicate COAC with addition of allowing two 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on aft mast to allow 360° visibility. |
| 2010 ..... | C–COURAGEOUS ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 21′ 8¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | DWIGHT S. RAMSAY ... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 20′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on aft mast to allow 360° visibility. |
| 2010 ..... | FAST GIANT ..... | Forward masthead light above the pilothouse 18.92′ above the hull, and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft and 14.76′ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | FAST TITAN ..... | Forward masthead light above the pilothouse 18.92′ above the hull, and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft and 14.76′ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | JOHN W. JOHNSON .... | Aft masthead lights on the main mast atop of each pilothouse 115″ aft of each forward masthead light located atop the opposing pilothouse. Sidelights located on the side of the pilothouse. |
| 2010 ..... | KELLIE CHOUEST ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 25′ 5⁵⁄₁₆″ aft of forward masthead light; sidelights 15′ 8″ inboard from greatest breadth; two sets of 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the aft mast, one set on each side of the mast, 1′ 1″ from the centerline. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V ANNA G ..... | Sidelights on the top of the pilothouse, 8′ 1″ inboard from the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V CHARLEVOIX ..... | Reduce the intensity of the required sound signal to 85 decibel when leaving the dock/berth during normal operations. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V JODY MCMINN ..... | Sidelights placed forward of the masthead light and located on the outermost edge of the pilothouse more than 10% inboard of the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V JOE GRIFFIN ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 21′ 10″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V NICHOLAS P CALLAIS. | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V QUEEN BEE ..... | Forward masthead light on top of the pilothouse 38′ 2¼″ above main deck and aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 18′ 10⁹⁄₁₆″ aft of the forward masthead light, and its aft anchor light 25′ 1⁵⁄₁₆″ off center to the starboard side, just forward of the stern. In addition, the sidelights may be placed on the side of the pilothouse 12′ 4½″ inboard of the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V RAYMOND C. PERCOR, JR. | Single Voyage COAC horizontal separation between forward and aft masthead light, 84′. Height of forward masthead light, 29′ 10″. Vertical separation of forward and aft masthead light, 6′ 11″. Sidelights placed 26′ 4″ above main deck. Vertical separation between sidelights and forward masthead light 3′ 6″. Sidelights placed on outside edge of pilothouse symmetric about the axis line of the masthead lights. |

[1] 33 U.S.C. 1605(c).

[2] 33 CFR 81.18.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2010 ..... | M/V RAYMOND C. PERCOR, JR. | Fore and aft masthead lights 7′ 2½″ off centerline of the vessel. In addition, the vessels sidelights may be placed on the outside edge of the pilothouse symmetric about the axis line of the masthead lights. |
| 2010 ..... | M/V SOUTHERN STAR | Forward masthead light on top forward portion of the pilothouse, 19′ 8″ above the aft masthead light. The aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 18′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | MARIE ELISE ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 19′ 11⅜″ aft of the forward masthead light. In addition, the sidelights may be placed on the outside edge of the pilothouse 7′ ¼″ inboard of the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2010 ..... | MS. YVONNE ..... | Forward masthead light on top of pilothouse 18′ 2″ above the hull; aft masthead light on the main mast above pilothouse, 16′ 9 15/16″ aft & 14′ 9 2/16″ above the forward masthead light; sidelights 5′ 7 1/16″ inboard from the greatest breadth. |
| 2010 ..... | OCEAN PROJECT ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 23′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | OUR LADY OF SALETTE. | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2010 ..... | REAL MCCOY II ..... | Masthead and running lights to be mounted on vessels portside to maximize allowable deck cargo area. |
| 2010 ..... | USCG SENTINEL CUTTER CLASS. | Masthead lights 4.7 m aft of amid ships. |
| 2010 ..... | SEWARD JOHNSON .... | Aft anchor light position. Aft masthead light position and horizontal separation w/forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | AARON S MCCALL ..... | Forward masthead atop pilothouse and aft masthead above pilothouse, reducing horizontal separation of forward and aft masthead lights. |
| 2011 ..... | ACO DODIE LORRAINE. | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | ACO JESSICA MOORE | Aft masthead installed on mainmast above pilothouse reducing horizontal separation of forward and aft masthead lights. |
| 2011 ..... | AET EXCELLENCE ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on bridge deck inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | AET INNOVATOR ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on bridge deck inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | AET PARTNERSHIP .... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on bridge deck inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | AET RESPONSIBILITY | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on bridge deck inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | ALYSSA CHOUEST ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse. All-around white light of restricted in ability to maneuver light has 13° obstruction and lower all-around red light has 16° obstruction. |
| 2011 ..... | CINDY BROWN TIDE ... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 25′ 9″ aft of forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | C–PACER ..... | Aft masthead on main mast above pilothouse, reducing horizontal separation of masthead lights. Sidelights placed inboard from the greatest breadth of the vessel. Not under command/restricted in ability to maneuver lights duplicated on main mast to ensure 360° visibility. Lower not under command red light installed less than required distance from white not under commands light. |
| 2011 ..... | DEEPSTIM BRASIL ..... | Aft masthead light on pilothouse, 22′ 9 13/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | HARVEY LEGEND (ex DRONE BEE). | Aft masthead light on the mainmast above pilothouse, 18′ 10 9/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights located on side of pilothouse 12′ 4¼″ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | FAST GOLIATH ..... | Forward masthead atop pilothouse, 18.92′ above the hull, and aft masthead on mainmast above the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft and 14.76′ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | FAST MAMMOTH ..... | Forward masthead light atop pilothouse 13′ 11″ above hull; aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse, 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | HARVEY CHAMPION ... | Aft masthead light o main mast above pilothouse 21′ ¼″ aft of forward masthead light. Two sets of 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights placed on aft mast, one set on each of the aft mast, 1′ 4″ from centerline to ensure 360° visibility, as allowed for in paragraph 9(b)(ii) of the COLREGS. |
| 2011 ..... | HARVEY SUPPORTER | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse 21′ ¼″ aft of forward masthead light. Two sets of 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights placed on aft mast, one set on each of the aft mast, 1′ 4″ from centerline. |
| 2011 ..... | HENRY B BIGELOW .... | Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on starboard side of mast w/36° arc of obstruction. |
| 2011 ..... | M/V HERCULES ..... | Sidelights placed 9′ 6″ from the vessels greatest breadth mounted on the deckhouse hand rail. |
| 2011 ..... | M/V JAMES A. MORAN | Sidelights placed 13′ 3″ from vessels side, mounted to the deckhouse overhead. |
| 2011 ..... | M/V TRISTAN K ..... | Sidelights installed 9′ 6″ from vessel's side mounted on the deckhouse handrail. |
| 2011 ..... | USCG Maritime Security Cutter WSML. | Aft masthead light at forward edge of mast platform (11′ 5″ above baseline) setting the horizontal location of the aft masthead light 23′ 3 9/19″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | MASON BEE ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 18′ 10 9/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on side of pilothouse, 12′ 4¼″ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | MS NETTY ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 16.79′ aft and 13.33′ above forward masthead light. Sidelights may be placed 4.81′ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | MURDEN ..... | Forward masthead light 14′ above hull on forward-most point of bow. |
| 2011 ..... | OCEAN PATRIOT ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 32′ 7¾″ aft of forward masthead light. Sidelights may be located on side of 2nd deck 8′ 7¼″ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2011 ..... | OSCAR DYSON ..... | Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on starboard side of mast with 36° arc of obstruction. |
| 2011 ..... | OSG COURAGEOUS ... | Sidelights atop pilothouse (with the understanding that sidelights on companion barge will be used when connected as a composite unit). |
| 2011 ..... | OSG ENDURANCE ..... | Sidelights atop pilothouse (with the understanding that sidelights on companion barge will be used when connected as a composite unit). |
| 2011 ..... | PISCES ..... | Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on starboard side of mast with 36° arc of obstruction. |
| 2011 ..... | POWER 320 ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse aft of forward masthead light; forward masthead light may be placed 128′ 4½″ from stem of vessel. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2011 ..... | RJ COCO MCCALL ..... | Forward masthead atop pilothouse and aft mast on mainmast above pilothouse, reducing horizontal separation of masthead lights. |
| 2011 ..... | SHIMADA ..... | Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on starboard side of mast w/36° arc of obstruction. |
| 2011 ..... | ST JOSEPH THE WORKER. | Aft masthead light above pilothouse 22′ 5″ aft of forward masthead light. |
| 2011 ..... | USNS HOWARD O LORENZEN. | Aft masthead 58.58 m aft of forward masthead, less than the required horizontal separation required. |
| 2012 ..... | AIVIQ ..... | Install the forward masthead light at bow of vessel beneath helicopter deck, aft masthead light 158′ 3″ aft of the forward masthead light and sidelights placed 38′ 5 9/16″ higher than the forward masthead light and 75′ 6″ above main deck. |
| 2012 ..... | BELL M. SHIMADA ..... | Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights placed on starboard side of mast w/a 36° arc of obstruction. |
| 2012 ..... | BERING ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast atop the pilothouse 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | BIG BLUE ..... | Forward masthead light atop pilothouse 18′ 2″ above hull and aft masthead light on mainmast atop the pilothouse 16′ 15/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be placed 5′ 11¾″ inboard from the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2012 ..... | BLUEWATER CHIEF .... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 16.79′ aft and 13.33′ above the forward masthead light. Restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights may be placed aft of the secondary mast with a forward obstruction of 11°. Sidelights may be place 4.81′ inboard of the greatest breadth. |
| 2012 ..... | CADE CANDIES ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse 35.645 m aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be placed 12.87m above the main deck. |
| 2012 ..... | CAPTAIN DONALD LOWE SR. | Sidelights just forward of the main mast atop the pilothouse 8″ forward of the masthead light. Sidelights may be placed 10.75′ inboard of the side of the hull. |
| 2012 ..... | DEEPSTIM BRASIL II ... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 22′ 9 13/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Additionally, there may be two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of the mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2012 ..... | FAST CARRIER ..... | Forward masthead light atop pilothouse 18′ 11″ above the hull and aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | FAST HAULER ..... | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse 18′ 11″ above the hull and aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | FAST RUNNER ..... | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse 18′ 11″ above the hull and aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | G. FREDRICK SEEMANN. | Forward masthead light on top forward portion of the pilothouse 18′ 2″ above main deck, aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse 16′ 9 5/16″ aft and 14′ 9 2/16″ above the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be placed on the pilothouse bulkhead 5′ 7 1/16″ inboard for the greatest breadth of the vessel. |
| 2012 ..... | GARY ROOK ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | ISLA BONITA ..... | Aft masthead on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, 27′ 11 11/16″ aft of forward masthead. Forward masthead light may be placed 13′ 11⅜″ above the hull. |
| 2012 ..... | JACK EDWARDS ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of the mast, screened in such a way to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2012 ..... | KEITH COWAN ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above the pilothouse, 25′ 10⅞″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | KELLY ANN CANDIES | Aft masthead light 33.023 m aft of forward masthead light, forward masthead light 10.5 m above main deck, sidelights 2.2 m above the forward masthead light, maneuvering light 1.212 m below the aft masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | LEAH G CALLAIS ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse; less than required horizontal separation. |
| 2012 ..... | PAUL A CALLAIS ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | PETER W CALLAIS ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2012 ..... | ROBERT ..... | Aft masthead light on main mast, reducing horizontal separation of mastheads to 18′ 8 9/16″. Forward masthead placed 107′ 10⅞″ from the bow with 7° of obstruction. Sidelights placed on superstructure inboard from port and starboard sides. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights to be placed on aft masthead for maximum visibility. |
| 2012 ..... | ROBERT ADAMS ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of mast, screened in such a way to allow unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2012 ..... | ROGER WHITE ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of mast, screened in such a way to allow unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2012 ..... | RUSSELL BOUZIGA .... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of mast, screened in such a way to allow unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2012 ..... | SIKULIAQ ..... | Replacement of 2011 Certificate of Alternative Compliance due to citation error. |
| 2012 ..... | SISUAQ (ex HARVEY HAULER). | Aft masthead light on main mast above the pilothouse, 21′ ¼″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights may be placed on the aft mast, one set on each, 1′ 4″ from the centerline of the vessel to ensure full 360° visibility, as allowed for in paragraph 9(b)(ii) of COLREGS. |
| 2012 ..... | WYATT CANDIES ..... | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 108.97′ aft of the forward masthead light. The forward masthead light may be placed 34.65′ above the hull and the sidelights may be placed 41.91′ above the hull. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2013 | ALEX F MCCALL | Forward masthead light on top of the pilothouse, 26.3′ above the hull and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse 11.1′ aft and 14.3′ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | ARABIAN | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 14.75′ above and 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | BAYOU BEE 2013 | Aft masthead light on the main mast, 20′ 9 13/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the after mast, screened in such a way to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | BLUE ORCA | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 36′ 10 7/8″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be installed 47′ 11″ above baseline. |
| 2013 | BRAZOS | Masthead light on the pilothouse, 91′ 5 7/8″ aft of the stem of the vessel. |
| 2013 | BUSY BEE | Aft masthead light on the main mast, 20′ 9 13/8″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the aft mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | CANYON RUNNER | Forward masthead atop the pilothouse 18′ 2″ above the hull, aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse 16′ 9 15/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | CARIBBEAN | Aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse. 14.75′ above and 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | CELTIC | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | C–ENDURANCE | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11 3/4″ aft of the forward masthead. Two sets restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of mast, screened in such a way to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | CHARLIE COMEAUX | Aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse, 20′ 11 3/4″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the starboard side of the mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | CHLOE K | Sidelights 3.66 m inboard of the sides. |
| 2013 | C-INSTALLER | Aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, 36′ 10 7/8″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights may be installed 47′ 11 5/16″ above the baseline. |
| 2013 | CLARENCE TRICHE | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse 20′ 11 3/4″ aft of the forward masthead light. Second set of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights 15″ forward of the first set. |
| 2013 | CONNOR BORDELON | Aft masthead lights 16′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the aft mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | FAST DELIVERER | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse 18′ 11″ above the hull and aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | FAST SUPPORTER | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse 18′ 11″ above the hull and aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse 16′ 10″ aft and 14′ 9″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | GRACIE CANDIES | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 6.6 m aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | HARVEY DEEP–SEA | Aft masthead light on the mainmast above the pilothouse, 118′ aft of the forward masthead light. One set of 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights carried in the required position would be obscured by greater than 6°. Two sets of 360° restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights may be placed in the aft mast, one side on each of the aft mast, 1′ 4″ from the centerline of the vessel to ensure full 360° visibility, as allowed for in Paragraph 9(ii) of COLREGS. |
| 2013 | HERCULES | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 8.87 m aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | HONEY BEE | Aft masthead light on main mast, 20′ 9 13/16″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the after mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2013 | HOS BEIGNET | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 16′ 6 3/4″ above, and 22′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | HOS BOUDIN | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 16′ 6 3/4″ above, and 22′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | HOS BOURRE | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 16′ 6 3/4″ above, and 22′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | HOS CAYENNE | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 16′ 6 3/4″ above, and 22′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | HOS CEDAR RIDGE | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop pilothouse, 26′ aft of the forward masthead light and the placement of the stern light on the aft bulkhead of the pilothouse. |
| 2013 | HOS CHICORY | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 16′ 6 3/4″ above, and 22′ 8″ aft of the forward masthead light. Sidelights 10′ 8″ from the side. |
| 2013 | HOS CLEARVIEW | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 26′ aft of the forward masthead light and the placement of the stern light on the aft bulkhead of the pilothouse. |
| 2013 | HOS RIVERBEND | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 20′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | JOHN JACOB | Aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, 13′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2013 | M/V CHARLEVOIX | Install two masthead lights for each direction of travel as near as practical to the vessels centerline and install two stern lights for each direction of travel at aft and forward end of deckhouse. |
| 2013 | USCG Maritime Security Cutter WSML. | Aft masthead light at forward edge of mast platform 24′ 3 5/8″ aft of the forward masthead light, vice 23′ 3 9/16″ on original WMSL certificate of alternative compliance. |
| 2014 | AGNES CANDIES | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 6.6 m aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | ALEXANDER S MCCALL. | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 12′ 4″ above and 8′ 4 1/2″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | AVERY ISLAND | Aft masthead atop the pilothouse, 32′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | BRAD DARTEZ | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 32′ 8 3/4″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2014 | CAPT ELLIOTT | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse, 17′ 3″ above the hull and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 14′ 3″ aft and 13′ 3″ above the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | CAROLINE F MCCALL | Forward masthead light atop the pilothouse, 15′ 11⅝″ above the hull and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 9′ 9″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | CLARENCE MOORE | Aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 11¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the main mast atop the pilothouse, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | DEEP RUNNER | Forward masthead light 3′ above the pilothouse and 17′ 8¾″ forward of the aft masthead light. |
| 2014 | DOVE | Forward masthead light located at forward end of helicopter deck 62′ above the main deck and aft mast light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 15′ 6″ above and 118′ ⅛″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | ELK | Aft masthead light on the main mast above pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | FAST CHEETAH | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 16′ 10″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | FAST SERVER | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop of the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | GRAND ISLE | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 32′ 8¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the main mast atop the pilothouse, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | GREAT EXPECTATIONS. | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 22′ 1⅝″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the main mast atop the pilothouse, screened in such a way to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | HARVEY GLADIATOR | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | HARVEY WORKER | Aft masthead light on main mast above the pilothouse, 24′ 4″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | HORN ISLAND | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 32′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | HOS BAYOU | Aft masthead light on main mast above pilothouse, 30′ 9″ above and 103′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | HOS BRAIRWOOD | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 20′ 10¼″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | IRISH | Aft masthead light on the pilothouse, 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | JAVA | Aft masthead light on the pilothouse, 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | JIM DAVIS | Aft masthead light on the mainmast atop the pilothouse, 28′ 1⅝″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | LB JILL | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 18.71′ aft of the forward masthead light. Port sidelight 27′ from the side and starboard sidelight 43′ from the side. |
| 2014 | MASON G | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 11′ 8½″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | MR STEVEN | Forward masthead light on the top of the pilothouse, 18.6′ above the hull and its aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 14.7′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | MS CHARLOTTE | Aft masthead light on the main mast 19′ 4¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the after mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | MS JOLIE | Aft masthead light on main mast of the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | MS SARA JANE | Aft masthead light on the main mast 18′ 5⅛″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the after mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | RAM NATION | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 29′ 10″ above and 25′ 1″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | REGULUS | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 23′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | RENEE | Aft masthead light on the main mast 19′ 4¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on both sides of the after mast, screened in such a way as to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2014 | SARGASSO | Aft masthead light on the pilothouse, 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | SEACOR BRAVE | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 18′ 1″ above and 23′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | SEACOR COURAGEOUS. | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 23′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | SEACOR FEARLESS | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 23′ 5″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | SHIP ISLAND | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 32′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2014 | TIMBALIER ISLAND | Aft masthead light on main mast atop pilothouse 32′ 8¾″ aft of the forward masthead light. Two sets of restricted in ability to maneuver/not under command lights on the main mast atop the pilothouse, screened in such a way to allow an unbroken 360° arc of visibility, as allowed for in Annex I, Paragraph 9(ii). |
| 2015 | ADRIATIC | Aft masthead light on the pilothouse, 30′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | FAST LEOPARD | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 16.83′ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | HARVEY ENERGY | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 26′ 9″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | HOS WARLAND | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 118′ 5½″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | Maritime Security Cutter WSML. | Aft masthead light on extension forward of uppermost mast platform 24′ 7⅛″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | RAM COUNTRY | Aft masthead light on the main mast above the pilothouse, 25′ 1″ aft of the forward masthead light. |
| 2015 | STIM STAR IV | Aft masthead light on the main mast atop the pilothouse, 26′ 8⅝″ aft of the forward masthead light. |

This notice is issued under authority of 5 U.S.C. 552(a), 33 U.S.C. 1605(c), and 33 CFR 81.18.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**J.C. Burton,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Inspections and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13027 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Federal Emergency Management Agency

**[Docket ID: FEMA–2015–0016; OMB No. 1660–0131]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment—State Preparedness Report Unified Reporting Tool

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on a revision of a currently approved information collection. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice seeks comments concerning the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)—State Preparedness Report (SPR) Unified Reporting Tool.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** To avoid duplicate submissions to the docket, please use only one of the following means to submit comments:

(1) *Online.* Submit comments at *www.regulations.gov* under Docket ID FEMA–2015–0016. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

(2) *Mail.* Submit written comments to Docket Manager, Office of Chief Counsel, DHS/FEMA, 500 C Street SW., 8NE, Washington, DC 20472–3100.

All submissions received must include the agency name and Docket ID. Regardless of the method used for submitting comments or material, all submissions will be posted, without change, to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov,* and will include any personal information you provide. Therefore, submitting this information makes it public. You may wish to read the Privacy Act notice that is available via the link in the footer of *www.regulations.gov.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Leiloni Stainsby, Section Chief—Assessments Branch, FEMA, National Preparedness Assessment Division, at 202–786–9737. You may contact the Records Management Division for copies of the proposed collection of information at email address: *FEMA-Information-Collections-Management@fema.dhs.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This package is a revision to the collection originally approved as the State Preparedness Report, OMB Control Number: 1660–0131. FEMA is updating the name of this collection from ''State Preparedness Report'' to the ''Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)—State Preparedness Report (SPR) Unified Reporting Tool'' to reflect more accurately the information and method of collection. The *Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (PKEMRA),* as amended by the *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007,* established an annual requirement for the 56 States and territories to submit a State Preparedness Report (SPR).

*PKEMRA* requires a report on current capability levels and a description of targeted capability levels from all States and territories receiving non-disaster preparedness grant funds administered by the Department of Homeland Security. Each report must also include a discussion of the extent to which target capabilities identified in the applicable State homeland security plan and other applicable plans are unmet, and an assessment of resources needed to meet the preparedness priorities established under *PKEMRA* Section 646(e), including: (i) An estimate of the amount of expenditures required to attain the preparedness priorities; and (ii) the extent to which the use of Federal assistance during the preceding fiscal year achieved the preparedness priorities. To meet this requirement, States and territories first identify capability targets through the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and then assess against these targets in the SPR. It is also important to note that the only allowable expenses under the grant awards are for completing the THIRA/SPR and THIRA.

FEMA holds annual after-action calls every January. All state and local jurisdictions that complete the THIRA/SPR are invited to participate and provide feedback on the collection process. FEMA uses this after-action process to gather feedback on the utility of the information and on how the burden can be further reduced. Participation in these calls is voluntary. FEMA estimates that the time it takes to participate in and respond to the THIRA/SPR After Action Conference Calls is one hour per respondent for a total of 123 hours.

**Collection of Information**

*Title:* Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)—State Preparedness Report (SPR) Unified Reporting Tool.

*Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved information collection.

*OMB Number:* 1660–0131.

*FEMA Forms:* FEMA Form 008–0–19, THIRA–SPR Unified Reporting Tool; FEMA Form 008–0–20, THIRA–SPR Unified Reporting Tool; FEMA Form 008–0–23, THIRA/SPR After Action Conference Calls.

*Abstract:* This package is a revision to the collection originally approved as the State Preparedness Report. The revised name more accurately reflects exactly what information is collected and how. It serves as a report on the current capability levels and a description of targeted capability levels from all states and territories receiving Federal preparedness assistance administered by the Department of Homeland Security.

*Affected Public:* State, Local or Tribal Government.

*Number of Respondents:* 123.

*Number of Responses:* 123.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 71,363 hours.

ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS AND COSTS

| Type of respondent | Form name/ form number | Number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Total number of responses | Average burden per response (in hours) | Total annual burden (in hours) | Average hourly wage rate | Total annual respondent cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Urban Areas) or Tribal Government. | THIRA/FEMA Form 008–0–19. | 67 | 1 | 67 | 408 hours | 27,336 | $45.33 | $1,239,140.88 |
| State or Territory. | SPR–THIRA/ FEMA Form 008–0–20. | 56 | 1 | 56 | 784 hours | 43,904 | 45.33 | 1,990,168.32 |
| THIRA/SPR After Action Conference Call. | FEMA Form 008–0–23. | 123 (same as the participants above, no additional participants). | 1 | 123 (same as the participants above, no additional participants). | 1 | 123 | | |
| Total | | 123 | | 123 | | 71,363 | | 3,234,884.79 |

• **Note:** The ''Avg. Hourly Wage Rate'' for each respondent includes a 1.4 multiplier to reflect a fully-loaded wage rate.

*Estimated Cost:* The estimated annual cost to respondents for the hour burden is $3,234,884.79. The estimated annual cost to respondents operations and maintenance costs for technical services is $10,833,275. There are no annual start-up or capital costs. The cost to the Federal Government is $2,154,074.

**Comments**

Comments may be submitted as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** caption above. Comments are solicited to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed data collection is necessary for the proper performance of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Janice Waller,**

*Acting Director, Records Management Division, Mission Support Bureau, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13020 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–46–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Federal Emergency Management Agency

**[Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026]**

### ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants'' (NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 2)

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requests public comments on the draft ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants'' (NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 2).

**DATES:** Comments must be received by August 27, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026, by one of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Please note that this draft guidance is not a rulemaking and the Federal Rulemaking Portal is being utilized only as a mechanism for receiving comments.

Mail/Hand Delivery/Courier: Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Eberst, Policy Supervisor, Professional Services Branch, Technological Hazards Division, Protection and National Preparedness Directorate, *william.eberst@fema.dhs.gov.* (202) 341–4917.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Public Participation**

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and Docket ID. Regardless of the method used for submitting comments or material, all submissions will be posted, without change, to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov,* and will include any personal information you provide. Therefore, submitting this information makes it public. You may wish to read the Privacy Act notice, which can be viewed by clicking on the ''Privacy Notice'' link on the homepage of *www.regulations.gov.*

You may submit your comments and material by methods specified in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Please submit your comments and any supporting material by only one means to avoid the receipt and review of duplicate submissions.

*Docket:* The draft guidance is available in Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026. For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for the Docket ID. Submitted comments may also be inspected at FEMA, Office of Chief Counsel, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472.

**II. Background**

In November 1980, the Federal Emergency Management Agency issued ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants'' (NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 1) jointly with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) as a joint policy document. (45 FR 85862, December 30, 1980).

NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 1 was issued as a joint FEMA/NRC policy document that provides guidance on the sixteen Planning Standards referenced in FEMA's regulations at 44 CFR 350.5 and the NRC's regulations at 10 CFR part 50. Both agencies use these Planning Standards to evaluate the adequacy of the emergency plans of commercial nuclear power plant owners and operators, and the emergency plans and preparedness of State and local governments within the Emergency Planning Zones surrounding commercial nuclear power plants.

Since the publication of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 1 in 1980, four supplementary documents and one addendum (66 FR 22270, May 3, 2001) have been issued that update and modify specific planning and procedural elements. These documents are available online at *http://www.regulations.gov* (Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026). FEMA and the NRC are considering revising NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 1 to address stakeholder interest and the various emergency planning and preparedness lessons learned since its initial publication.

Since the publication of these documents, there have been changes to FEMA and NRC regulations, guidance, policies and advances in technology. FEMA, working with the NRC, is soliciting comments from stakeholders and interested members of the public on the draft document ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants,'' NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 2. The document is available online at *http://www.regulations.gov* (Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026).

FEMA and the NRC held two public meetings on August 22, 2012 and September 13, 2012 as well as two public stakeholder engagement sessions held on October 29–31, 2013 and June 25, 2014. The purpose of these public meetings were to: (1) Solicit input from stakeholders and interested members of the public on the scope of future revisions to NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev.1; (2) describe the proposed timeline for the revisions to NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev.1; (3) promote transparency, public participation, and collaboration during the NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev.1 revision process; and (4) allow direct input to the writing teams during the writing process. All of the presentation material and meeting notes are available to review online at *http://www.regulations.gov* (Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026).

Through this Notice, FEMA and NRC are soliciting comments from stakeholders and interested members of the public on the draft document NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Rev. 2.

FEMA seeks comment on the draft guidance, which is available online at *http://www.regulations.gov* in Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026. Based on the comments received, FEMA may make appropriate revisions to the draft document. FEMA will consider any comments received in the drafting of the final policy. When FEMA issues a final policy, FEMA will publish a notice of availability in the **Federal Register** and make the final policy available at *http://www.regulations.gov.* The final policy will not impose legally binding requirements.

**Authority:** NRC Authorization Acts of 1980 (Pub. L. 96–295) and 1982–1983 (Pub. L. 97–415); Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, Titles II and VI, Sections 201 and 611, 42 U.S.C. 5131 and 5196; Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended, Title VI, Chapter 1, Subchapter V, Sections 503 and 504, 6 U.S.C. 313 and 314; Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006, Title V, Section 612, 6 U.S.C. 314a; Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations for 1999, 42 U.S.C. 5196e; Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, Title VI, Sections 602, 642, 643, and 644, 6 U.S.C. 701, 742, 743, and 744; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978; E.O. 12241, as amended; E.O. 12127, as amended. E.O. 12148, as amended; E.O. 12657, as amended; FEMA's regulations in Title 44, Chapter I, Parts 350–354 of the CFR.

Dated: May 4, 2015.

**W. Craig Fugate,**

*Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13023 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–21–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

**[OMB Control Number 1615–0016]**

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Request for Fee Waiver, Form I–912; Request for Fee Exemption; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; Revision

**AGENCY:** U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

**ACTION:** 30-Day Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection notice was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 17, 2015, at 80 FR 13880, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. USCIS accepted and considered comments received in connection with the 60-day notice until May 28, 2015.

**DATES:** The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 29, 2015. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, must be directed to the OMB USCIS Desk Officer via email at *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov*. Comments may also be submitted via fax at (202) 395–5806. All submissions received must include the agency name and the OMB Control Number 1615–0016.

You may wish to consider limiting the amount of personal information that you provide in any voluntary submission you make. For additional information please read the Privacy Act notice that is available via the link in the footer of *http://www.regulations.gov*.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you need a copy of the information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information, please contact us at: USCIS, Office of Policy and Strategy, Regulatory Coordination Division, Laura Dawkins, Chief, 20 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20529–2140, Telephone number (202) 272–8377. Please note contact information provided here is solely for questions regarding this notice. It is not for individual case status inquiries. Applicants seeking information about the status of their individual cases can check Case Status Online, available at the USCIS Web site at *http://www.uscis.gov,* or call the USCIS National Customer Service Center at (800) 375–5283; TTY (800) 767–1833.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Comments

You may access the information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information by visiting the Federal eRulemaking Portal site at: *http://www.regulations.gov* and enter

USCIS–1615–0016 in the search box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

**Overview of This Information Collection**

(1) *Type of Information Collection Request:* Revision of a Currently Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Request for Fee Waiver; Request for Fee Exemption.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of DHS sponsoring the collection:* I–912; USCIS.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary:* Individuals or households. The collection of information on Form I–912 is necessary in order for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to make a determination that the applicant is unable to pay the application fee for certain immigration benefits.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* The estimated total number of respondents for this information collection is 505,000 respondents at 1.17 hours.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total estimated annual hour burden associated with this collection is 590,849.92 hours.

(7) *An estimate of the total public burden (in cost) associated with the collection:* The estimated total annual cost burden associated with this collection of information is $1,893,750.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Samantha Deshommes,**

*Acting Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13014 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–97–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

**[Docket No. FR–5828–N–22]**

## Federal Property Suitable as Facilities to Assist the Homeless

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for use to assist the homeless.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Juanita Perry, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 7266, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 402–3970; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708–2565 (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free title V information line at 800–927–7588.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with 24 CFR part 581 and section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), as amended, HUD is publishing this Notice to identify Federal buildings and other real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. The properties were reviewed using information provided to HUD by Federal landholding agencies regarding unutilized and underutilized buildings and real property controlled by such agencies or by GSA regarding its inventory of excess or surplus Federal property. This Notice is also published in order to comply with the December 12, 1988 Court Order in *National Coalition for the Homeless* v. *Veterans Administration,* No. 88–2503–OG (D.D.C.).

Properties reviewed are listed in this Notice according to the following categories: Suitable/available, suitable/unavailable, and suitable/to be excess, and unsuitable. The properties listed in the three suitable categories have been reviewed by the landholding agencies, and each agency has transmitted to HUD: (1) Its intention to make the property available for use to assist the homeless, (2) its intention to declare the property excess to the agency's needs, or (3) a statement of the reasons that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use as facilities to assist the homeless.

Properties listed as suitable/available will be available exclusively for homeless use for a period of 60 days from the date of this Notice. Where property is described as for ''off-site use only'' recipients of the property will be required to relocate the building to their own site at their own expense. Homeless assistance providers interested in any such property should send a written expression of interest to HHS, addressed to: Ms. Theresa M. Ritta, Chief Real Property Branch, the Department of Health and Human Services, Room 5B–17, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, (301)-443–2265 (This is not a toll-free number.) HHS will mail to the interested provider an application packet, which will include instructions for completing the application. In order to maximize the opportunity to utilize a suitable property, providers should submit their written expressions of interest as soon as possible. For complete details concerning the processing of applications, the reader is encouraged to refer to the interim rule governing this program, 24 CFR part 581.

For properties listed as suitable/to be excess, that property may, if subsequently accepted as excess by GSA, be made available for use by the homeless in accordance with applicable law, subject to screening for other Federal use. At the appropriate time, HUD will publish the property in a Notice showing it as either suitable/available or suitable/unavailable.

For properties listed as suitable/unavailable, the landholding agency has decided that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use to assist the homeless, and the property will not be available.

Properties listed as unsuitable will not be made available for any other purpose for 20 days from the date of this Notice. Homeless assistance providers interested in a review by HUD of the determination of unsuitability should call the toll free information line at 1–800–927–7588 for detailed instructions or write a letter to Ann Marie Oliva at the address listed at the beginning of this Notice. Included in the request for review should be the property address (including zip code), the date of publication in the **Federal Register,** the landholding agency, and the property number.

For more information regarding particular properties identified in this Notice (*i.e.,* acreage, floor plan, existing sanitary facilities, exact street address), providers should contact the appropriate landholding agencies at the following addresses: GSA: Mr. Flavio Peres, General Services Administration, Office of Real Property Utilization and Disposal, 1800 F Street NW., Room 7040 Washington, DC 20405, (202) 501–0084; (This is not a toll-free number).

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Brian P. Fitzmaurice,**

*Director, Division of Community Assistance, Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs.*

05/19/2015

**TITLE V, FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM FEDERAL REGISTER REPORT FOR 05/29/2015**

**Suitable/Available Properties**

*Building*

Connecticut

Shepard of the Sea Chapel & Community Center
231 Gungywamp Rd.
Groton CT 06340
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510010
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: CT–0933
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA; Landholding Agency: Navy
Comments: 49+ yrs.-old; 28,777 sq. ft.; vacant 48+ mons.; wood & concrete; severe water damage; mold; sits on 13.5 acres; contact GSA for more information

South Dakota

Lemmon Vehicle Storage Building
207 10th Street W.
Lemmon SD 57638
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510009
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–D–SD–0633–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA; Landholding Agency: COE
Comments: 2,000 sq. ft.; vehicle storage barn; sits on 0.77 acres; contact GSA for more information

*Land*

Illinois

FAA Outer Marker
5549 Elizabeth Place
Rolling Meadows IL
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430004
Status: Excess
GSA Number: I–U–IL–807
Directions: Landholding Agency; FAA; Disposal Agency; GSA
Comments: 9,640 sq. ft.; 12+ months vacant; outer marker to assist planes landing at O'Hare Airport; contact GSA for more information.

Wisconsin

TACAN Annex
6400 Block of Lake Rd.
Windsor WI 53598
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320005
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–D–WI–611
Comments: 1 acre; moderate conditions

**Suitable/Unavailable Properties**

*Building*

Alaska

FAA Housing
111 Henrichs Loop Road
Cordova AK 99754
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440002
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–U–AK–0854
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Land Holding Agency; Transportation.
Comments: 25+ yrs. old; 2,688 sq. ft.; 3 months vacant; residential good condition; may be difficult to move; contact GSA for more information.

Arizona

13 Buildings
Wellton Property
Wellton AZ 85356
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420005
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–X–AZ–0865–AA
Directions: Landholding Agency: DHS; Disposal Agency: GSA; AZ0084; AZ0085; AZ0086; AZ0087; AZ0088; AZ0089; AZ0406; AZ0407; AZ0408; AZ3960; AZ0221; AZ0222; AZ0223
Comments: 95,521.44 total sq. ft. for all properties; built in 2004 & 2007; contact GSA for more information on a specific property

San Carlos Irrigation Project
BIA Old Main Office Bldg.
255 W. Roosevelt
Coolidge AZ 85128
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440008
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 9–I–AZ–1706–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Landholding Agency: Bureau of Indian Affairs.
Comments: 83+ yrs. old; 6,745 sq. ft. ; 36mos. vacant; residential and commercial; brick structure; fair condition; asbestos & lead based paint; contact GSA for more information.

Colorado

6 Bldgs. Grand Junction Complex
500 South 10th Street
Grand Junction CO 81501
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510002
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 7–I–CO–0698–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Landholding Agency; Bureau of Reclamation.
Comments: 50+ yrs. old; Brick/Metal structure; 11,244 sq. ft., total 6 bldgs.; sits on 1.2 acres; office/storage/warehouse; repairs needed totaling $10,000; contact GSA for more info.

Idaho

Ditchrider House
3970 1st Lane East
Parma ID 83660
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420011
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–I–ID–0585
Directions: Landholding Agency: Dept. of Homeland Security; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 1,194 sq. ft.; residence; 48+ months vacant; extensive repairs needed; contact GSA for more info.

BOR Upper Snake River
Field Office
1359 Hansen Ave.
Burley ID 83318
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420012
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–I–ID–0586
Directions: Landholding Agency: Interior; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 9,828 sq. ft.; office; 48+ months vacant; good to moderate conditions; contact GSA for more info.

Illinois

Peoria Radio Repeater Site
Between Spring Creek and Caterpillar Lane
Peoria IL
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420008
Status: Excess
GSA Number: I–D–IL–806
Directions: Landholding Agency; COE; Disposal agency GSA
Comments: 8x12 equipment storage shed; fair conditions contact GSA for more information.

Iowa

Pisgah Microwave Repeater Site
1585 Juneau Avenue
Mondamin IA 51564
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510001
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 7–D–IA–0514–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Landholding Agency; COE
Comments: 26+ yrs. old; metal structure; 128 sq. ft., storage; property has radio antenna; sit on 2.58 acres of land; for further info. contact GSA.

Kansas

Former SS Admin. Building
801 S. Broadway
Pittsburg KS 66762
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420007
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–G–KS–0529
Comments: 5,918 sq. ft.; sits on .52 acres; Admin. bldg.; 42+ yrs.-old; fair conditions; asbestos; lead-based paint; mold possible; contact GSA for more information

Maryland

Appraisers Store
Baltimore MD 21202
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201030016
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–G–MD–0623
Comments: Redetermination: 169,801 sq. ft., most recent use—federal offices, listed in the Nat'l Register of Historic Places, use restrictions

Metro West
300 N. Green St.
Baltimore MD 21201
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440004
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–G–MD–0624AA
Directions: 2 Federal office buildings totaling 1,085,741 sq. ft.
Comments: bldgs. located on 11 acres; 7 months vacant; good to fair conditions; includes garage w/410 spaces; coordinate access w/landholding agency's facilities management; contact GSA for more information

Michigan

Nat'l Weather Svc Ofc.
214 West 14th Ave.
Sault Ste. Marie MI
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54200120010
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–C–MI–802
Comments: 2230 sq. ft., presence of asbestos, most recent use—office

Sleeping Bear Dunes National
Lakeshore-Carmichael House
6234 S. Dune Highway
Empire MI 49630
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430013
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–I–MI–0702–AB
Comments: Off-site removal only; 2,253 sq. ft.; 100+yrs.-old; average condition; wood structure type; lead-based paint; contact GSA for more information.

Missouri

Former NMCB15 Richards-Gedaur
RPSUID 212
600 Seabee Drive
Belton MO 64068
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510004
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–D–MO–0705
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA; Landholding Agency: Navy
Comments: 10 bldgs. ranging from 960 to 4,980 sq. ft.; 12+ months vacant; some recent use includes: admin./classroom/warehouse; 14.67 acres; asbestos/lead/mold may be present; contact GSA for more information

Montana

Huntley Townsite Tract 127
Near Hwy 522
Huntley MT 59037
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201410006
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–I–MT–0633–AB
Directions: disposal Agency: GSA; Landholding Agency: Interior
Comments: sits on 2.37 acres; contact GSA for more information

Nevada

Alan Bible Federal Bldg.
600 S. Las Vegas Blvd.
Las Vegas NV 89101
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201210009
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–G–NV–565
Comments: 81,247 sf.; current use: federal bldg.; extensive structural issues; needs major repairs; contact GSA for further details

2 Buildings
Military Circle
Tonopah NV
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201240012
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–I–NV–514–AK
Directions: bldg. 102: 2,508 sf.; bldg. 103: 2,880 sf.
Comments: total sf. for both bldgs. 5,388; Admin.; vacant since 1998; sits on 0.747 acres; fair conditions; lead/asbestos present

New Jersey

Former SSA Trust Fund Bldg.
396 Bloomfield Ave.
Montclair NJ 07042
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201310004
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 1–G–NJ–0676
Comments: 7,183 sf.; office; vacant since March 2012

Portion of former Sievers—
Sandberg US Army Reserves Center (Camp Pedric
Artillery Ave at Garrison St.
Oldmans NJ 08067
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320003
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 1–D–NJ–0662–AB
Directions: On the north side of Rte. 130, between Perkintown Road (Rte. 644) and Pennsgove-Pedricktown Rd (Rte. 642)
Comments: #171; mess hall bldg. #173; 14,282 total sf.; fair/poor conditions; asbestos/lead-based paint; potential legal constraints in accessing property; Contact GSA for more info.

Portion of Former Sievers—
Sandberg US Army Reserves Center—Tract 1
NW Side of Artillery Ave. at Rte. 130
Oldmans NJ 08067
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320015
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–D–NJ–0662–AA
Directions: Previously reported under 54200740005 as suitable/available; 16 bldgs. usage varies: barracks/med./warehouses/garages; property is being parcelized.
Comments: 87,011 sf.; 10+ yrs. vacant fair/poor conditions; property may be landlocked; transferee may need to request access from Oldmans Township planning & zoning comm.; contact GSA for more info.

New York

Portion of GSA Binghamton
''Hillcrest'' Depot—Tract 1
1151 Hoyt Ave.
Fenton NY 13901
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320017
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 1–G–NY0760–AC
Directions: Previously reported on March 24, 2006 under 54200610016; this property includes 40 acres of land w/6 structures; property is being parcelized
Comments: warehouses range from approx. 16,347 sf.-172,830 sf.; admin. bldg. approx. 5,700 sf; guard house & butler bldg. sf. is unknown; 10 vacant; fair conditions; bldgs. locked; entry by appt. w/GSA

Former TSG Harold Lockwood US
Army Reserves Center
111 Finney Boulevard
Malone NY 12953
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201340007
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–D–NY–0966–AA
Comments: 29960 Sq. Ft.: office/administrative/garage; sits on 4.82+/-acres; age 1961–1983; entry by appointment with USAR/GSA; asbestos and lead based paint; contact GSA for more information.

A Scotia Depot
One Amsterdam Road
Scotia NY 12302
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420003
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 54201420003
Directions: Previously reported in 2006 but has been subdivided into smaller parcel.
Comments: 325,000 sq. ft.; storage; 120+ months vacant; poor conditions; holes in roof; contamination; access easement, contact GSA for more information.

Ohio

N. Appalachian Experimental
Watershed Research Ctr.
28850 State Rte. 621
Coshocton OH 43824
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420006
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–A–OH–849
Directions: Landholding Agency: Agriculture; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 70,539 total sq. ft. for two bldgs.; storage/office; fair to poor conditions; lead-based paint; asbestos; PCBs; mold; remediation required; contact GSA for more information

Glenn Research Center-
Plumbrook Station: Big Island Plumbing
Station; 6100 Columbus Ave.
Sandusky OH 44870
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440014
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–Z–OH–0598–3–AC
Directions: Landholding Agency: NASA; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: off-site removal only; 3,756 sq. ft.; 24+ months vacant; may be difficult to relocate due to size/type; contact GSA for more information

Oklahoma

Claremore Federal Office Building
118 South Missouri Avenue
Claremore OK 74017
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440001
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–I–OK–0568–AB
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Landholding Agency; Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Comments: 79+ yrs. old; 8,798 sq. ft.; vacant 114 months; office; brick; may be difficult to remove; ok condition; secure area; contact GSA for more information.

Oregon

3 Bldgs./Land
OTHR–B Radar
Cty Rd 514
Christmas Valley OR 97641
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54200840003
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–D–OR–0768
Comments: 14000 sq. ft. each/2626 acres, most recent use—radar site, right-of-way

South Carolina

Former US Vegetable Lab
2875 Savannah Hwy
Charleston SC 29414
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201310001
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–A–SC–0609AA
Directions: head house w/3 greenhouses, storage bins
Comments: 6,400 sf.; lab; 11 yrs. vacant; w/ in 100 yr. floodplain/floodway; however is contained; asbestos & lead based paint

Texas

2 Buildings; Natural Resource
Conservation Service Waco Facility
200 South Price Street
Waco TX 76501
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430007
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–A–TX–0556
Directions: Landholding agency; Agriculture; Disposal Agency; GSA.
Comments: 18,460 sq. ft.; storage; 60+ months vacant; very poor condition; within a security fence; contact GSA for more information.

FT Hancock Border Patrol Station
235 Knox Avenue
Ft. Hancock TX 79839
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430010
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 7–X–TX–1157–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Land holding Agency; US Customs and Border Protection
Comments: 3,022 sq. ft.; office, storage, detention; 49+ years old; fair to moderate condition; contact GSA for more information.

Virginia

Building 641
216 Hunting Ave.
Hampton VA 23681
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320006
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–Z–VA–0602–A1
Comments: 11,671 total sf.; office; fair/ moderate conditions; existing Federal need

Johnson House and Shed
12503 Cavalry Court
Spotsylvania VA 22553
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430005
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–I–VA–1145AA
Directions: Landholding Agency; Interior; Disposal Agency; GSA
Comments: Off-site removal only; 1,357 +/− sq. ft.; repairs needed; contact GSA for more information.

Washington

712 Records Center Printing & Repro Plant 712B IRM
940 Northgate Dr.
Richland WA 99352
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201320025
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–B–WA–1268
Directions: Property is improved w/2 contiguous bldgs., totaling approx. 22,714 sf.; Disposal: GSA, Landholding: Energy
Comments: 22,714 sf.; storage; moderate conditions; 60+ months vacant; asbestos & lead

Old Oroville Border Patrol Station
1105 Main St.
Oroville WA 98844
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201420010
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–Z–WA–1272–AB
Directions: Landholding Agency: Dept. of Homeland Security; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 5,500 sq. ft.; office; 18+ months vacant; good to moderate conditions; contact GSA for more info.

Old Lynden Border Patrol Station;
8334 Guide Meridian Rd.
Lynden WA 98264
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510003
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–Z–WA–1276
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA; Landholding Agency: Dept. of Homeland Security
Comments: 50+ yrs.-old; 2,763 sq. ft.; vacant 18+ months; contact GSA for more information

West Virginia

Naval Information Operations Center
133 Hedrick Drive
Sugar Grove WV 26815
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430015
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–N–WV–0560
Directions: Land holding agency—Navy; Disposal Agency GSA
Comments: 118 Buildings; 445,134 sq. ft.; Navy base; until 09/15 military checkpoint; wetlands; contact GSA for more info.

Wisconsin

St. Croix National Scenic
Riverway Residential Structures
401 N. Hamilton St.
St. Croix Falls WI 54204
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201430001
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–I–WI–541B
Directions: Landholding Agency: Interior; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: House#1: 1,048 sq. ft.; House #2: 2,376 sq. ft.; House #3: 2,936 sq. ft.; good to fair conditions; LBP; contact GSA for more information

California

Seal Beach RR Right of Way
Seal Beach
Seal Beach CA 90740
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201210006
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–N–CA–1508–AH
Comments: 4,721.90 sf.; current use: vacant lot between residential bldg.

Seal Beach RR Right of Way
Seal Beach
Seal Beach CA 90740
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201210007
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–N–CA–1508–AJ
Comments: 6,028.70 sf.; current use: vacant lot between residential bldgs.

Delano Transmitting Station
1105 Melcher Rd.
Delano CA 93215
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201330005
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–X–CA–1671
Directions: Landholding Agency: Broadcasting Board of Governors Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 800 acres; mostly land and some bldgs.; unavailable due to Federal interest; transmitting station; vacant since 2007; access can be gain by appt. only; contact GSA for more info.

Massachusetts

FAA Site
Massasoit Bridge Rd.
Nantucket MA 02554
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54200830026
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: MA–0895
Comments: approx. 92 acres, entire parcel within MA Division of Fisheries & Wildlife Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program

Nevada

Ditchrider Sorensen Road
2105 Sorensen Road
Fallon NV 89406
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440006
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 9–I–NV–0572–AB
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Landholding Agency; Interior.
Comments: 2.73 acres; formerly used us contractor/employee housing structure removal from the land 02/2011. Contact GSA for more information.

Ditchrider South East Street
207 South East St.
Fallon NV 89406
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440007
Status: Surplus
GSA Number: 9–I–NV–0572–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency; GSA; Land Holding Agency; Interior.
Comments: 0.32 acres; formerly used us contractor/employee housing structure demolished on land 02/2011. Contact GSA for more information.

Ohio

Glenn Research Center-
Plumbrook Station: Parcel #63
6100 Columbus Ave.
Sandusky OH 44870
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201440012
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–Z–OH–0598–5–AE
Directions: Landholding Agency: NASA; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 11.5 acres; contamination; various illegally dumped solid waste items (*e.g.,* lead acid batteries, oil filters & containers, & gas cylinders); contact GSA for more information

South Carolina

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center
2517 Vector Ave.
Goose Creek SC 29406
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201410009
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 4–N–SC–0630–AA
Directions: Landholding Agency: Navy; Disposal Agency: GSA
Comments: 5.59 acres; contact GSA for more information

Former FAA Outer Marker
Facility—Greer
Brookfield Parkway
Greer SC 29651
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201410011
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 1–U–SC–0631
Comments: 0.99 acres; contact GSA for more information.

Washington

FAS Fleet Motor Pool Parcel C
920 Northgate Drive
Richland WA 99352
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201510007
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 9–Z–WA–1277
Comments: 0.52 acre; asphalt paved; parking lot; contact GSA for more information.

[FR Doc. 2015–12748 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLWO2100000 L11100000.DQ0000.LXSISGST0000]**

### Notice of Availability of the Rocky Mountain Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments and Final Environmental Impact Statements for the Wyoming, Northwest Colorado, Lewistown, and North Dakota Sub-Regions.

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availibility.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, and the Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service have prepared Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments (LUPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) for planning units in Wyoming, Lewistown (Montana), Northwest Colorado, and North Dakota. There are four separate Final EISs being conducted in the Rocky Mountain Region and this notice announces the availability of all four.

**DATES:** BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's and Forest Service's Proposed LUP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with 36 CFR 219.59, the Forest Service will waive its objection procedures of this subpart and instead adopt the BLM's protest procedures outlined in 43 CFR 1610.5–2.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Wyoming, Lewistown, Northwest Colorado, and North Dakota Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs have been sent to affected Federal, State and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public who have requested copies. Copies of the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs are available for public inspection at the addresses listed in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section. Interested persons may also review the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs on the Internet at *http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/sagegrouse.html.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

*For the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* William West, BLM Planning and Environmental Coordinator, telephone 307–352–0259; address Rock Springs Field Office, 280 Highway 191 North, Rock Springs, Wyoming 82901; email *wwest@blm.gov.*

*For the Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Erin Jones, BLM Northwest District NEPA Coordinator, telephone 970–244–3008; address Northwest District Office, 2815 H Road, Grand Junction, CO, 81506; email *erjones@blm.gov.*

*For the Lewistown Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Adam Carr, BLM Project Lead, telephone 406–538–1913; address Lewistown Field Office, 920 Northeast Main, Lewistown, MT 59457; email *acarr@blm.gov.*

*For the North Dakota Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Ruth Miller, BLM Team Lead, telephone 406–896–5023; address Montana/Dakotas State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, MT, 5910; email *ramiller@blm.gov.*

Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individuals during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The BLM and Forest Service prepared the Wyoming and Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse LUPAs and EISs. The Lewistown and North Dakota EISs were prepared solely by the BLM because there were no National Forest System lands involved. All four of these Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs address a range of alternatives focused on specific conservation measures across the range of the Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG). All four of these EISs are part of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. These four EISs will amend the following BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) and Forest Service Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP) in the Rocky Mountain Region:

**Wyoming**

- Casper RMP (2007)
- Kemmerer RMP (2010)
- Newcastle RMP (2000)
- Pinedale RMP (2008)
- Rawlins RMP (2008)
- Green River RMP (1997) (being revised under the Rock Springs RMP)
- Bridger-Teton National Forest, LRMP (1990)
- Medicine Bow National Forest, LRMP (2003)
- Thunder Basin National Grassland, LRMP (2002)

**Northwest Colorado**

- Glenwood Springs RMP (1984)
- Grand Junction RMP (1987)
- Kremmling RMP (1984)
- Little Snake RMP (2011)
- White River RMP (1997)
- Routt National Forest, LRMP (1997)

**Lewistown (Montana)**

- Judith RMP (1994)
- Headwaters RMP (1984)

**North Dakota**

- North Dakota RMP (1988)

Management decisions made as a result of these Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs will apply only to BLM-administered and National Forest System lands in the planning area. The planning areas for all four EISs includes approximately 56.3 million acres of BLM, National Park Service, Forest Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, State, local, and private lands located in 17 Wyoming counties (Albany, Campbell, Carbon, Converse, Crook, Fremont, Goshen, Laramie, Lincoln, Natrona, Niobrara, Platte, Sublette, Sweetwater, Teton, Uinta, and Weston), 10 Colorado counties (Eagle, Garfield, Grand, Jackson, Larimer, Mesa, Moffat, Rio Blanco, Routt, and Summit), five Montana counties (Petroleum, Fergus, Judith Basin, Chouteau, and Meagher), and three North Dakota counties (Bowman, Slope, and Golden Valley). The decision area for these Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EISs is defined as those BLM-admistered and National Forest System lands and Federal mineral estate within the following habitat management categories:

- Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable GRSG populations; includes breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.
- Linkage Habitat (applicable to Northwest Colorado only)—Areas identified as broader regions of connectivity important to facilitate the movement of GRSG and maintain ecological processes.
- General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round GRSG habitat outside of PHMAs.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the Wyoming, Northwest Colorado, Lewistown, and North Dakota Greater Sage-Grouse LUPAs/EISs was published in the **Federal Register** on December 9, 2011. The Wyoming Draft LUPA/EIS was released to the public on December 27, 2013; the Northwest Colorado Draft LUPA/EIS was released to the public on August 16, 2013; the Lewistown Draft LUPA/Draft EIS was released to the public on November 8, 2013; and the North Dakota Draft LUPA/EIS was released to the public on September 27, 2013.

Comments on the Draft LUP Amendments/EISs received from the public and internal BLM and Forest Service review were considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the Proposed Plan.

The alternatives presented in Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs are described below:

- Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives and direction specified in the existing BLM RMPs and the Forest Service LRMPs.
- Alternative B is based on the conservation measures developed by the National Technical Team (NTT) planning effort in Washington Office Instructional Memorandum (IM) Number 2012–044. As directed in the IM, the conservation measures developed by the NTT must be considered and analyzed, as appropriate, through the land use planning process and NEPA by all BLM state and field offices that contain occupied GRSG habitat. Most management actions included in Alternative B would be applied to PHMAs.
- Alternative C is based on a citizen groups' recommended alternative. This alternative emphasizes improvement and protection of habitat for GRSG and is applied to all occupied GRSG habitat. Alternative C would limit commodity development in areas of occupied GRSG habitat, and would close or designate portions of the planning area to some land uses.
- Alternative D, which was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft EIS, balances opportunities to use and develop the planning area and ensures protection of GRSG habitat based on scoping comments and input from Cooperating Agencies involved in the alternatives development process. Protective measures would be applied to GRSG habitat.
- The Proposed LUPA incorporates guidance from specific State Conservation strategies, as well as additional management based on the NTT recommendations. This alternative emphasizes management of GRSG seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to support population objectives. For the Wyoming Proposed LUPA, this guidance is consistent with guidelines provided in the Governor's Sage-Grouse Implementation Team's Core Population Area strategy and the Governor's Executive Order (WY E.O. 2011–05).

The BLM and Forest Service received approximately 3,500 substantive comments, contained in 39,000 submissions during the Draft EISs' comment periods. Based on comments received during the NEPA process, the following topics were frequently identified:

- General (Process/Policy);
- Lands and Realty;
- Livestock Grazing;
- Minerals and Energy;
- Predation;
- Recreation;
- Socioeconomic;
- Special Management Area Designations;
- Special Status Species (Including GRSG);
- Travel and Access Management;
- Vegetation;
- Wildland Fire Management;
- Wildlife and Fisheries.

For the Wyoming GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM and Forest Service conducted six public meetings on the Draft EIS. These meetings were held in Casper, Douglas, Laramie, Pinedale, Rawlins and Rock Springs, Wyoming during February 2014. For the Northwest Colorado GRSP Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM and Forest Service conducted four public meetings on the Draft EIS. These meetings were held in Walden, Lakewood, Silt, and Craig, Colorado during October 2013. For the Lewistown GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM conducted two public meetings on the Draft EIS. These meetings were held in Lewistown and Winnett, Montana during December 2013. For the North Dakota GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM conducted one public meeting in Bowman, North Dakota on October 22, 2013. Comments on the Draft LUPAs/Draft EISs received from the public and internal BLM and Forest Service review were carefully considered and incorporated as appropriate into the proposed LUPAs/Final EISs. The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level GRSG mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

*Copies of the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Wyoming State Office, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009
- BLM Casper Field Office, 2987 Prospector Drive, Casper, Wyoming 82604
- BLM Kemmerer Field Office, 312 Highway 189 North, Kemmerer, Wyoming 83101
- BLM Newcastle Field Office, 1101 Washington Boulevard, Newcastle, Wyoming 82701
- BLM Pinedale Field Office, 1625 West Pine Street, Pinedale, Wyoming 82941
- BLM Rawlins Field Office, 1300 North Third, Rawlins, Wyoming 82301
- BLM Rock Springs Field Office, 280 Highway 191 North, Rock Springs, Wyoming 82901
- Bridger-Teton National Forest, 340 North Cache, Jackson, Wyoming 83001
- Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests and Thunder Basin National Grassland, 2468 Jackson Street, Laramie, Wyoming 82070

*Copies of the Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Northwest District Office, 2815 H Road, Grand Junction, Colorado, 81506
- BLM Colorado State Office, 2850 Youngfield Street, Lakewood, Colorado, 80215
- Medicine Bow-Routt National Forests and Thunder Basin National Grassland, 2468 Jackson Street, Laramie, Wyoming 82070

*Copies of the Lewistown Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Montana/Dakotas State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana, 59101
- BLM Lewistown Field Office, 920 Northeast Main, Lewistown, Montana 59457

*Copies of the North Dakota Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Montana/Dakotas State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana, 59101
- BLM North Dakota Field Office, 99 23rd Avenue East, Suite A, Dickinson, North Dakota, 58601

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular mail or overnight delivery postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM and Forest Service will consider an emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM and Forest Service with such advance notifications, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Amy Lueders,**

*Acting Assistant Director, Renewable Resources & Planning.*

**Authority:** 36 CFR 219.59, 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2; 43 CFR 1610.5

[FR Doc. 2015–12950 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–22–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLMTC00000.L16100000.DQ0000. LXSS036E0000 MO#4500079298]**

### Notice of Availability of the Miles City Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Miles City Field Office, Montana

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Miles City Field Office planning area and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Miles City Field Office Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public who have requested copies. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- BLM, Montana State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, MT 59101
- BLM, Miles City Field Office, 111 Garryowen Road, Miles City, MT 59301

Interested persons may also review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on the Internet at: *http://www.blm.gov/mt/st/en/fo/miles_city_field_office/rmp.html.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary Bloom, Miles City RMP Team Leader, telephone: 406–233–2800; address: 111 Garryowen Road, Miles City, MT 59301; email: *mbloom@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The planning area includes lands within the BLM Miles City Field Office's administrative boundaries in the following Montana counties: Carter, Custer, Daniels, Dawson, Fallon, Garfield, McCone, Powder River, Prairie, Richland, Roosevelt, Rosebud, Sheridan, Treasure, Wibaux and portions of Big Horn and Valley. The planning area includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, totaling approximately 25.8 million acres; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the

BLM's jurisdiction. Lands within the Planning Area under the BLM's jurisdiction make up the Decision Area. The Decision Area consists of BLM-administered surface, totaling approximately 2.75 million acres and the Federal mineral estate, totaling approximately 10.6 million acres. The Miles City Field Office RMP will revise and replace the Big Dry (1996) and Powder River (1985) RMPs. The Miles City Draft RMP/EIS was made available for a 90-day comment period on March 8, 2013 (78 FR 15041). The Draft RMP/EIS included a series of management actions, within five management alternatives, designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping. These included, but were not limited to, energy development (coal, oil and gas, renewable energy, and locatable minerals), wildlife habitat management, including Greater Sage-Grouse, livestock grazing, air quality, special management areas including areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC), and management of lands with wilderness characteristics. In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b), the Notice of Availability for the Draft RMP/EIS also announced a concurrent public comment period on nominated ACECs.

Comments on the Draft RMP/EIS were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, which analyzes five alternatives:

1. *Alternative A (No Action):* Continues existing management;
2. *Alternative B:* Emphasizes conservation of natural and cultural resources while providing for compatible development and use;
3. *Alternative C:* Provides development opportunities while protecting sensitive resources;
4. *Alternative D:* Emphasizes resource development and use while protecting natural and cultural resources; and
5. *Alternative E (Proposed):* Allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, heritage and visual resources.

As modified, Alternative E is now presented as the Miles City Proposed RMP in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS would provide comprehensive, long-range decisions for the use and management of resources in the planning area administered by the BLM and focus on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Alternative E generally allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, heritage and visual resources. Alternative E allocates land as Special Recreation Management Areas (eight) and ACECs (eighteen) and emphasizes moderate constraints on resource uses to reduce impacts to resource values. Additionally, Alternative E applies a no surface occupancy (NSO) stipulation to oil and gas leasing proposed in riparian/wetland systems and aquatic habitats and a controlled surface use (CSU) stipulation within 300 feet of riparian and wetland areas. Alternative E increases, over existing management, conservation within Greater Sage-Grouse habitats.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS, Alternative E, includes ACEC designation for the following areas (all resource use limitations are subject to valid existing rights):

- Ash Creek Divide (7,921 acres), Bug Creek (3,837 acres), Hell Creek (19,373 acres), and Sand Arroyo (9,052 acres) ACECs would continue to be designated and managed as ACECs. Management actions proposed for these significant paleontological areas are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, rights-of-way (ROWs) would be allowed in the Hell Creek ACEC and avoided in the Ash Creek Divide, Bug Creek and Sand Arroyo ACECs, geothermal leasing would be closed, and management would be per visual resource management (VRM) Classes II through III.
- Big Sheep Mountain ACEC (363 acres) would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, geothermal leasing would be closed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, livestock grazing would be allowed, and management would be per VRM Class II.
- Hoe ACEC (145 acres) would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, geothermal leasing would be closed, 19 acres of the ACEC would be closed to livestock grazing, and management would be per VRM Class II.
- Jordan Bison Kill ACEC (160 acres) would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, geothermal leasing would be closed, and management would be per VRM Class II.
- Powder River Depot ACEC (1,401 acres) would continue to be managed and designated as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, geothermal leasing would be closed, livestock grazing would be excluded on 19 acres of the ACEC, and management would be per VRM Class I (Terry Badlands WSA overlap) and II (remainder of the ACEC).
- Seline ACEC (80 acres) would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, geothermal leasing would be closed, and management would be per VRM Class II.
- Battle Butte Battlefield ACEC would increase in size from 121 acres to 320 acres and continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, ROWs would be excluded, and management would be per VRM Class II.
- Reynolds Battlefield ACEC would increase in size from 324 acres to 922 acres and would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, and management would be per VRM Class II.

• Finger Buttes ACEC (1,520 acres) would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant scenic area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, geothermal leasing would be closed, and management would be per VRM Class II.

• Smoky Butte ACEC would decrease in size from 80 to 40 acres and would continue to be designated and managed as an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant geologic area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would be allowed, OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails, ROWs would be allowed, and management would be per VRM Class III.

• Cedar Creek Battlefield (1,022 public surface acres) would be designated an ACEC. This significant battlefield would be managed to enhance and protect cultural resources. Management actions proposed for this area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with a NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would be not be allowed, off-highway vehicle (OHV) use would be limited to existing roads and trails, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, and management would be per VRM Class II.

• Flat Creek (339 acres) would be designated an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant paleontological area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, and the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area. Flat Creek would be managed per VRM Class III.

• Powderville (9,518 acres) would be designated an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant paleontological area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails, and the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area. The Powderville area would be managed per VRM Classes II and III.

• Long Medicine Wheel (179 acres) would be designated an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural resource site are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, ROWs would be excluded, and management would be per VRM Class II.

• The Walstein area (1,519 acres) would be designated an ACEC. Management actions proposed for this significant cultural and paleontological area are: Mineral material sales and permits would be closed, oil and gas leasing would be allowed with an NSO stipulation, geophysical exploration would not be allowed, OHV use would be closed, the area would be managed as a ROW avoidance area, and management would be per VRM Class II.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS does not adopt the following nominated ACECs: Black-footed Ferret, Howrey Island, Piping Plover and Yonkee.

The Miles City Field Office Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

• Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.

• General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative E supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives. Alternative E would limit or eliminate new surface disturbance in PHMA, while minimizing disturbance in GHMA.

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics. Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' letter of the Miles City Field Office Proposed RMP/Final EIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5.

**Jamie E. Connell,**

*State Director, Montana/Dakotas.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12997 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## Bureau of Land Management

**[LLMTC040000.L16100000.DP0000. LXSS059E0000 MO# 4500079352]**

## Notice of Availability of the South Dakota Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, South Dakota Field Office, Montana

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the South Dakota Field Office and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the South Dakota Field Office Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribal governments and to other stakeholders and members of the public. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- BLM, South Dakota Field Office, 310 Roundup Street, Belle Fourche, SD 57717.
- BLM, Montana/Dakota BLM State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana 59101.
- BLM, Meade County Courthouse, 1300 Sherman Street, Sturgis, SD 57785.
- USFS, Fort Pierre National Grasslands, 1020 N. Deadwood Street, Pierre, SD 57532.
- USFS, Wall Ranger District, 708 Main Street, Wall, SD 57790.

Copies of the Proposed RMP/EIS may also be viewed on the internet at *http://www.blm.gov/mt/st/en/fo/south_dakota_field/rmp.html.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mitch Iverson, RMP Project Manager, telephone: 605–892–7008; or Lori (Chip) Kimball, BLM South Dakota Field Manager, telephone: 605–892–7000; address: 310 Roundup Street, Belle Fourche, SD 57717; email: *BLM_MT_South_Dakota_RMP@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS), at 1–800–877–8339, to contact the above individuals during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individuals. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The planning area includes lands within the BLM South Dakota Field Office administrative boundaries which includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, in the State of South Dakota, however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM's jurisdiction. The BLM administers 274,239 acres of public land surface and approximately 1.72 million acres of federal mineral estate. Over 98 percent of the BLM-administered surface and Federal mineral estate in the decision area is located in western South Dakota. Counties with substantial amounts of BLM-administered surface or mineral estate (over 1 percent of the county land base), include Butte, Custer, Fall River, Haakon, Harding, Lawrence, Meade, Pennington, Perkins, and Stanley counties in western South Dakota. Other counties with small amounts of BLM-administered surface or federal minerals (less than 1 percent of the county land base), include Bennett, Bon Homme, Brule, Campbell, Charles Mix, Clark, Clay, Corson, Dewey, Edmunds, Faulk, Gregory, Hand, Hughes, Hyde, Jackson, Jones, Lyman, Marshall, McPherson, Mellette, Potter, Sully, Tripp, Walworth, Yankton, and Ziebach counties in South Dakota. An updated inventory of lands with wilderness characteristics was completed for the planning area and data from the inventory was analyzed in the Draft RMP/EIS. The revised RMP will replace the South Dakota RMP of 1986, as amended, and provide the South Dakota Field Office with an updated framework in which to administer the BLM-managed public lands in the planning area.

The formal scoping period began with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the **Federal Register** on July 19, 2007 (72 FR 39638). From August through October 2007, nine scoping meetings were held across the planning area. In addition to the nine scoping meetings, four open house meetings were held to address the concerns of Native American tribes. During scoping, the BLM requested public input to identify resource issues and concerns, management alternatives, or other ideas to help in determining future land use decisions for the planning area. The Draft RMP/EIS was made available for public review for a 90-day period on June 14, 2013 (78 FR 35959). Initially, the **Federal Register** NOI announced scoping for both North Dakota and South Dakota RMP revisions; however, based on the diverse planning issues and other management considerations, the South Dakota RMP revision continued ahead, and an RMP revision specific to North Dakota BLM will be addressed at a later date.

The issues raised during scoping included energy development, vegetation management, wildlife habitat, special status species management, Greater Sage-Grouse, travel, access, commercial uses, land tenure adjustments, visual resource management, and climate change. The BLM invited local, State, Federal, and tribal representatives to participate as cooperating agencies on the South Dakota RMP/EIS.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a range of management actions within four management alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative. These alternatives address the goals, management challenges, and issues raised during scoping.

The four alternatives analyzed are:

1. Alternative A: Continues existing management practices (No-Action Alternative).
2. Alternative B: Emphasizes commercial resource development and use while providing adequate levels of resource protection.
3. Alternative C: Emphasizes conservation of natural resources while providing for compatible development and use.
4. Alternative D (Proposed): Provides development opportunities and conserves high value and sensitive resources.

The South Dakota Field Office has identified Alternative D as the Proposed RMP. Alternative D supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives.

Two ACECs are currently designated in the existing South Dakota RMP and were re-evaluated and addressed in this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. All alternatives (including the Proposed Plan) would propose to maintain the two existing ACECs, as summarized below:

Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC (6,574 acres):

- Relevant and Important Values: Historical and archeological.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Closed to leasable and salable minerals, closed to geophysical exploration, recommended for withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.
- Other Restrictions: Right-of-way (ROW) exclusion area except in designated ROW corridors, motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, snowmobiles or machines specifically equipped to travel over snow prohibited, closed to construction of new roads except rerouting of existing roads to address resource impacts or safety, and the continued designation as a back country byway of

the route that traverses the southern portion of the ACEC.

Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres):

• Relevant and Important Values: Paleontological.

• Proposed Use Limitations: Closed to fluid minerals within the ACEC, closed to salable Federal minerals, sale of forest products not be allowed, collection of fossils without a BLM permit not allowed, and locatable Federal minerals recommended for withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.

• Other Restrictions: ROW exclusion area.

The South Dakota Field Office Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

• Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.

• General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative D supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives. Alternative D would limit or eliminate new surface disturbance in PHMA, while minimizing disturbance in GHMA.

The Proposed Plan provides for 127,735 acres of Greater Sage-Grouse PHMAs.

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics. Development of additional regional mitigation strategies for other resource programs may occur for implementation level decisions.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the South Dakota Proposed RMP/Final EIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and be mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original printed email by either regular or overnight mail, postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5

**Jamie E. Connell,**

*State Director, Montana/Dakotas.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12926 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLWYP0700.L16100000.DP0000. LXSS041K0000]**

### Notice of Availability of the Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Buffalo Resource Management Plan Revision, Buffalo Field Office, Wyoming

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Buffalo Field Office planning area and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** The BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Buffalo Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

• The BLM, Wyoming State Office, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, WY 82003

• The BLM, High Plains District Office, 2987 Prospector Drive, Casper, WY 82604

• The BLM, Buffalo Field Office, 1425 Fort Street, Buffalo, WY 82834

Interested persons may also review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on the Internet at *www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/buffalo.html.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Bills, Buffalo RMP Team Leader; The BLM Buffalo Field Office, 1425 Fort Street, Buffalo, WY 82834, by telephone 307–684–1133, or by email *tbills@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The planning area includes lands within the BLM Buffalo Field Office's administrative boundaries, including all of Campbell, Johnson, and Sheridan counties in Wyoming. The planning area includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, totaling approximately 7.35 million acres; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM's jurisdiction. Lands within the Planning Area under the BLM's jurisdiction make up the Decision Area. The Decision Area consists of BLM-administered surface, totaling approximately 782,000 acres, and Federal mineral estate, totaling

approximately 4.8 million acres. The revised RMP will replace the 1985 Buffalo RMP as amended. The Draft RMP/EIS was made available for public review for a 90-day comment period on June 28, 2013. The Draft RMP/EIS included a series of management actions, within four management alternatives, designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping. These included, but were not limited to, energy development (coal, oil and gas, renewable energy, and uranium), wildlife habitat management, including that of the Greater Sage-Grouse, livestock grazing, air quality, special management areas including Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), and travel management. In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b), the Notice of Availability for the Draft RMP/EIS announced a concurrent public comment period on proposed ACECs.

Comments on the Draft RMP/Draft EIS were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, which analyzes four alternatives:

A. *Alternative A:* (No Action): Continues existing management;

B. *Alternative B:* Emphasizes conservation of natural and cultural resources while providing for compatible development and use;

C. *Alternative C:* Emphasizes resource development and use while protecting natural and cultural resources; and

D. *Alternative D (Proposed):* Provides development opportunities and conserve sensitive resources.

As modified, Alternative D has been identified as the Proposed Buffalo RMP in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Proposed RMP would provide comprehensive, long-range decisions for the use and management of resources in the planning area administered by the BLM and focus on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Alternative D generally allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, and heritage and visual resources. Alternative D allocates land as Special Recreation Management Areas (seven) and ACECs (two) and emphasizes moderate constraints on resource uses to reduce impacts to resource values.

Under Alternative D, the BLM manages the suitable segment of the Middle Fork Powder River to protect and/or enhance its free-flowing condition, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification until such time that Congress designates the river or releases the river for other uses. If released by Congress for other uses, the river segment would be managed to retain its free-flowing condition and identified outstandingly remarkable values. Similarly, this alternative manages wilderness study areas to protect wilderness characteristics until such time that Congress designates the areas as wilderness or releases them for other uses. If released by Congress for other uses, the wilderness study areas would be managed to emphasize healthy ecosystems, opportunities for solitude, and primitive recreation. Additionally, Alternative D would apply a controlled surface use (CSU) stipulation to any mineral lease within 500 feet of riparian/wetland systems and aquatic habitats.

The Proposed Plan, Alternative D of the Final EIS, includes ACEC designation for the following areas:

- Pumpkin Buttes (1,733 acres). Value: Cultural resources. Proposed management would prohibit surface–disturbing activities not compatible with the area's values including a No Surface Occupancy stipulation for new fluid mineral leases; recommending withdrawal from locatable mineral entry; excluding rights-of-way (ROWs); and closing the area to motorized vehicles.
- Welch Ranch (1,116 acres). Values: visual resources, wildlife resources, and presence of a natural hazard. Proposed management would prohibit all surface–disturbing activities not compatible with the area's values including closing the area to all forms of mineral leasing and development, including solid minerals; recommending withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and excluding ROWs. Travel is limited to administrative use on designated routes.

The Proposed RMP does not adopt the following ACECs: Burnt Hollow, Cantontment Reno, Dry Creek/Petrified Tree, Fortification Creek, Hole in the Wall, and Sagebrush Ecosystem.

The Buffalo Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

- Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.
- General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative D supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives. Alternative D would limit or eliminate new surface disturbance in PHMA, while minimizing disturbance in GHMA. Alternative D is also consistent with guidelines provided in the Governor's Sage-Grouse Implementation Team's Core Population Area strategy and the Governor's Executive Order (WY EO 2011–05).

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the Buffalo Proposed RMP/Final EIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5

**Mary Jo Rugwell,**

*Acting State Director, Wyoming.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12998 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLWO2100000 L11100000.DQ0000.LXSISGST0000]**

### Notice of Availability of the Great Basin Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments and Final Environmental Impact Statements for the Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana; Nevada and Northeastern California; Oregon; and Utah

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, and the Resources Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service) have prepared Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments (LUPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) for planning units in Idaho, Southwestern Montana, Nevada, Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah. There are four separate Final EISs being conducted in the Great Basin Region and this notice announces the availability of all four.

**DATES:** BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's and Forest Service's Proposed LUP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with 36 CFR 219.59, the Forest Service will waive its objection procedures of this subpart and instead adopt the BLM's protest procedures outlined in 43 CFR 1610.5–2.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs have been sent to affected Federal, State and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public who have requested copies. Copies of the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs are available for public inspecton at the addresses listed in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section. Interested persons may also review the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs on the internet at *http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/sagegrouse.html.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** *For the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Jonathan Beck, BLM Idaho State Office GRSG Planning Lead, telephone 208–373–4070; address 1387 South Vinnell Way, Boise, ID 83709; email *jmbeck@blm.gov.*

*For the Nevada and Northeastern California Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Lauren Mermejo, BLM Nevada State Office GRSG Project Lead, telephone 775–861–6580; address 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502; email *lmermejo@blm.gov.*

*For the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Joan Suther, BLM Oregon State Office GRSG Planning Lead, telephone 541–573–4445; address BLM Burns District, 28910 Hwy 20, West Hines, OR 97738; email *jsuther@blm.gov.*

*For the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS:* Quincy Bahr, BLM Utah State Office GRSG Project Lead, telephone 801–539–4122; address 440 West 200 South, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, UT 84101–1345; email *qfbahr@blm.gov.*

Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individuals during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The BLM and Forest Service prepared the Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, and Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPAs and EISs. The Oregon LUPA/EIS was prepared solely by the BLM because there were no National Forest System lands involved. All four of these Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs address a range of alternatives focused on specific conservation measures across the range of the Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG). All four of these EISs are part of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. These four EISs will amend the following BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) and Management Framework Plans (MFPs) and Forest Service Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP) in the Great Basin Region:

**California**

- Alturas RMP (2008)
- Eagle Lake RMP (2008)
- Surprise RMP (2008)

**Idaho**

- Birds of Prey NCA RMP (2008)
- Bruneau RMP revision (and existing 1983 Bruneau MFP)
- Challis RMP (1999)
- Craters of the Moon NM RMP (2006)
- Four Rivers RMP revision (and existing 1988 Cascade RMP and 1983 Kuna and Bruneau MFPs)
- Jarbidge RMP revision (and existing 1987 Jarbidge RMP)
- Lemhi RMP (1987)
- Owyhee RMP (1999)
- Pocatello RMP revision
- Shoshone-Burley RMP revision (and existing 1980 Bennett Hills/Timmerman Hills, 1985 Cassia, 1975 Magic, 1985 Monument, 1981 Sun Valley, and 1982 Twin Falls MFPs/RMPs)
- Upper Snake RMP revision (and existing 1983 Big Lost, 1985 Medicine Lodge, 1981 Big Desert, and 1981 Little Lost-Birch Creek MFPs/RMPs)
- Boise National Forest, LRMP (2003)
- Curlew National Grassland Management Plan, LRMP (2002)
- Caribou National Forest, Revised LRMP (2003)
- Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Targhee National Forest LRMP (1997)
- Salmon-Challis National Forest, Challis National Forest LRMP (1987)
- Salmon-Challis National Forest, Salmon National Forest LRMP (1988)
- Sawtooth National Forest, Revised LRMP (2003)

**Montana**

- Dillon RMP (2006)
- Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, LRMP (2009)

**Nevada**

- Battle Mountain RMP revision (and existing 1997 Tonopah and 1986 Shoshone-Eureka RMPs)
- Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon NCA RMP (2004)
- Carson City RMP revision (and existing 2001 Carson City Consolidated RMP)
- Elko RMP (1987)
- Ely RMP (2008)

- Wells RMP (1985)
- Winnemucca RMP revision (and existing 1982 Paradise-Denio MFP and 1982 Sonoma-Gerlach RMP)
- Humboldt National Forest, LRMP (1986)
- Toiyabe National Forest, LRMP (1986)

**Oregon**

- Andrews RMP (2005)
- Baker RMP revision (and existing 1989 Baker RMP)
- Brothers-LaPine RMP (1989)
- Lakeview RMP amendment (and existing 2003 Lakeview RMP)
- Southeastern Oregon RMP amendment (and existing 2003 Southeastern Oregon RMP)
- Steens RMP (2005)
- Three Rivers RMP (1992)
- Upper Deschutes RMP (2005)

**Utah**

- Box Elder RMP (1986)
- Cedar/Beaver/Garfield/Antimony RMP (1986)
- Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Management Plan (2000)
- House Range RMP (1987)
- Kanab RMP (2008)
- Park City MFP (1975)
- Pinyon MFP (1978)
- Pony Express RMP (1990)
- Price RMP (2008)
- Randolph MFP (1980)
- Richfield RMP (2008)
- Salt Lake District Isolated Tracts Planning Analysis (1985)
- Vernal RMP (2008)
- Warm Springs RMP (1987)
- Dixie National Forest, LRMP (1986)
- Fishlake National Forest, LRMP (1986)
- Uinta National Forest, Revised LRMP (2003)
- Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Revised LRMP (2003)
- Ashley National Forest, LRMP (1986)
- Manti-La Sal National Forest, LRMP (1986)

Management decisions made as a result of these Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs will apply only to BLM-administered and National Forest System lands in the planning area. The planning areas for all four EISs includes approximately 194.0 million acres of BLM, National Park Service, Forest Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, State, tribal, local, and private lands located in 28 Idaho counties (Ada, Adams, Bear Lake, Bingham, Blaine, Bonneville, Butte, Camas, Caribou, Cassia, Clark, Custer, Elmore, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lemhi, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Oneida Owyhee, Payette, Power, Twin Falls, and Washington), 7 Montana counties (Montana, Beaverhead, Deer Lodge, Fremont, Clark, Madison, and Silver Bow), 16 Nevada counties (Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Storey, Washoe, and White Pine), 5 California counties (Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Siskiyou, and Sierra), 8 Oregon counties (Baker, Crook, Deschutes, Grant, Harney, Lake, Malheur, and Union), 24 Utah counties (Beaver, Box Elder, Cache, Carbon, Daggett, Duchesne, Emery, Garfield, Grand, Iron, Juab, Kane, Morgan, Piute, Rich, Sanpete, Sevier, Summit, Tooele, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, Wayne, and Weber), and 2 Wyoming counties (Sweetwater and Uinta). The decision area for these Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs is defined as those BLM-administered and National Forest System lands and Federal mineral estate within the following habitat management categories:

- Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable GRSG populations; includes breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.
- Important Habitat Management Area (IHMA) (applicable to Idaho only)—Areas identified as having generally moderate to high conservation value habitat and/or populations that provide a management buffer for the PHMA and to connect patches of PHMA.
- General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round GRSG habitat outside of PHMAs.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPAs/EISs was published in the **Federal Register** on December 9, 2011. A Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, and Utah Draft LUPAs/EISs was published in the **Federal Register** on November 1, 2013. The Oregon Draft LUPA/EIS was released to the public on November 26, 2013. Comments on the Draft LUPAs/EISs received from the public and internal BLM and Forest Service review were considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the Proposed Plan.

The alternatives presented in Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs are described below:

- Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives and direction specified in the existing BLM RMPs and the Forest Service LRMPs.
- Alternative B is based on the conservation measures developed by the National Technical Team (NTT) planning effort in Washington Office Instructional Memorandum (IM) Number 2012–044. As directed in the IM, the conservation measures developed by the NTT must be considered and analyzed, as appropriate, through the land use planning process and NEPA by all BLM state and field offices that contain occupied GRSG habitat. Most management actions included in Alternative B would be applied to PHMA.
- Alternative C is based on a citizen groups' recommended alternative. This alternative emphasizes improvement and protection of habitat for GRSG and is applied to all occupied GRSG habitat. Alternative C would limit commodity development in areas of occupied GRSG habitat, and would close or designate portions of the planning area to some land uses. The Utah LUPA/Draft EIS combined this alternative with Alternative F (discussed below).
- Alternative D, which was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft EIS, balances opportunities to use and develop the planning area and protects GRSG habitat based on scoping comments and input from Cooperating Agencies involved in the alternatives development process. Protective measures would be applied to GRSG habitat.
- Alternative E is the alternative provided by the State or Governor's offices for inclusion and analysis in the EISs. It incorporates guidance from specific State Conservation strategies and emphasizes management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to support population objectives. This alternative was identified as a co-Preferred Alternative in the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Draft EIS.
- Alternative F is also based on a citizen group recommended alternative. This alternative emphasizes improvement and protection of habitat for GRSG and defines different restrictions for PHMA and GHMA. Alternative F would limit commodity development in areas of occupied GRSG habitat, and would close or designate portions of the planning area to some land uses. This alternative does not apply to the Utah sub-regional planning effort, as it was combined with Alternative C.
- The Proposed LUPA incorporates guidance from specific State Conservation strategies, as well as

additional management based on the NTT recommendations. This alternative emphasizes management of GRSG seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to support population objectives.

The BLM and Forest Service received approximately 4,990 substantive comments, contained in 74,240 submissions during the four Draft EISs' comment periods. Based on comments received during the NEPA process, the following comment topics were frequently identified:

- General (Process/Policy);
- Lands and Realty;
- Livestock Grazing;
- Minerals and Energy;
- Predation;
- Recreation;
- Socioeconomic;
- Special Management Area Designations;
- Special Status Species (Including GRSG);
- Travel and Access Management;
- Vegetation;
- Wildland Fire Management;
- Wildlife and Fisheries.

For the Idaho and Southwestern Montana GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM and Forest Service conducted seven public meetings. These meetings were held in Murphy, Idaho Falls, Salmon, Pocatello, Twin Falls, and Boise in Idaho and Dillon in Montana during January 2014. For the Nevada and Northeastern California GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM and Forest Service conducted seven public meetings. These meetings were held in Cedarville and Susanville, California, and in Reno, Tonopah, Ely, Elko, and Winnemucca, Nevada in early December 2013. For the Oregon GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM conducted seven public meetings. These meetings were held in Baker City, Burns, Durkee, Jordan Valley, Lakeview, Ontario and Prineville, Oregon during January 2014. For the Utah GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, the BLM and Forest Service conducted eight public meetings. These meetings were held in Cedar City, Panguitch, Price, Randolph, Richfield, Salt Lake City, Snowville, and Vernal, Utah during November and December 2013. Comments on the Draft LUPAs/Draft EISs received from the public and internal BLM and Forest Service review were carefully considered and incorporated as appropriate into the proposed LUPAs/Final EISs. The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level GRSG mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

*Copies of the Idaho and Southwestern Montana GRSG Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Idaho State Office, 1387 S. Vinnell Way, Boise, ID 83709
- BLM Boise District Office, 3948 Development Avenue, Boise, ID 83705
- BLM Owyhee Field Office, 20 First Avenue West, Marsing, ID 83639
- BLM Idaho Falls District Office, 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401
- BLM Salmon Field Office, 1206 South Challis Street, Salmon, ID 83467
- BLM Challis Field Office, 1151 Blue Mountain Road, Challis, ID 83226
- BLM Pocatello Field Office, 4350 Cliffs Drive, Pocatello, ID 83204
- BLM Twin Falls District Office, 2536 Kimberly Road, Twin Falls, ID 83301
- BLM Shoshone Field Office, 400 West F Street, Shoshone, ID 83352
- BLM Burley Field Office, 15 East 200 South, Burley, ID 83318
- BLM Coeur d'Alene District Office, 3815 Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815
- BLM Cottonwood Field Office, 1 Butte Drive, Cottonwood, ID 83522
- BLM Montana State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, MT 59101
- BLM Butte District Office, 106 North Parkmont, Butte, MT 59701
- BLM Dillon Field Office, 1005 Selway Drive, Dillon, MT 59725–9431
- Caribou-Targhee National Forest Headquarters, 1405 Hollipart Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401
- Beaverhead-Deerlodge Supervisor's Office, 420 Barrett Street, Dillon, MT 59725
- Salmon-Challis Supervisor's Office, 1206 S. Challis Street, Salmon, ID 83467
- Boise Supervisor's Office, 1206 Vinnell Way, Suite 200, Boise, ID 83709
- Sawtooth Supervisor's Office, 2647 Kimberly Road, East, Twin Falls, ID 83301

*Copies of the Nevada and Northeastern California Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502
- BLM Winnemucca District Office, 5100 E. Winnemucca Boulevard, Winnemucca, NV 89445
- BLM Ely District Office, 702 North Industrial Way, Ely, NV 89301
- BLM Elko District Office, 3900 E. Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801
- BLM Carson City District Office, 5665 Morgan Mill Road, Carson City, NV 89701
- BLM Battle Mountain District Office, 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain, NV 89820
- BLM California State Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W–1623, Sacramento, CA 95825
- BLM Alturas Field Office, 708 W. 12th Street, Alturas, CA 96101
- BLM Eagle Lake Field Office, 2950 Riverside Drive, Susanville, CA 96130
- BLM Surprise Field Office, 602 Cressler Street, Cedarville, CA 96104
- Austin Ranger District, 100 Midas Canyon Road, Austin, NV 89310
- Carson Ranger District, 1536 South Carson Street, Carson City, NV 89701
- Ely Ranger District, 825 Avenue East, Ely, NV 90301
- Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest Headquarters, 1200 Franklin Way, Sparks, NV 89431
- Jarbidge Ranger District, 140 Pacific Avenue, Wells, NV 89835
- Modoc National Forest, 225 West 8th, Alturas, CA 96101
- Mountain City Ranger District, 2035 Last Chance Road, Elko, NV 89801
- Santa Rosa Ranger District, 1200 East Winnemucca Boulevard, Winnemucca, NV 89445
- Tonopah Ranger District, 1400 S. Erie Mian Street, Tonopah, NV 89049

*Copies of the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Oregon State Office, 1220 SW. 3rd Avenue, Portland, OR 97204
- BLM Baker Resource Area Office, 3100 H Street, Baker City, OR 97814
- BLM Burns District Office, 28910 Highway 20 West, Hines, OR 97738
- BLM Lakeview District Office, 1301 S. G Street, Lakeview, OR 97630
- BLM Prineville District Office, 3050 NE. 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754
- BLM Vale District Office, 100 Oregon Street, Vale, OR 97918

*Copies of the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed LUPA/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:*

- BLM Utah State Office, 440 West 200 South, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, UT 84101
- BLM Cedar City Field Office, 176 East D.L. Sargent Drive, Cedar City, UT 84721
- BLM Fillmore Field Office, 95 East 500 North, Fillmore, UT 84631
- BLM Kanab Field Office and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, 669 South Highway 89A, Kanab, UT 84741

- BLM Price Field Office, 125 South 600 West, Price, UT 84501
- BLM Richfield Field Office, 150 East 900 North, Richfield, UT 84701
- BLM Salt Lake Field Office, 2370 S. Decker Lake Boulevard, West Valley City, UT 84119
- BLM Vernal Field Office, 170 South 500 East, Vernal, UT 84078
- Ashley National Forest, 355 N. Vernal Avenue, Vernal, UT 84078
- Dixie National Forest, 1789 N. Wedgewood Lane, Cedar City, UT 84721
- Fishlake National Forest, 115 East 900 North, Richfield, UT 84701
- Manti-LaSal National Forest, 599 West Price River Drive, Price, UT 84501
- Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, 857 W. South Jordan Parkway, South Jordan, UT 84095
- United States Forest Service Intermountain Region, 324 25th Street, Ogden, UT 84401

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the Proposed LUPAs/Final EISs and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular mail or overnight delivery postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM and Forest Service will consider an emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM and Forest Service with such advance notifications, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 36 CFR 219.59, 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2; 43 CFR 1610.5

**Amy Lueders,**

*Acting Assistant Director, Renewable Resources & Planning.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12948 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–22–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLMT001000.L16100000.DP0000. LXSS065E0000 MO# 4500079413]**

### Notice of Availability of the Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Resource Management Plan Revision, Billings Field Office, Montana

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Billings planning area, including Pompeys Pillar National Monument, and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** The BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- BLM, Montana State Office and Billings Field Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, MT 59101.

Interested persons may also review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on the Internet at *http://on.doi.gov/1EJBdaE.*

All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carolyn Sherve-Bybee, Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument RMP Team Leader, telephone: 406–896–5234; address: 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, MT 59101; email: *billings_pompeyspillar_rmp@blm.gov*. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The planning area includes lands within the BLM Billings Field Office's administrative boundaries, including Carbon, Golden Valley, Musselshell, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Wheatland, and Yellowstone Counties in Montana, and portions of Big Horn County, Montana and Big Horn County, Wyoming. The planning area includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, totaling approximately 10.37 million acres; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM's jurisdiction. The BLM decision area is comprised of approximately 434,154 acres of the surface estate in the planning area and 889,479 acres of Federal mineral estate. The revised RMP will replace the 1984 Billings RMP, as amended. The Draft RMP/EIS was made available for public review for a 90-day period on March 29, 2013 (78 FR 19291). The Draft RMP/EIS included a series of management actions, within four management alternatives, designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping. These included, but were not limited to, trails and travel management, wildlife habitat management including that of the Greater Sage-Grouse, energy development (coal and oil and gas), livestock grazing, recreation, lands with wilderness characteristics, special management areas including Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range, and management of the cultural and historic resources at Pompeys Pillar National Monument. In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b), the Notice of Availability for the Draft RMP/EIS announced a concurrent public comment period on proposed ACECs.

Comments on the Draft RMP/Draft EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS which analyzes four alternatives:

1. Alternative A (No Action): Continues existing management;
2. Alternative B: Emphasizes conservation of natural and cultural resources while providing for compatible development and use;
3. Alternative C: Emphasizes resource development and use while protecting natural and cultural resources; and
4. Alternative D (Proposed): Provides development opportunities and conserves sensitive resources.

As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP would provide comprehensive, long-range decisions for the use and management of resources in the planning area administered by the BLM and focus on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Alternative D allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, and heritage and visual resources. Alternative D allocates land as Special Recreation Management Areas (nine), Extensive Recreation Management Areas (two), lands with wilderness characteristics (nine), Travel Management Areas (eleven), and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (eleven) and emphasizes moderate constraints on resource uses to reduce impacts to resource values.

Under Alternative D, the BLM manages the suitable segments of Crooked Creek to protect and/or enhance its free-flowing condition, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification until such time that Congress designates the river or releases the river for other uses. If released by Congress for other uses, the river segment would be managed to retain its free-flowing condition and identified outstandingly remarkable values.

The Proposed Plan includes ACEC designations for the following areas:

Pompeys Pillar National Monument ACEC (432 acres).

• Value: Cultural and historic resources. The National Monument (51 acres) and National Historic Landmark (6 acres) are included within the 432 acre ACEC.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: Eighty-three acres designated for rights-of-way (ROW) exclusion and 349 acres for ROW avoidance; land disposals prohibited; OHV use limited to designated roads and trails; 381 acres managed as VRM Class II and 51 acres as VRM Class III; 51 acres closed to fluid mineral leasing and manage 381 acres No Surface Occupancy for fluid mineral leasing; continue the withdrawal for locatable and solid leasable minerals (subject to valid existing rights) on 51 acres and recommend 381 acres for withdrawal from mineral entry; close 432 acres to mineral material sales, close the 432 acres to commercial renewable energy facilities and development; allow livestock grazing temporarily and only as a management tool; close 432 acres to target shooting (hunting allowed on 375 acres); and prohibit scattering of cremains.

Bridger Fossil Area ACEC (577 acres).

• Values: Paleontological resources. The Bridger Fossil Area National Natural Landmark (161 acres) is located entirely within this ACEC.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: Proposed management would prohibit all surface–disturbing activities not compatible with the area's values including closing the area to all forms of mineral leasing and development, including solid minerals; recommending withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, excluding ROWs, and prohibiting renewable energy development. The ACEC managed as a VRM Class II area. Travel limited to designated roads and trails.

Castle Butte ACEC (184 acres).

• Values: Cultural resources.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: Proposed management would prohibit renewable energy development, target shooting (for resource concerns), and the scattering of cremains. ROW avoidance area and a VRM Class II area. Animal trapping/traplines prohibited. Travel limited to designated routes.

East Pryor ACEC (11,122 acres).

• Values: Wild horse and wildlife habitat, historical, cultural, and paleontological resources, and special status plant species. The Crooked Creek Natural Area (2,101 acres) and the Crooked Creek National Natural Landmark (300 acres) are located within the ACEC. The 2,101 acres of the Crooked Creek Natural Area are currently withdrawn from mineral entry. The Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range (PMWHR) boundaries overlap most of the ACEC.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: Proposed management would prohibit land disposals, close the area to oil and gas and solid mineral leasing, recommend withdrawal from mineral entry, prohibit renewable energy development and geophysical exploration, close the portions of the ACEC within the PMWHR to livestock grazing except for Bad Pass Trail Allotment (grazing available outside the PMWHR), prohibit target shooting for public safety reasons between Memorial Day weekend and Labor Day weekend in T. 8 S., R. 28 E, (allowed in remainder of ACEC), prohibit the scattering of cremains; motorized vehicle use, including snowmobiles, is limited to designated routes; and limit the issuance of Special Recreation Use Permits (SRPs) and Letters of Authorization to existing SRPs and Letters of Authorization.

Four Dances Natural Area ACEC (784 acres).

• Values: Cultural and historic resources, scenic values, wildlife resources, and presence of a natural hazard.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: This ACEC would be an avoidance area for ROWs; it is currently withdrawn from mineral entry; land disposals, cremains scattering, animal trapping/traplines, and renewable energy development would be prohibited; the ACEC is closed to motorized use; livestock grazing only authorized to meet other resource objectives consistent with ACEC designation; no discharging of firearms within the ACEC; archery hunting allowed if deemed necessary by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (authorization from BLM required); SPRs initially limited to existing SRPs; closed to horseback riding, hang gliding, rock climbing, and paint ball activities; this is a day use only area and managed as a VRM Class II area.

Grove Creek ACEC (8,251 acres).

• Values: Significant archaeological and traditional cultural values and special status plants.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area and a VRM Class II area; no land disposals permitted; fluid mineral leasing permitted with a No Surface Occupancy (NSO); locatable minerals and solid leasable minerals recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry; and the scattering of cremains prohibited. Travel limited to designated routes.

Meeteetse Spires ACEC (1,523 acres).

• Values: Scenic values and special status plants.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area and managed as a VRM Class II area; no land disposals permitted; travel limited to designated routes; plant collecting only allowed for scientific use and range studies only (no collection of special status plant species without a permit); 965 acres closed (no lease) to fluid mineral leasing and recommended for withdrawal to mineral entry; livestock grazing permitted (except for sheep) on 965 acres; scattering of cremains and renewable energy development not permitted.

Petroglyph Canyon ACEC (240 acres).

• Values: Unique cultural resources.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: This ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area, no land disposals permitted; travel limited to designated routes; closed (no lease) to fluid mineral leasing, continue the 240 acre mineral entry withdrawal; closed to renewable energy development; closed to animal trapping/traplines; target shooting not permitted due to resource concerns; and scattering of cremains not permitted.

Pryor Foothills Research Natural Area (RNA) ACEC (2,606 acres).

• Values: Special status plants and rare plant communities and significant historic and cultural values.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area; no land disposals permitted; travel limited to designated routes; VRM Class II area; plant collecting allowed for scientific use or range studies only (no collection of special status plant species without a permit); the ACEC managed as a NSO within ¼ mile buffer on known sensitive plant sites and Controlled Surface Use (area must be inventoried for special status plants prior to surface disturbing activities) (Note: all lands in this ACEC east of Crooked Creek Road (839 acres) are within an Lands with Wilderness Characteristics unit which is No Lease to fluid mineral leasing); the ACEC is recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry; closed to solid leasable minerals and mineral material sales; and renewable energy development not permitted;

Stark Site ACEC (799 acres).

• Values: Unique cultural resources.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance area; motorized travel limited to designated routes; managed as a VRM Class II area, recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry; fluid mineral leasing leased with a NSO stipulation, Open to solid mineral leasing with NSO; closed to mineral material sales; closed to target shooting due to resource concerns; and scattering of cremains not permitted.

Weatherman Draw ACEC (12,277 acres).

• Values: Unique cultural values.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area on 4,986 acres and a ROW avoidance area on 7,291 acres; no land disposals permitted; travel limited to designated routes; the ACEC managed as a VRM Class II area; 4,986 acres closed (no lease) to fluid mineral leasing and 7,291 acres available to fluid mineral leasing with a NSO stipulation; 600 acres are currently withdrawn from mineral entry and 4,386 are recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry; 4,986 acres closed to development of solid leasable minerals and 7,291 acres are open to solid leasable mineral development with NSO; 4,986 acres closed to mineral material sales; the ACEC closed to renewable energy development; animal trapping/traplines prohibited on 4,986 acres; target shooting prohibited in the ACEC due to resource concerns; and the scattering of cremains prohibited.

The Proposed RMP does not adopt the following ACEC: Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat ACEC.

The Proposed RMP is also recommending the following river segments (3.15 miles) as suitable to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and classification. The following segments would be recommended as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:

• Crooked Creek (above fish barrier—1.59 miles) tentative management class would be Wild.

• Crooked Creek (below fish barrier—1.56 miles) tentative management class would be Scenic.

Wild and Scenic River eligible and suitable segments (14.08 miles total) would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development within ½ mile of the eligible and suitable river segments. The WSR eligible and suitable segments would be managed as exclusion areas for wind energy development.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

• Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.

• General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative D supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives. Alternative D would limit or eliminate new surface disturbance in PHMA, while minimizing disturbance in GHMA.

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics. Development of additional regional mitigation strategies for other resource programs may occur for implementation level decisions.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Proposed RMP/Final EIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov*.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5

**Jamie E. Connell,**

*State Director, Montana/Dakotas.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12937 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLWYR0000.L16100000.DP0000. LXSS042K0000]**

### Notice of Availability of the Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision, Cody and Worland Field Offices, Wyoming

**AGENCY:** The Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Cody and Worland Field Offices and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** The BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Bighorn Basin Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, Tribal, and local Government agencies and to other stakeholders and members of the public. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at:

- The Bureau of Land Management, Wyoming State Office, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009
- The Bureau of Land Management, Cody Field Office, 1002 Blackburn Avenue, Cody, Wyoming 82414
- The Bureau of Land Management, Worland Field Office, 101 South 23rd Street, Worland, Wyoming 82401

Interested persons may also review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on the internet at *http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/bighorn.html.* All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:

Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.

Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Holly Elliott, RMP Project Manager, telephone: 307–347–5193; address: 101 South 23rd Street, Worland, Wyoming 82401; email: *helliott@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Planning Area includes lands within the BLM Cody and Worland Field Offices' administrative boundaries, in all of Big Horn, Park, and Washakie counties, and most of Hot Springs County in north-central Wyoming. The Planning Area includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, totaling 5.6 million acres; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM's jurisdiction. Lands within the Planning Area under the BLM's jurisdiction make up the Decision Area. The Decision Area consists of BLM-administered surface, totaling 3.2 million acres, and the Federal mineral estate, totaling 4.2 million acres. The revised RMP will replace the Washakie and Grass Creek RMPs in the Worland Field Office, Wyoming, and the Cody RMP in the Cody Field Office, Wyoming.

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a series of management actions, within six management alternatives, designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping, including, but not limited to: recreation, areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs), wildlife habitats, livestock grazing, energy development, air quality and global climate change, and wilderness characteristics. Protection of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat is analyzed in all alternatives considered. The six alternatives are:

- *Alternative A* (No Action Alternative): Continues existing management practices;
- *Alternative B:* Fosters conservation of natural and cultural resources while providing for compatible development and use;
- *Alternative C:* Emphasizes resource development and use;
- *Alternative D (Proposed Plan):* Provides development opportunities and protects sensitive resources;
- *Alternative E:* Provides conservation of natural and cultural resources and protection of Greater Sage-Grouse Key Habitat Areas through the designation of an ACEC; and
- *Alternative F:* Provides development opportunities and protects sensitive resources and protection of Greater Sage-Grouse Core Habitat Areas through the designation of an ACEC.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the Bighorn Basin RMP/EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on October 17, 2008, and the Draft RMP/EIS was released to the public on April 22, 2011. On July 12, 2013 the Supplement to the Draft RMP/EIS was published in the **Federal Register** to include Alternatives E and F.

Comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the proposed plan. As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed Bighorn Basin RMP in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Alternative D generally allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, heritage and visual resources. Alternative D proposes ACEC designations for:

- Big Cedar Ridge (264 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Paleontological. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Right-of-way (ROW) exclusion area, no-surface occupancy (NSO) restriction applied to fluid mineral leases, closed to geophysical exploration, closed to mineral material disposals and related exploration and development activities, motorized vehicle use limited to existing roads and trails, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.
- Red Gulch Dinosaur Tracksite (1,798 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Paleontological. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Closed to surface disturbing activities except to enhance public education, heavy equipment restriction on fire suppression activities, motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, interpretive area closed to livestock grazing, an NSO restriction applied to fluid mineral leases, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.
- Sheep Mountain Anticline (13,260 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Geologic, Caves, Cultural and Scenic. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, generally closed to surface disturbing activities, unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.
- Spanish Point Karst (11,854 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Caves, Recreational, Sinking Stream Segments and Water Quality. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, closed to geophysical exploration, closed to off highway vehicle use, ROW avoidance/mitigation area, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.
- Brown/Howe Dinosaur Area (5,521 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Paleontological. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Closed to mineral material disposals, unavailable for fluid

mineral leasing, ROW avoidance/mitigation area, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.

• Carter Mountain (10,947 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Vegetation, Wildlife, Cultural, Recreational, Special Status Species, Watershed and Soils. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Heavy equipment restriction on fire suppression activities, ROW avoidance/mitigation area, motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, closed to surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 7 percent, unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, closed to mineral material disposals, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.

• Five Springs Falls (163 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Recreational, Scenic, Special Status Species, Geologic and Public Safety. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Heavy equipment restriction on fire suppression activities, ROW avoidance/mitigation area, climbing not allowed on the cliff that forms the falls, motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, and unavailable for fluid mineral leasing.

• Little Mountain (21,478 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Caves, Cultural, Paleontological, Scenic, Recreational, Special Status Species, Vegetation and Wildlife. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Heavy equipment restriction for fire suppression activities, motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, a ROW avoidance/mitigation area, unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, and pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws.

• Upper Owl Creek (13,572 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Cultural, Fish, Recreational, Scenic, Soils, Special Status Species, Vegetation and Wildlife. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, closed to surface-disturbing activities, pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws for 13,238 acres, ROW avoidance/mitigation area, and unavailable for fluid mineral leasing.

• Clarks Fork Canyon (4,759 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Geologic, Open Space, Recreational, Special Status Species, and Wildlife. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Close 1,211 acres to motorized vehicle use with the remainder limited to designated roads and trails, closed to surface-disturbing activities, closed to mineral material disposals, closed to geophysical exploration, unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws, renewable energy ROW exclusion area, and ROW avoidance/mitigation area.

• Sheep Mountain (25,962 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Special Status Species, Vegetation and Wildlife. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—Motorized vehicle use limited to designated roads and trails, unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, closed to mineral material disposals, pursue a withdrawal from appropriation under the mining laws, closed to surface-disturbing activities, and ROW avoidance/mitigation area.

• Paleocene, Eocene Thermal Maximum (14,913 acres): Value(s) of Concern—Paleontological. Proposed Use Limitation(s)—NSO restriction applied to fluid mineral leases, and closed to mineral material disposals.

The Proposed plan also makes a determination that 20 waterways (92 miles) are not suitable for WSR designation and releases those eligible waterways from further interim protection.

The Bighorn Basin Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

• Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.

• General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative D supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives. Alternative D would limit or eliminate new surface disturbance in PHMA, while minimizing disturbance in GHMA. Alternative D is also consistent with guidelines provided in the Governor's Sage-Grouse Implementation Team's Core Population Area strategy and the Governor's Executive Order (WY EO 2011–05).

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' letter of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for the Bighorn Basin RMP Revision Project and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5

**Mary Jo Rugwell,**

*Acting State Director, Wyoming.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12941 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–22–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLMTM00000 L16100000.DQ0000.LXSS048E0000 MO# 4500079299]**

### Notice of Availability of the HiLine District Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, HiLine District, Montana

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the HiLine District in Montana and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** BLM planning regulations state that any person who meets the conditions as described in the regulations may protest the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. A person who meets the conditions and files a protest must file the protest within 30 days of the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the HiLine Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been sent to affected Federal, State, and local government agencies, tribal governments, and to other stakeholders and members of the public who have requested copies. Copies of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- The BLM, Montana/Dakotas State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana 59101.
- The BLM, Havre Field Office, 3990 Highway 2 West, Havre, Montana 59501.
- The BLM, Malta Field Office, 501 South 2nd Street, Malta, Montana 59538.
- The BLM, Glasgow Field Office, 5 Lasar Drive, Glasgow, Montana 59230.

Interested persons may also review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS on the Internet at *http://www.blm.gov/8qkd.* All protests must be in writing and mailed to one of the following addresses:
Regular Mail: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, P.O. Box 71383, Washington, DC 20024–1383.
Overnight Delivery: BLM Director (210), Attention: Protest Coordinator, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134LM, Washington, DC 20003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Hockett, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, telephone: 406–262–2837; address: 3990 Highway 2 West, Havre, MT 59501; email: *MT_HiLine_RMP@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The planning area includes lands within the HiLine District Office's administrative boundaries in the following Montana counties: Blaine, Chouteau, Glacier, Hill, Liberty, Phillips, Toole, and Valley Counties. The Planning area includes all lands, regardless of jurisdiction, totaling approximately 17.6 million acres; however, the BLM will only make decisions on lands that fall under the BLM's jurisdiction. Lands within the Planning Area under the BLM's jurisdiction make up the Decision Area. The Decision Area consists of 2.43 million acres of public land surface and 4.24 million acres of federal mineral estate. These lands and minerals are managed by three BLM Field Offices in Havre, Malta, and Glasgow, Montana, along with the Great Falls Oil and Gas Field Office, which provides oil and gas program support in western, central, and north central Montana. The Proposed RMP will replace the current guidance provided by the West HiLine (1988) and Sweet Grass Hills Amendment (1996) and Judith-Valley-Phillips Resource Management Plans (1994) and land use plan amendments (1996). The Proposed RMP will also manage oil and gas leasing in Phillips and Valley counties, which is currently managed under four Management Framework Plans (MFP): Phillips MFP, Valley MFP, Little Rocky Mountains MFP, and the UL Bend/Zortman MFP.

The BLM published the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the Malta Field Office Draft RMP/EIS in the **Federal Register** on September 6, 2006 (71 FR 52572). This Draft RMP/EIS included the Malta, Havre and Glasgow Montana Field Offices which currently make up the HiLine District in Montana. The HiLine Draft RMP/EIS was released to the public on March 22, 2013 (78 FR 17714). The BLM conducted five public meetings regarding the HiLine Draft RMP/EIS. These meetings were held in Glasgow, Malta, Havre, Chester and Great Falls, Montana during May 2013. The Draft RMP/EIS included a series of management actions, within five management alternatives, designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping. These included, but were not limited to, renewable and traditional energy development, management of solid minerals, soil and vegetation management, land tenure, public land access, off-highway vehicles, lands with wilderness characteristics, wildlife habitat and special status species, including Greater Sage-Grouse, cultural and paleontological resources, special designations and management areas including areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC), wildfire and prescribed fire management, and social and economic conditions across the HiLine District. Cooperating agencies assisted the BLM in the identification and refinement of the issues and the development of the alternatives.

Comments on the HiLine Draft RMP/EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS which analyzes five alternatives:

1. *Alternative A (No Action):* Continues existing management;
2. *Alternative B:* Emphasizes conservation of natural and cultural resources while providing for compatible development and use;
3. *Alternative C:* Provides development opportunities while protecting sensitive resources;
4. *Alternative D:* Emphasizes resource development and use while protecting natural and cultural resources; and
5. *Alternative E (Proposed):* Focuses on a balance between managing public lands for economic and recreational growth and protecting valuable resources.

The HiLine District has identified Alternative E as the Proposed RMP. Alternative E supports management of greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintaining habitat connectivity to achieve population objectives.

In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b), the Notice of Availability for the Draft RMP/EIS also announced a concurrent public comment period on nominated ACECs. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS, Alternative E, includes ACEC designation for the following areas (all resource use limitations are subject to valid existing rights).

Azure Cave ACEC (141 Acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Wildlife habitat, natural hazards.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.
- Other Restrictions: Avoidance area for rights-of-way (ROWs).

Big Bend of the Milk River ACEC (1,972 Acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Cultural, historic.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Oil and gas leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.
- Other Restrictions: Avoidance area for ROWs.

Bitter Creek ACEC (60,701 Acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Historic, cultural, scenic, wildlife habitat, natural processes.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, commercial wind energy development.
- Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Kevin Rim ACEC (4,557 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: cultural, wildlife habitat.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Mountain Plover ACEC (24,762 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: wildlife habitat.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Sweet Grass Hills ACEC (7,419 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: historic, cultural.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Frenchman Breaks ACEC (42,020 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: scenic, wildlife habitat, natural processes.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Malta Geological ACEC (6,153 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: geologic, paleontological, natural processes.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs; personal collection of common fossils would not be allowed.

Woody Island ACEC (32,869 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: scenic, wildlife habitat.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: oil and gas leasing, solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs.

Zortman/Landusky Mine Reclamation ACEC (2,682 Acres)

• Relevant and Important Values: natural hazards, public safety.

• Limitations on the Following Uses: commercial wind energy development.

• Other Restrictions: avoidance area for ROWs, closed to all unauthorized vehicle use during reclamation activities.

Two areas are being considered for designation as off-highway vehicle (OHV) use areas. In the Proposed RMP, 40 acres in the Glasgow OHV area would remain open until an alternate site is located, and in the Fresno OHV area 125 acres would be designated as open to OHV use.

The Hiline District Proposed RMP/Final EIS is one of a total of 15 separate EISs that make up the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. Greater-Sage Grouse habitat within the planning area consists of:

• Priority Habitat Management Area (PHMA)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value for maintaining sustainable Greater Sage-Grouse populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.

• General Habitat Management Area (GHMA)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA.

Alternative E identifies 1,006,312 acres as Greater Sage-Grouse PHMAs and 426,355 acres as Grassland Bird/Greater Sage-Grouse PHMAs. The latter areas have special management prescriptions to provide high-quality habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse and other sagebrush-dependent species. These PHMAs would be closed to solid mineral leasing, and oil and gas leasing would be subject to a no surface occupancy (NSO) and use stipulation with only limited exceptions, and no waivers or modifications. Both areas would be designated as exclusion areas for wind and solar energy ROWs, and avoidance areas for all other ROWs.

The BLM and Forest Service, via the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy to address impacts within that Zone. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements. The Regional Mitigation Strategy will be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP/Final EIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the HiLine Proposed RMP/Final EIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to *protest@blm.gov.*

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5.

**Jamie E. Connell,**

*State Director, Montana/Dakotas.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12999 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

**[NPS–WASO–NRSS–SSB–18382; PPWONRADE3, PPMRSNR1Y.NM0000 (155)]**

### Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Programmatic Clearance for NPS-Sponsored Surveys

**AGENCY:** National Park Service (NPS), Interior.

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

**SUMMARY:** We (National Park Service) will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the Information Collection (IC) described below. The National Park Service (NPS) sponsors public surveys to provide park managers with information needed for park planning, management, operations and evaluation of performance related to protecting park resources and meeting the needs of the public. In consultation with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Department of the Interior (DOI), the NPS has developed a Programmatic Review and Clearance Process for NPS-sponsored public surveys. It significantly streamlines the information collection review process. To comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, and as part of our continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, we invite the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on this IC. This IC is scheduled to expire on October 31, 2015. We may not conduct or sponsor

and a person is not required to respond to a collection unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** To ensure that your comments on this IC are considered, we must receive them on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send your comments to Phadrea Ponds, Information Collections Coordinator, National Park Service, 1201 Oakridge Drive, Fort Collins, CO 80525 (mail); or *phadrea_ponds@nps.gov* (email). Please reference ''Information Collection 1024–0224—Programmatic Renewal'' in the subject line.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bret Meldrum, Chief, Social Science Program, National Park Service, 1201 Oakridge Drive, Fort Collins, CO 80525–5596 (mail); *Bret_Meldrum@nps.gov* (email); or 970–267–7295 (phone).

## I. Abstract

The Programmatic Clearance for NPS-Sponsored Surveys applies to surveys designed to furnish usable information to NPS managers and planners concerning park visitors, visitor services, potential park visitors, and residents of communities near parks. This information is intended to provide NPS managers with data that can be used to improve the quality and utility of agency programs, services, and planning efforts. Questions asked under the programmatic review process must show a clear tie to NPS management and planning needs. The programmatic review may only be used for non-controversial surveys that are unlikely to attract or include topics of significant public interest in the programmatic review process.

To qualify for the NPS generic programmatic review process, all information collections must be directly tied to an area managed by the NPS or research that will benefit NPS management efforts. All collections must be reviewed by the NPS and approved by OMB before the survey can be initiated.

## II. Data

*OMB Control Number:* 1024–0224.

*Title:* Programmatic Clearance for NPS-Sponsored Surveys.

*Type of Request:* Renewal of a currently approved collection.

*Affected Public:* General Public (*i.e.* Park Visitors, potential visitors to parks, and residents of communities near park) and local, state and tribal governments.

*Respondent Obligation:* Voluntary.

*Estimated Number of Annual Respondents:* 150,000.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 50,000 hours. We estimate the public reporting burden will average 20 minutes per response.

*Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Non-Hour Cost'':* None.

## III. Request For Comments

We invite comments concerning this IC on:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this IC. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Debra Melton,**

*Acting Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13036 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–EH–P

---

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## National Park Service

**[NPS–USPP–15826; PPWOUSPPS1, PPMPRPP02.Y00000 (155)]**

## Proposed Information Collection; United States Park Police Application Forms

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

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

**SUMMARY:** We (National Park Service) will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the information collection (IC) described below. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and as part of our continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, we invite the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on this IC. This IC is scheduled to expire on March 31, 2017. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** You must submit comments on or before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send your comments on the IC to Madonna L. Baucum, Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive (Room 2C114, Mail Stop 242), Reston, VA 20192 (mail); or *madonna_baucum@nps.gov* (email). Please include ''1024–0245'' in the subject line of your comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To request additional information about this IC, contact Pamela Blyth, United States Park Police, 1100 Ohio Drive SW., Washington, DC 20242 (mail); or at *pamela_blyth@nps.gov* (email). Please reference ''1024–0245 Revision'' in your comments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Abstract

The United States Park Police (USPP) is a unit of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with jurisdiction in all National Park Service areas and certain other Federal and State lands. The USPP are highly trained, professional police officers who prevent and detect criminal activity; conduct investigations; apprehend individuals suspected of committing offenses against Federal, State, and local laws; provide protection to the President of the United States and visiting dignitaries; and provide protective services to some of the most recognizable monuments and memorials in the world. Applicants for USPP officer positions must complete and pass a competitive written examination, an oral interview, a medical examination and psychological evaluation, and a battery of physical fitness and agility tests. As part of this application and screening process, the USPP uses the following forms:

*USPP Form (TBD) ''Physician Consent Form''*

The USPP Form TBD ''Physician Consent Form'' is an optional form used by the applicant to obtain clearance by their personal physician to complete the PEB. The applicant's personal physician uses this form to certify whether or not the applicant is cleared to participate in the Physical Efficiency Battery (PEB) and requests the following information

pertaining to the physician making the physical suitability determination:

- Name,
- complete mailing address,
- telephone number, and
- physician's comments.

*USPP Form (TBD) ''Physical Efficiency Battery ''Waiver'' ''*

An applicant's physical fitness is assessed using the PEB. The PEB consists of five measures of physical fitness including: Body composition, determined through subcutaneous fat folds; flexibility, determined by sit and reach; agility, measured by negotiating a time obstacle course; muscular strength, determined with one maximal chest press; and cardiovascular endurance, measured by a timed 1.5 mile walk/run. The applicant may choose to self-certify their ability to complete the PEB by completing the optional USPP Form (TBD) ''Physical Efficiency Battery ''Waiver'' '' which requests the candidate provide the following information as part of the self-certification process:

- Date of last medical evaluation,
- name and address of personal physician,
- purpose of last medical examination,
- identification of any known medical conditions the USPP must be made aware of, and
- documentation to support identified known medical conditions.

*USPP Form (TBD) ''Release to Obtain a Credit Report''*

Applicants are also required to complete USPP Form (TBD) ''Release to Obtain a Credit Report'' as part of the application process. Information obtained on this form is used in connection with the applicant's background investigation is used to determine their:

1. Fitness for Federal employment,
2. clearance to perform contractual service for the Federal Government, and/or
3. security clearance or access.

Information collected on the USPP Form (TBD) ''Release to Obtain a Credit Report'' includes personally identifiable information (PII), to include:

- Full name,
- Social Security Number,
- date of birth,
- current and former home addresses,
- home telephone number,
- current employer's name, and
- current occupation.

*USPP Form (TBD) ''Applicant Documentation Form''*

The USPP Form (TBD) ''Applicant Documentation Form'' is an optional form used by applicants to either decline or defer employment with the USPP. The form collects the following PII:

- Name,
- Social Security Number,
- address,
- telephone,
- date and location of written test, and
- reason for declining or deferring employment with the USPP.

*USPP Form 1 ''United States Park Police Personal History Statement''*

USPP Form 1 ''United States Park Police Personal History Statement,'' also known as the ''Blue Book,'' is used to collect detailed personal history information from applicants. Investigators verify the information provided to determine an applicant's suitability for a USPP officer position. The information collected includes, but is not limited to:

- Personal background information, including financial data and residence history,
- selective Service information and military data,
- references,
- education and employment information,
- driving record, arrest/conviction data, and criminal history information,
- illegal drug usage,
- alcohol usage,
- gambling information, and
- miscellaneous information, such as firearm permits, special skills, other languages, hobbies and interests, other enforcement agencies where applicant applied, and whether or not applicant previously applied for a USPP officer position.

*USPP Form (TBD) Personal Essay—''Why I Want to Be a United States Park Police Officer''*

Applicants are required to write a personal essay (minimum of 200 words) describing in their own words why they want to be a USPP officer. The applicant's essay must also address:

- How they became aware of the USPP,
- what they think the role of a park police officer should be, and
- their career aspirations/expectations as a USPP officer.

*USPP Form (TBD) ''Disqualification for Misdemeanor Convictions for Domestic Violence''*

On September 30, 1996, Title 18 U.S.C. Section 922 (g) (9) took effect, making it a felony for anyone who has been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence to possess a firearm or ammunition. Thus, any law enforcement officer and other government employees who have been convicted of a domestic violence misdemeanor may not lawfully possess or receive firearms or ammunition for any purpose, including performance of their official duties. Candidates for USPP officers are required to disclose information pertaining to convictions of domestic violence, to include whether the candidate was convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, and if yes, the following information is required to be disclosed or the candidate will be automatically disqualified from the application process:

- Court/jurisdiction,
- docket/case number,
- statute, charge,
- date sentenced, and
- whether the conviction was expunged or set aside, or whether they were pardoned for the offense.

**II. Data**

*OMB Control Number:* 1024–0245.

*Title:* United States Park Police Application Forms.

*Service Form Number(s):*

- USPP Form (TBD) ''Physician Consent Form''
- USPP Form (TBD) ''Physical Efficiency Battery ''Waiver'' ''
- USPP Form (TBD) ''Release to Obtain a Credit Report,'' and
- USPP Form (TBD) ''Applicant Documentation Form''
- USPP Form 1 ''Personal History Statement''
- USPP Form (TBD) Personal Essay—''Why I Want to Be a United States Park Police Officer''
- USPP Form (TBD) ''Disqualification for Misdemeanor Convictions for Domestic Violence''

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Description of Respondents:* Candidates for employment as a United States Park Police officer.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

*Frequency of Collection:* On occasion.

| Activity | Estimated annual number of responses | Estimated completion time per response | Estimated total annual burden hours |
|---|---|---|---|
| USPP Form (TBD) "Physician Consent Form" | 2,500 | 10 min | 417 |
| USPP Form (TBD) "Physical Efficiency Battery "Waiver"" | 2,500 | 5 | 208 |
| USPP Form (TBD) "Release to Obtain a Credit Report" | 2,500 | 5 | 208 |
| USPP Form (TBD) "Applicant Documentation Form" | 2,500 | 5 | 208 |
| USPP Form 1 "United States Park Police Personal History Statement" | 2,500 | 8 hours | 20,000 |
| USPP Form (TBD) Personal Essay—"Why I Want to Be a United States Park Police Officer" | 2,500 | 30 min | 1,250 |
| USPP Form (TBD) "Disqualification for Misdemeanor Convictions for Domestic Violence" | 2,500 | 5 min | 208 |
| TOTALS | 17,500 | | 22,499 |

*Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost:* $227,500, primarily for costs (1) associated with printing and notarizing the application and (2) incurred to provide supporting documentation.

**III. Comments**

We invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Debra Melton,**

*Acting Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13039 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–EH–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## National Park Service

**[NPS–WASO–NRNHL–18266; PPWOCRADI0, PCU00RP14.R50000]**

## National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations and Related Actions

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing or related actions in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before May 2, 2015. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60, written comments are being accepted concerning the significance of the nominated properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation. Comments may be forwarded by United States Postal Service, to the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW., MS 2280, Washington, DC 20240; by all other carriers, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service,1201 Eye St. NW., 8th floor, Washington, DC 20005; or by fax, 202–371–6447. Written or faxed comments should be submitted by June 15, 2015. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: May 6, 2015.

**J. Paul Loether,**

*Chief, National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmarks Program.*

**ARIZONA**

**Maricopa County**

Boardwalk Apartments Historic District, Address Restricted, Phoenix, 15000342

**IOWA**

**Washington County**

Baxter, H.A., Coal Company Historic District, 601 E. 3rd St., Washington, 15000343

McCleery Calendar Factory, 632 E. 3rd St., Washington, 15000344

**LOUISIANA**

**Catahoula Parish**

Harrisonburg Methodist Church, 105 Pine St., Harrisonburg, 15000345

**Orleans Parish**

New Orleans Federal Savings and Loan Building, 4948 Chef Menteur Hwy., New Orleans, 15000346

**Terrebonne Parish**

Houma Elementary School, 711 Grinage St., Houma, 15000347

**West Feliciana Parish**

Dawson, John S., High School, 7565 Tunica Trace, St. Francisville, 15000348

**MARYLAND**

**Washington County**

Packhouse Ford, Potomac R. at Canal Rd., Sharpsburg, 15000349

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**Dukes County**

Hill, Polly, Arboretum Historic District, 795–833 State Rd., West Tisbury, 15000350

**Essex County**

Bradford Burial Ground, 326 Salem St., Haverhill, 15000351

**Plymouth County**

Centre and Montello Streets Historic District, 43–51, 53–61, 63–77, 91–93 Centre & 95, 124–126 Montello Sts., Brockton, 15000352

**MICHIGAN**

**Gogebic County**

Rice Bay, Indian Village Rd., Watersmeet Township, 15000353

**MISSOURI**

**Cape Girardeau County**

Broadway Theatre, 805 Broadway, Cape Girardeau, 15000354

**NEW MEXICO**

**Socorro County**

Gran Quivera Historic District, Along NM 55 approx. 25 mi. N. of Mountainair, Mountainair, 15000355

**WISCONSIN**

**Dane County**

Sunset Hills Historic District, Bounded by Owen Pkwy., Regent & Larkin Sts., Hillcrest Dr., Madison, 15000356

**WYOMING**

**Natrona County**

Pathfinder Dam Historic District, 12 mi. SW. of Alcova, Alcova, 15000357

A request for removal has been made for the following resources:

**UTAH**

**Davis County**

Young Men's Hall—Tingey House, 85 South 300 East, Centerville, 97001324

**Salt Lake County**

Carlson Hall, (Public Works Buildings TR) 369 S. University St., Salt Lake City, 96000414

Granite Lumber Company Building, (Sugar House Business District MPS) 1090 East 2100 South, Salt Lake City, 03000629

Utah—Idaho Sugar Factory, 2140 W. Sugar Factory Rd., West Jordan, 09000018

Utah Slaughter Company Warehouse, (Salt Lake City Business District MRA) 370 W. 100 South, Salt Lake City, 82004148

[FR Doc. 2015–12994 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312–51–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement

**[Docket ID BSEE–2015–0009; OMB Control Number 1014–0007; 15XE1700DX EEEE500000 EX1SF0000.DAQ000]**

### Information Collection Activities: Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** 60-day notice.

**SUMMARY:** To comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), BSEE is inviting comments on a collection of information that we will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The information collection request (ICR) concerns a renewal to the paperwork requirements in the regulations under *Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line.*

**DATES:** You must submit comments by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by either of the following methods listed below.

- Electronically go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* In the Search box, enter BSEE–2015–0009 then click search. Follow the instructions to submit public comments and view all related materials. We will post all comments.
- Email *cheryl.blundon@bsee.gov.* Mail or hand-carry comments to the Department of the Interior; Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement; Regulations and Standards Branch; ATTN: Cheryl Blundon; 45600 Woodland Road, Sterling, VA 20166. Please reference ICR 1014–0007 in your comment and include your name and return address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cheryl Blundon, Regulations and Standards Branch at (703) 787–1607 to request additional information about this ICR.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* 30 CFR part 254, *Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line.*

*OMB Control Number:* 1014–0007.

*Abstract:* Section 2(b)(3) of E.O. 12777 delegated to the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) those responsibilities under section 311(j)(1)(C) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) (October 18, 1991; 56 FR 54757), requiring the Secretary to establish procedures, methods, and requirements for equipment to prevent and contain discharges of oil and hazardous substances from offshore facilities, including associated pipelines. Under section 2(d)(3) of E.O. 12777, section 311(j)(5) of FWPCA, and section 4202(b)(4) of OPA, the Secretary is required to issue regulations requiring the owners or operators of offshore facilities, including associated pipelines, to prepare and submit response plans that ensure the availability of private spill-response personnel and equipment and to permit the operation of offshore facilities, including associated pipelines, without approved response plans if certain conditions are met. Under section 2(e)(3) of E.O. 12777 and section 311(j)(6)(A) of FWPCA, the Secretary must require periodic inspections of containment booms and equipment used to remove discharges at offshore facilities, including associated pipelines. The Secretary has redelegated these responsibilities to the Director, BSEE.

The FWPCA, as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA), requires that a spill-response plan be submitted for offshore facilities prior to February 18, 1993. The OPA specifies that after that date, an offshore facility may not handle, store, or transport oil unless a plan has been submitted. Regulations at 30 CFR 254 establish requirements for spill-response plans for oil-handling facilities seaward of the coast line, including associated pipelines.

To provide supplementary guidance and procedures, BSEE issues Notices to Lessees and Operators (NTLs) on a regional or National basis. Regulation 30 CFR 250.103 allows BSEE to issue NTLs to clarify, supplement, or provide more detail about certain requirements. Additional guidance pertaining to Oil-Spill Response Requirements is provided by NTLs when needed.

Regulations implementing these responsibilities are among those delegated to BSEE. The regulations under 30 CFR 254 pertain to preparation and submittal of response plans that ensure the availability of private-spill response personnel and equipment.

We use the information collected under 30 CFR 254 to determine compliance with OPA by lessees/operators. Specifically, BSEE needs the information to:

- Determine that lessees/operators have an adequate plan and are sufficiently prepared to implement a quick and effective response to a discharge of oil from their facilities or operations.
- Review plans prepared under the regulations of a State and submitted to BSEE to satisfy the requirements in 30 CFR 254 to ensure that they meet minimum requirements of OPA.
- Verify that personnel involved in oil-spill response are properly trained and familiar with the requirements of the spill-response plans and to lead and witness spill-response exercises.
- Assess the sufficiency and availability of contractor equipment and materials.
- Verify that sufficient quantities of equipment are available and in working order.
- Oversee spill-response efforts and maintain official records of pollution events.
- Assess the efforts of lessees/operators to prevent oil spills or prevent substantial threats of such discharges.

No questions of a sensitive nature are asked. Generally, no proprietary information is collected under 30 CFR 254. However, if respondents did submit proprietary information, we protect such information under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and DOI's implementing regulations (43 CFR 2), 30 CFR 250.197, ''Data and information to be made

available to the public,'' and 30 CFR 252, ''Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Information Program.'' Responses are mandatory.

*Frequency:* The frequencies of responses are on occasion, monthly, annually, and biennially and as a result of situations encountered depending upon the requirements.

*Description of Respondents:* Potential respondents comprise Federal oil, gas, or sulphur lessees and/or operators.

*Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:* The currently approved annual reporting burden for this collection is 60,198 hours. In this submission, we are requested a total of 74,461 burden hours. The following chart details the individual components and respective hour burden estimates of this ICR. In calculating the burdens, we assumed that respondents perform certain requirements in the normal course of their activities. We consider these to be usual and customary and took that into account in estimating the burden.

| CITATION 30 CFR 254 and NTLs | Reporting requirement | Hour burden | Average number of annual responses | Annual burden hours (rounded) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subpart A—General** | | | | |
| 1(a) thru (d); 2(a); 3 thru 5; 7; 20 thru 29; 44(b); 47(a)(3); 51. | Submit spill response plan for OCS facilities and related documents/copies of referenced documents; any additional information necessary for compliance purposes. | 192.8 | 18 new plans | 3,470 |
| 1(e) | Request BSEE jurisdiction over facility landward of coast line (no recent request received). | 0.4 | 2 requests | 1 |
| 2(b) | Submit certification of capability to respond to worst case discharge or substantial threat of such. | 15.8 | 18 certification | 284 |
| 2(c) | Request deadline extension for submission of revised plan | 2 | 8 extensions | 16 |
| 8 | Appeal BSEE orders or decisions per 30 CFR Part 290 | Exempt under 5 CFR 1320.4(a)(2), (c). | | 0 |
| **Subtotal** | | | 46 responses | 3,771 hours |
| **Subpart B—Oil-Spill Response Plans for Outer Continental Shelf Facilities** | | | | |
| Subpart B 52 | Requirements for your oil-spill response plans | Burden included with specific requirements under subparts A and D. | | 0 |
| 30 | Submit and/or resubmit revised spill response plan for OCS facilities at least every 2 years or within 15 days whenever certain changes occur (see (b)(1–4) or (see (e)(1–3)). | 62 | 159 revised plans | 9,858 |
| 30 | Notify BSEE of no change to your plan | 1 | 1 plan | 1 |
| **Subtotal** | | | 160 responses | 9,859 |
| **Subpart C—Related Requirements for OCS Facilities** | | | | |
| 40 | Make records of all OSRO-provided services, equipment, personnel available to BSEE. | 7 | 40 records | 280 |
| 41 | Conduct annual training; retain training records for 2 years | 149 | 138 plans holders/operators. | 20,562 |
| 42(a) thru (e) | Conduct triennial response plan exercise; retain exercise records for 3 years. | 215 | 138 exercises | 29,670 |
| 42(f) | Inform BSEE 30 days before the date of any exercise (triennial) | 1.3 | 138 notifications | 179 |
| 43 | Inspect response equipment monthly; retain inspection & maintenance records for 2 years. | 10.5 | 780 (65 sites × 12 months). | 8,190 |
| 44(b) | Request approval to use a different efficiency factor for specific oil recovery devices; submit evidence to demonstrate the request. | 1.5 | 1 request | 2 |
| 46(a) NTL | Notify NRC of all oil spills from owner/operator facility. | Burden would be included in the NRC inventory. | | 0 |
| 46(b) NTL(s) | Notify BSEE of oil spills of one barrel or more from owner/operator facility; submit follow-up report; after catastrophic event may be requested to meet w/BSEE to discuss storm recovery strategies/pollution. | 2 | 6 notifications & reports. | 12 |
| 46(c) | Notify BSEE & responsible party of oil spills from operations at another facility. | 1.8 | 24 notifications | 43 |
| 47(d) | Request instructions on how to calculate volume of WDC scenario if not listed in § 203. 47(a–c). | 0.9 | 1 request | 1 |
| **Subtotal** | | | 1,266 responses | 58,939 hours |

| CITATION 30 CFR 254 and NTLs | Reporting requirement | Hour burden | Average number of annual responses | Annual burden hours (rounded) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subpart D—Oil Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located in State Waters Seaward of the Coast Line** | | | | |
| 50; 52 | Submit response plan for facility in State waters following format for OCS plan. | 46.3 | 13 plans | 602 |
| 50; 51; 52 | Submit response plan for facility in State waters by modifying existing OCS plan. | 14.3 | 50 plans | 715 |
| 50; 53; | Submit response plan for facility in State waters developed under State requirements including all information as required in these sections. | 40 | 8 plans | 320 |
| 54 | Submit description of oil-spill prevention procedures and demonstrate compliance; include any industry safety and pollution prevention standards your facility meets. | 3.8 | 67 submissions | 255 |
| **Subtotal** | | | 138 responses | 1,892 hours |
| **Total Hour Burden** | | | 1,610 Responses | 74,461 Hours |

*Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping Non-Hour Cost Burden:* We have identified no non-hour cost burdens for this collection.

*Public Disclosure Statement:* The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

*Comments:* Before submitting an ICR to OMB, PRA section 3506(c)(2)(A) requires each agency ''. . . to provide notice . . . and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information . . .''. Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the collection is necessary or useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of technology.

Agencies must also estimate the non-hour paperwork cost burdens to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. Therefore, if you have other than hour burden costs to generate, maintain, and disclose this information, you should comment and provide your total capital and startup cost components or annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. For further information on this burden, refer to 5 CFR 1320.3(b)(1) and (2), or contact the Bureau representative listed previously in this notice.

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB.

*Public Comment Procedures:* Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: May 20, 2015.

**Robert Middleton,**

*Deputy Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13003 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–VH–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

### United States v. Verso Paper Corp. and NewPage Holdings Inc.; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States* v. *Verso Paper Corp., et al.,* Civil Action No. 1:14–CV–2216–TSC (D.D.C. 2014), together with the Response of the United States to Public Comments.

Copies of the comments, attachments to these comments, and the United States' Response are available for inspection at the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at *http://www.justice.gov/atr/cases/verso.html,* and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may also be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement.*

### United States District Court for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. VERSO PAPER CORP., and NEWPAGE HOLDINGS INC., Defendants.

Case No. 1:14–cv–2216 (TSC)

### Response of Plaintiff United States to Public Comments on the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)–(h) (''APPA'' or ''Tunney Act''), the United States hereby responds to the public comments received regarding the proposed Final Judgment in this case. After careful consideration of the submitted comments, the United States continues to believe that the proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint. The United States will move the Court for entry of the proposed Final Judgment after the public comments and this response have been published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 16(d).[1]

[1] On May 7, 2015, the United States submitted its Unopposed Motion and Supporting Memorandum to Excuse **Federal Register** Publication of Attachments to Public Comments requesting that

## I. Procedural History

On January 3, 2014, Verso Paper Corp. (''Verso'') entered into an agreement to acquire NewPage Holdings Inc. (''NewPage'') in a transaction valued at approximately $1.4 billion.[2] The United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint on December 31, 2014, seeking to enjoin Verso from acquiring NewPage. The United States alleged in its Complaint that the acquisition likely would substantially lessen competition in the sale of coated freesheet web paper, coated groundwood paper, and label papers to customers in North America in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18. At the time the Complaint was filed, Verso and NewPage were vigorous competitors in these coated paper markets.

Simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment and a Stipulation signed by Plaintiff and Defendants consenting to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16, and a Competitive Impact Statement (''CIS'') describing the transaction and the proposed Final Judgment. The United States published the proposed Final Judgment and CIS in the **Federal Register** on January 14, 2015, *see* 80 FR 1957, and caused summaries of the proposed Final Judgment and CIS, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, to be published in *The Washington Post* on January 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, and 22, 2015. The 60-day period for public comment ended on March 24, 2015. The United States received two comments, as described below and attached hereto as Exhibits 1 and 2.

## II. The Investigation and the Proposed Resolution

The proposed Final Judgment is the culmination of a nearly year-long investigation by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice (''Department'') of the proposed transaction. As part of its investigation, the Department issued 19 Civil Investigative Demands for documents and information to third parties, collected almost one million documents from the Defendants and third parties, interviewed more than 100 customers, brokers, and competitors in the relevant coated paper markets, deposed 12 Verso and NewPage employees, and consulted with industry experts. The Department carefully analyzed the information it obtained from these sources and thoroughly considered all of the issues presented.

The Department found that the proposed acquisition would likely have eliminated substantial head-to-head competition in the relevant markets between Verso and NewPage, providing the combined firm with an incentive to raise prices and reduce output. The Department also found in the coated freesheet web paper and coated groundwood paper markets that the transaction would have likely caused the remaining players to accommodate one another's price increases and output reductions. Overall, the Department concluded that if Verso and NewPage had completed the proposed transaction as structured, the loss of competition likely would have resulted in higher prices to consumers. For these reasons, the Department filed a civil antitrust lawsuit to block the merger and alleged that the proposed transaction violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18.

The proposed Final Judgment eliminates the anticompetitive effects identified in the Complaint by requiring Defendants to divest NewPage's Rumford, Maine and Biron, Wisconsin paper mills and related assets (collectively, ''the Divestiture Assets'') to Catalyst Paper Corporation (''Catalyst'') on terms acceptable to the United States. The divestitures eliminate the anticompetitive effects of the transaction by transferring the Rumford and Biron paper mills to a vigorous and independent competitor and preserving the pre-merger market structure in the coated freesheet web paper, coated groundwood paper, and label paper markets.

Since the United States submitted the proposed Final Judgment on December 31, 2014, Verso has acquired NewPage, and Catalyst has acquired and is operating the Divestiture Assets.

## III. Standard of Judicial Review

The APPA requires that proposed consent judgments in antitrust cases brought by the United States be subject to a 60-day public comment period, after which the court shall determine whether entry of the proposed Final Judgment ''is in the public interest.'' 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1). In making that determination, the court, in accordance with the statute as amended in 2004, is required to consider:

> (A) The competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are ambiguous, and any other competitive considerations bearing upon the adequacy of such judgment that the court deems necessary to a determination of whether the consent judgment is in the public interest; and
>
> (B) the impact of entry of such judgment upon competition in the relevant market or markets, upon the public generally and individuals alleging specific injury from the violations set forth in the complaint including consideration of the public benefit, if any, to be derived from a determination of the issues at trial.

15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1). In considering these statutory factors, the court's inquiry is necessarily a limited one as the government is entitled to ''broad discretion to settle with the defendant within the reaches of the public interest.'' *United States* v. *Microsoft Corp.,* 56 F.3d 1448, 1461 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see also United States* v. *SBC Commc'ns, Inc.,* 489 F. Supp. 2d 1, 10–11 (D.D.C. 2007) (assessing public interest standard under the Tunney Act); *United States* v. *InBev N.V./S.A.,* No. 08–cv–1965 (JR), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *3 (D.D.C. Aug. 11, 2009) (discussing nature of review of consent judgment under the Tunney Act; inquiry is limited to ''whether the government's determination that the proposed remedies will cure the antitrust violations alleged in the complaint was reasonable, and whether the mechanisms to enforce the final judgment are clear and manageable'').

Under the APPA, a court considers, among other things, the relationship between the remedy secured and the specific allegations set forth in the Complaint, whether the decree is sufficiently clear, whether the enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether the decree may positively harm third parties. *See Microsoft,* 56 F.3d at 1458–62. With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not ''engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public.'' *United States* v. *BNS, Inc.,* 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing *United States* v. *Bechtel Corp.,* 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981)). Instead, courts have held that:

> [t]he balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is

this Court authorize an alternative means for publishing the attachments to the public comments received in this action. (Docket No. 11.)

[2] After the United States initiated this action on December 31, 2014, Verso Paper Corp. changed its name to Verso Corporation.

the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement in ''*within the reaches of the public interest.''* More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.

*Bechtel,* 648 F.2d at 666 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

In determining whether a proposed settlement is in the public interest, ''the court 'must accord deference to the government's predictions about the efficacy of its remedies.''' *United States* v. *U.S. Airways Grp., Inc.,* 38 F. Supp. 3d 69, 76 (D.D.C. 2014) (quoting *SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. at 17). *See also Microsoft,* 56 F.3d at 1461 (noting that the government is entitled to deference as to its ''predictions as to the effect of the proposed remedies''); *United States* v. *Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.,* 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (noting that the court should grant due respect to the United States' ''prediction as to the effect of the proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its views of the nature of the case''); *United States* v. *Morgan Stanley,* 881 F. Supp. 2d 563, 567–68 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (explaining that the government is entitled to deference in choice of remedies).

Courts ''may not require that the remedies perfectly match the alleged violations.'' *SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17. Rather, the ultimate question is whether ''the remedies [obtained in the decree are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the 'reaches of the public interest.' '' *Microsoft,* 56 F.3d at 1461. Accordingly, the United States ''need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.'' *SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17. And, a ''proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is within the reaches of the public interest.'' *United States* v. *Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.,* 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982) (citations and internal quotations omitted); *see also United States* v. *Alcan Aluminum Ltd.,* 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985) (approving the consent decree even though the court would have imposed a greater remedy).

In its 2004 amendments to the Tunney Act,[3] Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of using consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction that ''[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.'' 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(2). The procedure for the public interest determination is left to the discretion of the court, with the recognition that the court's ''scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of the Tunney Act proceedings.'' *SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11; *see also United States* v. *Enova Corp.,* 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 17 (D.D.C. 2000) (''[T]he Tunney Act expressly allows the court to make its public interest determination on the basis of the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone.'').

## IV. Summary of Public Comments and the United States' Response

### *A. Summary of the Public Comments*

During the 60-day comment period, the United States received two comments regarding the proposed Final Judgment, although no comments were received from any printer, publisher, or other paper customer. The only comments were made by former employees of the now closed Bucksport, Maine paper mill. Verso produced coated groundwood and specialty paper products at the Bucksport mill until closing the mill in December 2014 and selling it to AIM Development (USA) LLC (''AIM''). AIM is the U.S. subsidiary of American Iron & Metal, Inc., a company that purchases discontinued manufacturing facilities and salvages the metal. Both comments focus upon competition in the coated groundwood paper market and the closure of the Bucksport mill.

Local 1821 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (''Local 1821''), consisting of 58 former employees of the Bucksport mill, submitted a comment arguing that: (1) The divestitures provided by the proposed Final Judgment are inadequate to redress the merger's anticompetitive effects and should have included the Bucksport mill; (2) Catalyst is an insufficiently independent and vigorous competitor and should not have been selected as the buyer of the Divestiture Assets; (3) recent price increases by Verso and Catalyst demonstrate the failure of the proposed Final Judgment to remedy the transaction's anticompetitive effects; and (4) the United States should have investigated alleged anticompetitive conduct that Verso's parent company, Apollo Capital Management (''Apollo''), has engaged in since at least 2011, including efforts to buy NewPage, acquiring NewPage's debt to influence its business operations, and causing Verso and NewPage to shut down mills in order to reduce output and raise prices. Local 1821 further argues that the Department should open an investigation into whether the sale of the Bucksport mill to AIM violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

Herbert R. Gilley also submitted a comment. Mr. Gilley, who is not a member of Local 1821, worked at the Bucksport mill for more than 38 years before losing his job when the mill closed. In his comment, Mr. Gilley similarly contests the closure and sale of the Bucksport mill and argues that the closure was anticompetive and will result in reduced output and higher prices.

### *B. The United States' Response to the Public Comments*

1. The Divestiture Assets Are Sufficient To Remedy the Harm Alleged in the Complaint

Local 1821 and Mr. Gilley argue that the required divestitures are not sufficient to prevent the merger's anticompetitive effects and assert that additional paper mills, including Verso's Bucksport mill, should have been included in the divestiture package. But the required divestitures essentially preserve the preexisting competitive structure of the affected coated paper markets by providing Catalyst with approximately the same capacity as Verso had prior to the merger. The divested Rumford and Biron mills produced approximately 940,000 tons per year of coated publication papers, label paper, and other papers, which is approximately the same amount of production capacity that Verso had after closing the Bucksport mill but before acquiring NewPage. In the coated groundwood market in which the Bucksport mill competed, the output of the divested mills actually exceeds the output of the assets Verso held after it closed the Bucksport mill and before it completed the merger. In fact, the Biron mill alone produces more coated groundwood than Verso's remaining coated groundwood production assets. Furthermore, both the Rumford and Biron mills have a strong track record of competitively producing a range of coated publication papers and label paper, and Catalyst's ownership of the mills will give it a

[3] The 2004 amendments substituted ''shall'' for ''may'' in directing relevant factors for courts to consider and amended the list of factors to focus on competitive considerations and to address potentially ambiguous judgment terms. *Compare* 15 U.S.C. § 16(e) (2004), *with* 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1) (2006); *see also SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11 (concluding that the 2004 amendments ''effected minimal changes'' to Tunney Act review).

market presence comparable to Verso's pre-merger market presence in the relevant markets. *See also* Competitive Impact Statement at 11. For these reasons, the Department concluded that Verso's divestiture of the Rumford and Biron mills sufficiently redressed the merger's competitive harm.

Local 1821 and Mr. Gilley assert that the Department should have required Verso to divest the Bucksport mill. But, as discussed above, the Department concluded that the required divestitures would sufficiently preserve competition, making the divestiture of the Bucksport mill unnecessary. *See US Airways,* 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75–76 (explaining that the government is entitled to deference in choice of remedies); *United States* v. *Abitibi Consol. Inc.,* 584 F. Supp. 2d 162, 166 (D.D.C. 2008) (rejecting claim that paper mill divestiture was too small because the government had factual basis for concluding that a single mill divestiture was adequate).

The Bucksport mill, moreover, was less viable than the mills included in the Divestiture Assets. The Department carefully reviewed evidence related to the Verso mills, including Verso's plans relating to the Bucksport mill that pre-dated the merger and deposition testimony of senior Verso executives about the future of the Bucksport mill. Based on this evidence, the Department concluded that Verso closed the Bucksport mill because the mill was not profitable and that the merger did not cause the mill's closure.[4]

Notably, Local 1821 made many of the same antitrust arguments about the Bucksport mill in a recent—and unsuccessful—lawsuit it brought to enjoin Verso's sale of the Bucksport mill to AIM. On December 15, 2014, Local 1821 filed a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Maine alleging that the pending sale violated federal and state antitrust laws. *See Int'l Ass'n of Machinists and Aerospace Workers* v. *Verso Paper Corp.,* No. 1:14–cv–00530 (JAW), _____ F. Supp. 3d _____, 2015 WL 248819, at *8–*34 (D. Me. Jan. 20, 2015) (attached as Exhibit 3). After extensive briefing and oral argument, the Court rejected Local 1821's motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order, concluding in a 73-page opinion that Local 1821 had not ''met its burden to prove a strong likelihood of success on the merits of their claims under federal antitrust law.'' *Verso Paper,* 2015 WL 248819, at *73.

2. Catalyst Is an Appropriate Buyer for the Divested Assets

Local 1821 asserts that Catalyst is not an appropriate buyer for the Divestiture Assets because it is insufficiently vigorous and independent to compete with Verso. However, Catalyst operated three paper mills in British Columbia, Canada, before it acquired the Divestiture Assets and the Department thoroughly examined Catalyst before approving it as the purchaser of the Divestiture Assets. The Department carefully reviewed the proposed transaction, Catalyst's plans to compete in the relevant markets, and the transitional agreements between Verso and Catalyst.[5] Based upon this review, the Department concluded that Catalyst would be a vigorous and independent competitor.

3. Verso's and Catalyst's Recent Announcements of Price Increases Do Not Show That the Department's Proposed Remedy Is Inadequate

Local 1821 notes that Verso and Catalyst each announced price increases in January 2015 and argues that these announced price increases demonstrate that the divestiture is inadequate. But Local 1821 has not offered any evidence that the price increases arise from or are connected to the merger. To the contrary, the price increases likely are related to a number of factors, including input costs, demand fluctuations, and recent and significant capacity reductions in the coated groundwood market that are unrelated to the merger. In addition to Verso's Bucksport mill closure, coated groundwood paper producer Futuremark also closed its Alsip, Illinois coated groundwood mill in August 2014. *See* Press Release, FutureMark Alsip, *FutureMark Alsip to Idle Mill* (Aug. 21, 2014), *available at http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20140821005972/en/#.VUjFcv-Jiig* (''FutureMark Alsip [] today announced that, due to increasingly challenging market conditions in the North American coated paper market, it will indefinitely idle its mill in early September.'').

4. Local 1821's Allegations That Other Conduct by Apollo and Verso Violated the Antitrust Laws Are Outside the Scope of the Tunney Act

Lastly, Local 1821 alleges that Apollo, Verso's parent company, has engaged in anticompetitive conduct since at least 2011 and argues that the Department should have investigated these earlier activities. Local 1821 also asserts that the Department should investigate whether Verso's 2015 sale of the Bucksport mill to AIM violates Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

Although the Department takes all allegations of anticompetitive conduct seriously, Local 1821's claim that the United States should bring or have brought an enforcement action relating to conduct not challenged in the Complaint is outside the scope of this Tunney Act proceeding. It is well-settled that the Department's decision to bring an action alleging harm is left to the Department's prosecutorial discretion and is not part of the court's Tunney Act review. *See Microsoft,* 56 F.3d at 1459 (explaining that in an APPA proceeding, the ''district court is not empowered to review the actions or behavior of the Department of Justice; the court is only authorized to review the decree itself''). Indeed, this Court has squarely held that ''a district court is not permitted to 'reach beyond the complaint to evaluate claims that the government did *not* make and to inquire as to why they were not made.' '' *SBC Commc'ns,* 489 F. Supp. 2d at 14 (quoting *Microsoft,* 56 F.3d at 1459) (emphasis in original); s*ee also US Airways,* 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76. Consequently, Local 1821's allegations of anticompetitive conduct not challenged in the Complaint do not provide a basis for rejecting the proposed Final Judgment.

**V. Conclusion**

After reviewing the public comments, the United States continues to believe that the proposed Final Judgment, as drafted, provides an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint, and is therefore in the public interest. The United States will move this Court to enter the proposed Final Judgment after the comments and this response are published in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: May 18, 2015

Respectfully submitted, /s/Karl D. Knutsen., Karl D. Knutsen, Richard Martin, Garrett M. Liskey (D.C. Bar No.

[4] Consequently, the closure of the Bucksport mill is not an anticompetitive effect of Verso's acquisition of NewPage. *See also* Competitive Impact Statement at 3 n.1.

[5] While Catalyst recently emerged from bankruptcy, bankruptcy reorganization is a fairly common occurrence in the paper industry and not a sign that Catalyst will not be an effective competitor. *See, e.g.,* Judy Newman, *NewPage Corp. Emerges from Chapter 11 Bankruptcy,* Wis. State J., Dec. 12, 2012, *available at http://host.madison.com/business/newpage-corp-emerges-from-chapter-bankruptcy/article_d31c8f88-4bc8-11e2-9164-001a4bcf887a.html* (discussing NewPage's emergence from bankruptcy); Press Release, AbitibiBowater, *AbitibiBowater Emerges from Creditor Protection* (Dec. 9, 2010), *available at http://www.newswire.ca/en/story/586251/abitibibowater-emerges-from-creditor-protection.*

1000937), Attorneys for the United States, Litigation I Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 4100, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202) 514–0976, Facsimile: (202) 305–1190, Email: *karl.knutsen@usdoj.gov.*

BILLING CODE P

**From:** [REDACTED]
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 06, 2015 10:49 AM
**To:** Knutsen, Karl
**Subject:** Verso paper merger case #1:14-cv-2216

Hi Karl
Just would like to express my opinion on the Verso,Newpage merger seeing how I have nothing but time on my hands looking for a new job after working 38+ years at the Bucksport Maine mill. I am quite sure I wont get a response because I have also filed a complaint with the consumer complaint division and both times they responded with a automated response stating someone would contact me,not yet?
So my concern is that you approved the merger and I still believe their is a anti trust violation concerning them scrapping the Bucksport mill? This will take paper off the market and it will drive the price up and it eliminates competition doesn't it and also Lyle Fellows from Verso stated they would not sell the mill to a competitor but was open for other options(scrapping the mill)?
As I stated I have operate a paper machine for 38 years and I still believe that we can make a go at Bucksport if the mill is sold to another company that wants to make paper not take advantages of government and town,state tax breaks like Verso has. Since Verso has bought us we have not made a profit in 8 plus years but they we remained taking concessions thru bargaining and yet we still produced the best sheet of paper and still broke production records along with safety records and they couldn't make a profit?
You might want to look at how they do their book keeping as far as shifting costs from one mill to the other.
So on that note how can a mill get 30 to 40 million in tax credits and tax breaks to put into the power plant and turn around and shut down 3 paper machines and sell the mill to a scrap company(AIM) for 58 million when the power plant is worth 2 to 3 times more than that and the machines are still capable in making paper.
All we want at Bucksport is to at least get a chance like the other mills in the state to try and make it go and if the Bucksport Mill cant make money then why is VERSO so afraid of selling it ? There is at least 2 companies interested in buying the mill to make paper and the state of Maine is aware of that but cannot force Verso to sell to them because Verso is more concerned in taking the paper off the market.
I really believe that your department can force verso to sell and you can do so by getting involved with the pending lawsuit that International Machinist Union has coming up with Judge Woodcock this month on Jan 13th.this lawsuit is the only thing that can save the jobs at Bucksport and if we don't stop corporate Greed and big businesses controlling our government pretty soon we wont have any working people left to pay taxes then how will you people keep your jobs?
Enough said and would look forward to hear from you or anyone else about this matter.
Thank You Herbert R Gilley

[PERSONAL INFORMATION REDACTED]

**Kim Ervin Tucker**
Attorney at Law
Katahdin Counsel

Admitted to Practice:
State of Maine
State of Florida
District of Columbia

United States Supreme Court
United States District Court District of Maine
United States District Court Northern District of Florida
United States District Court Middle District of Florida

March 12, 2015

Peter J. Mucchetti, Esquire
Chief, Litigation I Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice,
450 Fifth Street, NW
Suite 4100
Washington, DC 20530

RE: Proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. Verso Paper Corp. and NewPage Holdings*; Case No. 1:14-cv-2216 (D.D.C.)

Dear Mr. Mucchetti:

I am submitting this letter, pursuant to the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)-(h), to protest the clear inadequacy of the Antitrust Division's proposed Consent Decree – which fails to eliminate the negative competitive consequences of permitting a merger between Verso Paper Corp. and New Page Holdings ("Verso-NewPage Merger"). Not only were the two proposed divestitures required by the Consent Decree (in Biron, WI and Rumford, ME) insufficient in scale, but they were made to a party (Catalyst) which has already become Verso's dancing partner on pricing increases in the oligopolistic market that Verso now dominates as a result of the Verso-NewPage Merger. Moreover, the Division allowed Verso to amplify the likely anticompetitive effects of the Verso-NewPage merger by shutting down and selling its operational mill in Bucksport, Maine ("the Bucksport Mill") *for scrap* – which is intended to, and likely will result in the permanent loss of this facility as a productive asset in the economy of Maine and the North American coated paper market.[1] The loss of the Bucksport Mill and its capacity is a consequence that the Division had ample basis, opportunity and time to prevent – but inexplicably chose instead to allow to occur.

**The Post-Merger Price Increases in January 2015**

To see how badly the Division's proposed Consent Decree has failed to reduce the predictable and long-predicted, anticompetitive and negative market impacts of the Verso-NewPage merger, the reviewing Court will need look no further than the $40/ton price increase announced by Verso, on

[1] This letter is submitted on behalf of 58 former employees of the Bucksport Mill who have lost their jobs as result of Verso's capacity-reduction actions made possible by the Verso-New Page Merger. A list of the impacted employees is attached to this letter as Exhibit A. I am also acting as counsel for Local 1821 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers ("Local 1821"), which has represented these hourly wage employees for collective bargaining purposes.

48 Harbour Pointe Drive ♦ Lincolnville, Maine ♦ 04849 ♦ Phone: 207-706-7913 ♦ Cell: 202-841-5439
k.ervintucker@gmail.com

Friday January 30, 2015.[2] This price increase was followed in quick succession with a similar price increase by Catalyst – the very entity to which the divested Biron and Rumford Mills were sold in order to "eliminate the anticompetitive effects of the [NewPage] acquisition in the North American market for coated publication papers by establishing a new, independent, and economically-viable competitor" (Competitive Impact Statement p. 9).[3] Ironically, the Verso price increase occurred on the very day that the Division advised representatives of employees from the Bucksport Mill that the Division would not, *under any circumstances*, open an inquiry into the sale and closure of the Bucksport Mill by Verso to a scrap dealer (rather than a competitor willing to pay more to continue to operate the Mill).

As the Division's Complaint asserts, the Verso-NewPage Merger violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act. We believe that it also involves likely violations of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. So far, requiring the divestiture of only the Biron and Rumford Mills to Catalyst has done less than nothing to reduce or even slow-down the adverse impact on consumers, direct and indirect, of the anticompetitive consequences of allowing this merger to proceed. A bigger divestiture package, to a more independent and vigorous competitor than Catalyst (which recently emerged from bankruptcy), might have provided greater consumer protections, but this option was expressly rejected by the Division when proposed by me and my colleagues on behalf of the employees of the Bucksport Mill.

The fact that Verso Corporation acted with such haste to increase prices after the merger deal with NewPage was approved by the Division – not even waiting until the 60-day Tunney Act comment period was past – demonstrates the impunity with which Verso will act now that it has been granted near monopoly status in the North American coated printing paper market. Further, Catalyst's immediate adoption of the price increase that Verso announced last month demonstrates that the divestiture of the Biron and Rumford Mills to Catalyst was, and is, a grossly inadequate remedy to prevent or delay the inevitable anticompetitive consequences of approving the Verso-NewPage Merger – utterly bereft of any chance of protecting direct and indirect consumers of coated paper products, now or in the future.

**The Antitrust Division's Too Narrow Focus**

The Division's inquiry into the Verso-NewPage Merger was fatally flawed from the outset, because of Litigation I Section's apparent limitation of its investigation to consideration of only events *after* the initial public announcement of this proposed merger by Verso and NewPage *in January of 2014*. This myopic 2014-centric focus on events and actions failed to put this merger in a realistic (and accurate) competitive context and ignored ample evidence, available from publicly available sources, regarding the lengths to which Apollo Global Management ("Apollo"), Verso's parent, had gone to use its acquisition of NewPage's second lien debt in 2011 as leverage

[2] "Price hike prospects brighten on coated as Verso announces immediate $20-40 CFS, CM, SC increases", PPI Pulp & Paper Week, January 30, 2015. This price increase information is available at: http://www.risiinfo.com/pulp-paper/ppippw/Price-hike-prospects-brighten-on-coated-as-Verso-announces-immediate-20-40-CFS-CM-SC-increases.html

[3] "Catalyst announces Apr. 1 price increase of $40/ton for Its coated freesheet, CM, and high-brite grades in the US", PPI Pulp & Paper Week, February 6, 2015, *available at* https://www.risiinfo.com/pulp-paper/ppippw/Catalyst-announces-Apr-1-price-increase-of-40ton-for-Its-coated-freesheet-CM-and-high-brite-grades-in-the-US.html

to force a Verso-NewPage merger and to have both Verso and NewPage reduce capacity prior to the merger Apollo has sought to achieve since 2011.

Even the most cursory review of publicly available sources reveals that the January 2014 announcement of a Verso-NewPage merger was merely the most recent step in Apollo's quest to reduce competition by shutting down capacity and achieving this merger. In fact, a Verso-NewPage merger has been a goal actively pursued by Apollo, Verso's parent, since *at least* 2011 -- when Apollo acquired a significant amount of NewPage's second lien debt and began exerting influence to force a Verso-NewPage merger. Publicly available sources reveal: (i) discussions of a merger between Verso and NewPage in 2011 and 2012; (ii) public claims by Verso of abandonment of interest in a merger with NewPage by mid-year in 2011, whileApollo was simultaneously attempting to use its status as a second line debt holder to force a Verso-NewPage merger through the NewPage bankruptcy proceedings in the Delaware Bankruptcy Court (efforts that continued through at least August 2012);[4] and (iii) evidence that Verso and NewPage have engaged in a campaign to restrain competition and reduce industry capacity, by scrapping the equipment and physical plants of otherwise operational and productive paper mills with the help of AIM Development (USA) LLC.

Attached to this letter, as Exhibit B, is the Chronology that representatives of the Bucksport Mill employees previously provided to the Division, but which the Division chose to ignore. This Chronology lays out some of the pattern of conduct, engaged in by Apollo in conjunction with Verso and NewPage, to reduce capacity in anticipation of a Verso-NewPage merger, and committed in furtherance of an anticompetitive scheme to increase Verso's market power after such a merger. This pattern includes: (i) shutting down and scrapping paper making machinery and laying off hundreds of workers at Verso's Sarterll and Bucksport Mills in 2011; (ii) the destruction of two viable and productive paper mills (NewPage's Kimberly, WI mill, and Verso's Sartell, MN mill) in 2011 through 2013; and (iii) the pending destruction of the Bucksport Mill, as ways of reducing capacity in order to facilitate post-merger pricing increases. All of these three facilities (Kimberly, Sartell and Bucksport) have been sold to the scrap metal company AIM Development (USA) LLC -- which has destroyed the paper making capacity of the first two mills and has indicated an intent to do the same with the Bucksport Mill, while spinning off the electrical assets of these facilities (after the electric plants had been upgraded with millions of dollars in public funds in the case of Sartell and Bucksport).[5]

---

[4] Law360, "*Verso Paper publicly ended talks to acquire NewPage*," by Jamie Santo (Spetember 5, 2012) http://www.law360.com/articles/375444/verso-paper-ends-talks-to-acquire-newpage http://www.law360.com/articles/375444/attachments/0

[5] Despite the availability of buyers willing to purchase the Bucksport Mill for more than AIM paid, on March 11, 2015, AIM's agents announced that the Mill's equipment will be auctioned off on March 24, 2015 – the same pattern used prior to the razing of the Sartell and Kimberly Mills, that have still left those communities in ruin. Bangor Daily News, "*Former Verso Equipment to go up for Auction,*" by Bill Trotter (March 11, 2015) http://bangordailynews.com/2015/03/11/news/hancock/former-verso-equipment-to-go-up-for-auction/?utm_source=BDN+News+Updates&utm_campaign=e7ceb1d32c-RSS_AFTERNOONUPDATE_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_715eed3192-e7ceb1d32c-82421111

Apollo's substantial acquisition of the NewPage debt, for the purpose of exercising some control over the largest printing paper competitor of Apollo's subsidiary Verso, appears to be an asset acquisition which violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 18. See *Mr. Frank, Inc. v. Waste Mgmt.*, 591 F.Supp. 859, 864-67 (N.D. Ill. 1984) (Section 7 is applicable where acquisition of debt may create opportunities to control a competitor's decision making); and *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc. v. Transamerica Corp.*, 303 F. Supp. 1344, 1351 (S.D.N.Y. 1969) ("[i]t would be naive, of course, to believe that a powerful creditor, which has placed a debtor in a position of dependency upon it, would not use its position as leverage to put pressure upon the debtor to conduct its business, including its control over others, in a way that would accord with the creditor's interests"). Ironically, both the Antitrust Division and Apollo have had reported first hand experience with this very subject. See *United States v. The Gillette Company, et al.*, Civil No. 90-0053-TFH (D.D.C.), 55 FR 12567 (April 4, 1990) (Proposed Final Judgment preventing Gillette from acquiring additional debt in competitor, and requiring them to remain passive debt holder); and *Vantico Holdings S.A. v. Apollo Mgmt.*, 247 F. Supp. 2d 437, 455 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (analyzing whether acquisition of a competitor's debt by Apollo was anti-competitive, but ultimately finding that the facts presented by the plaintiff were not sufficient to support imposition of a preliminary injunction).

In Apollo's present case involving NewPage debt, subsequent history has proven that this possibility of control was not just speculative; rather, in the subsequent NewPage bankruptcy proceeding, Apollo tried unsuccessfully to use its position as debtor to force a $1.5 billion merger with Verso. See f.n. 4 above. Given this reality, we respectfully suggest that the question of whether Apollo used this debt-based-influence to encourage NewPage to shut down its Kimberly, WI mill in 2013 is entirely worthy of a Government Sherman Act investigation as well.

Indeed, it ought to be a source of concern to the broader public, and not just the Bucksport Mill employees, that the Division staff ignored their pleas for an investigation into the implementation and anticompetitive effects of the reductions of capacity since January 2011 by Verso and NewPage, and Apollo's involvement in those actions, given Apollo's history and tactics laid out in detail in *Vantico Holdings S.A. v. Apollo Management, LP, supra.* The substantial body of information relating to Apollo and these simultaneous capacity reducing activities in 2011-2013 was readily available through simple Googling and thus an initial investigation could have been carried out without requiring a significant expenditure of the Division's resources. The known fact and law all favored the Division undertaking the requested inquiry and requiring divestiture (rather than destruction) of the Bucksport Mill.

The Bucksport Mill, located in Bucksport, Maine, which was owned by Verso Paper Corp. until January 29, 2015, had been a fully operational paper mill for more than eighty (80) years, and at the time of its closure in December, 2014, produced coated and specialty paper. In order to provide a more complete record, I attach as Exhibit C a statement detailing the competitive significance of the Bucksport Mill and the summary of the Division's failure to take steps to prevent Verso's plan to eliminate its capacity from the market in conjunction with the Verso-NewPage Merger. This sad history is no doubt familiar to the Division, but will not necessarily be familiar to the reviewing Court.

The most troubling aspect of the Division's failure to act to prevent the destruction of the Bucksport Mill and its capacity is that it would have cost Verso no legitimate gain to avoid the human and economic suffering that closure has imposed on the Bucksport Mill employees and this

entire region of the State of Maine. First, had the Division required Verso to sell this valuable asset (that by the Division's own estimate in the Competitive Impact Statement would cost $2 billion+ to rebuild from scratch) to a competitor willing and able to continue to operate it in the coated paper market, Verso would have directly made more money than the scrapper AIM paid Verso. Further, had such a sale been required, many or all of the 570 individual who worked at this Mill for decades (some over 4 decades) would still be working today. Instead, 524 people have lost their jobs, the town of Bucksport has lost 44% of its tax base, the State of Maine has lost a productive source of revenue that has employed thousands of people for more than 80-years, and the North American coated paper market has *permanently* lost a facility capable of producing hundreds of thousands of tons of coated and specialty paper annually. And, in addition, Verso and Catalyst have raised prices – to the detriment of all direct and indirect consumers of North American coated paper products.

These anticompetitive consequences were not speculative or unpredictable – in fact, within days of the announcement of the closure of the Bucksport Mill, industry analysts had raised Verso's credit rating *expressly because of* the anticipated anticompetitive benefits of the closure of the Bucksport Mill and the permanent loss of its capacity from the North American coated paper market.[6]

I also attach two letters to Assistant Attorney General William Baer from Donald Baker of Baker & Miller, arguing as a matter antitrust policy and established precedents, that parties to a merger among industry leaders should never be permitted to close down and eliminate capacity without having made a good faith offer of the closed capacity for sale to any qualified buyer willing to continue to operate in the market. Mr. Baker has served as our antitrust counsel during the Division's investigation of this matter and, as you know, is former head of the Antitrust Division. In the first of these letters dated December 5, 2014 (Exhibit D), Mr. Baker traced the history to show how the Bucksport Mill closure was premised on the Division allowing the Verso-NewPage merger to proceed. In the second letter dated January 27, 2015 (Exhibit E), Mr. Baker stressed that the Division's reliance on Verso's statement of its prior intentions was an improper and insufficient reason for the Division to ignore the competitive impact of the Bucksport Mill closure (see pp. 4-6); and he urged the Division to investigate the Verso-AIM transaction on the ground that its purpose and effect was to reduce competition in coated printing papers by destroying the significant productive capacity represented by the Bucksport Mill (see pp. 11-12).

---

[6] In June 2014, Moody's had downgraded Verso's bond rating from B3 to Caa3, a change that reflected Moody's belief that Verso's debt obligations were "judged to be of poor standing and are subject to very high credit risk."[6] The investors' service also speculated that the future of the acquisition was unclear. In taking this action, Moody's wrote in its report that: "The rating action reflects Moody's view that the announced agreement to acquire NewPage is becoming less likely to occur as the Department of Justice continues its review." *See*: http://www.risiinfo.com/content-gateway/pulpandpaper/news/Market-profilesCoated-papers-A-sector-in-flux-in-the-face-of-secular-decline.html?industryId=21.

However, within two days of Verso's announcement of the closure of the Mill in Buckport, Moody's Rating Service upgraded Verso's rating, on October 3, 2014, and identified the closure of the Bucksport Mill and layoffs of more than 500 people by year's end as "a credit positive event."
Portland Press Herald, "*Verso's finances benefit from Bucksport mill closure, Moody's analyst says*," by Whit Richardson (October 8, 2014).
http://www.pressherald.com/2014/10/08/versos-finances-helped-by-bucksport-mill-closure-moodys-analyst-says/

Tunney Act Protest Letter Re: Verso-NewPage Merger
March 11, 2015
Page 6

Unfortunately, Mr. Baker never received any written response to these letters (or the earlier one that he had written Mr. Baer on November 12, 2014). And, as noted above, the only response Mr. Baker received was in the January 30, 2015 phone call that you and other Division staff members had with him and our team to advise us that no inquiry would be made of the Verso-AIM transaction – fittingly but ironically stated on the very same day that the merged Verso entity announced the $40/ton increase in its pricing for coated printing paper! In that call, you responded to our request for clarification by telling us explicitly that the Division would "never undertake any Sherman Act investigation" into the propriety of the Verso-AIM sale and scrapping of the Bucksport Mill.

The Tunney Act submissions made to the District Court concerning communications between Verso and the Division tend to confirm that the Division failed to conduct any serious inquiry into the issues that Mr. Baker raised in his letters and other communications -- including: (i) the 2011-2013 merger-related efforts and capacity reduction activities involving Apollo, Verso, NewPage, and AIM; (ii) the likely adverse, anticompetitive market consequences of eliminating the Bucksport Mill's capacity from the North American coated paper market; (iii) Verso's express statements to Bucksport employees that it "would never sell the Bucksport Mill to a competitor"; and (iv) the likely availability of competitors willing to continue to operate the Bucksport Mill as a productive paper mill who were, and are, willing to pay more for the Bucksport Mill than the scrapper AIM ultimately paid for this facility as an incipient scrap heap.

**Requested Action**

Pursuant to the Tunney Act, I respectfully request, on behalf of 58 former Bucksport Mill employees and IAMAW Local 1821 that: (i) the Division withdraw its consent to the Consent Decree, and (ii) if the Division fails to do so, that the Court reject the Consent Decree. The Court should then instruct the Division that it should either: (i) require the parties to divest at least two more paper mills, preferably to some more independent operator than Catalyst; or (ii) take steps to cause (or require Verso to cause) AIM to sell the Bucksport Mill to a qualified operator willing to reopen it as a paper mill and cease and desist from all actions intended to scrap the Mill's paper-making capacity. Such a sale could be to a competitor of Verso's willing to pay *a reasonable price* (i.e., scrap value + $1) and continue to operate this facility as a paper mill engaged in the production of paper in the North American market.

We also respectfully request that the Division more fully explain than it did in the Competitive Impact Statement whatever legal reasoning and economic analysis there was behind its decision to only require, as a condition for approving the merger, the divestment of paper mills located in Rumford, Maine, and Biron, Wisconsin, while permitting destruction *rather than divestiture* of the Bucksport Mill. Such an explanation, if credible, might do much to improve the public image of the Division among those of us who live and work in the Penobscot Bay area of Maine.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly J. Tucker
D.C. Bar No. 478517
Maine Bar No. 6969

[FR Doc. 2015–13025 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE C

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Office of the Secretary

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Disclosures by Insurers to General Account Policyholders

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, ''Disclosures by Insurers to General Account Policyholders,'' to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for continued use, without change, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* Public comments on the ICR are invited.

**DATES:** The OMB will consider all written comments that agency receives on or before June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained free of charge from the RegInfo.gov Web site at *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewICR?ref_nbr=201505-1210-003* (this link will only become active on the day following publication of this notice) or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129, TTY 202–693–8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at *DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.*

Submit comments about this request by mail or courier to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL–EBSA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503; by Fax: 202–395–5806 (this is not a toll-free number); or by email: *OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov.* Commenters are encouraged, but not required, to send a courtesy copy of any comments by mail or courier to the U.S. Department of Labor-OASAM, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attn: Departmental Information Compliance Management Program, Room N1301, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; or by email: *DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129, TTY 202–693–8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at *DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov.*

**Authority:** 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This ICR seeks to extend PRA authority for the Disclosures by Insurers to General Account Policyholders information collection. Regulations 29 CFR 2550.401(c)-1 imposes specific requirements on insurers that are parties to transition policies, in order to ensure fiduciaries acting on behalf of plans have adequate information and understanding of how the transition policies work. Certain of these requirements constitute information collections subject to the PRA. Specifically, to the extent a transition policy first issued prior to January 1, 1999, to or for the benefit of an employee benefit plan is not a guaranteed benefit policy, the insurer must annually disclose to the plan fiduciary: (1) The methods by which income and expenses of the insurer's general account are allocated to the policy, the actual annual return to the plan, and other pertinent information; (2) the extent to which alternative arrangements supported by the assets of the insurer's separate accounts are available; (3) any rights under the policy to transfer funds to a separate account and the terms governing such right; and (4) the extent to which support by assets of the insurer's separate accounts might pose differing risks to the plan. Employee Retirement Income Security Act section 404(c) authorizes this information collection. *See* 29 U.S.C. 1104(c).

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid Control Number. *See* 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. The DOL obtains OMB approval for this information collection under Control Number 1210–0114.

OMB authorization for an ICR cannot be for more than three (3) years without renewal, and the current approval for this collection is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2015. The DOL seeks to extend PRA authorization for this information collection for three (3) more years, without any change to existing requirements. The DOL notes that existing information collection requirements submitted to the OMB receive a month-to-month extension while they undergo review. For additional substantive information about this ICR, see the related notice published in the **Federal Register** on October 15, 2014 (79 FR 61903).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the address shown in the **ADDRESSES** section within thirty (30) days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In order to help ensure appropriate consideration, comments should mention OMB Control Number 1210–0114. The OMB is particularly interested in comments that:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Agency:* DOL–EBSA.

*Title of Collection:* Disclosures by Insurers to General Account Policyholders.

*OMB Control Number:* 1210–0114.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector—Businesses or other for profits.

*Total Estimated Number of Respondents:* 397.

*Total Estimated Number of Responses:* 32,000.

*Total Estimated Annual Time Burden:* 135,000 hours.

*Total Estimated Annual Other Costs Burden:* $12,000.

Dated: May 22, 2015.

**Michel Smyth,**

*Departmental Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12955 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

### Information Security Oversight Office

**[NARA–2015–044]**

### National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice of advisory committee meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app 2) and implementing regulation 41 CFR 101–6, NARA announces a meeting of the National Industrial Security Program Policy Advisory Committee (NISPPAC) .

**DATES:** The meeting will be on July 15, 2015, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. EDT.

**ADDRESSES:** National Archives and Records Administration; 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.; Archivist's Reception Room, Room 105; Washington, DC 20408.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Tringali, Program Analyst, by mail at ISOO, National Archives Building; 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.; Washington, DC 20408, by

telephone at (202) 357–5335, or by email at *robertl.tringali@nara.gov.* Contact ISOO at *ISOO@nara.gov* and the NISPPAC at *NISPPAC@nara.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The purpose of this meeting is to discuss National Industrial Security Program policy matters. The meeting is open to the public. However, due to space limitations and access procedures, you must submit the name and telephone number of individuals planning to attend to the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) no later than Friday, July 10, 2015. ISOO will provide additional instructions for accessing the meeting.

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**Patrice Little Murray,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12988 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515–01–P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Proposal Review; Notice of Meetings

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub., L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to hold proposal review meetings throughout the year. The purpose of these meetings is to provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NSF for financial support. The agenda for each of these meetings is to review and evaluate proposals as part of the selection process for awards. The review and evaluation may also include assessment of the progress of awarded proposals. The majority of these meetings will take place at NSF, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Virginia 22230.

These meetings will be closed to the public. The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act. NSF will continue to review the agenda and merits of each meeting for overall compliance of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

These closed proposal review meetings will not be announced on an individual basis in the **Federal Register**. NSF intends to publish a notice similar to this on a quarterly basis. For an advance listing of the closed proposal review meetings that include the names of the proposal review panel and the time, date, place, and any information on changes, corrections, or cancellations, please visit the NSF Web site: *http://www.nsf.gov/events/.* This information may also be requested by telephoning, 703/292–8687.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Suzanne Plimpton,**

*Acting, Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13040 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; NSF's Science, Engineering, and Education for Sustainability (SEES) Portfolio of Programs Survey; Proposed Information Collection Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request establishment and clearance of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting that OMB approve clearance of this collection for no longer than three years.

A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

**DATES:** Submit comments before July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1265, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send email to *splimpto@nsf.gov.* Copies of the submission may be obtained by calling (703) 292–7556.

*Instructions:* Please submit one copy of your comments by only one method. All submissions received must include the agency name and collection name identified above for this information collection. Commenters are strongly encouraged to transmit their comments electronically via email. Comments, including any personal information provided become a matter of public record. They will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1265, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send email to *splimpto@nsf.gov.* Copies of the submission may be obtained by calling (703) 292–7556. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title of Collection:* Survey of Grantees of SEES and Comparable Non-SEES Programs.

*OMB Number:* 3145–NEW.

*Type of request:* Intent to seek approval for ICR.

### Abstract

In 2010, NSF established the SEES Portfolio as a multi-year effort to coordinate Agency research and education activities related to the environment, energy and sustainability. The overarching goals of the SEES portfolio are to (1) support interdisciplinary research and education that can facilitate the move towards global sustainability; (2) build linkages among existing projects and partners and add new participants in the sustainability research enterprise; and (3) develop a workforce trained in the interdisciplinary scholarship needed to understand and address the complex issues of sustainability.

NSF is supporting an evaluation of the SEES portfolio to determine the extent to which it has achieved its program- and portfolio-level goals. Specifically, the evaluation seeks to measure the output and outcomes of SEES in terms of the development of new knowledge and concepts that advance the overarching goal of a sustainable human future, new and productive connections made between researchers in a range of disciplines, and the development of a workforce capable of meeting sustainability challenges.

This comment request relates to a proposed *survey of NSF grant recipients.* The survey respondents are principal investigators (PIs) in NSF-funded SEES and comparable non-SEES projects. The survey will collect information on respondents' career pathways, NSF grant activities, and the development of interdisciplinary networks of scholars among researchers.

### I. Review Focus

NSF is interested in comments on the practical utility of the survey in view of the project goals and the study approach, the burden on respondents and potential ways to minimize it.

Comments submitted in response to this Notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the ICR; they will also become a matter of public record.

## II. Current Actions

*Affected Public:* Grant recipients of NSF SEES and comparable non-SEES Programs.

*Total Respondents:* 950.

*Frequency:* One-time collection.

*Total responses:* 760.

*Average Time per response:* 45 minutes.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 576.3 hours.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13041 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–P**

---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[FEMA–2012–0026, NRC–2015–0133]**

## Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Draft NUREG; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing for public comment draft NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2, ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants.'' This guidance document was originally issued in December 1980 by the NRC in conjunction with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Both agencies use the document to evaluate the adequacy of the emergency plans and preparedness of commercial nuclear power plant (NPP) licensees and applicants, as well as those of State, local, and Tribal governments within the emergency planning zones (EPZs) surrounding commercial NPPs. This revision reflects changes to the NRC's and FEMA's regulations, guidance, and policies, as well as advances in technology and methods for responding to radiological incidents that have occurred since the document was originally issued. It also incorporates the four supplemental documents and addenda to NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1, that have been issued in the intervening years, and is intended to modernize the guidance while lessening administrative burden on users.

**DATES:** Submit comments by August 27, 2015. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** In order to avoid the receipt and review of duplicate submissions, please submit your comments and any supporting material by only one of the following means:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026. For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.
- *Mail comments to:* Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472–3100.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see ''Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments'' in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Don Tailleart, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–287–9257; email: *Don.Tailleart@nrc.gov* or William Eberst, Technological Hazards Division, National Preparedness Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Washington, DC 20472–3100; telephone: 202–341–4917; email: *William.Eberst@fema.dhs.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

### *A. Obtaining Information*

Please refer to Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026.
- *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select ''*ADAMS Public Documents''* and then select ''*Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.''* For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.* The draft guidance document is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14246A519.
- *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Submitted comments may also be inspected at FEMA, Office of Chief Counsel, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472–3100.

### *B. Submitting Comments*

Please include Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026 in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that FEMA is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

All submissions received must include the agency name (FEMA) and docket ID. Regardless of the method used for submitting comments or material, FEMA will post all submissions, without change, to *www.regulations.gov* and will include any personal information that you provide. Therefore, submitting this information makes it public. You may wish to read the Privacy Act notice, which can be viewed by clicking on the ''Privacy Notice'' link on the homepage of *www.regulations.gov.*

## II. Discussion

In December 1980, the NRC issued NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1, ''Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants,'' in conjunction with FEMA (45 FR 85862; December 30, 1980).

Revision 1 of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1 provides guidance on meeting the 16 planning standards for NPP emergency response plans found in the NRC's regulations in paragraph 50.47(b) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) and FEMA's regulations set forth in 44 CFR 350.5(a). Both agencies use the guidance in determining compliance with these planning standards and evaluating the overall adequacy of the emergency plans and preparedness of commercial NPP licensees and applicants, as well as State, local, and Tribal governments within the EPZs surrounding commercial NPPs, for responding to a radiological incident at an NPP.

Since the publication of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1, in 1980, four supplemental documents and one set of addenda have been issued that update and modify specific planning and procedural elements. These documents are available online at the Federal rulemaking Web site, *www.regulations.gov,* under Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026. There have also been changes to the NRC's and FEMA's regulations, guidance, and policies, as well as advances in technology and methods for responding to radiological incidents. The NRC and FEMA are revising NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1, to incorporate information from the supplements and addenda; address regulatory, guidance, and policy changes; and include various emergency planning and preparedness lessons learned since its initial publication.

The NRC is developing an emergency preparedness handbook (a NUREG document) in conjunction with the revision of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1. The handbook will provide amplifying guidance on meeting the intent of the NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2 evaluation criteria applicable to commercial NPP applicants and licensees, and the level of detail that applicant and licensee emergency plans should provide regarding each evaluation criterion. A preliminary draft version of the handbook will be available for viewing in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15140A415 during the public comment period for NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2; a final draft version of the handbook will be issued at a later time.

The NRC and FEMA held two public meetings on August 22, 2012, and September 13, 2012, as well as two public stakeholder engagement sessions on October 29–31, 2013, and June 25, 2014. The public meetings were conducted in order to: (1) solicit input from stakeholders and interested members of the public on the scope of future revisions to NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1; (2) describe the proposed timeline for the revisions to NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1; (3) promote transparency, public participation, and collaboration during the NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 1, revision process; and (4) allow direct input from stakeholders and the public on changes being made during the initial writing process. Presentation material and meeting notes are available for review on the Federal rulemaking Web site, *www.regulations.gov,* under Docket ID FEMA–2012–0026.

## III. Backfitting and Issue Finality

Issuance of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2, in final form, would not constitute backfitting under 10 CFR 50.109 and would not otherwise be inconsistent with the issue finality provisions in 10 CFR part 52. As discussed in section I.B., ''Scope,'' under the subsection titled ''Use by NRC,'' of NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2, the NRC has no current intention to impose NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2, on current holders of a construction permit, operating license, early site permit, or combined license.

NUREG–0654/FEMA–REP–1, Revision 2, if finalized, could be applied to applications for certain 10 CFR part 50 operating licenses or construction permits and 10 CFR part 52 combined licenses and early site permits. Such action would not constitute backfitting as defined in 10 CFR 50.109 or be otherwise inconsistent with the applicable issue finality provision in 10 CFR part 52, inasmuch as such applicants are not, with certain exceptions, within the scope of entities protected by 10 CFR 50.109 or the relevant issue finality provisions in 10 CFR part 52. This is because neither the Backfit Rule nor the issue finality provisions under 10 CFR part 52—with certain exclusions discussed below—was intended to apply to every NRC action that substantially changes the expectations of current and future applicants. The exceptions to the general principle are applicable whenever an applicant references a 10 CFR part 52 license (*e.g.,* an early site permit), NRC regulatory approval (*e.g.,* a design certification rule), or both, with specified issue finality provisions. The staff does not, at this time, intend to impose the positions represented in the draft NUREG (if finalized) in a manner that is inconsistent with any issue finality provisions. If, in the future, the staff seeks to impose a position in the draft NUREG (if finalized) in a manner that does not provide issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision, then the staff must address the criteria for avoiding issue finality as described in the applicable issue finality provision.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of May, 2015.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brian E. Holian,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13079 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Release No. 34–75036; File No. SR–FINRA–2015–003]**

## Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Code of Arbitration Procedure for Customer Disputes and the Code of Arbitration Procedure for Industry Disputes To Increase a Fee for the Late Cancellation of a Scheduled Hearing, Lengthen the Notice Period for Cancelling a Scheduled Hearing, and Increase the Amount of Honoraria Paid to Arbitrators Affected by a Late Cancellation of a Scheduled Hearing

May 22, 2015.

### I. Introduction

On February 5, 2015, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'' or ''Exchange Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to amend Rules 12214 and 12601 of FINRA's Code of Arbitration Procedure for Customer Disputes (''Customer Code'') and Rules 12214 and 12601 of its Code of Arbitration Procedure for Industry Disputes (''Industry Code'') (together, ''Codes'') to increase the fee for the late cancellation or postponement of a scheduled hearing, lengthen the notice period for cancelling or postponing a scheduled hearing session, and increase the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators affected by the late cancellation or postponement of a scheduled hearing session. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 2015.[3] The Commission received twelve comment letters on the proposal.[4] On March 26, 2015, FINRA

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 74289 (Feb. 18, 2015), 80 FR 9773 (Feb. 24, 2015) (''Notice'').

[4] *See* Letters from Steven B. Caruso, Esq., Maddox Hargett & Caruso, P.C., dated February 20, 2015 (''Caruso Letter''); Philip M. Aidikoff, Aidikoff, Uhl & Bakhtiari, dated February 24, 2015 (''Aidikoff Letter''); George H. Friedman, Esq., George H. Friedman Consulting, LLC, dated March 1, 2015 (''Friedman Letter''); Joseph C. Pfeiffer, President, Public Investors Arbitration Bar Association (''PIABA''), dated March 9, 2015 (''PIABA Letter''); Ryan K. Bakhtiari, Aidikoff, Uhl & Bakhtiari, dated March 9, 2015 (''Bakhtiari Letter''); Jasmine Blake-Stewart, Francis Laryea, Jason Robinson, and Darius Wood, Student Interns, and Nicole Iannarone, Assistant Clinical Professor, Investor Advocacy Clinic, Georgia State University College of Law, dated March 13, 2015 (''GSU Letter''); Mark R.

granted the Commission an extension of time, until May 25, 2015, to act on the proposal.[5] FINRA responded to the comment letters on April 24, 2015.[6] This order approves the rule change as proposed.

## II. Description of the Proposed Rule Change

### *A. Background*

As stated in the Notice, FINRA is proposing to amend the Codes to increase the fee for the late cancellation or postponement of a scheduled hearing session for the primary purpose of encouraging parties to provide more advance notice of cancellations and postponements, or, in the alternative, to compensate arbitrators more for lost time and opportunities in the event of a late cancellation or postponement.[7]

Under current Rules 12601(b)(2) and 13601(b)(2) of the Codes, each arbitrator selected to hear a case receives a $100 honorarium [8] when a hearing is cancelled or postponed within three business days of the scheduled hearing date.[9] In the event a scheduled hearing is cancelled or postponed more than three business days in advance of the scheduled hearing date, the arbitrators do not receive an honorarium.[10]

FINRA stated that it has ''received many complaints from arbitrators concerning the current late cancellation rule,'' noting that it is the most frequent complaint Dispute Resolution staff receives from arbitrators.[11] Moreover, when FINRA formed its Dispute Resolution Task Force in 2014 to consider possible enhancements to its arbitration and mediation forum, it published a request for comment.[12] FINRA stated that the majority of comments it received from arbitrators suggested that FINRA address the issue of late cancellation of scheduled hearings.[13] More specifically, FINRA reported that it has learned that ''the lack of sufficient notice and compensation is frustrating for arbitrators and is a reason some arbitrators leave FINRA's roster'' [14] and that many arbitrators have expressed concern that ''the forum's honoraria are too low.'' [15] In addition, FINRA received feedback that ''the current rule is inadequate because the three-business-day cancellation window does not provide arbitrators . . . with enough time to schedule other income-generating opportunities.'' [16]

FINRA stated that it has started addressing these concerns by amending its rules to increase the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators to $300 per hearing session in 2014.[17] In order to further respond to arbitrators' concerns, however, FINRA is proposing to amend the Codes to require that parties to an arbitration give more advance notice before cancelling a hearing, or be assessed a higher late cancellation fee if sufficient advance notice is not provided.[18] Specifically, FINRA's proposal would amend Rule 12601(b)(2) to provide that if a cancellation request is made by one or more parties within ten calendar days before a scheduled hearing session and granted, the party or parties making the request shall pay a fee of $600 per arbitrator (''Late Cancellation Fee'') in addition to any required Postponement Fee.[19]

FINRA believes that these changes would result in fewer late cancellations by parties to an arbitration as the higher Late Cancellation Fee would incentivize parties to begin settlement negotiations earlier in the process.[20] FINRA also believes that the increased Late Cancellation Fee would help address arbitrators' concerns about honoraria and compensation for lost time and opportunities, thus helping decrease arbitrator turnover.[21]

### *B. Proposed Increase to Late Cancellation Fees and Cancellation Timeframe*

The proposal would amend Rules 12601(b)(2) and 13601(b)(2) to increase from three business days to ten calendar days the timeframe before which parties must request cancellation of hearings in order to avoid incurring the proposed Late Cancellation Fee. FINRA believes that the increased time would give arbitrators more opportunity to secure other income-generating opportunities and potentially save arbitrators time lost in preparation for assigned hearings.[22]

The proposed rule change would also increase the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators for late cancellations of hearings from $100 to $600 per arbitrator, making the honorarium equal to that which arbitrators would have received for one typical day of hearings,[23] no matter how many consecutive days are cancelled.[24] The

Harris, dated March 16, 2015 (''Harris Letter''); Patrick J. Paul, Student Intern, Elissa Germaine, Supervising Attorney, and Jill Gross, Director, Pace Investor Rights Clinic at Pace University School of Law, dated March 16, 2015 (''PIRC Letter''); Matthew Chan, Student, and William A. Jacobson, Esq., Clinical Professor of Law, Cornell Law School, and Director, Cornell Securities Law Clinic, dated March 17, 2015 (''CSLC Letter''); Paige M. Szymanski, Law Student Clinician, Investor Advocacy Clinic, Michigan State University College of Law, dated March 17, 2015 (''MSU Letter''); Leonard Steiner, Steiner & Libo, dated April 7, 2015 (''Steiner Letter''); and Richard P. Ryder, Esq., President, Securities Arbitration Commentator, Inc., dated April 7, 2015 (''Ryder Letter'').

[5] *See* Letter from Mignon McLemore, Assistant Chief Counsel, FINRA Dispute Resolution, Inc., to Lourdes Gonzalez, Assistant Chief Counsel, Sales Practices, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, dated March 26, 2015.

[6] *See* Letter from Mignon McLemore, Assistant Chief Counsel, FINRA Dispute Resolution, Inc., to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, dated April 24, 2015 (''FINRA Response Letter'').

[7] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774.

[8] These honoraria are typically funded by the Late Cancellation Fee (defined *infra*).

[9] If the parties settle an arbitration claim, hearings that were scheduled to occur after settlement are cancelled and, depending on the timing of the cancellation, could result in the assessment of a Late Cancellation Fee. *See* FINRA Rules 12902(d) and 13902(d). These rules incorporate the fees and costs incurred under FINRA Rules 12601 and 13601, and, therefore, would incorporate the proposed increase to the Late Cancellation Fee.

[10] For each postponement agreed to by the parties, or granted upon request of one or more parties, FINRA also assesses an additional postponement fee to the parties, equal to the applicable hearing session fee (''Postponement Fee''). *See* FINRA Rules 12601(b)(1) and 13601(b)(1). The Postponement Fee is paid to FINRA and not passed through to the arbitrators. *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774, note 4.

[11] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774.

[12] *See id.* FINRA's Dispute Resolution Task Force comprises individuals from the public and industry sectors who work together to suggest strategies to enhance the transparency, impartiality, and efficiency of FINRA's securities dispute resolution forum for all participants. *See FINRA Dispute Resolution Task Force,* available at *http://www.finra.org/ArbitrationAndMediation/FINRADisputeResolution/MoreonFINRADisputeResolution/P600966.*

[13] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774.

[14] *Id.*

[15] *Id.* at 9775.

[16] *Id.* at 9774. Commenters also noted that the current $100 honorarium for late cancellations does not adequately compensate arbitrators for the time they have spent preparing for a cancelled hearing or the income they would have earned for conducting a hearing. *Id.*

[17] *See id.* at 9775. *See also* Exchange Act Release No. 73245 (Sept. 29, 2014), 79 FR 59876 (Oct. 3, 2014) (Order Approving File No. SR–FINRA–2014–026) (''Honoraria Order'').

[18] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774, note 10. The text of the proposed rule change is available at the principal office of FINRA, on FINRA's Web site at *http://www.finra.org,* and at the Commission's Public Reference Room. For ease of reference, this Order generally refers only to rules in the Customer Code. However, the changes and discussion would also apply to the same rules of the Industry Code.

[19] *See id.* at 9774–75. *See also supra* note 10.

[20] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9775.

[21] *See id.*

[22] *See id.* (explaining that many hours of reviewing materials might be involved depending on the number of parties involved and the complexity of the case).

[23] A hearing is a meeting between the parties and the arbitrators of four hours or less to determine the merits of the arbitration. *See* FINRA Rules 12100(m) and 13100(m); *see also* FINRA Rules 12100(n) and 13100(n). A typical day in an arbitration case has two hearing sessions. *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774, note 7.

[24] Under the proposed rule change, the Late Cancellation Fee for a three-person arbitration panel would be $1,800, instead of $300 under the current rules. FINRA reported in the Notice that it found that approximately 80% of arbitration cases were

Continued

Late Cancellation Fee would continue to be charged to the party or parties making the request, but under Rule 12601(b)(2), arbitrators have the authority to allocate all or a portion of the fee to the non-requesting party if the arbitrators determine that the non-requesting party caused or contributed to the cancellation.[25] Moreover, Rule 12601(b)(2) also permits the panel to waive the Late Cancellation Fee if an extraordinary circumstance prevented a party or parties from making a timely cancellation request.[26] This would not change if the Commission approves the proposed rule change.

The proposed rule change would also shift the phrase ''and granted'' to the end of the first dependent clause in Rule 12601(b)(2) to clarify that the timing of a cancellation request controls whether the fee is assessed, not the timing of the arbitrators' decision on the request, if a decision is required.[27]

FINRA is also proposing to make conforming changes to Rule 12214(a), by amending the reference to the Late Cancellation Fee in Rule 12214(a).

## III. Summary of Comments and FINRA's Response

As noted above, the Commission received twelve comment letters on the proposed rule change[28] and a response letter from FINRA.[29] As discussed in more detail below, ten of the twelve commenters expressed support for FINRA's proposal.[30] Five of those ten commenters, however, also suggested some modifications.[31] Two of the twelve commenters expressed opposition to the proposed rule change.[32] The sections below outline the suggestions or specific concerns raised by the commenters suggesting changes or opposed to the proposal as well as FINRA's response.

### *A. Effect of Late Cancellation Fees on Customer Claimants*

#### 1. Potential Impact on Settlement of Claims

While a majority of the commenters supported the proposed increase in arbitrator honoraria, two commenters opposed the proposed rule change stating that the increased Late Cancellation Fee could discourage parties from settling their claims and, instead, encourage them to arbitrate their claims.[33] One of these commenters stated that the proposal would impose additional costs on customer claimants making the arbitration forum less consumer friendly.[34] The other commenter stated that the proposal would negatively impact small investors. In this commenter's view, investors asserting ''small'' claims may feel pressure to arbitrate even when it is in their best interest to settle a claim because of the threat of the increased Late Cancellation Fee.[35]

In its response, FINRA acknowledged that customers would likely be required to pay some of the increased Late Cancellation Fee under the proposed rule change.[36] FINRA also acknowledged that the proposed increase could affect settlement negotiations if the potential settlement amount is small compared to the Late Cancellation Fee.[37] FINRA noted, however, that ''the Codes provide parties with some cost mitigation options, regardless of their claim amount.''[38] For instance, parties could avoid the Late Cancellation Fee by providing sufficient notice when requesting the cancellation of a scheduled hearing.[39] FINRA also stated that if, however, parties settle a claim with fewer than ten days remaining to cancel a scheduled hearing,[40] the parties could negotiate (as part of any settlement agreement) the allocation of fees.[41] In addition, FINRA noted that arbitrators have the authority under the Codes (i) to allocate all or a portion of the Late Cancellation Fee to the party or parties that cause a delay or contribute to the need to cancel or otherwise postpone a scheduled hearing[42] or (ii) to waive the Late Cancellation Fee ''in the event that an extraordinary circumstance prevents a party or parties from making a timely postponement request.''[43]

#### 2. Proposed Exemptions for ''Small'' Claims

Two commenters suggested that FINRA amend the proposal to create exceptions for investors with ''small'' claims.[44] One of these commenters recommended setting an exemption threshold for claims of $100,000 or less.[45] The other commenter, who otherwise supported the proposal, also suggested that FINRA amend the proposal to exempt investors with claims of $50,000 or less.[46] This commenter suggested that an investor with a claim of $50,000 or less who cancels a hearing session less than ten days before the scheduled date would pay more in Late Cancellation Fees than he or she would pay in honorarium if the hearing took place.[47] The commenter stated that this may create ''another roadblock to requesting a hearing.''[48] This commenter believes that investors with claims of $50,000 or less who cancel a scheduled hearing should only be subject to the Postponement Fee,[49] or alternatively, that FINRA should reduce the Late

heard by a three-person panel based on an analysis of arbitration data from September 2013 to August 2014. *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774, note 6.

[25] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9775.

[26] *See id.* (explaining that ''the panel [may] waive the fees . . . if the circumstances warrant, like a sudden illness or accident'').

[27] *See id.* (describing the circumstances when the Late Cancellation Fee would not apply when parties jointly request cancellation or postponement ten calendar days or more before a scheduled hearing date or one party makes a cancellation request).

[28] *See supra* note 4.

[29] *See supra* note 6.

[30] *See* Caruso Letter, Aidikoff Letter, Friedman Letter, Bakhtiari Letter, Harris Letter, PIRC Letter, CSLC Letter, MSU Letter, PIABA Letter, and Ryder Letter.

[31] *See* PIRC Letter, CSLC Letter, MSU Letter, PIABA Letter, and Ryder Letter.

[32] *See* GSU Letter and Steiner Letter.

[33] *See id.*

[34] *See* Steiner Letter.

[35] *See* GSU Letter (noting that the proposal represents a 500% increase in the penalty for cancellation and claimants might choose to forego settlement to avoid the increased Late Cancellation Fee).

[36] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[37] *See id. See also* Notice, 80 FR at 9775.

[38] *See* FINRA Response Letter (stating that ''parties would avoid the late cancellation fee by providing notice of a cancellation 10 or more days prior to the first scheduled hearing session'').

[39] *See id.*

[40] *See* GSU Letter (stating that ''many matters settle on the eve of arbitration'').

[41] *See* FINRA Response Letter (stating, for example, that if a party waits until the day before a hearing to begin settlement negotiations in earnest, the party who is not the cause of the delay has leverage to negotiate with the other party to pay all, or a larger percentage of, the Late Cancellation Fee). *See* FINRA Rules 12701(b) and 13701(b) (under Rules 12701(b) and 13701(b), a customer may only be responsible for half the proposed Late Cancellation Fee if the settlement agreement does not address its allocation).

[42] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[43] *Id.*

[44] *See* GSU Letter and Ryder Letter (generally supportive of the proposal because it would help FINRA recruit and retain arbitrators).

[45] *See* GSU Letter.

[46] *See* Ryder Letter (noting that arbitrators receive a $350 honorarium under FINRA Rules 12800(a) and 12800(f) when they oversee arbitration claims of $50,000 or less. If parties request and schedule a hearing, then later cancel the hearing with insufficient notice, however, the fees would include the $450 Postponement Fee and the $600 Late Cancellation Fee).

[47] *See id.* (stating that ''[c]harging for the late notice more than three times ($450 & $600) the amount the Arbitrator is to be compensated for service ($350) will erect an unnecessary, unhealthy and substantial impediment to aggrieved customers'').

[48] *See id.*

[49] *See id.* (recommending that FINRA pay arbitrators from funds collected under the Postponement Fee rather than charging a Late Cancellation Fee when a late settlement occurs, which would ''allow customers a more realistic choice of a hearing.'').

Cancellation Fee for small claims to ''an amount that comports with the lower compensation rate for Rule 12800 arbitrators.'' [50]

In its response, FINRA noted that claims of $50,000 or less are subject to FINRA Rules 12800 and 13800 (''simplified arbitration rules'').[51] Under the simplified arbitration rules, these types of claims are usually decided by one arbitrator based on the pleadings submitted. In these cases, no hearings are held and, consequently, the Late Cancellation Fee would not apply to these investors. The simplified arbitration rules, however, permit customers who have claims of $50,000 or less to request a hearing.[52] In that event, the provisions of the Code relating to hearings and prehearings, including those governing fee, would apply; [53] accordingly, the customer claimant could be subject to the increased Late Cancellation Fee if the parties do not request a cancellation or postponement before the point when the Late Cancellation Fee would apply. FINRA stated, however, that when a customer with a claim of $50,000 or less requests a hearing, FINRA pays the arbitrators regular hearing session honoraria pursuant to Rule 12214 instead of the $350 honorarium for deciding a claim based solely on the pleadings pursuant to FINRA Rules 12800(f).[54]

FINRA also stated that it believes that exempting claims of $100,000 or less as suggested in the GSU Letter would not address the primary goal of the proposed rule change, which is to encourage parties to provide earlier notice to cancel a scheduled hearing.[55] FINRA believes that, irrespective of the amount in dispute, the current fee does not adequately compensate arbitrators for the amount of time they devote to preparing for hearings as well as the opportunity cost relating to the time they have set aside for scheduled hearings.[56]

In addition, FINRA believes that small claims customers could mitigate the Late Cancellation Fee by, among other things, negotiating (as part of any settlement agreement) the allocation of fees, requesting that the panel waive the late cancellation fee based on extraordinary circumstances, or requesting that the panel or FINRA waive the Late Cancellation Fee pursuant Rule 12601(b)(3).[57]

Moreover, FINRA believes that carving out an exception for ''small'' claims would create a two-tiered fee system and lead to an additional burden on FINRA staff.[58]

For the reasons discussed above, FINRA believes that the proposed rule change should apply to all scheduled hearings regardless of the size of the claim.[59] Therefore, FINRA declined to modify the proposed rule change to exempt parties of $100,000 or less from the Late Cancellation Fee.[60]

*B. Eliminate the Cost to Claimants in the Event of a Settlement*

One commenter recommended that FINRA amend the proposal to exempt parties from Late Cancellation Fees incurred due to late cancellations that are ''necessary to accommodate a mediation (or other settlement efforts) or because a case has been settled.'' [61] This commenter stated that the customer claimants cannot control when member firms begin to consider settlement [62] and that the financial impact of the increased Late Cancellation Fee would negatively affect customer claimants more than broker-dealers.[63]

In the Notice, FINRA acknowledged that customers would likely be required to pay some of the increased Late Cancellation Fee under the proposed rule change.[64] FINRA believes, however, that ''the cost of arbitration should be borne by users of the forum.'' [65] FINRA stated that since either customers or members may seek to cancel or postpone a hearing, it would be inequitable to require industry members to bear the entire proposed Late Cancellation Fee.[66] FINRA also believes that both customers and members ''benefit from the forum attracting and retaining qualified, dedicated arbitrators . . . and they should share in the effort to sustain and improve the forum.'' [67]

For these reasons, FINRA declined to modify its proposal to exempt parties from Late Cancellation Fees incurred by parties attempting to accommodate mediation or other settlement efforts.

*C. Presumption That Only Members Would Pay Late Cancellation Fee*

One commenter expressed concern that the proposed rule change would ''run counter to FINRA's objective of providing an affordable method to resolve disputes'' [68] and recommended that FINRA create a rebuttable presumption that either the member firm or the associated person be responsible for the proposed Late Cancellation Fee unless the arbitrators determine that the customer caused the need for the cancellation or postponement.[69]

In its response, FINRA stated that that it does not believe that the proposed Late Cancellation Fee would significantly affect the affordability of the dispute resolution forum, noting that investors ''experience substantial savings in arbitration compared to litigation.'' [70] Specifically, FINRA stated that ''the benefits and cost of savings of arbitration make filing an arbitration claim a less costly option for investors, notwithstanding the potential costs of the proposed late cancellation fee.'' [71] In addition, FINRA stated that customers can avoid the proposed new Late Cancellation Fee by cancelling or postponing a hearing at least ten calendar days before the scheduled hearing date; and, FINRA stated that ''the Codes provide parties with some mitigation strategies to use to

[50] *See id.*

[51] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[52] *See* FINRA Rule 12800(c)(1). The Ryder Letter noted that out of approximately 200 small claims awards in 2014, 36 investor claimants requested a hearing.

[53] *See* FINRA Rule 12800(c)(2).

[54] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[55] *See id.*

[56] *See id.*

[57] *See id.* (stating that a ''waiver of the fee by the panel or by FINRA would not affect the payment of the honorarium''). *See also infra* note 85 (describing the forum's policy regarding payment of the honorarium to the arbitrators in the event the fee is waived).

[58] *See* FINRA Response Letter. *See also infra* Section III.D.

[59] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[60] *See id.*

[61] PIABA Letter.

[62] *See id.* (arguing that ''[s]ince it is respondents that get to keep their dollars in their pockets until a given claimant's case is over . . . it is respondents that need incentives to 'address issues earlier in their cases' [citing the Notice]'').

[63] *See id.* (suggesting that it is not fair to make claimants equally bear the financial burden due to ''the financial impact of the increase in the amount of the per-arbitrator fee in the proposed rule change, as between a typical individual claimant and a large broker dealer, is too disparate to claimants, who will 'feel' the impact of the fee much more than broker dealers will'').

[64] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9775.

[65] FINRA Response Letter.

[66] *See id.* FINRA also stated that as part of the fee increases approved in the Honoraria Order, FINRA ''allocated a large portion of the arbitration fee increases to members by significantly increasing member surcharges and process fees'' and that these fees cannot be allocated to other parties. In addition, FINRA noted that member firms may also be responsible for the related fees, such as filing fees and hearing session fees.

[67] *Id.*

[68] CSLC Letter.

[69] *See id.*

[70] FINRA Response Letter (explaining that ''claims in arbitration are typically resolved more quickly than claims in litigation'' due to limits on discovery and the avoidance of delays and costs associated with appeals and that ''[a]ttacks on awards are rare and are based on narrow grounds under the Federal Arbitration Act'').

[71] *Id.*

potentially reduce the amount of the fee assessed.'' [72]

FINRA also believes that amending the proposal to impose a rebuttable presumption that the member or associate person be responsible for any Late Cancellation Fee would be unfair because there are instances in which customers create the need for and request a cancellation.[73] Furthermore, FINRA stated that since both customers and FINRA members benefit from the arbitration forum and its ability to attract and retain qualified, dedicated arbitrators, ''it would be inequitable for industry members to pay 100 percent of the proposed late cancellation fee.'' [74]

For these reasons, FINRA declined to modify its proposed rule to create a presumption that member firms and associated persons pay the proposed late cancellation fees.

*D. Creation of Late Cancellation Fee Tiers*

Two commenters recommended that FINRA modify the proposed rule to create separate tiers of Late Cancellation Fees that would apply based on when a request for cancellation or postponement is made.[75] Under these modifications, the earlier a party requests cancellation or postponement, the smaller the Late Cancellation Fee.[76]

FINRA believes adopting a phased-in, or sliding-scale, approach would be confusing for parties and more complex and time-consuming for staff to implement.[77] For example, FINRA believes that a tiered approach to calculating Late Cancellation Fees may lead to inaccurate fee calculations and create an additional burden on its staff resources.[78] In addition, FINRA stated that it does not believe that a sliding scale of Late Cancellation Fees ''would provide enough of an incentive to encourage parties to change their behavior.'' [79] Moreover, FINRA stated that incorporating the commenters' suggestions would delay the implementation of the rule (if approved by the Commission) because FINRA would need to ''reprogram its technology platforms to implement the changes.'' [80]

For these reasons, FINRA declined to modify its proposal to create additional tiers of late cancellation fees.[81]

*E. Arbitrators' Conflict of Interest*

Three commenters expressed concern that the proposed rule change would create a conflict of interest for arbitrators considering whether to waive the Late Cancellation Fee in the event of an extraordinary circumstance as permitted under Rule 12601(b)(2).[82] Specifically, these commenters suggested that the proposed increase to arbitrator honoraria would provide arbitrators greater incentive to deny a request for waiver because the Late Cancellation Fees are typically used to fund their honoraria payments.[83] In order to neutralize this conflict, one commenter recommended revising the proposal to require FINRA to ''bear the financial responsibility for the late cancellation honoraria in those limited situations where it is appropriate for the arbitrators to waive the late cancellation fee.'' [84]

THE CSLC LETTER PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING SLIDING-SCALE LATE CANCELLATION FEE SCHEDULE

| Calendar days before hearing when notice given | Cancellation fee per arbitrator |
|---|---|
| 11 or more | $0 |
| 9–10 | 100 |
| 7–8 | 200 |
| 5–6 | 300 |
| 4 or fewer | 600 |

In its response, FINRA stated that the forum's policy currently is ''to pay arbitrators the fee they would have received in the event the panel waives the late cancellation fee for the parties'' [85] and that this policy would not change if the proposal is approved by the Commission.[86] Accordingly, FINRA declined to modify its proposal as recommended.[87]

*F. Additional Arbitrator Training*

One commenter suggested that FINRA provide additional arbitrator training on the types of extraordinary circumstances that would be appropriate to consider when deciding whether to waive the late cancellation fee, as well as how to verify the accuracy of these circumstances.[88]

In its response, FINRA stated that while ''it has not received any complaints from parties about arbitrators failing to waive late cancellation fees in the event of extraordinary circumstances'' it has issued guidance on this issue in its Notice to Members 04–53.[89] The guidance states that ''there are some extraordinary circumstances that could prevent a party from making an adjournment request in time to avoid the additional fee assessment (*e.g.,* a serious accident or sudden severe illness).'' [90] FINRA stated that this guidance would continue to apply if the Commission approves the proposal.[91] FINRA also stated, however, that it ''would review the applicable arbitrator training modules and scenarios and update them, where necessary'' if the Commission approves the proposed rule change.[92] FINRA also stated that it would publish a Regulatory Notice ''explain[ing] how the rule would be applied, including any changes to the examples of what FINRA considers 'extraordinary circumstances.'" [93]

*G. Education for Pro se Claimants About Late Cancellation*

Three commenters expressed concern that the proposed rule change may harm investors who represent themselves in the forum (''pro se claimants'') because they may be less likely to be aware of the increased fee and deadline for

[72] *Id. See also supra* note 41.

[73] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[74] *Id.*

[75] *See* GSU Letter (arguing that this modification would ''lessen the impact on parties who decide to settle closer to the arbitration date while still ensuring arbitrators are adequately compensated for their lost time and opportunities''); and CSLC Letter.

[76] The GSU Letter suggested a phased-in Late Cancellation Fee that would cost $100 per arbitrator ''if a hearing is cancelled between ten and four business days in advance of a hearing, with the fee increasing to $600 per arbitrator for a cancellation or postponement three business days prior to the scheduled hearing.''

[77] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[78] *See id.*

[79] *Id.*

[80] *Id.*

[81] *See id.*

[82] *See* PIABA Letter; MSU Letter; and CLSC Letter (citing support for the issue in the PIABA Letter).

[83] *See, e.g.,* MSU Letter (stating that ''the substantial increase in the fee granted to each arbitrator could discourage an arbitrator from granting the waiver''); and CSLC Letter (noting that ''the requesting party is asking the arbitrators to waive the compensation that the arbitrators themselves would be entitled to'' and arguing that the conflict ''is amplified when the late cancellation fee is increased as dramatically as proposed'').

[84] PIABA Letter.

[85] FINRA Response Letter (referencing Exchange Act Release No. 49545 (Apr. 8, 2004), 69 FR 19887 (Apr. 14, 2004) (File No. SR–NASD–2003–164) (Notice of Filing by NASD, Inc. Relating to the Adjournment of a Hearing Within Three Business Days of the First Scheduled Hearing Session), at 19889, which states that ''a waiver of the fee . . . will not affect the payment of the honorarium'').

[86] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[87] *See id.*

[88] *See* PIABA Letter (noting that this training would ''reinforce the need for arbitrators to give appropriate consideration of the parties' requests for a waiver of late cancellation fees in extraordinary circumstances'' and further suggesting that arbitrators be reminded that ''the rules involved specifically acknowledge that there can be 'extraordinary circumstances' that can excuse a late cancellation'').

[89] FINRA Response Letter.

[90] *Id.*

[91] *See id.*

[92] *Id.*

[93] *Id.*

timely requesting a cancellation.[94] The commenters recommended that FINRA provide additional information and education to pro se claimants to help ensure that they are aware of the Late Cancellation Fee and timeline.[95] One of these commenters also recommended that FINRA notify pro se claimants with claims under $100,000 by letter 30 days before a scheduled hearing to inform them of the fees and the ten-day cancellation period.[96]

In its response, FINRA stated that it believes that ''all parties should be reminded of the proposed rule change, so that they are aware of the ramifications of postponing or cancelling a scheduled hearing inside of the proposed cancellation period.'' [97] Accordingly, FINRA stated that it would train arbitrators to remind the parties of the deadline and Late Cancellation Fees at the initial prehearing conference (''IPHC''), as well as publish an updated *Regulatory Notice* describing the proposed rule changes.[98] Furthermore, FINRA stated that it would instruct the arbitrators to include this reminder in the IPHC Scheduling Order, which is provided to the parties at the outset of the dispute, so that parties will be informed of their responsibilities.[99]

## IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

The Commission has carefully considered the proposal, the comments received, and FINRA's response to the comments. Based on its review of the record, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities association.[100] In particular, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 15A(b)(5) of the Act,[101] which requires that FINRA's rules provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among its members and other persons using any facility or system which FINRA operates or controls. The Commission also finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[102] which requires, among other things, that FINRA's rules be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

As discussed above, the proposed rule change would: (i) Increase a fee for the late cancellation of a scheduled arbitration hearing, (ii) lengthen the notice period for a party to cancel a scheduled hearing without incurring the fee, and (iii) increase the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators affected by the late cancellation of a scheduled hearing. As stated above, FINRA designed the proposal to, among other things: (i) encourage parties to an arbitration to provide more advance notice of cancellations and postponements of hearing sessions, and (ii) help recruit and arbitrators by better compensating them for their lost time and opportunities in the event of a late cancellation or postponement.

The Commission received twelve comment letters on the proposed rule change [103] and FINRA's response to the comments.[104] The Commission notes that most of the commenters generally supported the proposed rule change, believing that ''the increase in the late cancellation fee will assist the forum in its efforts to retain qualified arbitrators willing to devote the time and energy necessary to serve on arbitration panels.'' [105] The Commission also notes that a number of commenters believe that the proposal would provide ''a financial incentive for parties to begin negotiations and finalize settlements earlier in the process.'' [106] The Commission also notes, however, that some commenters opposed the proposal [107] or recommended FINRA revise certain aspects of it.[108]

While the Commission appreciates the recommendations made by some commenters and recognizes that the proposal may result in an increased financial burden on some customer claimants, including those with small claims, the Commission believes that FINRA responded appropriately to their concerns. In particular, the Commission acknowledges the safeguards that FINRA has built into its proposal to mitigate the impact of the increase Late Cancellation Fee on customer claimants. For example, FINRA stated that parties could negotiate (as part of any settlement agreements) the allocation of fees, request that an arbitration panel waive the Late Cancellation Fee based on extraordinary circumstances, or FINRA could waive the Late Cancellation Fee.[109] In addition, FINRA has represented that it would take additional steps to help pro se claimants by providing additional notice of the proposed increased fee as well as instructions for when parties must cancel a hearing in order to avoid the Late Cancellation Fee.[110]

Moreover, the Commission agrees with the views of certain commenters that the proposed rule ''strike[s] a balance between the parties and arbitrators that serve the forum.'' [111] In addition, the Commission agrees with the many commenters who argue that the rule proposal would also more adequately compensate arbitrators for lost time and opportunities when hearings are cancelled without appropriate notice.[112] Accordingly, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change would further the purposes of the Act by providing for the equitable allocation of reasonable fees, in this case the Late Cancellation Fee, among FINRA members, customers, associated persons, or other non-members using FINRA's arbitration forum.[113]

Furthermore, the Commission agrees with FINRA's assessment that the proposal would ''encourage parties to

[94] *See* PIABA Letter (noting that ''there will likely be pro se claimants that are unaware of the existence of the rule calling for late cancellation fees''); PIRC Letter (citing support for the position in the PIABA Letter); and MSU Letter (arguing that ''pro se claimants need extra protection against incurring unexpected fees in a complicated arbitration forum'').

[95] *See, e.g.,* PIABA Letter (suggesting that ''FINRA provide additional education to pro se claimants so that they can make informed decisions about postponing final hearing sessions'').

[96] *See* MSU Letter (noting that a claimant ''could be responsible for paying large percentages of her possible settlement in fees that she may not know exist'').

[97] FINRA Response Letter.

[98] *See id.*

[99] *See id.*

[100] In approving the proposed rule change, the Commission has also considered the rule change's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[101] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

[102] 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[103] *See supra* note 4.

[104] *See supra* note 6.

[105] FINRA Response Letter. *See also* Friedman Letter (noting that ''arbitrator retention is very challenging'' and arguing that ''anything that can be done, such as the proposed rule change, to discourage last-minute settlements should be supported'').

[106] FINRA Response Letter. *See also supra* note 4.

[107] *See supra* note 32.

[108] *See supra* note 31.

[109] *See* FINRA Response Letter.

[110] *See id.* (noting that FINRA would publish a *Regulatory Notice* explaining how the rule would be applied, and would train arbitrators to advise parties at the IPHC that they would be subject to a Late Cancellation Fee if they requested a cancellation of a scheduled hearing within ten-business days of the hearing).

[111] *See* Bakhtiari Letter (stating that the proposed rules ''provide a financial incentive for parties to discuss and consummate settlements . . . while providing arbitrators with fair compensation when hearings are cancelled at the last minute'').

[112] *See* Harris Letter (arguing that ''[t]he $100 does not come close to compensating an arbitrator for the time or energy that he or she spent preparing''). *See also* Aidikoff Letter (stating that ''waiting until the last minute does great disservice to the arbitrator pool in that arbitrators set aside the days that the hearing is scheduled and then are not compensated for last minute cancellations or postponements'').

[113] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(5).

provide more advance notice of postponements and cancellations, or, in the alternative, to compensate arbitrators more than they are currently paid for lost time and opportunities in the event of a late postponement or cancellation.'' [114] In addition, the Commission believes that increase the amount of honoraria paid to arbitrators affected by a late cancellation of a scheduled hearing would help FINRA achieve its goal of retaining and recruiting arbitrators to serve in its dispute resolution forum. Accordingly, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change would further the purposes of the Act as it is reasonably designed to protect investors and the public interest.[115]

For the reasons stated above, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

## V. Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[116] that the proposed rule change (SR–FINRA–2015–003), be, and hereby is, approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[117]

**Robert W. Errett,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12971 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

[114] *See* Notice, 80 FR at 9774. *See also* FINRA Response Letter.

[115] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78o–3(b)(6).

[116] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[117] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Investment Company Act Release No. 31645; File No. 812–14363]**

## KCAP Financial, Inc.; Notice of Application

May 21, 2015.

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'').

**ACTION:** Notice of an application for an order under section 23(c)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'') for an exemption from section 23(c) of the Act.

**SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION:** KCAP Financial, Inc. (''Company'') requests an order to amend a prior order [1] that permits the Company to issue Restricted Stock [2] to the Company's Employees [3] under the terms of its Amended and Restated 2006 Equity Incentive Plan, as further amended and restate effective June 20, 2014 (the ''Incentive Plan''). The Company seeks to amend the Prior Order to permit it to engage in certain transactions in connection with the Incentive Plan that may constitute purchases by the Company of its own securities within the meaning of section 23(c) of the Act.

**FILING DATES:** The application was filed on September 22, 2014, and amended on January 28, 2015, May 15, 2015, and May 21, 2015.

**HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING:** An order granting the requested relief will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on June 15, 2015, and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicant, in the form of an affidavit, or for lawyers, a certificate of service. Pursuant to rule 0–5 under the Act, hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, any facts bearing upon the desirability of a hearing on the matter, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request notification by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090. Applicant: c/o Dayl W. Pearson, President and Chief Executive Officer, KCAP Financial, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10017.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven I. Amchan, Senior Counsel, at (202) 551–6826, or David P. Bartels, Branch Chief, at (202) 551–6821, (Division of Investment Management, Chief Counsel's Office).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained via the Commission's Web site by searching for the file number, or for the applicant using the Company name box, at *http://www.sec.gov/search/search.htm* or by calling (202) 551–8090.

*Applicant's Representations:*

1. The Company is an internally managed, non-diversified, closed-end investment company that has elected to be regulated as a business development company (''BDC'') under the Act. The Incentive Plan authorizes the Company, among other things, to grant to its Employees in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Prior Order (i) Restricted Stock and (ii) options to acquire shares of the Company's common stock, par value $0.01 per share (''Common Stock'') in accordance with section 61(a)(3)(B) of the Act. The Company seeks to amend the Prior Order to permit it to withhold shares of the Company's Common Stock or purchase shares of Common Stock from the Participants [4] to satisfy tax withholding obligations related to the vesting of Restricted Stock or the exercise of options to purchase shares of Common Stock granted pursuant to the Incentive Plan. In addition, the Company seeks to permit Participants to pay the exercise price of options to purchase shares of Common Stock granted pursuant to the Incentive Plan with shares of Common Stock already held by them or pursuant to a net share settlement feature.[5] The Company will continue to comply with all of the terms and conditions of the Prior Order.

2. On the date that any Restricted Stock vests, such vested shares of the Restricted Stock are released to the Participant and are available for sale or transfer.[6] The Company states that value of the vested shares is deemed to be wage compensation for the Employee. As discussed more fully in the application, upon the exercise of certain options the amount by which the Fair Market Value of the shares of the Company's Common Stock, determined as of the date of exercise, exceeds the exercise price will be treated as ordinary income to the recipient of the option in the year of exercise. The Company states that any compensation income recognized by an employee generally is subject to federal withholding for

[1] Investment Company Act Release Nos. 28168 (Feb. 25, 2008) (notice) and 28199 (Mar. 24, 2008) (order) (the ''Prior Order'').

[2] As defined in the Prior Order.

[3] As defined in the Prior Order.

[4] As defined in the Prior Order.

[5] Net share settlement allows the Company to deliver only gain shares (*i.e.,* shares of its Common Stock with a Fair Market Value (as defined below) equal to the option spread upon exercise) directly to the optionee without the need for the optionee to sell shares of Common Stock on the open market or borrow cash from third parties in order to exercise his or her options. The Company states that the Board has determined to use the closing sales price of the Common Stock on the NASDAQ Global Select Market (or any other such exchange on which the Common Stock may be traded in the future) on the date of the applicable transaction or other event as the fair market value (''Fair Market Value'') with respect to the Common Stock for all purposes under the Incentive Plan.

[6] During the restriction period (*i.e.,* prior to the lapse of the forfeiture restrictions), the Restricted Stock may not be sold, transferred, pledged, hypothecated, margined, or otherwise encumbered by a Participant.

income and employment tax purposes. The Incentive Plan provides that the delivery of any shares, or the lifting or lapse of restrictions on any Award, shall be subject to the Participant's satisfaction of all applicable federal, state and local income and employment tax withholding obligations.

3. The Incentive Plan, as amended and restated effective June 20, 2014, was approved by the Company's board of directors (''Board''), including the required majority of the Company's directors with the meaning of section 57(o) of the Act. The Company states that the Board is permitted to allow the Company to withhold shares of Common Stock or purchase shares of Common stock from the Company's Employees to satisfy tax withholding obligations related to the vesting of Restricted Stock, or the exercise of options to acquire Common Stock or Restricted Stock granted pursuant to the Incentive Plan. The Company states that the Incentive Plan further provides the Board with discretion to permit the Company's Employees to pay the exercise price of options to purchase shares of Common Stock or Restricted Stock with shares of Common Stock already held by them or pursuant to net share settlement.

*Applicant's Legal Analysis:*

1. Section 23(c) of the Act, which is made applicable to BDCs by section 63 of the Act, generally prohibits a BDC from purchasing any securities of which it is the issuer except in the open market, pursuant to tender offers or under other circumstances as the Commission may permit to ensure that the purchase is made on a basis that does not unfairly discriminate against any holders of the class or classes of securities to be purchased. The Company states that the withholding or purchase of shares of Restricted Stock and Common Stock in payment of applicable withholding tax obligations or of Common Stock in payment for the exercise price of a stock option might be deemed to be purchases by the Company of its own securities within the meaning of section 23(c) and therefore prohibited by the Act.

2. Section 23(c)(3) provides that the Commission may issue an order that would permit a BDC to purchase its shares in circumstances in which the purchase is made in a manner or on a basis that does not unfairly discriminate against any holders of the class or classes of securities to be purchased. The Company states that it believes that the requested relief meets the standards of section 23(c)(3).

3. The Company states that these purchases will be made on a basis which does not unfairly discriminate against the stockholders of the Company because all purchases of Common Stock will be at the closing sales price of the Common Stock on the NASDAQ Global Select Market on the relevant date (*i.e.,* the public market price on the date of vesting of the Restricted Shares, the date of exercise of Non-Statutory Stock Options, and the date of a disqualifying disposition with respect to Incentive Stock Options). The Company further states that no transactions will be conducted pursuant to the requested order on days where there are no reported market transactions involving the Common Stock. The Company submits that because all transactions would take place at the public market price for the Company's common stock, the transactions would not be significantly different than could be achieved by any stockholder selling in a market transaction.

4. The Company submits that the proposed purchases do not raise concerns about preferential treatment of the Company's insiders because the Incentive Plan is a bona fide compensation plan of the type that is common among corporations generally. Further, the Company argues that the vesting schedule is determined at the time of the initial grant of the Restricted Stock and the option exercise price is determined at the time of the initial grant of the options. The Company represents that that all purchases may be made only as permitted by the Incentive Plan and in the discretion of the Board, which is composed of at least a majority of ''non-interested'' persons within the meaning of section 2(a)(19) of the Act. The Company argues that granting the requested relief would be consistent with policies underlying the provisions of the Act permitting the use of equity compensation as well as prior exemptive relief granted by the Commission for relief under section 23(c) of the Act.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

**Robert W. Errett,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12970 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Release No. 34–75038; File No. SR–NYSE–2015–06]**

## Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange, LLC; Notice of Filing of Amendment No. 1 and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1, Adopting New NYSE Rule 124 To Conduct a Midday Auction and Amending NYSE Rule 104 To Codify the Obligation of Designated Market Makers To Facilitate the Midday Auction

May 22, 2015.

### I. Introduction

On February 2, 2015, New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to institute a daily, single-price auction during the trading day in certain lower-volume securities (''Midday Auction'') and to amend NYSE Rule 104 to address the responsibilities and duties of Designated Market Makers (''DMMs'') to facilitate the Midday Auction. The proposed rule change was published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 2015.[3] The Commission has received one comment letter on the proposal.[4] On April 6, 2015, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[5] the Commission designated a longer period within which to approve the proposed rule change, disapprove the proposed rule change, or institute proceedings to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change.[6] On May 20,

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74281 (Feb. 17, 2015), 80 FR 9496 (''Notice''). In the Notice, the Exchange stated its intention to submit a request for exemptive relief, pursuant to Rule 611(d) of Regulation NMS, 17 CFR 242.611(d), from the requirements of Rule 611 of Regulation NMS. *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9497 n.21. In Amendment No. 1, *see infra,* note 7, the Exchange stated that it will no longer submit a request for exemptive relief because the Exchange believes that the proposed Midday Auction fits within the exception provided by Rule 611(b)(3) of Regulation NMS, 17 CFR 242.611(b)(3). *See infra,* Section III.

[4] *See* Letter from Theodore R. Lazo, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission (Mar. 20, 2015).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74648, 80 FR 19385 (Apr. 10, 2015). The Commission designated May 24, 2015, as the date by which it should approve, disapprove, or institute

Continued

2015, the Exchange filed Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.[7] The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on Amendment No. 1 from interested persons and is approving the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

## II. Description of the Proposal, as Modified by Amendment No. 1

The Exchange proposes to adopt new NYSE Rule 124 to conduct a daily Midday Auction in certain lower-volume securities. Under the proposal, the Exchange would conduct one Midday Auction per trading day[8] for each security that the Exchange designates as a Midday Auction Stock. Only NYSE-listed securities that have a consolidated average daily trading volume (''CADV'') of 1,000,000 shares or less would be eligible to be designated as a Midday Auction Stock.[9]

The Exchange proposes to update the list of Midday Auction Stocks at least quarterly.[10] The Exchange would not conduct a Midday Auction on trading days when the Exchange is scheduled to close before 4:00 p.m. ET, and the Exchange would not conduct a Midday Auction in a Midday Auction Stock if that stock is halted, paused, suspended, or not opened at the time of the Midday Auction.[11]

To initiate the Midday Auction, the Exchange would pause trading in Midday Auction Stocks on the Exchange for five minutes (''Midday Auction Pause'') by suspending automatic executions and publishing a zero quote.[12] The Midday Auction Pause would occur between 11:00 a.m. ET and 2:00 p.m. ET at a time specified by the Exchange and communicated to market participants in advance through a Trader Update.[13] The Exchange has stated that the Midday Auction Pause is intended to provide market participants with an opportunity to enter interest intended for the auction.[14]

During the Midday Auction Pause, the Exchange would: (i) Maintain resting orders on the Exchange's book that would be eligible to participate in the Midday Auction; (ii) accept new orders that would be eligible to participate in the Midday Auction, including Market On-the-Open orders (''MOO Orders'')[15] and Limit On-the-Open orders (''LOO Orders'');[16] (iii) cancel resting and arriving Non-Displayed Reserve Orders[17] and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes,[18] which are not eligible to participate in the Midday Auction;[19] (iv) accept and process cancellations of new and resting orders;[20] (v) continue to re-price sell short orders, including MOO Orders and LOO Orders, consistent with NYSE Rule 440B(e), which is the NYSE rule governing short sales; (vi) continue to re-price and/or cancel orders eligible to participate in the Midday Auction,[21] including MOO Orders and LOO Orders, consistent with NYSE Rule 80C(a)(5);[22] (vii) publish Order Imbalance Information, as defined in NYSE Rule 15(c),[23] approximately every five seconds during the Midday Auction Pause until the Midday Auction Stock reopens; (viii) cancel resting and arriving orders designated to cancel at the start of the Midday Auction Pause;[24] and (ix) route orders designated to route if the order becomes locked or crossed by an away market quote and to route the returned quantity of a routed order.[25]

At the end of the Midday Auction Pause, the Exchange would conduct the Midday Auction.[26] DMMs registered in

---

proceedings to determine whether to disapprove the proposed rule change.

[7] Amendment No. 1 is publicly available on the Exchange's Web site at: *https://www.nyse.com/publicdocs/nyse/markets/nyse/rule-filings/filings/2015/NYSE%202015-06,%20Pt.Am.%201.pdf.* In Amendment No. 1, the Exchange proposes to: (1) Allow a member organization to designate an order to cancel at the beginning of the Midday Auction Pause (*see, infra,* note 12 and the accompanying text for the definition of Midday Auction Pause); (2) allow a member organization to designate an order to route to an away market quote that locks or crosses the previously displayed price of the order, during the Midday Auction Pause, in which case the returned quantity of a routed order would also route; (3) have the Exchange cancel, during the Midday Auction Pause, resting and arriving Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes, which the Exchange specifies are not eligible to participate in the Midday Auction; (4) clarify that only orders that are eligible to participate in the Midday Auction would continue to be repriced during the Midday Auction Pause; and (5) prevent the Midday Auction from executing at a price outside of the Limit-Up-Limit-Down Bands or the Exchange's Trading Collars (*see, infra,* note 33 and the accompanying text), whichever is lower (for a buy imbalance) or higher (for a sell imbalance). Furthermore, the Exchange proposes to make a technical change to Exhibit 5 to correct an errant cross reference in Proposed NYSE Rule 124(e). The Exchange also proposes to add additional text to the filing to explain the revisions contained in Amendment No. 1, to further explain other aspects of the proposed rule change, and to remove from the filing text stating that the Exchange intends to submit separately a request for exemptive relief pursuant to Rule 611(d) of Regulation NMS.

[8] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(a)(3).

[9] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(a). The Exchange has represented that approximately 16 percent of the consolidated volume of all NYSE-listed securities consists of NYSE-listed securities with a CADV of 1,000,000 shares or less. *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9496 n.4.

[10] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(a)(1).

[11] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(a)(2). In the Notice, the Exchange represents that, if trading for a Midday Auction Stock is halted, paused, suspended, or not opened at the time of the Midday Auction, the Exchange would not conduct a Midday Auction for that security. *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9496. Instead, under those circumstances, the Exchange would reopen trading for that security pursuant to the applicable procedures, such as those for a reopening following a National Market System Plan to Address Extraordinary Market Volatility (''LULD Plan'') pause or following a regulatory halt. *See id.; see also* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 68876 (Feb. 8, 2013), 78 FR 10643 (Feb. 14, 2013) (SR–NYSE–2013–09) (Notice of filing and immediate effectiveness of proposed rule change to establish Exchange rules to comply with the requirements of the LULD Plan).

[12] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(b). The Exchange has represented that it would publish a zero quote on both the public and proprietary data feeds. *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9496.

[13] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(b); *see also Notice,* 80 FR at 9496 n.9.

[14] *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9496.

[15] Under the Exchange's rules, an MOO Order is ''a market order in a security that is to be executed in its entirety on the opening or reopening trade of the security on the Exchange. A MOO order will be immediately and automatically cancelled if the security opens on a quote or if it is not executed due to tick restrictions. MOO orders can be entered before the open to participate on the opening trade or during a trading halt or pause to participate on a reopening trade.'' *See* NYSE Rule 13.

[16] Under the Exchange's rules, an LOO Order is ''a limit order in a security that is to be executed on the opening or reopening trade of the security on the Exchange. A LOO order, or part thereof, will be immediately and automatically cancelled if by its terms it is not marketable at the opening price, it is not executed on the opening trade of the security on the Exchange, or if the security opens on a quote. LOO orders can be entered before the open to participate on the opening trade or during a trading halt or pause to participate on a reopening trade.'' *See* NYSE Rule 13.

[17] Under Exchange Rules, a Non-Displayed Reserve Order is a limit order that is not displayed, but remains available for potential execution against all incoming automatically executing orders until executed in full or cancelled. *See* NYSE Rule 13.

[18] Under Exchange Rules, ''e-Quotes'' are broker agency interest files that a Floor Broker places within the Exchange's Display Book with respect to orders the Floor Broker is representing. *See* NYSE Rule 70(a). A Reserve e-Quote is an e-Quote with reserve interest. *See* NYSE Rule 70(f). A Non-Display Reserve e-Quote is a Reserve e-Quote without a displayable portion. *See* NYSE Rule 70(f)(ii).

[19] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7.

[20] The Exchange has represented that it processes orders in the same manner during a trading halt or a pause pursuant to the LULD Plan. *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9497.

[21] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7.

[22] NYSE Rule 80C(a)(5) sets forth the LULD rules for the repricing and cancellation of trading interests.

[23] Order Imbalance Information disseminated by Exchange systems prior to the opening transaction is the data feed disseminated by Exchange systems of real-time order imbalances that accumulate prior to the opening transaction on the Exchange and of the price at which interest eligible to participate in the opening transaction may be executed in full. Order Imbalance Information includes all interest eligible for execution in the opening transaction of the security in Exchange systems. *See* NYSE Rule 15(c)(1). Order Imbalance Information is disseminated on the Exchange's proprietary data feeds. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74837 (Apr. 29, 2015), 80 FR 25741, 25741 n.4 (May 5, 2015) (SR–NYSE–2015–19).

[24] *See* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7.

[25] *See id. See also* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(b)(1)–(9).

[26] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(c).

each Midday Auction Security would be responsible for facilitating the Midday Auction for that security, by providing liquidity as needed (under NYSE Rule 104(a)(2)) [27] and, under NYSE Rule 123D(1),[28] by conducting the Midday Auction either manually or electronically.[29]

The Midday Auction would reopen the Midday Auction Stocks at a single equilibrium price in the same manner as set forth in NYSE Rule 123D (Openings and Halts in Trading), with two exceptions.[30] The first proposed exception to NYSE Rule 123D would conform the Midday Auction to the way in which the Exchange reopens securities following a LULD Plan pause, as set forth in NYSE Rule 80C(b)(2)(A).[31] NYSE Rule 123D(1) requires the dissemination of an ''indication'' (*i.e.,* an indication of anticipated price) in connection with any delayed opening, and all indications pursuant to NYSE Rule 123D require the supervision and approval of an Exchange Floor Official. During a Midday Auction Pause, as with an LULD Pause, indications would be permitted, but not required, and prior approval by Exchange officials would not be required before publishing an indication. If an indication were published, it would not need to be updated before the Midday Auction, and the Midday Auction would be permitted to occur outside of any prior indication. Furthermore, as with reopenings after a LULD Pause, a Midday Auction would not be subject to the NYSE Rule 123D requirements that: (i) A minimum of three minutes must elapse between the first indication and a stock's reopening; or (ii) if more than one indication is published, a minimum of one minute must elapse before a stock's reopening.[32]

The second proposed exception to NYSE Rule 123D would provide that the Midday Auction would not execute at a price outside (i) the LULD Price Bands in effect at the time of the Midday Auction, as provided for in NYSE Rule 80C(a)(4), or (ii) the Exchange's Trading Collars, as provided for in NYSE Rule 1000(c)(i), whichever price threshold is lower (for a buy imbalance) or higher (for a sell imbalance) at the time of the Midday Auction.[33]

Orders would participate in the Midday Auction in the same way they would participate in openings or reopenings, subject to the two exceptions explained above.[34] Additionally, as noted above, the Exchange would cancel resting and arriving Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes during the Midday Auction pause.[35] Orders that are not eligible to participate in openings or reopenings pursuant to NYSE rules would not participate in the Midday Auction.[36] Finally, if there were a significant imbalance in a Midday Auction Stock at the end of the Midday Auction Pause, the Midday Auction Pause could, with the approval of a Floor Governor or two Floor Officials, be converted to an order imbalance halt.[37] If a Midday Auction Pause were converted into an order imbalance halt, each order that had been re-priced would be re-filed according to the order's original instructions, and the security would be reopened pursuant to the procedures set forth in NYSE Rule 123D.[38]

## III. Summary of Comment Letter and NYSE's Response

The Commission has received one comment letter on the Exchange's proposal. The commenter asserts that broad-based, significant changes to equity market structure should be conducted through the Commission rulemaking process, not through a single exchange's rulemaking process. The commenter argues that the Commission should carry out market structure changes in a manner designed to benefit the entire market, rather than approving a self-regulatory organization rulemaking proposal that is designed to improve the market share for a single market participant.

Further, the commenter states that the proposal should not be approved before both the Exchange and the Commission confirm that a member firm that relies on NYSE's displayed book for compliance with the limit order display requirement of Rule 604 of Regulation NMS (''Limit Order Display Rule''),[39] and whose order is blacked out during the Midday Auction Pause, would still be considered to be in compliance with the Limit Order Display Rule.

Finally, the commenter objects to the Exchange's statement that it will request an exemption under Rule 611(d) of Regulation NMS [40] for the Midday Auction process. The commenter asserts that the Midday Auction should be designed so that it operates within and in compliance with existing regulatory requirements. The commenter argues that, if the Commission determines that periodic intraday auctions are a beneficial way to improve trading quality in lower-volume securities, the Commission should apply the same rules or relief for those auctions to all market participants. The commenter asserts that the Midday Auction does not qualify for an exemption from Rule 611 of Regulation NMS because the Midday Auction would be substantially different than the operation of a single-priced reopening transaction. The commenter states that a single-priced reopening transaction, as the term is used in Rule 611 of Regulation NMS, is a price discovery event on a single venue that generally occurs when the entire market has halted trading in that security to address unusual market, operational, or regulatory situations. The commenter states that the single-priced reopening transaction exception under Rule 611 of Regulation NMS would not be applicable to a daily auction mechanism whose purpose is to increase the market share of a single exchange.

In Amendment No. 1, the Exchange responds that, to address the commenter's concerns regarding the Limit Order Display Rule and a member organization's best-execution requirements, it has amended the proposal. First, the Exchange has amended the proposal to allow a member organization to designate an

[27] NYSE Rule 104(a)(2) sets forth a DMM's responsibilities and duties to facilitate openings and reopenings for each of the securities in which the DMM is registered under Exchange rules. *See* NYSE Rule 104(a)(2). NYSE Rule 104(a)(2) also requires DMMs to supply liquidity on the opening and reopening, as needed, for each security in which the DMM is registered. *See id.* The Exchange is proposing to add these liquidity provisions for Midday Auctions to the DMM's responsibilities and duties under NYSE Rule 104(a)(2).

[28] NYSE Rule 123D(1) provides that openings may be effectuated manually or electronically. *See* NYSE Rule 123D(1).

[29] *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9497.

[30] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(c).

[31] *See Notice,* 80 FR at 9497.

[32] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(c)(1). *See* NYSE Rule 123D(1) (''Generally, a minimum of three minutes must elapse between the first indication and a stock's opening as measured by the time the indication appears on the PDU. However, when more than one indication is disseminated, a stock may open one minute after the last indication provided that at least three minutes must have elapsed from the dissemination of the first indication.''). An indication published pursuant to NYSE Rule 123D is published to the Consolidated Tape. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74837 (Apr. 29, 2015), 80 FR 25741, 25741 n.5 (May 5, 2015) (SR–NYSE–2015–19).

[33] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(c)(2); *see also* Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7.

[34] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(d).

[35] *See supra,* note 19 and the accompanying text. The Exchange also proposes to continue to re-price sell short orders, including MOO and LOO Orders, consistent with NYSE Rule 440B(e), *see* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(b)(5), and to continue to re-price and/or cancel orders eligible to participate in the Midday Auction, including MOO and LOO Orders, consistent with the LULD Plan, *see* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(b)(6).

[36] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(d).

[37] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(e).

[38] *See* Proposed NYSE Rule 124(e).

[39] 17 CFR 242.604.

[40] 17 CFR 242.611(d).

order not to participate in the Midday Auction (by designating that order to cancel at the beginning of the Midday Auction Pause). The Exchange has further amend the proposal to allow a member organization to designate an order to route to an away market quote that locks or crosses the previously displayed price of the order during the Midday Auction Pause. To further address concerns regarding execution opportunities during the Midday Auction Pause, the Exchange has amended the proposal to cancel Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes resting on the Exchange's book during the Midday Auction Pause and to reject Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes entered during the Midday Auction Pause.

With respect to the applicability of Rule 611 of Regulation NMS, the Exchange states in Amendment No. 1 that it will not be submitting a request for exemptive relief. The Exchange states its belief that the exception under Rule 611(b)(3) of Regulation NMS [41] would apply to the single-priced trade at the conclusion of the Midday Auction conducted pursuant to proposed NYSE Rule 124, because the Midday Auction would result in a single-priced reopening transaction after a trading halt conducted pursuant to Exchange rules and, thus, would be excepted from the Order Protection Rule pursuant to Rule 611(b)(3) under Regulation NMS.

## IV. Discussion and Commission Findings

After careful review and consideration of the Exchange's proposal and the comment letter, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange.[42] In particular, the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[43] which requires, among other things, that the rules of a national securities exchange be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade; to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system; and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and that the rules of a national securities exchange not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers or dealers.

The Commission believes that the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is reasonably designed to potentially improve market quality in thinly traded securities, including securities issued by small-to-medium-sized issuers, by aggregating intra-day liquidity on the Exchange through an auction process. The Midday Auction would be limited to NYSE-listed stocks that have a consolidated average daily trading volume of 1,000,000 shares or less, and it would provide market participants with a new alternative for seeking liquidity in these stocks. Market participants could participate in the Midday Auction, but they would also be free to route orders to participate in continuous trading on other competing exchanges and trading venues.

The commenter argues that broad-based, significant changes to equity market structure should be conducted through Commission rulemaking and not through a single exchange's self-regulatory organization rulemaking process. The question before the Commission, however, is whether the Exchange's proposal is consistent with the Act. If the Commission finds that the Exchange's proposal is consistent with the Act, the Commission must approve the proposal,[44] and, if the Commission is unable to find that the Exchange's proposal is consistent with the Act, the Commission must disapprove the proposal.[45]

As noted above, the Exchange has proposed an alternative means of aggregating intra-day liquidity—adapting an existing auction mechanism to function during the trading day—and the Commission believes that the Act permits exchanges to experiment with new trading mechanisms, so long as those mechanisms are consistent with the Act and the regulations thereunder. The mere fact that a single exchange proposes, consistent with the Act, to operate differently from another exchange, or even all other exchanges, or that it seeks to gain market share from its competitors by doing so, does not mean that the exchange's proposed rule change constitutes a broad-based change to equity market structure that should only be accomplished by Commission rulemaking. The current equity market structure features, and the Act permits, fierce competition among numerous national securities exchanges, alternative trading systems, and other trading venues, each of which seeks to gain market share by differentiating itself through offering, among other things, different order types, data products, and trading fees and rebates. The Commission believes that the Exchange's proposal fits comfortably within the bounds of existing competition between trading venues and that it is consistent with the Act.

The commenter has also raised questions with respect to Exchange member firms' obligations under the Limit Order Display Rule. The Exchange has responded to these questions, and broader best-execution concerns, by filing Amendment No. 1, which would: (1) Allow a member organization to designate an order to cancel at the beginning of the Midday Auction Pause; (2) allow a member organization to designate an order to route to an away market quote that locks or crosses the previously displayed price of that order during the Midday Auction Pause; and (3) cancel resting and arriving Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes during the Midday Auction Pause.

The Commission notes that the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, would allow Exchange member organizations to affirmatively opt out of participating in the Midday Auction by designating orders to be canceled at the start of the Midday Auction Pause and to conditionally opt out of the Midday Auction by designating an order to route to away markets that lock or cross the order during the Midday Auction Pause. The Commission believes that the operation of the Midday Auction, including the Midday Auction Pause, would not conflict with the ability of member organizations to comply with their obligations under the Limit Order Display Rule [46] or their best-execution obligations to their customers.

[41] *See* 17 CFR 242.611(b)(3) (providing an exception from the Order Protection Rule under Rule 611 of Regulation NMS when the ''transaction that constituted the trade-through was a single-priced opening, reopening, or closing transaction by the trading center'').

[42] In approving this proposed rule change, as amended, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. *See* 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[43] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[44] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(C)(i) (''The Commission shall approve a proposed rule change of a self-regulatory organization if it finds that such proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of this chapter and the rules and regulations issued under this chapter that are applicable to such organization.'').

[45] *See* 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(C)(ii) (''The Commission shall disapprove a proposed rule change of a self-regulatory organization if it does not make a finding described in clause (i) [*i.e.,* that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act].'').

[46] The Commission notes that Rule 604(b)(5) under Regulation NMS, 17 CFR 242.604(b)(5), exempts from the requirements of the Limit Order Display Rule any customer limit order that is delivered immediately upon receipt to a national securities exchange or national securities association-sponsored system, or an electronic

Finally, the commenter asserts that the Midday Auction does not qualify for an exemption from the requirements of Rule 611 of Regulation NMS because the Midday Auction would be substantially different from the operation of a single-priced reopening transaction. The commenter argues that the Rule 611 exception for reopening auctions was intended to apply in very specific, limited circumstances to address unusual market, operational, or regulatory situations, not to permit daily auction mechanism whose purpose is to increase the market share of a single exchange.

In response, the Exchange has clarified that it will not be submitting a request for exemptive relief under Rule 611 of Regulation NMS because it believes that the Midday Auction would qualify for the single-priced reopening exception of Rule 611(b)(3). The Exchange explains, in Amendment No. 1, that ''the single-priced trade at the conclusion of the Midday Auction is a single-priced reopening transaction after a trading halt conducted pursuant to Exchange rules and would be excepted under paragraph (b)(3) of Rule 611 under Regulation NMS from the trade-through requirements under Rule 611.'' [47]

The Commission agrees that the proposal falls within the exception for single-priced reopening transactions pursuant to Rule 611(b)(3) of Regulation NMS.[48] Pursuant to Rule 611(a) under Regulation NMS,[49] the Order Protection Rule requires a trading center to have written policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent trade-throughs on that trading center of protected quotations in NMS stocks.[50] Rule 611(b)(3) under Regulation NMS excepts from the Order Protection Rule a single-priced opening, reopening, or closing transaction by the trading center.[51] In adopting Regulation NMS, the Commission directly addressed concerns that a trading center might attempt to use the Rule 611(b)(3) exception to halt trading and then reopen solely to enable it to trade-through other trading centers.[52] The Commission therefore specified in the Regulation NMS Adopting Release that the exception provided by Rule 611(b)(3) applies ''only to single-priced reopenings and therefore requires that a trading center conduct, pursuant to its rules or written procedures, a formalized and transparent process for executing orders during reopening after a trading halt that involves the queuing and ultimate execution of multiple orders at a single equilibrium price.'' [53] Neither the text of Rule 611(b)(3), nor the Commission's discussion in the Regulation NMS Adopting Release, requires that the relevant trading halt be a market-wide regulatory halt or that it necessarily address unusual market, operational, or regulatory situations.

As proposed, the Midday Auction would be conducted once per day, pursuant to Exchange rules and at a time that would be publicly announced in advance. The Midday Auction would halt trading on the Exchange in Midday Auction Securities for five minutes to allow market participants an opportunity to enter, cancel, or modify trading interest. During this five-minute pause, the Exchange would publish Order Imbalance Information, and would be permitted to publish ''indications,'' to attract liquidity. At the conclusion of the five-minute pause, the Exchange would reopen each of the Midday Auction Stocks, executing the queued orders at a single equilibrium price in the same manner as NYSE Rule 123D reopenings.

The Commission believes that the proposal is not designed to permit the Exchange to declare a trading halt merely to be able to circumvent the operation of the Order Protection Rule upon reopening. Instead, the Exchange has proposed a formalized and transparent process for the Midday Auction that would involve the queuing and execution of multiple orders at a single equilibrium price, pursuant to a trading halt declared pursuant to its own rules. The Commission therefore believes that the proposal falls within the exception for single-priced reopenings pursuant to Rule 611(b)(3) of Regulation NMS.[54]

For the above reasons, the Commission finds that the proposal, as modified by Amendment No. 1, is consistent with the requirements of the Act.

## V. Solicitation of Comments on Amendment No. 1

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

*Electronic Comments*

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number SR–NYSE–2015–06 on the subject line.

*Paper Comments*

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NYSE–2015–06. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–NYSE–2015–06 and should be submitted on or before June 19, 2015.

communications network that complies with the requirements of § 242.602(b)(5)(ii) with respect to that order.

[47] Amendment No. 1, *supra* note 7.

[48] 17 CFR 242.611(b)(3).

[49] 17 CFR 242.611(a).

[50] A trade-through occurs when one trading center executes an order at a price that is inferior to the price of a protected quotation displayed by another trading center. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 37496, 37501 (June 29, 2005) (File No. S7–10–04) (''Regulation NMS Adopting Release''). An ''NMS stock'' means any security or class of securities, other than an option, for which transaction reports are collected, processed, and made available pursuant to an effective transaction reporting plan. *See* 17 CFR 242.600(b)(46), (47).

[51] *See* 17 CFR 242.611(b)(3).

[52] *See* Regulation NMS Adopting Release, 70 FR at 37520.

[53] *See* Regulation NMS Adopting Release, 70 FR at 37521. In addition, the Commission stated that the trading center must have formally declared a trading halt, pursuant to its rules or written procedures, to fall within the Rule 611(b)(3) exception. *Id.*

[54] *See* 17 CFR 242.611(b)(3).

**VI. Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1**

The Commission finds good cause to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, prior to the 30th day after the date of publication of notice of Amendment No. 1 in the **Federal Register**. As discussed above, in Amendment No. 1, the Exchange proposes to: (1) Allow a member organization to designate an order to cancel at the beginning of the Midday Auction Pause; (2) allow a member organization to designate an order to route to an away market quote that locks or crosses the previously displayed price of the order during the Midday Auction Pause, in which case the returned quantity of a routed order would also route; (3) have the Exchange cancel, during the Midday Auction Pause, resting and arriving Non-Displayed Reserve Orders and Non-Display Reserve e-Quotes, which the Exchange specifies are not eligible to participate in the Midday Auction; (4) clarify that only orders that are eligible to participate in the Midday Auction would continue to be repriced during the Midday Auction Pause; (5) prevent the Midday Auction from executing at a price outside of the LULD Bands or the Exchange's Trading Collars, whichever is lower (for a buy imbalance) or higher (for a sell imbalance). Furthermore, the Exchange proposes to make a technical change to Exhibit 5 to correct an errant cross reference in Proposed NYSE Rule 124(e). The Exchange has also added additional text to the filing to explain the revisions contained in Amendment No. 1, further explained other aspects of the proposed rule change, and removed from the filing text stating that the Exchange intends to submit separately a request for exemptive relief pursuant to Rule 611(d) of Regulation NMS.

The Commission believes that Amendment No. 1 provides market participants with the option to opt out of the Midday Auction, provides that non-displayed orders would not participate in the Midday Auction, and addresses the price limitations within which the Midday Auction would occur. In particular, the Commission believes that permitting member organizations to designate orders to cancel when the Midday Auction Pause begins, or to route when an order becomes locked or crossed by an away market quote during the Midday Auction Pause, should provide Exchange member organizations with appropriate options to help them comply with their best-execution duties to their customers. Furthermore, the Commission believes that providing for the cancellation or rejection of non-displayed orders during the Midday Auction Pause provides clarity as to how the Exchange intends the proposed auction to operate in regard to order execution. Additionally, the Commission believes that limiting the Midday Auction execution price to the lower (for a buy imbalance) or higher (for a sell imbalance) of the Exchange's LULD Band or Trading Collar Band, at the time of the Midday Auction, should mitigate the risk of an execution at prices that are too far away from the prevailing price of a given security in continuous trading on other national securities exchanges and trading venues. Finally, the Commission believes that the Exchange's proposed technical revisions, and additional explanation regarding the proposal, will provide market participants more clarity regarding how the proposed rule is intended to operate.

The Commission finds that Amendment No. 1 is consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest. Accordingly, the Commission finds good cause, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[55] to approve the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, on an accelerated basis.

**VI. Conclusion**

*It is therefore ordered* that, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[56] the proposed rule change, as modified by Amendment No. 1, (SR–NYSE–2015–06) be, and hereby is, approved on an accelerated basis.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[57]

**Robert W. Errett,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12968 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8011–01–P**

[55] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[56] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[57] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: Recording of Aircraft Conveyances and Security Documents

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. Approval is needed for security reasons such as mortgages submitted by the public for recording against aircraft, engines, propellers, and spare parts locations.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0043

*Title:* Recording of Aircraft Conveyances and Security Documents

*Form Numbers:* FAA Form 8050–41.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* Title 49, U. S. C. Section 44108 provides for establishing and maintaining a system for the recording of security conveyances affecting title to, or interest in U.S. civil aircraft, as well as certain specifically identified engines, propellers, or spare parts locations, and for recording of releases relating to those conveyances. The original security conveyance is examined by the Civil Aviation Registry to insure that it meets recording requirements as set forth in FAR Part 49. If it does, it is given a recording number and made a permanent part of the aircraft record.

*Respondents:* Approximately 45,469 lienholders.

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 45,469 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12975 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Meeting: RTCA Program Management Committee (PMC)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of RTCA Program Management Committee Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of RTCA Program Management Committee.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 18th from 8:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at RTCA, Inc., 1150 18th Street, Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, Tel: (202) 330–0654.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Harold Moses, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *hmoses@rtca.org,* 202–330–0654.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby given for a meeting of the Program Management Committee. The agenda will include the following:

**Thursday, June 18, 2015**

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Review/Approve meeting summary
a. March 24, 2015, RTCA paper no. 119–15/PMC–1332
3. Publication consideration/approval
a. Final draft, revised document, DO–200A—standards for processing aeronautical data, prepared by SC–217.
b. Final draft, revised document, DO–230D—standard for airport security access control systems, prepared by SC–224.
c. Final draft, revised document, DO–311—minimum operational performance standards for rechargeable lithium battery systems, prepared by SC–225.
4. Integration and coordination committee (ICC)
a. Task status—SC–186/SC–227 A–IM concept—discussion.
5. Action item review
a. PMC ad hoc—standards overlap and alignment—discussion—workshop status.
b. SC–229—406 MHz emergency locator transmitters (ELTs)—discussion—coordination status—aircraft tracking and in-flight triggering
c. SC–159—global positioning system—discussion—revised terms of reference (TOR)
6. Discussion
a. SC–214—standards for air traffic data communication services—discussion—revised TOR
b. SC–217—aeronautical databases—discussion—revised TOR
c. Wake vortex tiger team—discussion—white paper—review/approve
d. Minimum operational performance standards for small cell non-rechargeable lithium batteries—discussion—possible new special committee to revise RTCA DO–227
e. SC–233—addressing human factors/pilot interface issues for avionics—discussion—document table of contents ''buckets''
f. Design assurance guidance for airborne electronic hardware—status—possible new special committee to update RTCA DO–254
g. SC–186—automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast—discussion—BADA testing criteria/MITRE software FastLicense
h. NAC—status update
i. FAA actions taken on previously published documents—report
j. Special committees—chairmen's reports and active inter-special committee requirements agreements (ISRA)—review
k. European/EUROCAE coordination—status update
7. Other business
8. Schedule for committee deliverables and next meeting date

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12974 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: Certification: Airmen Other Than Flight Crewmembers, Subpart C, Aircraft Dispatchers and App. A Aircraft Dispatcher Courses

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. The respondents to this information collection are FAR Part 135 and Part 121 operators seeking airman certification and approval of aircraft dispatcher courses. The FAA uses the information to ensure compliance and adherence to the regulations.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0648

*Title:* Certification: Airmen Other Than Flight Crewmembers, Subpart C, Aircraft Dispatchers and App. A Aircraft Dispatcher Courses

*Form Numbers:* There are no FAA forms associated with this collection.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* Each applicant for an aircraft dispatcher certificate or FAA approval of an aircraft dispatcher course much comply with 14 CFR part 65, subpart C and Appendix A. Any paperwork is provided to the local Flight Standards District Office of the FAA which oversees the certificates and FAA approvals.

*Respondents:* Approximately 36 applicants.

*Frequency:* Information is collected as needed.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1 hour.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 4,679 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12983 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Fourth Meeting: Special Committee 230 (SC 230)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Fourth Meeting Notice of Special Committee 230.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the fourth meeting of Special Committee 230.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 16th–18th from 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at The Boeing Company, 635 Park Avenue, N Renton, WA 98057, Tel: (202) 330–0663.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Sophie Bousquet, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *sbousquet@rtca.org,* 202–330–0663.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby given for a meeting of the Special Committee 230. The agenda will include the following:

**Tuesday, June 16, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Meeting #3 Minutes approval
4. Discussion of activities with EUROCAE WG–95
5. Review of final findings from DO–220 draft

**Wednesday, June 17, 2015**

1. Review of issues being addressed in DO–213
2. Review of findings from DO–213 draft

**Thursday, June 18, 2015**

1. Review of findings from DO–213 draft
2. Action Item Review
3. Other Actions
4. FRAC Progress
5. Date and Place of Next Meetings
6. Adjourn

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12973 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Sixty-Third Meeting: Subcommittee 186 (SC 186)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Sixty-Third Meeting Notice of Subcommittee 186.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the sixty-third meeting of Subcommittee 186.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 8th–12th from 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at Erzabt-Klotz Strasse 1, 5020 Salzburg, Austria, Tel: (202) 330–0654.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC, 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Harold Moses, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *hmoses@rtca.org,* 202–330–0654.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby given for a meeting of the NextGen Advisory Committee. The agenda will include the following:

**Monday, June 8, 2015**

1. All Day, WG–4/EUROCAE Subgroup 3—Application Technical Requirements, University of Salzburg
2. FIM SPR and MOPS FRAC/WC Comment Resolutions

**Tuesday, June 9, 2015**

1. All Day, WG–4/EUROCAE Subgroup 3—Application Technical Requirements, University of Salzburg
2. FIM SPR and MOPS FRAC/WC Comment Resolutions Official Statement of Designated Federal Official—The Honorable Mike Whitaker, FAA Deputy Administrator

**Wednesday, June 10, 2015**

1. All Day, WG–4/EUROCAE Subgroup 3—Application Technical Requirements, University of Salzburg
2. FIM SPR and MOPS FRAC/WC Comment Resolutions

**Thursday, June 11, 2015**

1. All Day, WG–4/EUROCAE Subgroup 3—Application Technical Requirements, Crowne Plaza, University of Salzburg
2. FIM SPR and MOPS FRAC/WC Comment Resolutions

**Friday, June 12, 2015**

1. Chairman's Introductory Remarks.
2. Review of Meeting Agenda.
3. Review/Approval of the 62nd Meeting Summary, RTCA Paper No. RTCA Paper No. 023–15/SC186–337.
4. Surveillance Broadcast Services (SBS) Program Status
5. European Activities
6. WG–4—Application Technical Requirements
   a. Document Approval: Revision A for Safety, Performance, and

Interoperability Requirements (SPR) for ASPA–FIM (ED–195A/DO–328A) (RTCA Paper # 059–15/SC–186–340)
b. Document Approval: MOPS for Flight Deck Interval Management (FIM) (RTCA Paper # 057–15/SC–186–338)
c. Advanced Interval Management (A–IM) Development Status
7. Coordination with SC–214/WG–78 for ADS–B Application Data Link Rqts–Status.
8. FAA information briefings
a. Equip 2020
b. Planned TIS–B Service Changes Update
c. Identified TIS–B Open Issues
d. Summary of Avionics Monitoring results
e. Date, Place and Time of Next Meeting.
9. New Business.
a. None
10. Other Business.
a. Aireon Status Update
11. Review Action Items/Work Programs.
12. Adjourn Plenary

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12956 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Fourteenth Meeting: Subcommittee 227 (SC 227)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Fourteenth Meeting Notice of Subcommittee 227.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the fourteenth meeting of the Subcommittee 227.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 15th–19th from 9:00 a.m.–4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at RTCA Headquarters, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, Tel: (202) 330–0663.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC, 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Sophie Bousquet, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *sbousquet@rtca.org,* 202–330–0663.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a) (2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby given for a meeting of the NextGen Advisory Committee. The agenda will include the following:

**Monday, June 15, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Overview of Planned Work Program for the Week
a. Action Items Review
b. MOPS Draft Review
c. Miscellaneous Items
4. Plenary Review/Discussion
a. Planned Work Schedule (Note, schedule subject to change)
b. Draft MOPS Issues
c. CNS–ATM appendix: Interval Management Operations, addition or not at this time.
d. Status of new working group for map MOPS
e. Release of the MOPS (Rev to DO–283A) for FRAC
5. Technical Requirements Breakout Sessions (as needed)
6. Other Business

**Tuesday, June 16, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Overview of Planned Work Program for the Week
a. Action Items Review
b. MOPS Draft Review
c. Miscellaneous Items
4. Plenary Review/Discussion
a. Planned Work Schedule (Note, schedule subject to change)
b. Draft MOPS Issues
c. CNS–ATM appendix: Interval Management Operations, addition or not at this time.
d. Status of new working group for map MOPS
e. Release of the MOPS (Rev to DO–283A) for FRAC
5. Technical Requirements Breakout Sessions (as needed)
6. Other Business

**Wednesday, June 17, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Overview of Planned Work Program for the Week
a. Action Items Review
b. MOPS Draft Review
c. Miscellaneous Items
4. Plenary Review/Discussion
a. Planned Work Schedule (Note, schedule subject to change)
b. Draft MOPS Issues
c. CNS–ATM appendix: Interval Management Operations, addition or not at this time.
d. Status of new working group for map MOPS
e. Release of the MOPS (Rev to DO–283A) for FRAC
5. Technical Requirements Breakout Sessions (as needed)
6. Other Business

**Thursday, June 18, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Overview of Planned Work Program for the Week
a. Action Items Review
b. MOPS Draft Review
c. Miscellaneous Items
4. Plenary Review/Discussion
a. Planned Work Schedule (Note, schedule subject to change)
b. Draft MOPS Issues
c. CNS–ATM appendix: Interval Management Operations, addition or not at this time.
d. Status of new working group for map MOPS
e. Release of the MOPS (Rev to DO–283A) for FRAC
5. Technical Requirements Breakout Sessions (as needed)
6. Other Business

**Friday, June 19, 2015**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
2. Agenda Overview
3. Overview of Planned Work Program for the Week
a. Action Items Review
b. MOPS Draft Review
c. Miscellaneous Items
4. Plenary Review/Discussion
a. Planned Work Schedule (Note, schedule subject to change)
b. Draft MOPS Issues
c. CNS–ATM appendix: Interval Management Operations, addition or not at this time.
d. Status of new working group for map MOPS
e. Release of the MOPS (Rev to DO–283A) for FRAC
5. Technical Requirements Breakout Sessions (as needed)
6. Other Business

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability.

With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12962 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: ACSEP Evaluation Customer Feedback Report

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. The information is collected from holders of FAA production approvals and selected suppliers to obtain their input on how well the agency is performing the administration and conduct of the Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program (ACSEP).

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0605

*Title:* ACSEP Evaluation Customer Feedback Report

*Form Numbers:* FAA Form 8100–7.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* The information collected is used by the Aircraft Certification Service's Manufacturing Inspection Offices, Aircraft Certification Offices, and the Production & Airworthiness Certification Division to improve the administration and conduct of the Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program at the local and national levels. Improvements to FAA Order 8100.7, Aircraft Certification Systems Evaluation Program, have been and will continue to be incorporated as a result of the on-going collection of data. It is also used for reporting as a Customer Service Standard in fulfillment of Executive Order 12862, Setting Customer Service Standards.

*Respondents:* Approximately 200 holders of FAA production approvals and selected suppliers.

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 100 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12982 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: Procedures for Non-Federal Navigation Facilities

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. Non-Federal navigation facilities are electrical/electronic aids to air navigation which are purchased, installed, operated, and maintained by an entity other than the FAA and are available for use by the flying public.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0014.

*Title:* Procedures for Non-Federal Navigation Facilities.

*Form Numbers:* FAA Forms 6030–1, 6030–17, 6790–4, 6790–5.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* FAR Part 171 establishes procedures and requirements for sponsors, both private and public other than FAA, to purchase, install, operate, and maintain electronic navaids for use by the flying public in the National Airspace System (NAS). FAR Part 171 describes procedures for receiving permission to install a facility and requirements to be fulfilled to keep it in service. These requirements include inspection and periodic maintenance. These tasks and any other repair work done to these facilities is recorded in on-site logs, copies of which are sent to the Service Center office.

*Respondents:* Approximately 2,413 sponsors of non-federal navigation facilities.

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 13.72 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 33,116 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12984 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Fifth Meeting: Special Committee 231 (SC 231)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Fifth Meeting Notice of Special Committee 231.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the fifth meeting of the Special Committee 231.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 9th–11th from 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at RTCA Headquarters, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, Tel: (202) 330–0663.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Sophie Bousquet, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *sbousquet@rtca.org,* 202–330–0663.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby given for a meeting of the Special Committee 231. The agenda will include the following:

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

1. Welcome/Introduction
2. Administrative Remarks
3. Agenda Review
4. Summary of Working Group activities
5. Other Business
6. Date and Place of Next Meeting

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

1. Continuation of Plenary or Working Group Session Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions

Thursday, June 11, 2015

1. Continuation of Plenary or Working Group Session

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12961 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: Certification of Airmen for the Operation of Light-Sport Aircraft

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. Regulation generates a need for new designated pilot examiners and designated airworthiness representatives to support the certification of new light-sport aircraft, pilots, flight instructors, and ground instructors.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0690.

*Title:* Certification of Airmen for the Operation of Light-Sport Aircraft.

*Form Numbers:* FAA form 8130–15, 8710–11, 8710–12.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* The Final Rule ''Certification of Aircraft and Airmen for the Operation of Light-Sport Aircraft'' [69 FR 44771] generated a need for new designated pilot examiners and designated airworthiness representatives to support the certification of new light-sport aircraft, pilots, flight instructors, and ground instructors.

*Respondents:* Approximately 57,214 respondents.

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 1.27 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 39,640 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12987 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Twenty-Fourth Meeting: Subcommittee 217 (SC 217)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Twenty-Fourth Meeting Notice of Subcommittee 217.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Subcommittee 217.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 15th–19th from 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at RTCA Headquarters, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, Tel: (202) 330–0663.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The RTCA Secretariat, 1150 18th Street NW., Suite 910, Washington, DC 20036, or by telephone at (202) 833–9339, fax at (202) 833–9434, or Web site at *http://www.rtca.org* or Sophie Bousquet, Program Director, RTCA, Inc., *sbousquet@rtca.org,* 202–330–0663.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., App.), notice is hereby

given for a meeting of the Subcommittee 217. The agenda will include the following:

**Monday, June 15, 2015**

1. Open Plenary Session
a. Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions
b. Approve minutes from 23nd meeting
c. Review and approve meeting agenda for 24rd meeting
d. ED–76A—DO–200B progress status
e. Discussion on the outcome of DO–201A/ED–77 Scoping Exercise
f. Schedule and working arrangements for this week
2. FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
a. DO–272/ED–99, DO–276/ED–98, DO–291/ED–119—FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
b. Overview of comments received—by FRAC Preparation Team
c. Resolution of individual comments by priority
d. Summary of FRAC resolution
e. Action Plan to get the final document draft copies to RTCA and EUROCAEWelcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks

**Tuesday, June 16, 2015**

1. Open Plenary Session
a. Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions
b. Approve minutes from 23nd meeting
c. Review and approve meeting agenda for 24rd meeting
d. ED–76A—DO–200B progress status
e. Discussion on the outcome of DO–201A/ED–77 Scoping Exercise
f. Schedule and working arrangements for this week
2. FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
a. DO–272/ED–99, DO–276/ED–98, DO–291/ED–119—FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
b. Overview of comments received—by FRAC Preparation Team
c. Resolution of individual comments by priority
d. Summary of FRAC resolution
e. Action Plan to get the final document draft copies to RTCA and EUROCAEWelcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks

**Wednesday, June 17, 2015**

1. Open Plenary Session
a. Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions
b. Approve minutes from 23nd meeting
c. Review and approve meeting agenda for 24rd meeting
d. ED–76A—DO–200B progress status
e. Discussion on the outcome of DO–201A/ED–77 Scoping Exercise
f. Schedule and working arrangements for this week
2. FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
a. DO–272/ED–99, DO–276/ED–98, DO–291/ED–119—FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
b. Overview of comments received—by FRAC Preparation Team
c. Resolution of individual comments by priority
d. Summary of FRAC resolution
e. Action Plan to get the final document draft copies to RTCA and EUROCAEWelcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks

**Thursday, June 18, 2015**

1. Open Plenary Session
a. Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions
b. Approve minutes from 23nd meeting
c. Review and approve meeting agenda for 24rd meeting
d. ED–76A—DO–200B progress status
e. Discussion on the outcome of DO–201A/ED–77 Scoping Exercise
f. Schedule and working arrangements for this week
2. FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
a. DO–272/ED–99, DO–276/ED–98, DO–291/ED–119—FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
b. Overview of comments received—by FRAC Preparation Team
c. Resolution of individual comments by priority
d. Summary of FRAC resolution
e. Action Plan to get the final document draft copies to RTCA and EUROCAEWelcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks

**Friday, June 19, 2015**

1. Open Plenary Session
a. Co-Chairmen's remarks and introductions
b. Approve minutes from 23nd meeting
c. Review and approve meeting agenda for 24rd meeting
d. ED–76A—DO–200B progress status
e. Discussion on the outcome of DO–201A/ED–77 Scoping Exercise
f. Schedule and working arrangements for this week
2. FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
a. DO–272/ED–99, DO–276/ED–98, DO–291/ED–119—FRAC and Open Consultation Resolution
b. Overview of comments received—by FRAC Preparation Team
c. Resolution of individual comments by priority
d. Summary of FRAC resolution
e. Action Plan to get the final document draft copies to RTCA and EUROCAEWelcome/Introductions/Administrative Remarks
3. Closing Plenary Session
a. Approval of Documents for the PMC/TAC Meeting in September 2015
b. Next meetings, TORs, dates, locations
c. Any other business and Adjourn

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time. Issued in Washington, DC, on May 21, 2015.

**Latasha Robinson,**

*Management & Program Analyst, NextGen, Program Oversight and Administration, Federal Aviation Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12972 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Requests for Comments; Clearance of Renewed Approval of Information Collection: Certification of Repair Stations

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. Information is collected from applicants who wish to obtain repair station certification. Applicants must submit FAA form 8310–3 to the appropriate FAA flight standards district office for review.

**DATES:** Written comments should be submitted by July 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ronda Thompson, Room 300, Federal Aviation Administration, ASP–110, 950 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20024.

*Public Comments Invited:* You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of

information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ronda Thompson at (202) 267–1416, or by email at: *Ronda.Thompson@faa.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*OMB Control Number:* 2120–0682.

*Title:* Certification of Repair Stations.

*Form Numbers:* FAA Form 8310–3.

*Type of Review:* Renewal of an information collection.

*Background:* Part 145 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) prescribes the requirements for the issuance of repair station certificates and associated ratings to maintenance and alteration organizations. The information requested is required from applicants who wish repair station certification. Applicants must submit the required data to the appropriate FAA district office for review and acceptance/approval. If the information is satisfactory, an onsite inspection is conducted. When all the FAR Part 145 requirements have been met an air agency certificate and repair station operations specifications with appropriate ratings and limitations are issued.

*Respondents:* Approximately 4,625 maintenance and alteration organizations.

*Frequency:* Information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden per Response:* 8 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 37,000 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 21, 2015.

**Ronda Thompson,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, ASP–110.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12980 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Maritime Administration

### Recognition Awards for U.S.-Flag Vessel Usage

**AGENCY:** Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** By this notice the Maritime Administration (MARAD) announces the ''*U.S. Ships*'' program to recognize private commercial entities that reach certain U.S.-flag vessel usage rates for the carriage of goods or private or governmental entities that otherwise make noteworthy contributions to utilization of U.S.-flag vessels. The initial nomination period for awards recognizing support for U.S.-flag carriage in 2015 will open January 4, 2016. MARAD will publish another **Federal Register** Notice prior to opening the nomination period to provide additional information about this program, including additional information on specific awards eligibility, criteria, and nomination procedures. Consistent with the established policy of the United States to encourage and aid the development and maintenance of a robust maritime industry, and MARAD's mission to ''foster, promote, and develop the merchant maritime industry of the United States,'' MARAD will issue recognition awards to encourage the use of U.S.-flag vessels, whether in domestic or international commerce. This notice informs the public of this awards recognition program in anticipation of nominations and articulates the criteria for *U.S. Ships* recognition awards.

**DATES:** This policy is effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**. (See also Paperwork Reduction Act section.)

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** You may contact Clifford Johnson, Office of Cargo and Commercial Sealift, Maritime Administration, at (202) 366–2105. You may send mail to Mr. Johnson at Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., MAR 620, Washington, DC 20590–0001. You may send electronic mail to *Clifford.Johnson@dot.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

The promotion of the United States maritime industry is a central mission of MARAD. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted to promote a well-equipped and efficient fleet owned and operated by United States citizens and supported by domestic shipbuilding and repair facilities.[1] MARAD was specifically formed as a maritime promotional entity separate from the Federal Maritime Commission.[2] The Message of the President transmitting Plan 7 states that the ''basic objective of the plan is to strengthen and revitalize the administration of our Federal programs concerned with the promotion and development of the U.S. merchant marine by concentrating responsibility in separate agencies for the performance of regulatory and promotional functions.''

It is central to MARAD's promotional mission to encourage and aid the development of the U.S. merchant maritime industry. 49 U.S.C. 109(b). Consistent with the Military Cargo Preference Act of 1904 and the Cargo Preference Act of 1954, as implemented by 46 CFR part 381, MARAD's Office of Cargo and Sealift Support maintains a program to ensure compliance with statutory requirements requiring U.S.-flag vessel carriage of Government-generated cargo. Just as important as encouraging the use of U.S.-flag vessels for the carriage of Government-generated cargo, it is part of MARAD's mission to encourage both private parties and Government agencies to use U.S.-flag vessels to carry their goods. The purpose of the *U.S. Ships* program is to help to encourage broad, voluntary use of U.S.-flag vessels in a manner complementary to required cargo preference.

### Components of the U.S. Ships Recognition Program

By this notice, MARAD announces the establishment of the *U.S. Ships* recognition awards program as described below. The purpose of these recognition awards is to encourage the use of U.S.-flag vessels for carriage of exports, imports, cargoes moving in foreign waters, and goods moving within the United States and along its coasts. The awards are also intended to educate and remind the public of the value of a strong U.S. maritime industry for national security and economic stability.

*U.S. Ships Logo*

MARAD will develop a *U.S. Ships* logo. Award recipients will be granted a license to display variations of the logo, as described below, on their premises, equipment, publications, advertising, uniforms, or correspondence within the context of being a *U.S. Ships* award recipient. Recipients may not use the logo to claim that the Department of Transportation or MARAD promotes or endorses their company, products, and/or services. *U.S. Ships* awardees will be permitted to display their status using the *U.S. Ships* logo and the year in which they earned the award. The logo will be released to recipients only in non-editable electronic format.

[1] *American Trading Transportation Company, Inc.* v. *United States,* 791 F.2d 942, 944 (D.C. Cir. 1986).

[2] Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, 75 Stat. 840 (August 12, 1961).

MARAD will have the right, at all reasonable times, to examine an award recipient's goods, services, and promotional activities employing a *U.S. Ships* logo to ensure that such use is reasonable, of proper quality, and is otherwise consistent with the license, and may terminate the license should it determine that the use is inconsistent.

The license is not assignable. Award recipients may not share the use of the *U.S. Ships* logo with any other person, organization, or company, nor may it transfer or assign its license to use the logo if its company is sold, merged, or reconfigured. An award recipient who hires subcontractors to perform manufacturing or distribution activities will be allowed to use the logo without risk of jeopardizing its license to use the logo.

*Nomination and Review Process*

Entities may apply, self-nominate, or be nominated for recognition by third-parties including Government agencies. MARAD reserves the right to request additional information to support nominations and to verify those nominations and supporting information. Individuals that make nominations will be required to certify that, to the best of their knowledge, the entity they are nominating is eligible for the specified *U.S. Ships* award. MARAD will provide information on how to submit nominations in a future **Federal Register** Notice.

MARAD will consider the information contained in a nomination or application to be business confidential and will treat it as such to the extent permitted by law.

MARAD will determine whether nominated entities have any business before or are under investigation by regulatory agencies. If MARAD determines that adverse information exists that would likely be adverse to the U.S. Government should the *U.S. Ships* award be granted, the nomination will be rejected without further consideration.

*Awards for Fixing Cargo on U.S.-flag Vessels*

These awards will recognize non-Governmental shipper entities that achieve specified U.S.-flag vessel usage rates for a calendar year as determined by gross revenue tons. Entities eligible to receive awards include any U.S. or foreign entity that achieved at least the applicable percentage threshold for U.S.-flag carriage during the applicable calendar year of their domestic movements of goods or international shipments other than Government-generated cargo. Covered carriage includes imports, exports, water carriage outside the United States, and freight and cargo shipments between points in the United States, including goods that might otherwise move over land. Recipients will be permitted to display the *U.S. Ships* logo for achievements at the following percentage levels of shipper freight or cargo carriage aboard U.S.-flag vessels:

a. Gold—50%–plus
b. Silver—40–49%
c. Bronze—30–39%

Percentage brackets may be adjusted in later years. Awards will authorize the licensed use of the appropriate level of *U.S. Ships* logo; award notices will be transmitted soon as possible after administrative approval, normally by the end of the first calendar quarter of each year.

*Cargo Preference Ship Management and Resource Training (SMART) Awards*

These awards will recognize private and Governmental entities which have at least 50% of their staffs involved in booking or cargo-preference-related processes successfully complete the Office of Cargo and Commercial Sealift online cargo preference training courses. These courses are currently under development and the first awards would be made for activities undertaken in 2016. Recipients would qualify to display the blue *U.S. Ships* logo for a period up to three years, subject to subsequent recertification. This award is intended to distinguish shippers, freight-forwarders, and brokers which have facilitated U.S.-flag usage through staff education on cargo preference requirements. Awards will authorize the licensed use of the blue *U.S. Ships* logo; award notices will be transmitted at any time during the year as soon as possible after administrative approval.

*The Extra Ton-Mile Awards*

MARAD will accept nominations for noteworthy, non-numerical contributions to the utilization of U.S.-flag vessels through an annual nomination process. Up to six private or Governmental entities or individuals may receive this award annually. Eligible recipients include any individual or entity that engaged in activities other than the marketing of products that assisted or facilitated the usage of U.S.-flag carriage by providing financing, transportation, promotion, or other export or import assistance or facilitation service during the applicable calendar year. Recipients would receive official recognition from MARAD and would be permitted to use a special, red-white-and-blue *U.S. Ships* logo for a period of three years following receipt. MARAD will announce recipients of these awards at its annual Maritime Day observance. The following is a non-exclusive list of actions that might qualify for this award:

- Exclusive use of U.S.-flag carriage to the extent available.
- Significantly increased usage of U.S.-flag carriage through voluntary action.
- Exceptional advocacy encouraging the use of U.S.-flag vessels or compliance with MARAD's cargo preference requirements.
- Exceptional facilitation of U.S.-flag vessel usage.
- Development of technical advances or commercial practices that facilitate or enhance U.S.-flag vessel usage.
- Employment of high-performance business processes to ensure U.S.-flag vessel usage.

The Maritime Administrator will appoint a panel of Federal officials to consider all nominations and recommend recipients to the Maritime Administrator, who will make final award determinations.

**Policy Analysis and Notices**

Consistent with the Administrative Procedures Act and Department of Transportation rulemaking policy, MARAD is publishing this notice in the **Federal Register** to indicate how it plans to exercise the discretionary authority provided by 49 U.S.C. 109. Nothing in this notice or in the policy itself requires MARAD to exercise its discretionary authority under the law.

**Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and, is, therefore, not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

*Paperwork Reduction Act:* Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), a Federal agency must obtain approval from the OMB for each collection of information it conducts, sponsors, or requires. The *U.S. Ships* recognition awards program may impose new collection requirements when MARAD opens the nomination period. MARAD will conduct a full PRA analysis and include it in the **Federal Register** Notice released at that time and obtain an information collection number if required.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 109)

Dated: May 26, 2015.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

**Thomas M. Hudson, Jr.,**

*Secretary, Maritime Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13019 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–81–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

**[Docket No. NHTSA–2014–0097; Notice 1]**

### Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision that Nonconforming Model Year 1991 BMW M3 Convertible Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Receipt of petition.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that nonconforming model year (MY) 1991 BMW M3 convertible passenger cars that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS), are eligible for importation into the United States because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all such standards.

**DATES:** June 29, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should refer to the docket and notice numbers above and submitted by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Send comments by mail addressed to: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* Deliver comments by hand to: West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- *Electronically:* Submit comments electronically by: Logging onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at *http://www.regulations.gov/.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Comments may also be faxed to (202) 493–2251.

Comments must be written in the English language, and be no greater than 15 pages in length, although there is no limit to the length of necessary attachments to the comments. If comments are submitted in hard copy form, please ensure that two copies are provided. If you wish to receive confirmation that your comments were received, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard with the comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided.

Documents submitted to a docket may be viewed by anyone at the address and times give above. The documents may also be viewed on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by following the online instructions for accessing the dockets DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement is available for review in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477–78)

The petition, supporting materials, and all comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated below will be filed and will be considered. All comments and supporting materials received after the closing date will also be filed and will be considered to the extent possible. When the petition is granted or denied, notice of the decision will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George Stevens, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5308).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable FMVSS, and has no substantially similar U.S.-certified counterpart, shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle has safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable FMVSS based on destructive test data or such other evidence as NHTSA decides to be adequate.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

G&K Automotive Conversion, Inc. of Santa Ana, CA (Registered Importer R90–007) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming MY 1991 BMW M3 convertible passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States.

G&K noted in its petition that although conforming MY 1991 BMW M3 vehicles were not sold in the U.S., NHTSA has determined that nonconforming MY 1989 BMW M3 vehicles are eligible for importation. G&K compared the nonconforming MY 1991 BMW M3 vehicles to the nonconforming MY 1989 BMW M3 vehicles that have been determined eligible for importation, and based its arguments that the 1991 BMW M3 vehicles conform to many applicable FMVSS, and are capable of being altered to meet the remainder of the applicable FMVSS, in part, on the similarities between the MY 1989 and MY 1991 vehicles.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified MY 1991 BMW M3 convertible passenger cars, as originally manufactured, conform to: Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect;* 103 *Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems;* 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems;* 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems;* 106 *Brake Hoses;* 107 *Reflective Surfaces;* 109 *New Pneumatic Tires;* 113 *Hood Latch System;* 115 *Vehicle Identification Number—Basic Requirements;* 116 *Motor Vehicle Brake Fluids;* 118 *Power-Operated Window Systems;* 124 *Accelerator Control Systems;* 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact;* 202 *Head Restraints;* 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement;* 205 *Glazing Materials;* 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components;* 207 *Seating Systems;* 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies;* 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages;* 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Disks, and Hub Caps;* 212 *Windshield Mounting;* 214 *Side Impact Protection;* 216 *Roof Crush Resistance;* 219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion;* 301 *Fuel System Integrity;* and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials.*

The petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 101 *Controls and Displays:* addition of the word ''BRAKE'' to the brake system warning indicator lamp located on the instrument cluster.

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment:* installation of U.S.-model high mounted stop lamp.

Standard No. 110 *Tire Selection and Rims:* installation of a tire information placard.

Standard No. 111 *Rearview Mirrors:* replacement of the passenger side rearview mirror with a U.S.-model component or inscription of the required warning statement on the face of that mirror.

Standard No. 114 *Theft Protection:* installation of a supplemental key warning buzzer, or activation of the U.S.-version software to meet the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection:* installation of a seat belt warning symbol in the dash, a U.S.-model airbag system, and U.S.-model knee bolsters.

The petitioner also states that a vehicle identification plate must be affixed to the vehicles near the left windshield post to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 565 and that a certification label must be affixed to the driver's door jamb to meet the requirements of 49 CFR part 567.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.7; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8.

Issued On: May 21, 2015.

**Jeffrey Giuseppe,**

*Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12967 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–59–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

**[Docket No. AB 1234]**

### New Hampshire Central Railroad, Inc.—Discontinuance of Service Exemption—Between Littleton and Bethlehem, NH

New Hampshire Central Railroad, Inc. (NHCR) filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR part 1152 subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments and Discontinuances of Service* to discontinue service over approximately 6.86 miles of railroad line (the Line), between milepost C 113 (station 995+66) at Littleton, NH, and milepost C 119.86 (station 1359+77), at Bethlehem, NH. The Line traverses United States Postal Service Zip Codes 03561 and 03574.[1]

NHCR has certified that: (1) No local traffic has moved over the Line for at least two years; (2) there is no overhead traffic on the Line; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the Line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the Line either is pending before the Surface Transportation Board or any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of a complainant within the two-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

As a condition to this exemption, any employee adversely affected by the discontinuance shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line Railroad—Abandonment Portion Goshen Branch Between Firth & Ammon, in Bingham & Bonneville Counties, Idaho,* 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) to subsidize continued rail service has been received, this exemption will become effective on June 30, 2015 (50 days after the filing of the exemption), unless stayed pending reconsideration. Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues and formal expressions of intent to file an OFA to subsidize continued rail service under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2)[2] must be filed by June 8, 2015.[3] Petitions to reopen must be filed by June 18, 2015, with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001.

A copy of any petition filed with the Board should be sent to NHCR's representative: Jack E. Dodd, Rail Business Consultant, 73 Bishop St., Saint Albans, VT 05478.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio.*

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at *WWW.STB.DOT.GOV.*

Decided: May 26, 2015.

By the Board, Rachel D. Campbell, Director, Office of Proceedings.

**Jeffrey Herzig,**

*Clearance Clerk.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13012 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915–01–P**

[1] On May 12, 2015, NHCR filed an amendment clarifying the territory, the total mileage, and the zip codes involved in the Notice of Exemption.

[2] Each OFA must be accompanied by the filing fee, which is currently set at $1,600. *See* 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25).

[3] Because this is a discontinuance proceeding and not an abandonment, interim trail use/rail banking and public use conditions are not appropriate.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Office of Foreign Assets Control

### Sanctions Actions Pursuant to Executive Order 13224

**AGENCY:** Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of 1 individual and 2 entities whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to Executive Order (E.O.) 13224 and whose names have been added to OFAC's list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List). OFAC is also publishing identifying information relating to 9 aircraft that OFAC has determined to be property in which Mahan Air, a person designated under E.O. 13224, has an interest, and which therefore are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13224.

**DATES:** OFAC's actions described in this notice were effective May 21, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Associate Director for Global Targeting, tel.: 202/622–2420, Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance & Evaluation, tel.: 202/622–2490, Assistant Director for Licensing, tel.: 202/622–2480, Office of Foreign Assets Control, or Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), tel.: 202/622–2410, Office of the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury (not toll free numbers).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Electronic and Facsimile Availability

The SDN List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available from OFAC's Web site (*www.treas.gov/ofac*). Certain general information pertaining to OFAC's sanctions programs is also available via facsimile through a 24-hour fax-on-demand service, tel.: 202/622–0077.

#### Notice of OFAC Actions

On May 21, 2015, OFAC blocked the property and interests in property of the following 1 individual and 2 entities pursuant to E.O. 13224, ''Blocking Property and Prohibiting Transactions With Persons Who Commit, Threaten To

Commit, or Support Terrorism''. In addition, on May 21, 2015, OFAC identified 9 aircraft, whose identifying information is detailed below, as property in which Mahan Air, a designated entity, has an interest, and which therefore are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13224:

**Individual**

1. SHAMMOUT, Issam (a.k.a. SHAMMOUT, Muhammad Isam Muhammad Anwar Nur); DOB 26 Aug 1971; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions; Passport 006327129 (Syria) (individual) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).

**Entities**

1. AL–NASER AIRLINES (a.k.a. ALNASER AIRLINES), Al-Karrada, Babil Region—District 929, St. 21, Home 46, Baghdad, Iraq; P.O. Box 28360, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; P.O. Box 911399, Amman 11191, Jordan; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
2. SKY BLUE BIRD AVIATION (a.k.a. SKY BLUE AIRLINES; a.k.a. SKY BLUE BIRD FZE), P.O. Box 16111, Ras al Khaimah Trade Zone, United Arab Emirates; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).

**Aircraft**

1. MSN 164; Aircraft Manufacture Date 1997; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–313X; Previous Aircraft Tail Number G–VAIR; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 164; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
2. MSN 371; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2001; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number YI–NAC; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 371; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
3. MSN 376; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2001; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number YI–NAB; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 376; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
4. MSN 383; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2002; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number YI–NAA; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 383; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
5. MSN 391; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2002; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 391; Aircraft Tail Number EP–MMH; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
6. MSN 416; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2002; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number YI–NAD; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 416; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
7. MSN 449; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2002; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number YI–NAE; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 449; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
8. MSN 550; Aircraft Manufacture Date 1995; Aircraft Model Airbus A321–131; Previous Aircraft Tail Number 2–WGLP; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 550; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).
9. MSN 615; Aircraft Manufacture Date 2004; Aircraft Model Airbus A340–642; Previous Aircraft Tail Number G–VSSH; Aircraft Manufacturer's Serial Number (MSN) 615; Additional Sanctions Information—Subject to Secondary Sanctions (aircraft) [SDGT] [IFSR] (Linked To: MAHAN AIR).

Dated: May 21, 2015.

**John E. Smith,**

*Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13026 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Department of the Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice.

The Department of the Treasury will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, on or after the date of publication of this notice.

**DATES:** Comments should be received on or before June 29, 2015 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to (1) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Treasury, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, or email at *OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.gov* and (2) Treasury PRA Clearance Officer, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Suite 8140, Washington, DC 20220, or email at *PRA@treasury.gov.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by email at *PRA@treasury.gov* or the entire information collection request may be found at *www.reginfo.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Internal Revenue Service (IRS)**

*OMB Number:* 1545–0013.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Notice Concerning Fiduciary Relationship; Form 56–F, Notice Concerning Fiduciary Relationship of Financial Institution.

*Form:* 56, 56–F.

*Abstract:* Form 56 is used to inform the IRS that a person in acting for another person in a fiduciary capacity so that the IRS may mail tax notices to the fiduciary concerning the person for whom he/she is acting. The data is used to ensure that the fiduciary relationship is established or terminated and to mail or discontinue mailing designated tax notices to the fiduciary. The filing of Form 56–F by a fiduciary (FDIC or other federal agency acting as a receiver or conservator of a failed financial institution (bank or thrift) gives the IRS the necessary information to submit send letters, notices, and notices of tax liability to the federal fiduciary now in charge of the financial institution rather than sending the notice, etc. to the institution's last known address.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 349,786.

*OMB Number:* 1545–0913.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* TD 8045—Below-Market Loans (NPRM LR–165–84).

*Abstract:* Section 7872 recharacterizes a below-market loan as a market rate loan and an additional transfer by the lender to the borrower equal to the amount of imputed interest. The regulation requires both the lender and the borrower to attach a statement to their respective income tax returns for years in which they have either imputed income or claim imputed deductions under section 7872.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 481,722.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1041.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* TD 8316—Cooperative Housing Corporations.

*Abstract:* This document contains amendments to the Income Tax Regulations under section 216 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, relating to cooperative housing corporations. Section 216 of the Code was amended by the Tax Reform Act of 1986. The regulations provide cooperative housing corporations and tenant-stockholders with guidance needed to comply with the law.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 1,250.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1417.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Indian Employment Credit.

*Form:* 8845.

*Abstract:* Under Internal Revenue Code section 45A, employers can claim an income tax credit for hiring American Indians or their spouses to work in a trade or business on an Indian reservation. Form 8845 is used by employers to claim the credit and by IRS to ensure that the credit is computed correctly.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 4,332.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1466.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Third-Party Disclosure Requirements in the IRS Regulations.

*Abstract:* This submission contains third-party disclosure regulations subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 68,885,183.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1467.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Electronic Federal Tax Payment System (EFTPS).

*Form:* 9779, 9783, 9787, 9789.

*Abstract:* Enrollment is vital to the implementation of the Electronic Federal Tax Payment System (EFTPS). EFTPS is an electronic remittance processing system that the Service will use to accept electronically transmitted federal tax payments. This system is a necessary outgrowth of advanced information and communication technologies.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 726,450.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1505.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Orphan Drug Credit.

*Form:* 8820.

*Abstract:* Filers use this form to elect to claim the orphan drug credit, which is 50 percent of the qualified clinical testing expenses paid or incurred with respect to low or unprofitable drugs for rare diseases and conditions, as designated under section 526 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 348.

*OMB Number:* 1545–1962.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Notice of Income from Donated Intellectual Property.

*Form:* 8899.

*Abstract:* Form 8899 is filed by charitable organizations receiving donations of intellectual property if the donor provides a timely notice. The initial deduction is limited to the donor's basis, additional deductions are allowed to the extent of income from the property, reducing excessive deductions.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 5,430.

*OMB Number:* 1545–2209.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* REG–112805–10—Branded Prescription Drugs.

*Abstract:* Section 9008 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), Public Law 111–148 (124 Stat. 119 (2010)), as amended by section 1404 of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (HCERA), Public Law 111–152 (124 Stat. 1029 (2010)) imposes an annual fee on manufacturers and importers of branded prescription drugs that have gross receipts of over $5 million from the sales of these drugs to certain government programs (covered entity/covered entities). The final regulations supersede temporary regulations and describe how the IRS will administer the branded prescription drug fee. Section 51.7T(b) of the temporary regulations provides that the IRS will send each covered entity notification of its preliminary fee calculation by May 15 of the fee year. If a covered entity chooses to dispute the IRS' preliminary fee calculation, the covered entity must follow the procedures for submitting an error report that are established in § 51.8T.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 1,800.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 16,745.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Dawn D. Wolfgang,**

*Treasury PRA Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–13008 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Department of the Treasury.

**NOTICE:** Notice.

The Department of the Treasury will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, on or after the date of publication of this notice.

**DATES:** Comments should be received on or before June 29, 2015 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to (1) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and

Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Treasury, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, or email at *OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.gov* and (2) Treasury PRA Clearance Officer, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Suite 8140, Washington, DC 20220, or email at *PRA@treasury.gov.*

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by emailing *PRA@treasury.gov* or viewing the entire information collection request at *www.reginfo.gov.*

**Departmental Offices**

*OMB Number:* 1505–0199.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Treasury International Capital (TIC) Form D: Report of Holdings of, and Transactions in, Financial Derivatives Contracts with Foreign Residents.

*Form:* TIC Form D.

*Abstract:* Form D is required by law and is designed to collect timely information on International portfolio capital movements, including U.S. residents' holdings of, and transactions in, financial derivatives contracts with foreign residents. The information is used in the computation of the U.S. balance of payments accounts and international investments position, as well as in the formulation of U.S. International financial and monetary policies.

*Affected Public:* Private Sector: Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* 4,200.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

**Dawn D. Wolfgang,**

*Treasury PRA Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015–12995 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–25–P

# FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 80 Friday,

No. 103 May 29, 2015


Part II

## Department of Homeland Security

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Distribution of Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset to Affected Domestic Producers; Notices

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### U.S. Customs and Border Protection

### Distribution of Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset to Affected Domestic Producers

**AGENCY:** U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to distribute offset for Fiscal Year 2015.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the *Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000,* this document is U.S. Customs and Border Protection's (CBP) notice of intent to distribute assessed antidumping or countervailing duties (known as the continued dumping and subsidy offset) for Fiscal Year 2015 in connection with countervailing duty orders, antidumping duty orders, or findings under the *Antidumping Act of 1921.* This document provides the instructions for affected domestic producers, or anyone alleging eligibility to receive a distribution, to file certifications to claim a distribution in relation to the listed orders or findings.

**DATES:** Certifications to obtain a continued dumping and subsidy offset under a particular order or finding must be received by July 28, 2015. Any certification received after July 28, 2015 will be denied, making claimants ineligible for the distribution.

**ADDRESSES:** Certifications and any other correspondence (whether by mail, or an express or courier service) must be addressed to the Assistant Commissioner, Office of Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attention: CDSOA Team, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN, 46278.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** CDSOA Team, Revenue Division, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN, 46278; telephone (317) 614–4462.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

The *Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000* (CDSOA) was enacted on October 28, 2000, as part of the *Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act,* 2001 (the ''Act''). The provisions of the CDSOA are contained in title X (sections 1001–1003) of the Appendix of the Act (H.R. 5426).

The CDSOA amended title VII of the *Tariff Act of 1930* by adding a new section 754 (codified at 19 U.S.C. 1675c) in order to provide that assessed duties received pursuant to a countervailing duty order, an antidumping duty order, or a finding under the *Antidumping Act of 1921* will be distributed to affected domestic producers for certain qualifying expenditures that these producers incur after the issuance of such an order or finding. The term ''affected domestic producer'' means any manufacturer, producer, farmer, rancher or worker representative (including associations of such persons) who:

(A) Was a petitioner or interested party in support of a petition with respect to which an antidumping order, a finding under the *Antidumping Act of 1921,* or a countervailing duty order has been entered;

(B) Remains in operation continuing to produce the product covered by the countervailing duty order, the antidumping duty order, or the finding under the *Antidumping Act of 1921;* and

(C) Has not been acquired by another company or business that is related to a company that opposed the antidumping or countervailing duty investigation that led to the order or finding (e.g., opposed the petition or otherwise presented evidence in opposition to the petition).

The distribution that these parties may receive is known as the continued dumping and subsidy offset.

Section 7601(a) of the *Deficit Reduction Act of 2005* repealed 19 U.S.C. 1675c. According to section 7701 of the *Deficit Reduction Act,* the repeal takes effect as if enacted on October 1, 2005. However, section 7601(b) provides that all duties collected on an entry filed before October 1, 2007, must be distributed as if 19 U.S.C. 1675c had not been repealed by section 7601(a). The funds available for distribution were also affected by section 822 of the *Claims Resolution Act of 2010* and section 504 of the *Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010.*

Consequently, the full impact of the CDSOA repeal on amounts available for distribution may be delayed for several years. Because of the statutory constraints in the assessments of antidumping and countervailing duties, the distribution process will be continued for an undetermined period. It should also be noted that amounts distributed may be subject to recovery as a result of reliquidations, court actions, administrative errors, and other reasons.

On March 10, 2014, President Obama ordered the sequester of non-exempt budgetary resources for Fiscal Year 2015 pursuant to section 251A of the *Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985,* as amended. (79 FR 14365, Mar. 10, 2014) To implement this sequester during Fiscal Year 2015, the calculation of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requires a reduction of 7.3 percent of the assessed duties and interest received in the CDSOA Special Account (account number 015–12–5688). On March 17, 2015, OMB concluded that any amounts sequestered in the CDSOA Special Account during Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015 would become available in the subsequent fiscal year. *See* 2 U.S.C. 906(k)(6). As a result, CBP intends to include the funds that are temporarily reduced via sequester during Fiscal Year 2015 in the continued dumping and subsidy offset for Fiscal Year 2015, which will be distributed not later than 60 days after the first day of Fiscal Year 2016 in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1675c(c). In other words, the continued dumping and subsidy offset that affected domestic producers receive for Fiscal Year 2015 will include the funds that were temporarily sequestered during Fiscal Year 2015. This differs from the distribution of sequestered funds for Fiscal Year 2014, which were distributed later in time as a supplemental distribution because, at the time of the Fiscal Year 2014 disbursement, CBP had not yet received OMB's determination as to whether the sequestered funds would become available in the subsequent fiscal year.

### List of Orders or Findings and Affected Domestic Producers

It is the responsibility of the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) to ascertain and timely forward to CBP a list of the affected domestic producers that are potentially eligible to receive an offset in connection with an order or finding. In this regard, it is noted that USITC has supplied CBP with the list of individual antidumping and countervailing duty cases, and the affected domestic producers associated with each case who are potentially eligible to receive an offset. This list appears at the end of this document.

A significant amount of litigation has challenged various provisions of the CDSOA, including the definition of the term ''affected domestic producer.'' In two decisions the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) upheld the constitutionality of the support requirement contained in the CDSOA. Specifically, in *SKF USA Inc.* v. *United States Customs & Border Prot.,* 556 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2009), the CAFC held that the CDSOA's support requirement did not violate either the First or Fifth

Amendments. The Supreme Court of the United States denied plaintiff's petition for certiorari, *SKF USA, Inc.* v. *United States Customs & Border Prot.,* 560 U.S. 903 (2010). Similarly, in *PS Chez Sidney, L.L.C.* v. *United States,* 409 Fed. Appx. 327 (Fed. Cir. 2010), the CAFC summarily reversed the U.S. Court of International Trade's judgment that the support requirement was unconstitutional, allowing only plaintiff's non-constitutional claims to go forward. *See PS Chez Sidney, L.L.C.,* v. *United States,* 684 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Furthermore, in two cases interpreting the CDSOA's language, the CAFC concluded that a producer who never indicates support for a dumping petition by letter or through questionnaire response, despite the act of otherwise filling out a questionnaire, cannot be an affected domestic producer. *Ashley Furniture Indus.* v. *United States; Ethan Allen Global, Inc.* v. *United States,* 734 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2013), *cert. denied,* 135 S. Ct. 72 (2014).

Domestic producers who are not on the USITC list but believe they nonetheless are eligible for a CDSOA distribution under one or more antidumping and/or countervailing duty cases are required, as are all potential claimants that expressly appear on the list, to properly file their certification(s) within 60 days after this notice is published. Such domestic producers must allege all other bases for eligibility in their certification(s). CBP will evaluate the merits of such claims in accordance with the relevant statutes, regulations, and decisions. Certifications that are not timely filed within the requisite 60 days and/or that fail to sufficiently establish a basis for eligibility will be summarily denied. Additionally, CBP may not make a final decision regarding a claimant's eligibility to receive funds until certain legal issues which may affect that claimant's eligibility are resolved. In these instances, CBP may withhold an amount of funds corresponding to the claimant's alleged *pro rata* share of funds from distribution pending the resolution of those legal issues.

It should also be noted that the CAFC ruled in *Canadian Lumber Trade Alliance* v. *United States,* 517 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2008), *cert. denied sub nom. United States Steel* v. *Canadian Lumber Trade Alliance,* 129 S. Ct. 344 (2008), that CBP was not authorized to distribute such antidumping and countervailing duties to the extent they were derived from goods from countries that are parties to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Due to this decision, CBP does not list cases related to NAFTA on the Preliminary Amounts Available report, and no distributions will be issued on these cases.

**Regulations Implementing the CDSOA**

It is noted that CBP published Treasury Decision (T.D.) 01–68 (Distribution of Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset to Affected Domestic Producers) in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 48546) on September 21, 2001, which was effective as of that date, in order to implement the CDSOA. The final rule added a new subpart F to part 159 of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (19 CFR part 159, subpart F (sections 159.61–159.64)). More specific guidance regarding the filing of certifications is provided in this notice in order to aid affected domestic producers and other domestic producers alleging eligibility (''claimants'' or ''domestic producers'').

**Notice of Intent To Distribute Offset**

This document announces that CBP intends to distribute to affected domestic producers the assessed antidumping or countervailing duties that are available for distribution in Fiscal Year 2015 in connection with those antidumping duty orders or findings or countervailing duty orders that are listed in this document. All distributions will be issued by paper check to the address provided by the claimants. Section 159.62(a) of title 19, Code of Federal Regulations (19 CFR 159.62(a)) provides that CBP will publish such a notice of intention to distribute assessed duties at least 90 calendar days before the end of a fiscal year. Failure to publish the notice at least 90 calendar days before the end of the fiscal year will not impact an affected domestic producer's obligation to file a timely certification within 60 days after the notice is published. *See Dixon Ticonderoga* v. *United States,* 468 F.3d 1353, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

**Certifications; Submission and Content**

To obtain a distribution of the offset under a given order or finding, an affected domestic producer (and anyone alleging eligibility to receive a distribution) must submit a certification for each order or finding under which a distribution is sought, to CBP, indicating their desire to receive a distribution. To be eligible to obtain a distribution, certifications must be received by CBP no later than 60 calendar days after the date of publication of this notice of intent to distribute in the **Federal Register**. All certifications not received by the 60th day will not be eligible to receive a distribution.

As required by 19 CFR 159.62(b), this notice provides the case name and number of the order or finding concerned, as well as the specific instructions for filing a certification under section 159.63 to claim a distribution. Section 159.62(b) also provides that the dollar amounts subject to distribution that are contained in the Special Account for each listed order or finding are to appear in this notice. However, these dollar amounts were not available in time for inclusion in this publication. The preliminary amounts will be posted on the CBP Web site (*http://www.cbp.gov*). However, the final amounts available for disbursement may be higher or lower than the preliminary amounts.

CBP will provide general information to claimants regarding the preparation of certification(s). However, it remains the sole responsibility of the domestic producer to ensure that the certification is correct, complete, and accurate so as to demonstrate the eligibility of the domestic producer for the distribution requested. Failure to ensure that the certification is correct, complete, and accurate as provided in this notice will result in the domestic producer not receiving a distribution.

Specifically, to obtain a distribution of the offset under a given order or finding, each potential claimant must timely submit a certification containing the required information detailed below as to the eligibility of the domestic producer (or anyone alleging eligibility) to receive the requested distribution and the total amount of the distribution that the domestic producer is claiming. Certifications should be submitted to the Assistant Commissioner, Office of Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attention: CDSOA Team, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN, 46278. The certification must enumerate the qualifying expenditures incurred by the domestic producer since the issuance of an order or finding and it must demonstrate that the domestic producer is eligible to receive a distribution as an affected domestic producer or allege another basis for eligibility. Any false statements made in connection with certifications submitted to CBP may give rise to liability under the *False Claims Act* (*see* 31 U.S.C. 3729–3733) and/or to criminal prosecution.

A successor to a company that was an affected domestic producer at the time of acquisition should consult 19 CFR 159.61(b)(1)(i). Any company claiming to be the successor company to an

affected domestic producer will be deemed to have consented to joint and several liability for the return of any overpayments arising under section 159.64(c)(3) that were previously paid to the predecessor. CBP may require the successor company to provide documents to support its eligibility to receive a distribution as set out in section 159.63(d). Additionally, any individual or company who purchases any portion of the operating assets of an affected domestic producer, a successor to an affected domestic producer, or an entity that otherwise previously received distributions may be jointly and severally liable for the return of any overpayments arising under section 159.64(c)(3) that were previously paid to the entity from which the operating assets were purchased or its predecessor, regardless of whether the purchasing individual or company is deemed a successor company for purposes of receiving distributions.

A member company (or its successor) of an association that appears on the list of affected domestic producers in this notice, where the member company itself does not appear on this list, should consult 19 CFR 159.61(b)(1)(ii). Specifically, for a certification under 19 CFR 159.61(b)(1)(ii), the claimant must name the association of which it is a member, specifically establish that it was a member of the association at the time the association filed the petition with the USITC, and establish that the claimant is a current member of the association.

In order to promote accurate filings and more efficiently process the distributions, we offer the following guidance:

- If claimants are members of an association but the association does not file on their behalf, each association will need to provide their members with a statement that contains notarized company-specific information including dates of membership and an original signature from an authorized representative of the association.
- An association filing a certification on behalf of a member must also provide a power of attorney or other evidence of legal authorization from each of the domestic producers it is representing.
- An association filing a certification on behalf of a member is responsible for verifying the accuracy of the member's financial records, which support their claim, and is responsible for that certification.
- Any association filing a certification on behalf of a member is responsible for verifying the legal sufficiency and accuracy of the member's financial records, which support the claim, and may be liable for repayment of any claim found to have been paid in error.

The association may file a certification in its own right to claim an offset for that order or finding, but its qualifying expenditures would be limited to those expenditures that the association itself has incurred after the date of the order or finding in connection with the particular case.

As provided in 19 CFR 159.63(a), certifications to obtain a distribution of an offset must be received by CBP no later than 60 calendar days after the date of publication of the notice of intent in the **Federal Register**. All certifications received after the 60-day deadline will be summarily denied, making claimants ineligible for the distribution regardless of whether or not they appeared on the USITC list.

A list of all certifications received will be published on the CBP Web site (*http://www.cbp.gov*) shortly after the receipt deadline. This publication will not confirm acceptance or validity of the certification, but merely receipt of the certification. Due to the high volume of certifications, CBP is unable to respond to individual telephone or written inquiries regarding the status of a certification appearing on the list.

While there is no required format for a certification, CBP has developed a standard certification form to aid claimants in filing certifications. The certification form is available at *https://www.pay.gov* under the Public Form Name ''Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000 Certification'' (CBP Form Number 7401) or by directing a web browser to *https://www.pay.gov/paygov/forms/formInstance.html?agencyFormId=8776895*. The certification form can be submitted electronically through *https://www.pay.gov* or by mail. All certifications not submitted electronically must include original signatures. Regardless of the format for a certification, per 19 CFR 159.63(b), the certification must contain the following information:

(1) The date of this **Federal Register** notice;
(2) The Commerce case number;
(3) The case name (producer/country);
(4) The name of the domestic producer and any name qualifier, if applicable (for example, any other name under which the domestic producer does business or is also known);
(5) The mailing address of the domestic producer (if a post office box, the physical street address must also appear) including, if applicable, a specific room number or department;
(6) The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) number (with suffix) of the domestic producer, employer identification number, or social security number, as applicable;
(7) The specific business organization of the domestic producer (corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship);
(8) The name(s) of any individual(s) designated by the domestic producer as the contact person(s) concerning the certification, together with the phone number(s), mailing address, and, if available, facsimile transmission number(s) and electronic mail (e-mail) address(es) for the person(s). Correspondence from CBP may be directed to the designated contact(s) by either mail or phone or both;
(9) The total dollar amount claimed;
(10) The dollar amount claimed by category, as described in the section below entitled ''Amount Claimed for Distribution'';
(11) A statement of eligibility, as described in the section below entitled ''Eligibility to Receive Distribution''; and
(12) For certifications not submitted electronically through *https://www.pay.gov,* an original signature by an individual legally authorized to bind the producer.

**Qualifying Expenditures That May Be Claimed for Distribution**

Qualifying expenditures that may be offset under the CDSOA encompass those expenditures incurred by the domestic producer after issuance of an antidumping duty order or finding or a countervailing duty order, and prior to its termination, provided that such expenditures fall within certain categories. The repeal language parallels the termination of an order. Therefore, for duty orders or findings that have not been previously revoked, expenses must be incurred before October 1, 2007, to be eligible for offset. For duty orders or findings that have been revoked, expenses must be incurred before the effective date of the revocation to be eligible for offset. For example, assume for case A–331–802 certain frozen warm-water shrimp and prawns from Ecuador, that the order date is February 1, 2005, and that the revocation effective date is August 15, 2007. In this case, eligible expenditures would have to be incurred between February 1, 2005, and August 15, 2007.

For the convenience and ease of the domestic producers, CBP is providing guidance on what the agency takes into consideration when making a calculation for each of the following categories:

(1) Manufacturing facilities (Any facility used for the transformation of raw material into a finished product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(2) Equipment (Goods that are used in a business environment to aid in the manufacturing of a product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(3) Research and development (Seeking knowledge and determining the best techniques for production of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(4) Personnel training (Teaching of specific useful skills to personnel, that will improve performance in the

production process of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(5) Acquisition of technology (Acquisition of applied scientific knowledge and materials to achieve an objective in the production process of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(6) Health care benefits for employees paid for by the employer (Health care benefits paid to employees who are producing the specific product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(7) Pension benefits for employees paid for by the employer (Pension benefits paid to employees who are producing the specific product that is the subject of the related order or finding);

(8) Environmental equipment, training, or technology (Equipment, training, or technology used in the production of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding, that will assist in preventing potentially harmful factors from impacting the environment);

(9) Acquisition of raw materials and other inputs (Purchase of unprocessed materials or other inputs needed for the production of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding); and

(10) Working capital or other funds needed to maintain production (Assets of a business that can be applied to its production of the product that is the subject of the related order or finding).

**Amount Claimed for Distribution**

In calculating the amount of the distribution being claimed as an offset, the certification must indicate:

(1) The total amount of any qualifying expenditures previously certified by the domestic producer, and the amount certified by category;

(2) The total amount of those expenditures which have been the subject of any prior distribution for the order or finding being certified under 19 U.S.C. 1675c; and

(3) The net amount for new and remaining qualifying expenditures being claimed in the current certification (the total amount previously certified as noted in item ''(1)'' above minus the total amount that was the subject of any prior distribution as noted in item ''(2)'' above). In accordance with 19 CFR 159.63(b)(2)(i)–(iii), CBP will deduct the amount of any prior distribution from the producer's claimed amount for that case. Total amounts disbursed by CBP under the CDSOA for some prior Fiscal Years are available on the CBP Web site.

Additionally, under 19 CFR 159.61(c), these qualifying expenditures must be related to the production of the same product that is the subject of the order or finding, with the exception of expenses incurred by associations which must be related to a specific case. Any false statements made to CBP concerning the amount of distribution being claimed as an offset may give rise to liability under the *False Claims Act* (*see* 31 U.S.C. 3729–3733) and/or to criminal prosecution.

**Eligibility To Receive Distribution**

As noted, the certification must contain a statement that the domestic producer desires to receive a distribution and is eligible to receive the distribution as an affected domestic producer or on another legal basis. Also, the domestic producer must affirm that the net amount certified for distribution does not encompass any qualifying expenditures for which distribution has previously been made (19 CFR 159.63(b)(3)(i)). Any false statements made in connection with certifications submitted to CBP may give rise to liability under the *False Claims Act* (*see* 31 U.S.C. 3729–3733) and/or to criminal prosecution.

Furthermore, under 19 CFR 159.63(b)(3)(ii), where a domestic producer files a separate certification for more than one order or finding using the same qualifying expenditures as the basis for distribution in each case, each certification must list all the other orders or findings where the producer is claiming the same qualifying expenditures.

Moreover, as required by 19 U.S.C. 1675c(b)(1) and 19 CFR 159.63(b)(3)(iii), the certification must include information as to whether the domestic producer remains in operation at the time the certifications are filed and continues to produce the product covered by the particular order or finding under which the distribution is sought. If a domestic producer is no longer in operation, or no longer produces the product covered by the order or finding, the producer will not be considered an affected domestic producer entitled to receive a distribution.

In addition, as required by 19 U.S.C. 1675c(b)(5) and 19 CFR 159.63(b)(3)(iii), the domestic producer must state whether it has been acquired by a company that opposed the investigation or was acquired by a business related to a company that opposed the investigation. If a domestic producer has been so acquired, the producer will not be considered an affected domestic producer entitled to receive a distribution. However, CBP may not make a final decision regarding a claimant's eligibility to receive funds until certain legal issues which may affect that claimant's eligibility are resolved. In these instances, CBP may withhold an amount of funds corresponding to the claimant's alleged *pro rata* share of funds from distribution pending the resolution of those legal issues.

The certification must be executed and dated by a party legally authorized to bind the domestic producer and it must state that the information contained in the certification is true and accurate to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief under penalty of law, and that the domestic producer has records to support the qualifying expenditures being claimed (see section below entitled ''Verification of Certification''). Moreover as provided in 19 CFR 159.64(b)(3), overpayments to affected domestic producers are recoverable by CBP and CBP reserves the right to use all available collection tools to recover overpayments, including but not limited to garnishments, court orders, administrative offset, enrollment in the Treasury Offset Program, and/or offset of tax refund payments. Overpayments may occur for a variety of reasons such as reliquidations, court actions, settlements, insufficient verification of a certification in response to an inquiry from CBP, and administrative errors. With diminished amounts available over time, the likelihood that these events will require the recovery of funds previously distributed will increase. As a result, domestic producers who receive distributions under the CDSOA may wish to set aside any funds received in case it is subsequently determined that an overpayment has occurred. CBP considers the submission of a certification and the negotiation of any distribution checks received as acknowledgements and acceptance of the claimant's obligation to return those funds upon demand.

**Review and Correction of Certification**

A certification that is submitted in response to this notice of distribution and received within 60 calendar days after the date of publication of the notice in the **Federal Register** may, at CBP's sole discretion, be subject to review before acceptance to ensure that all informational requirements are complied with and that any amounts set forth in the certification for qualifying expenditures, including the amount claimed for distribution, appear to be correct. A certification that is found to be materially incorrect or incomplete

will be returned to the domestic producer within 15 business days after the close of the 60 calendar-day filing period, as provided in 19 CFR 159.63(c). In making this determination, CBP will not speculate as to the reason for the error (e.g., intentional, typographical, etc.). CBP must receive a corrected certification from the domestic producer and/or an association filing on behalf of an association member within 10 business days from the date of the original denial letter. Failure to receive a corrected certification within 10 business days will result in denial of the certification at issue. It is the sole responsibility of the domestic producer to ensure that the certification is correct, complete, and satisfactory so as to demonstrate the eligibility of the domestic producer to the distribution requested. Failure to ensure that the certification is correct, complete, and satisfactory will result in the domestic producer not receiving a distribution.

**Verification of Certification**

Certifications are subject to CBP's verification. Claimants may also be required to provide copies of additional records for further review by CBP. Therefore, parties are required to maintain records supporting their claims for a period of five years after the filing of the certification (19 CFR 159.63(d)). The records must support each qualifying expenditure enumerated in the certification, and they must support how the qualifying expenditures are determined to be related to the production of the product covered by the order or finding. Although CBP will accept comments and information from the public and other domestic producers, CBP retains complete discretion regarding the initiation and conduct of investigations stemming from such information. In the event that a distribution is made to a domestic producer from whom CBP later seeks verification of the certification and sufficient supporting documentation is not provided as determined by CBP, then the amounts paid to the affected domestic producer are recoverable by CBP as an overpayment. CBP reserves the right to use all available collection tools to recover overpayments, including but not limited to garnishments, court orders, administrative offset, enrollment in the Treasury Offset Program, and/or offset of tax refund payments. CBP considers the submission of a certification and the negotiation of any distribution checks received as acknowledgements and acceptance of the claimant's obligation to return those funds upon demand. Additionally, the submission of false statements, documents, or records in connection with a certification or verification of a certification may give rise to liability under the *False Claims Act* (*see* 31 U.S.C. 3729–3733) and/or to criminal prosecution.

**Disclosure of Information in Certifications; Acceptance by Producer**

The name of the claimant, the total dollar amount claimed by the party on the certification, as well as the total dollar amount that CBP actually disburses to that affected domestic producer as an offset, will be available for disclosure to the public, as specified in 19 CFR 159.63(e). To this extent, the submission of the certification is construed as an understanding and acceptance on the part of the domestic producer that this information will be disclosed to the public and a waiver of any right to privacy or non-disclosure. Additionally, a statement in a certification that this information is proprietary and exempt from disclosure may result in CBP's rejection of the certification.

**List of Orders or Findings and Related Domestic Producers**

The list of individual antidumping duty orders or findings and countervailing duty orders is set forth below together with the affected domestic producers associated with each order or finding who are potentially eligible to receive an offset. Those domestic producers not on the list must allege another basis for eligibility in their certification. Appearance of a domestic producer on the list is not a guarantee of distribution.

Dated: May 8, 2015.

**Eugene Schied,**

*Assistant Commissioner, Office of Administration.*

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–122–006 | AA1921–49 | Steel Jacks/Canada | Bloomfield Manufacturing (formerly Harrah Manufacturing). |
| | | | Seaburn Metal Products. |
| A–122–047 | AA1921–127 | Elemental Sulphur/Canada | Duval. |
| A–122–085 | 731–TA–3 | Sugar and Syrups/Canada | Amstar Sugar. |
| A–122–401 | 731–TA–196 | Red Raspberries/Canada | Northwest Food Producers' Association. |
| | | | Oregon Caneberry Commission. |
| | | | Rader Farms. |
| | | | Ron Roberts. |
| | | | Shuksan Frozen Food. |
| | | | Washington Red Raspberry Commission. |
| A–122–503 | 731–TA–263 | Iron Construction Castings/Canada | Alhambra Foundry. |
| | | | Allegheny Foundry. |
| | | | Bingham & Taylor. |
| | | | Campbell Foundry. |
| | | | Charlotte Pipe & Foundry. |
| | | | Deeter Foundry. |
| | | | East Jordan Foundry. |
| | | | Le Baron Foundry. |
| | | | Municipal Castings. |
| | | | Neenah Foundry. |
| | | | Opelika Foundry. |
| | | | Pinkerton Foundry. |
| | | | Tyler Pipe. |
| | | | US Foundry & Manufacturing. |
| | | | Vulcan Foundry. |
| A–122–506 | 731–TA–276 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Canada | CF&I Steel. |
| | | | Copperweld Tubing. |
| | | | Cyclops. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | KPC. |
| | | | Lone Star Steel. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | Maverick Tube. |
| | | | Quanex. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| A–122–601 | 731–TA–312 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Canada | Allied Industrial Workers of America. |
| | | | American Brass. |
| | | | Bridgeport Brass. |
| | | | Chase Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Hussey Copper. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56). |
| | | | The Miller Company. |
| | | | Olin. |
| | | | Revere Copper Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–122–605 | 731–TA–367 | Color Picture Tubes/Canada | Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. |
| | | | International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Technical, Salaried and Machine Workers. |
| | | | Philips Electronic Components Group. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | Zenith Electronics. |
| A–122–804 | 731–TA–422 | Steel Rails/Canada | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | CF&I Steel. |
| A–122–814 | 731–TA–528 | Pure Magnesium/Canada | Magnesium Corporation of America. |
| A–122–822 | 731–TA–614 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Canada. | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| A–122–823 | 731–TA–575 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Canada | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–122–830 | 731–TA–789 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Canada | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | J&L Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| A–122–838 | 731–TA–928 | Softwood Lumber/Canada | 71 Lumber Co. |
| | | | Almond Bros Lbr Co. |
| | | | Anthony Timberlands. |
| | | | Balfour Lbr Co. |
| | | | Ball Lumber. |
| | | | Banks Lumber Company. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Barge Forest Products Co.<br>Beadles Lumber Co.<br>Bearden Lumber.<br>Bennett Lumber.<br>Big Valley Band Mill.<br>Bighorn Lumber Co Inc.<br>Blue Mountain Lumber.<br>Buddy Bean Lumber.<br>Burgin Lumber Co Ltd.<br>Burt Lumber Company.<br>C&D Lumber Co.<br>Ceda-Pine Veneer.<br>Cersosimo Lumber Co Inc.<br>Charles Ingram Lumber Co Inc.<br>Charleston Heart Pine.<br>Chesterfield Lumber.<br>Chips.<br>Chocorua Valley Lumber Co.<br>Claude Howard Lumber.<br>Clearwater Forest Industries.<br>CLW Inc.<br>CM Tucker Lumber Corp.<br>Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports Executive Committee.<br>Cody Lumber Co.<br>Collins Pine Co.<br>Collums Lumber.<br>Columbus Lumber Co.<br>Contoocook River Lumber.<br>Conway Guiteau Lumber.<br>Cornwright Lumber Co.<br>Crown Pacific.<br>Daniels Lumber Inc.<br>Dean Lumber Co Inc.<br>Deltic Timber Corporation.<br>Devils Tower Forest Products.<br>DiPrizio Pine Sales.<br>Dorchester Lumber Co.<br>DR Johnson Lumber.<br>East Brainerd Lumber Co.<br>East Coast Lumber Company.<br>Eas-Tex Lumber.<br>ECK Wood Products.<br>Ellingson Lumber Co.<br>Elliott Sawmilling.<br>Empire Lumber Co.<br>Evergreen Forest Products.<br>Excalibur Shelving Systems Inc.<br>Exley Lumber Co.<br>FH Stoltze Land & Lumber Co.<br>FL Turlington Lbr Co Inc.<br>Fleming Lumber.<br>Flippo Lumber.<br>Floragen Forest Products.<br>Frank Lumber Co.<br>Franklin Timber Co.<br>Fred Tebb & Sons.<br>Fremont Sawmill.<br>Frontier Resources.<br>Garrison Brothers Lumber Co and Subsidiaries.<br>Georgia Lumber.<br>Gilman Building Products.<br>Godfrey Lumber.<br>Granite State Forest Prod Inc.<br>Great Western Lumber Co.<br>Greenville Molding Inc.<br>Griffin Lumber Company.<br>Guess Brothers Lumber.<br>Gulf Lumber.<br>Gulf States Paper.<br>Guy Bennett Lumber.<br>Hampton Resources.<br>Hancock Lumber. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Hankins Inc.<br>Hankins Lumber Co.<br>Harrigan Lumber.<br>Harwood Products.<br>Haskell Lumber Inc.<br>Hatfield Lumber.<br>Hedstrom Lumber.<br>Herrick Millwork Inc.<br>HG Toler & Son Lumber Co Inc.<br>HG Wood Industries LLC.<br>Hogan & Storey Wood Prod.<br>Hogan Lumber Co.<br>Hood Industries.<br>HS Hofler & Sons Lumber Co Inc.<br>Hubbard Forest Ind Inc.<br>HW Culp Lumber Co.<br>Idaho Veneer Co.<br>Industrial Wood Products.<br>Intermountain Res LLC.<br>International Paper.<br>J Franklin Jones Lumber Co Inc.<br>Jack Batte & Sons Inc.<br>Jasper Lumber Company.<br>JD Martin Lumber Co.<br>JE Jones Lumber Co.<br>Jerry G Williams & Sons.<br>JH Knighton Lumber Co.<br>Johnson Lumber Company.<br>Jordan Lumber & Supply.<br>Joseph Timber Co.<br>JP Haynes Lbr Co Inc.<br>JV Wells Inc.<br>JW Jones Lumber.<br>Keadle Lumber Enterprises.<br>Keller Lumber.<br>King Lumber Co.<br>Konkolville Lumber.<br>Langdale Forest Products.<br>Laurel Lumber Company.<br>Leavitt Lumber Co.<br>Leesville Lumber Co.<br>Limington Lumber Co.<br>Longview Fibre Co.<br>Lovell Lumber Co Inc.<br>M Kendall Lumber Co.<br>Manke Lumber Co.<br>Marriner Lumber Co.<br>Mason Lumber.<br>MB Heath & Sons Lumber Co.<br>MC Dixon Lumber Co Inc.<br>Mebane Lumber Co Inc.<br>Metcalf Lumber Co Inc.<br>Millry Mill Co Inc.<br>Moose Creek Lumber Co.<br>Moose River Lumber.<br>Morgan Lumber Co Inc.<br>Mount Yonah Lumber Co.<br>Nagel Lumber.<br>New Kearsarge Corp.<br>New South.<br>Nicolet Hardwoods.<br>Nieman Sawmills SD.<br>Nieman Sawmills WY.<br>North Florida.<br>Northern Lights Timber & Lumber.<br>Northern Neck Lumber Co.<br>Ochoco Lumber Co.<br>Olon Belcher Lumber Co.<br>Owens and Hurst Lumber.<br>Packaging Corp of America.<br>Page & Hill Forest Products.<br>Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union.<br>Parker Lumber. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Pate Lumber Co Inc.<br>PBS Lumber.<br>Pedigo Lumber Co.<br>Piedmont Hardwood Lumber Co.<br>Pine River Lumber Co.<br>Pinecrest Lumber Co.<br>Pleasant River Lumber Co.<br>Pleasant Western Lumber Inc.<br>Plum Creek Timber.<br>Pollard Lumber.<br>Portac.<br>Potlatch.<br>Potomac Supply.<br>Precision Lumber Inc.<br>Pruitt Lumber Inc.<br>R Leon Williams Lumber Co.<br>RA Yancey Lumber.<br>Rajala Timber Co.<br>Ralph Hamel Forest Products.<br>Randy D Miller Lumber.<br>Rappahannock Lumber Co.<br>Regulus Stud Mills Inc.<br>Riley Creek Lumber.<br>Roanoke Lumber Co.<br>Robbins Lumber.<br>Robertson Lumber.<br>Roseburg Forest Products Co.<br>Rough & Ready.<br>RSG Forest Products.<br>Rushmore Forest Products.<br>RY Timber Inc.<br>Sam Mabry Lumber Co.<br>Scotch Lumber.<br>SDS Lumber Co.<br>Seacoast Mills Inc.<br>Seago Lumber.<br>Seattle-Snohomish.<br>Seneca Sawmill.<br>Shaver Wood Products.<br>Shearer Lumber Products.<br>Shuqualak Lumber.<br>SI Storey Lumber.<br>Sierra Forest Products.<br>Sierra Pacific Industries.<br>Sigfridson Wood Products.<br>Silver City Lumber Inc.<br>Somers Lbr & Mfg Inc.<br>South & Jones.<br>South Coast.<br>Southern Forest Industries Inc.<br>Southern Lumber.<br>St Laurent Forest Products.<br>Starfire Lumber Co.<br>Steely Lumber Co Inc.<br>Stimson Lumber.<br>Summit Timber Co.<br>Sundance Lumber.<br>Superior Lumber.<br>Swanson Superior Forest Products Inc.<br>Swift Lumber.<br>Tamarack Mill.<br>Taylor Lumber & Treating Inc.<br>Temple-Inland Forest Products.<br>Thompson River Lumber.<br>Three Rivers Timber.<br>Thrift Brothers Lumber Co Inc.<br>Timco Inc.<br>Tolleson Lumber.<br>Toney Lumber.<br>TR Miller Mill Co.<br>Tradewinds of Virginia Ltd.<br>Travis Lumber Co.<br>Tree Source Industries Inc.<br>Tri-State Lumber. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | TTT Studs. |
| | | | United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners. |
| | | | Viking Lumber Co. |
| | | | VP Kiser Lumber Co. |
| | | | Walton Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Warm Springs Forest Products. |
| | | | Westvaco Corp. |
| | | | Wilkins, Kaiser & Olsen Inc. |
| | | | WM Shepherd Lumber Co. |
| | | | WR Robinson Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Wrenn Brothers Inc. |
| | | | Wyoming Sawmills. |
| | | | Yakama Forest Products. |
| | | | Younce & Ralph Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Zip-O-Log Mills Inc. |
| A–122–840 | 731–TA–954 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/Canada. | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills. |
| | | | Connecticut Steel Corp. |
| | | | Co-Steel Raritan. |
| | | | GS Industries. |
| | | | Keystone Consolidated Industries. |
| | | | North Star Steel Texas. |
| | | | Nucor Steel—Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp). |
| | | | Republic Technologies International. |
| | | | Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–122–847 | 731–TA–1019B | Hard Red Spring Wheat/Canada | North Dakota Wheat Commission. |
| A–201–504 | 731–TA–297 | Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware/Mexico | General Housewares. |
| A–201–601 | 731–TA–333 | Fresh Cut Flowers/Mexico | Burdette Coward. |
| | | | California Floral Council. |
| | | | Floral Trade Council. |
| | | | Florida Flower Association. |
| | | | Gold Coast Uanko Nursery. |
| | | | Hollandia Wholesale Florist. |
| | | | Manatee Fruit. |
| | | | Monterey Flower Farms. |
| | | | Topstar Nursery. |
| A–201–802 | 731–TA–451 | Gray Portland Cement and Clinker/Mexico | Alamo Cement. |
| | | | Blue Circle. |
| | | | BoxCrow Cement. |
| | | | Calaveras Cement. |
| | | | Capitol Aggregates. |
| | | | Centex Cement. |
| | | | Florida Crushed Stone. |
| | | | Gifford-Hill. |
| | | | Hanson Permanente Cement. |
| | | | Ideal Basic Industries. |
| | | | Independent Workers of North America (Locals 49, 52, 89, 192 and 471). |
| | | | International Union of Operating Engineers (Local 12). |
| | | | National Cement Company of Alabama. |
| | | | National Cement Company of California. |
| | | | Phoenix Cement. |
| | | | Riverside Cement. |
| | | | Southdown. |
| | | | Tarmac America. |
| | | | Texas Industries. |
| A–201–805 | 731–TA–534 | Circular Welded Nonalloy Steel Pipe/Mexico | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | CSI Tubular Products. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | LTV Tubular Products. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | USX. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | Wheatland Tube. |
| A–201–806 | 731–TA–547 | Carbon Steel Wire Rope/Mexico | Bridon American. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Macwhyte.<br>Paulsen Wire Rope.<br>The Rochester Corporation.<br>United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers (Local 960).<br>Williamsport.<br>Wire-rope Works.<br>Wire Rope Corporation of America. |
| A–201–809 | 731–TA–582 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Mexico | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–201–817 | 731–TA–716 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Mexico | IPSCO.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Newport Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–201–820 | 731–TA–747 | Fresh Tomatoes/Mexico | Accomack County Farm Bureau.<br>Ad Hoc Group of Florida, California, Georgia, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia Tomato Growers.<br>Florida Farm Bureau Federation.<br>Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.<br>Florida Tomato Exchange.<br>Florida Tomato Growers Exchange.<br>Gadsden County Tomato Growers Association.<br>South Carolina Tomato Association. |
| A–201–822 | 731–TA–802 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Mexico | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–201–827 | 731–TA–848 | Large-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/Mexico. | North Star Steel.<br>Timken.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–201–828 | 731–TA–920 | Welded Large Diameter Line Pipe/Mexico | American Cast Iron Pipe.<br>Berg Steel Pipe.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Napa Pipe/Oregon Steel Mills.<br>Saw Pipes USA.<br>Stupp.<br>US Steel. |
| A–201–830 | 731–TA–958 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/Mexico. | AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills.<br>Connecticut Steel Corp.<br>Co-Steel Raritan.<br>GS Industries.<br>Keystone Consolidated Industries.<br>North Star Steel Texas.<br>Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp).<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–201–831 | 731–TA–1027 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/Mexico. | American Spring Wire Corp.<br>Insteel Wire Products Co.<br>Sivaco Georgia LLC. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Strand Tech Martin Inc. |
| | | | Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |
| A–201–834 | 731–TA–1085 | Purified Carboxymethylcellulose/Mexico | Aqualon Co a Division of Hercules Inc. |
| A–274–804 | 731–TA–961 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/Trinidad & Tobago. | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills. |
| | | | Connecticut Steel Corp. |
| | | | Co-Steel Raritan. |
| | | | GS Industries. |
| | | | Keystone Consolidated Industries. |
| | | | North Star Steel Texas. |
| | | | Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp). |
| | | | Republic Technologies International. |
| | | | Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–301–602 | 731–TA–329 | Fresh Cut Flowers/Colombia | Burdette Coward. |
| | | | California Floral Council. |
| | | | Floral Trade Council. |
| | | | Florida Flower Association. |
| | | | Gold Coast Uanko Nursery. |
| | | | Hollandia Wholesale Florist. |
| | | | Manatee Fruit. |
| | | | Monterey Flower Farms. |
| | | | Pajaro Valley Greenhouses. |
| | | | Topstar Nursery. |
| A–307–803 | 731–TA–519 | Gray Portland Cement and Clinker/Venezuela | Florida Crushed Stone. |
| | | | Southdown. |
| | | | Tarmac America. |
| A–307–805 | 731–TA–537 | Circular Welded Nonalloy Steel Pipe/Venezuela. | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | CSI Tubular Products. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | LTV Tubular Products. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | USX. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | Wheatland Tube. |
| A–307–807 | 731–TA–570 | Ferrosilicon/Venezuela | AIMCOR. |
| | | | Alabama Silicon. |
| | | | American Alloys. |
| | | | Globe Metallurgical. |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389). |
| | | | Silicon Metaltech. |
| | | | United Autoworkers of America (Local 523). |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–307–820 | 731–TA–931 | Silicomanganese/Venezuela | Eramet Marietta. |
| | | | Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, Local 5–0639. |
| A–331–602 | 731–TA–331 | Fresh Cut Flowers/Ecuador | Burdette Coward. |
| | | | California Floral Council. |
| | | | Floral Trade Council. |
| | | | Florida Flower Association. |
| | | | Gold Coast Uanko Nursery. |
| | | | Hollandia Wholesale Florist. |
| | | | Manatee Fruit. |
| | | | Monterey Flower Farms. |
| | | | Topstar Nursery. |
| A–337–803 | 731–TA–768 | Fresh Atlantic Salmon/Chile | Atlantic Salmon of Maine. |
| | | | Cooke Aquaculture US. |
| | | | DE Salmon. |
| | | | Global Aqua USA. |
| | | | Island Aquaculture. |
| | | | Maine Coast Nordic. |
| | | | Scan Am Fish Farms. |
| | | | Treats Island Fisheries. |
| | | | Trumpet Island Salmon Farm. |
| A–337–804 | 731–TA–776 | Preserved Mushrooms/Chile | LK Bowman. |
| | | | Modern Mushroom Farms. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Monterey Mushrooms. |
| | | | Mount Laurel Canning. |
| | | | Mushroom Canning. |
| | | | Southwood Farms. |
| | | | Sunny Dell Foods. |
| | | | United Canning. |
| A–337–806 | 731–TA–948 | Individually Quick Frozen Red Raspberries/ Chile. | A&A Berry Farms. |
| | | | Bahler Farms. |
| | | | Bear Creek Farms. |
| | | | David Burns. |
| | | | Columbia Farms. |
| | | | Columbia Fruit. |
| | | | George Culp. |
| | | | Dobbins Berry Farm. |
| | | | Enfield. |
| | | | Firestone Packing. |
| | | | George Hoffman Farms. |
| | | | Heckel Farms. |
| | | | Wendell Kreder. |
| | | | Curt Maberry. |
| | | | Maberry Packing. |
| | | | Mike & Jean's. |
| | | | Nguyen Berry Farms. |
| | | | Nick's Acres. |
| | | | North Fork. |
| | | | Parson Berry Farm. |
| | | | Pickin 'N' Pluckin. |
| | | | Postage Stamp Farm. |
| | | | Rader. |
| | | | RainSweet. |
| | | | Scenic Fruit. |
| | | | Silverstar Farms. |
| | | | Tim Straub. |
| | | | Thoeny Farms. |
| | | | Townsend. |
| | | | Tsugawa Farms. |
| | | | Updike Berry Farms. |
| | | | Van Laeken Farms. |
| A–351–503 | 731–TA–262 | Iron Construction Castings/Brazil | Alhambra Foundry. |
| | | | Allegheny Foundry. |
| | | | Bingham & Taylor. |
| | | | Campbell Foundry. |
| | | | Charlotte Pipe & Foundry. |
| | | | Deeter Foundry. |
| | | | East Jordan Foundry. |
| | | | Le Baron Foundry. |
| | | | Municipal Castings. |
| | | | Neenah Foundry. |
| | | | Opelika Foundry. |
| | | | Pinkerton Foundry. |
| | | | Tyler Pipe. |
| | | | US Foundry & Manufacturing. |
| | | | Vulcan Foundry. |
| A–351–505 | 731–TA–278 | Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/Brazil | Grinnell. |
| | | | Stanley G Flagg. |
| | | | Stockham Valves & Fittings. |
| | | | U-Brand. |
| | | | Ward Manufacturing. |
| A–351–602 | 731–TA–308 | Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Brazil | Ladish. |
| | | | Mills Iron Works. |
| | | | Steel Forgings. |
| | | | Tube Forgings of America. |
| | | | Weldbend. |
| A–351–603 | 731–TA–311 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Brazil | Allied Industrial Workers of America. |
| | | | American Brass. |
| | | | Bridgeport Brass. |
| | | | Chase Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Hussey Copper. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56). |
| | | | The Miller Company. |
| | | | Olin. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Revere Copper Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–351–605 | 731–TA–326 | Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice/Brazil | Alcoma Packing. |
| | | | B&W Canning. |
| | | | Berry Citrus Products. |
| | | | Caulkins Indiantown Citrus. |
| | | | Citrus Belle. |
| | | | Citrus World. |
| | | | Florida Citrus Mutual. |
| A–351–804 | 731–TA–439 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/Brazil | Hercules. |
| A–351–806 | 731–TA–471 | Silicon Metal/Brazil | American Alloys. |
| | | | Globe Metallurgical. |
| | | | International Union of Electronics, Electrical, Machine and Furniture Workers (Local 693). |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389). |
| | | | Silicon Metaltech. |
| | | | SiMETCO. |
| | | | Textile Processors, Service Trades, Health Care Professional and Technical Employees (Local 60). |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Locals 5171, 8538 and 12646). |
| A–351–809 | 731–TA–532 | Circular Welded Nonalloy Steel Pipe/Brazil | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | CSI Tubular Products. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | LTV Tubular Products. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | USX. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | Wheatland Tube. |
| A–351–817 | 731–TA–574 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Brazil | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–351–819 | 731–TA–636 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Brazil | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–351–820 | 731–TA–641 | Ferrosilicon/Brazil | AIMCOR. |
| | | | Alabama Silicon. |
| | | | American Alloys. |
| | | | Globe Metallurgical. |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389). |
| | | | Silicon Metaltech. |
| | | | United Autoworkers of America (Local 523). |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–351–824 | 731–TA–671 | Silicomanganese/Brazil | Elkem Metals. |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 3–639). |
| A–351–825 | 731–TA–678 | Stainless Steel Bar/Brazil | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Crucible Specialty Metals. |
| | | | Electralloy. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Slater Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–351–826 | 731–TA–708 | Seamless Pipe/Brazil | Koppel Steel. |
| | | | Quanex. |
| | | | Timken. |
| | | | United States Steel. |
| A–351–828 | 731–TA–806 | Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Brazil | Acme Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Gallatin Steel. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Independent Steelworkers. |
| | | | IPSCO. |
| | | | Ispat/Inland. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nucor. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Steel Dynamics. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| | | | Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–351–832 | 731–TA–953 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/ Brazil. | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills. |
| | | | Connecticut Steel Corp. |
| | | | Co-Steel Raritan. |
| | | | GS Industries. |
| | | | Keystone Consolidated Industries. |
| | | | North Star Steel Texas. |
| | | | Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp). |
| | | | Republic Technologies International. |
| | | | Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–351–837 | 731–TA–1024 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/Brazil | American Spring Wire Corp. |
| | | | Insteel Wire Products Co. |
| | | | Sivaco Georgia LLC. |
| | | | Strand Tech Martin Inc. |
| | | | Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |
| A–351–840 | 731–TA–1089 | Certain Orange Juice/Brazil | A Duda & Sons Inc. |
| | | | Alico Inc. |
| | | | John Barnelt. |
| | | | Ben Hill Griffin Inc. |
| | | | Bliss Citrus. |
| | | | BTS A Florida General Partnership. |
| | | | Cain Groves. |
| | | | California Citrus Mutual. |
| | | | Cedar Haven Inc. |
| | | | Citrus World Inc. |
| | | | Clonts Groves Inc. |
| | | | Davis Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | D Edwards Dickinson. |
| | | | Evans Properties Inc. |
| | | | Florida Citrus Commission. |
| | | | Florida Citrus Mutual. |
| | | | Florida Farm Bureau Federation. |
| | | | Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. |
| | | | Florida State of Department of Citrus. |
| | | | Flying V Inc. |
| | | | GBS Groves Inc. |
| | | | Graves Brothers Co. |
| | | | H&S Groves. |
| | | | Hartwell Groves Inc. |
| | | | Holly Hill Fruit Products Co. |
| | | | Jack Melton Family Inc. |
| | | | K-Bob Inc. |
| | | | L Dicks Inc. |
| | | | Lake Pickett Partnership Inc. |
| | | | Lamb Revocable Trust Gerilyn Rebecca S Lamb Trustee. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lykes Bros Inc.<br>Martin J McKenna.<br>Orange & Sons Inc.<br>Osgood Groves.<br>William W Parshall.<br>PH Freeman & Sons.<br>Pierie Grove.<br>Raymond & Melissa Pierie.<br>Roper Growers Cooperative.<br>Royal Brothers Groves.<br>Seminole Tribe of Florida Inc.<br>Silverman Groves/Rilla Cooper.<br>Smoak Groves Inc.<br>Sorrells Groves Inc.<br>Southern Gardens Groves Corp.<br>Southern Gardens Processing Corp.<br>Southern Groves Citrus.<br>Sun Ag Inc.<br>Sunkist Growers Inc.<br>Texas Citrus Exchange.<br>Texas Citrus Mutual.<br>Texas Produce Association.<br>Travis Wise Management Inc.<br>Uncle Matt's Fresh Inc.<br>Varn Citrus Growers Inc. |
| A–357–007 | 731–TA–157 | Carbon Steel Wire Rod/Argentina | Atlantic Steel.<br>Continental Steel.<br>Georgetown Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>Raritan River Steel. |
| A–357–405 | 731–TA–208 | Barbed Wire and Barbless Wire Strand/Argentina. | CF&I Steel.<br>Davis Walker.<br>Forbes Steel & Wire.<br>Oklahoma Steel Wire. |
| A–357–802 | 731–TA–409 | Light-Walled Rectangular Tube/Argentina | Bull Moose Tube.<br>Hannibal Industries.<br>Harris Tube.<br>Maruichi American.<br>Searing Industries.<br>Southwestern Pipe.<br>Western Tube & Conduit. |
| A–357–804 | 731–TA–470 | Silicon Metal/Argentina | American Alloys.<br>Elkem Metals.<br>Globe Metallurgical.<br>International Union of Electronics, Electrical, Machine and Furniture Workers (Local 693).<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389).<br>Silicon Metaltech.<br>SiMETCO.<br>SKW Alloys.<br>Textile Processors, Service Trades, Health Care Professional and Technical Employees (Local 60).<br>United Steelworkers of America (Locals 5171, 8538 and 12646). |
| A–357–809 | 731–TA–707 | Seamless Pipe/Argentina | Koppel Steel.<br>Quanex.<br>Timken.<br>United States Steel. |
| A–357–810 | 731–TA–711 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Argentina | IPSCO.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Lone Star Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Newport Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–357–812 | 731–TA–892 | Honey/Argentina | AH Meyer & Sons.<br>Adee Honey Farms.<br>Althoff Apiaries.<br>American Beekeeping Federation.<br>American Honey Producers Association.<br>Anderson Apiaries. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Arroyo Apiaries.<br>Artesian Honey Producers.<br>B Weaver Apiaries.<br>Bailey Enterprises.<br>Barkman Honey.<br>Basler Honey Apiary.<br>Beals Honey.<br>Bears Paw Apiaries.<br>Beaverhead Honey.<br>Bee Biz.<br>Bee Haven Honey.<br>Belliston Brothers Apiaries.<br>Big Sky Honey.<br>Bill Rhodes Honey.<br>Richard E Blake.<br>Curt Bronnenbery.<br>Brown's Honey Farms.<br>Brumley's Bees.<br>Buhmann Apiaries.<br>Carys Honey Farms.<br>Chaparrel Honey.<br>Charles Apiaries.<br>Mitchell Charles.<br>Collins Honey.<br>Conor Apiaries.<br>Coy's Honey Farm.<br>Dave Nelson Apiaries.<br>Delta Bee.<br>Eisele's Pollination & Honey.<br>Ellingsoa's.<br>Elliott Curtis & Sons.<br>Charles L Emmons, Sr.<br>Gause Honey.<br>Gene Brandi Apiaries.<br>Griffith Honey.<br>Haff Apiaries.<br>Hamilton Bee Farms.<br>Hamilton Honey.<br>Happie Bee.<br>Harvest Honey.<br>Harvey's Honey.<br>Hiatt Honey.<br>Hoffman Honey.<br>Hollman Apiaries.<br>Honey House.<br>Honeybee Apiaries.<br>Gary M Honl.<br>Rand William Honl and Sydney Jo Honl.<br>James R & Joann Smith Trust.<br>Jaynes Bee Products.<br>Johnston Honey Farms.<br>Larry Johnston.<br>Ke-An Honey.<br>Kent Honeybees.<br>Lake-Indianhead Honey Farms.<br>Lamb's Honey Farm.<br>Las Flores Apiaries.<br>Mackrill Honey Farms & Sales.<br>Raymond Marquette.<br>Mason & Sons Honey.<br>McCoy's Sunny South Apiaries.<br>Merrimack Valley Apiaries & Evergreen Honey.<br>Met 2 Honey Farm.<br>Missouri River Honey.<br>Mitchell Brothers Honey.<br>Monda Honey Farm.<br>Montana Dakota Honey.<br>Northern Bloom Honey.<br>Noye's Apiaries.<br>Oakes Honey.<br>Oakley Honey Farms.<br>Old Mill Apiaries.<br>Opp Honey. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Oro Dulce. |
| | | | Peterson's "Naturally Sweet" Honey. |
| | | | Potoczak Bee Farms. |
| | | | Price Apiaries. |
| | | | Pure Sweet Honey Farms. |
| | | | Robertson Pollination Service. |
| | | | Robson Honey. |
| | | | William Robson. |
| | | | Rosedale Apiaries. |
| | | | Ryan Apiaries. |
| | | | Schmidt Honey Farms. |
| | | | Simpson Apiaries. |
| | | | Sioux Honey Association. |
| | | | Smoot Honey. |
| | | | Solby Honey. |
| | | | Stahlman Apiaries. |
| | | | Steve E Parks Apiaries. |
| | | | Stroope Bee & Honey. |
| | | | T&D Honey Bee. |
| | | | Talbott's Honey. |
| | | | Terry Apiaries. |
| | | | Thompson Apiaries. |
| | | | Triple A Farm. |
| | | | Tropical Blossom Honey. |
| | | | Tubbs Apiaries. |
| | | | Venable Wholesale. |
| | | | Walter L Wilson Buzz 76 Apiaries. |
| | | | Wiebersiek Honey Farms. |
| | | | Wilmer Farms. |
| | | | Brent J Woodworth. |
| | | | Wooten's Golden Queens. |
| | | | Yaddof Apiaries. |
| A–357–814 | 731–TA–898 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Argentina | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Gallatin Steel. |
| | | | Independent Steelworkers. |
| | | | IPSCO. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nucor. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Steel Dynamics. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel Inc. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| | | | Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–401–040 | AA1921–114 | Stainless Steel Plate/Sweden | Jessop Steel. |
| A–401–601 | 731–TA–316 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Sweden | Allied Industrial Workers of America. |
| | | | American Brass. |
| | | | Bridgeport Brass. |
| | | | Chase Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Hussey Copper. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56). |
| | | | The Miller Company. |
| | | | Olin. |
| | | | Revere Copper Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–401–603 | 731–TA–354 | Stainless Steel Hollow Products/Sweden | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Allegheny Ludlum Steel. |
| | | | ARMCO. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Crucible Materials. |
| | | | Damacus Tubular Products. |
| | | | Specialty Tubing Group. |
| A–401–801 | 731–TA–397–A | Ball Bearings/Sweden | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | MPB. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–401–801 | 731–TA–397–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/Sweden | Barden Corp. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission.<br>MPB.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–401–805 | 731–TA–586 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Sweden | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–401–806 | 731–TA–774 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Sweden | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–401–808 | 731–TA–1087 | Purified Carboxymethylcellulose/Sweden | Aqualon Co a Division of Hercules Inc. |
| A–403–801 | 731–TA–454 | Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon/Norway | Heritage Salmon.<br>The Coalition for Fair Atlantic Salmon Trade. |
| A–405–802 | 731–TA–576 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Finland | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–405–803 | 731–TA–1084 | Purified Carboxymethylcellulose/Finland | Aqualon Co a Division of Hercules Inc. |
| A–412–801 | 731–TA–399–A | Ball Bearings/United Kingdom | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Kubar Bearings.<br>McGill Manufacturing Co.<br>MPB.<br>Rexnord Inc.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–412–801 | 731–TA–399–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/United Kingdom | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>MPB.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–412–803 | 731–TA–443 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/United Kingdom | Hercules. |
| A–412–805 | 731–TA–468 | Sodium Thiosulfate/United Kingdom | Calabrian. |
| A–412–814 | 731–TA–587 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/United Kingdom. | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–412–818 | 731–TA–804 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/United Kingdom. | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–412–822 | 731–TA–918 | Stainless Steel Bar/United Kingdom | Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–421–701 | 731–TA–380 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Netherlands | Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Empire Specialty Steel.<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–421–804 | 731–TA–608 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Netherlands. | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>North Coast Brass & Copper.<br>Olin.<br>Pegg Metals.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–421–805 | 731–TA–652 | Aramid Fiber/Netherlands | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| A–421–807 | 731–TA–903 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Netherlands | E I du Pont de Nemours. |
| A–421–811 | 731–TA–1086 | Purified Carboxymethylcellulose/Netherlands | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–423–077 | AA1921–198 | Sugar/Belgium | Aqualon Co a Division of Hercules Inc. |
| A–423–602 | 731–TA–365 | Industrial Phosphoric Acid/Belgium | Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association. |
| A–423–805 | 731–TA–573 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Belgium | Albright & Wilson.<br>FMC.<br>Hydrite Chemical.<br>Monsanto.<br>Stauffer Chemical. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–423–808 | 731–TA–788 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Belgium | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–427–001 | 731–TA–44 | Sorbitol/France | Lonza. |
| | | | Pfizer. |
| A–427–009 | 731–TA–96 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/France | Hercules. |
| A–427–078 | AA1921–199 | Sugar/France | Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association. |
| A–427–098 | 731–TA–25 | Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate/France | PQ. |
| A–427–602 | 731–TA–313 | Brass Sheet and Strip/France | Allied Industrial Workers of America. |
| | | | American Brass. |
| | | | Bridgeport Brass. |
| | | | Chase Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Hussey Copper. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56). |
| | | | The Miller Company. |
| | | | Olin. |
| | | | Revere Copper Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–427–801 | 731–TA–392–A | Ball Bearings/France | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | McGill Manufacturing Co. |
| | | | MPB. |
| | | | Rexnord Inc. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–427–801 | 731–TA–392–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/France | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | MPB. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–427–801 | 731–TA–392–C | Spherical Plain Bearings/France | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | McGill Manufacturing Co. |
| | | | Rexnord Inc. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–427–804 | 731–TA–553 | Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products/France. | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | USS/Kobe Steel. |
| A–427–808 | 731–TA–615 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/France. | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| A–427–811 | 731–TA–637 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/France | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–427–814 | 731–TA–797 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/France | Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–427–816 | 731–TA–816 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/France | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–427–818 | 731–TA–909 | Low Enriched Uranium/France | United States Enrichment Corp.<br>USEC Inc. |
| A–427–820 | 731–TA–913 | Stainless Steel Bar/France | Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Empire Specialty Steel.<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–428–082 | AA1921–200 | Sugar/Germany | Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association. |
| A–428–602 | 731–TA–317 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Germany | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>Olin.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–428–801 | 731–TA–391–A | Ball Bearings/Germany | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Kubar Bearings.<br>McGill Manufacturing Co.<br>MPB.<br>Rexnord Inc.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–428–801 | 731–TA–391–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/Germany | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>MPB.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–428–801 | 731–TA–391–C | Spherical Plain Bearings/Germany | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–428–802 | 731–TA–419 | Industrial Belts/Germany | The Gates Rubber Company.<br>The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. |
| A–428–803 | 731–TA–444 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/Germany | Hercules. |
| A–428–807 | 731–TA–465 | Sodium Thiosulfate/Germany | Calabrian. |
| A–428–814 | 731–TA–604 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Germany. | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–428–815 | 731–TA–616 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Germany. | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |
| A–428–816 | 731–TA–578 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Germany | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |
| A–428–820 | 731–TA–709 | Seamless Pipe/Germany | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Quanex.<br>Timken.<br>United States Steel. |
| A–428–821 | 731–TA–736 | Large Newspaper Printing Presses/Germany | Rockwell Graphics Systems. |
| A–428–825 | 731–TA–798 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Germany | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–428–830 | 731–TA–914 | Stainless Steel Bar/Germany | Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Empire Specialty Steel.<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–437–601 | 731–TA–341 | Tapered Roller Bearings/Hungary | L&S Bearing.<br>Timken.<br>Torrington. |
| A–437–804 | 731–TA–426 | Sulfanilic Acid/Hungary | Nation Ford Chemical. |
| A–447–801 | 731–TA–340C | Solid Urea/Estonia | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–449–804 | 731–TA–878 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Latvia | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Auburn Steel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | CMC Steel Group. |
| | | | Co-Steel Inc. |
| | | | Marion Steel. |
| | | | North Star Steel Co. |
| | | | Nucor Steel. |
| | | | Rebar Trade Action Coalition. |
| | | | Riverview Steel. |
| | | | Sheffield Steel. |
| | | | TAMCO. |
| | | | TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–451–801 | 731–TA–340D | Solid Urea/Lithuania | Agrico Chemical. |
| | | | American Cyanamid. |
| | | | CF Industries. |
| | | | First Mississippi. |
| | | | Mississippi Chemical. |
| | | | Terra International. |
| | | | WR Grace. |
| A–455–802 | 731–TA–583 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Poland | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–455–803 | 731–TA–880 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Poland | AB Steel Mill Inc. |
| | | | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Auburn Steel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Border Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc. |
| | | | CMC Steel Group. |
| | | | Co-Steel Inc. |
| | | | Marion Steel. |
| | | | North Star Steel Co. |
| | | | Nucor Steel. |
| | | | Rebar Trade Action Coalition. |
| | | | Riverview Steel. |
| | | | Sheffield Steel. |
| | | | TAMCO. |
| | | | TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–469–007 | 731–TA–126 | Potassium Permanganate/Spain | Carus Chemical. |
| A–469–803 | 731–TA–585 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Spain | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–469–805 | 731–TA–682 | Stainless Steel Bar/Spain | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Crucible Specialty Metals. |
| | | | Electralloy. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Slater Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–469–807 | 731–TA–773 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Spain | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–469–810 | 731–TA–890 | Stainless Steel Angle/Spain | Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–469–814 | 731–TA–1083 | Chlorinated Isocyanurates/Spain | BioLab Inc.<br>Clearon Corp.<br>Occidental Chemical Corp. |
| A–471–806 | 731–TA–427 | Sulfanilic Acid/Portugal | Nation Ford Chemical. |
| A–475–059 | AA1921–167 | Pressure-Sensitive Plastic Tape/Italy | Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing. |
| A–475–601 | 731–TA–314 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Italy | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>Olin.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–475–703 | 731–TA–385 | Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene/Italy | E I du Pont de Nemours.<br>ICI Americas. |
| A–475–801 | 731–TA–393–A | Ball Bearings/Italy | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Kubar Bearings.<br>McGill Manufacturing Co.<br>MPB.<br>Rexnord Inc.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–475–801 | 731–TA–393–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/Italy | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>MPB.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–475–802 | 731–TA–413 | Industrial Belts/Italy | The Gates Rubber Company.<br>The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. |
| A–475–811 | 731–TA–659 | Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel/Italy | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Union. |
| A–475–814 | 731–TA–710 | Seamless Pipe/Italy | Koppel Steel.<br>Quanex.<br>Timken.<br>United States Steel. |
| A–475–816 | 731–TA–713 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Italy | Bellville Tube.<br>IPSCO.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Lone Star Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Newport Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–475–818 | 731–TA–734 | Pasta/Italy | A Zerega's Sons.<br>American Italian Pasta.<br>Borden.<br>D Merlino & Sons.<br>Dakota Growers Pasta.<br>Foulds.<br>Gilster-Mary Lee.<br>Gooch Foods.<br>Hershey Foods.<br>LaRinascente Macaroni Co.<br>Pasta USA.<br>Philadelphia Macaroni.<br>ST Specialty Foods. |
| A–475–820 | 731–TA–770 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Italy | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–475–822 | 731–TA–790 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Italy | Allegheny Ludlum. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–475–824 | 731–TA–799 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Italy | Armco Steel.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Allegheny Ludlum. |
| A–475–826 | 731–TA–819 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Italy | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–475–828 | 731–TA–865 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Italy | Flo-Mac Inc.<br>Gerlin.<br>Markovitz Enterprises.<br>Shaw Alloy Piping Products.<br>Taylor Forge Stainless. |
| A–475–829 | 731–TA–915 | Stainless Steel Bar/Italy | Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Empire Specialty Steel.<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–479–801 | 731–TA–445 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/Yugoslavia | Hercules. |
| A–484–801 | 731–TA–406 | Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide/Greece | Chemetals.<br>Kerr-McGee.<br>Rayovac. |
| A–485–601 | 731–TA–339 | Solid Urea/Romania | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–485–602 | 731–TA–345 | Tapered Roller Bearings/Romania | L&S Bearing.<br>Timken.<br>Torrington. |
| A–485–801 | 731–TA–395 | Ball Bearings/Romania | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Kubar Bearings.<br>MPB.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–485–803 | 731–TA–584 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Romania | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–485–805 | 731–TA–849 | Small-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/ Romania | Koppel Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Timken.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | USS/Kobe. |
| | | | Vision Metals' Gulf States Tube. |
| A–485–806 | 731–TA–904 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Romania | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Gallatin Steel. |
| | | | Independent Steelworkers. |
| | | | IPSCO. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nucor. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Steel Dynamics. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel Inc. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| | | | Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–489–501 | 731–TA–273 | Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube/Turkey | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bernard Epps. |
| | | | Bock Industries. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Central Steel Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | Copperweld Tubing. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Hughes Steel & Tube. |
| | | | Kaiser Steel. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Maverick Tube. |
| | | | Merchant Metals. |
| | | | Phoenix Steel. |
| | | | Pittsburgh Tube. |
| | | | Quanex. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | Southwestern Pipe. |
| | | | UNR-Leavitt. |
| | | | Welded Tube. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | Wheatland Tube. |
| A–489–602 | 731–TA–364 | Aspirin/Turkey | Dow Chemical. |
| | | | Monsanto. |
| | | | Norwich-Eaton. |
| A–489–805 | 731–TA–735 | Pasta/Turkey | A Zerega's Sons. |
| | | | American Italian Pasta. |
| | | | Borden. |
| | | | D Merlino & Sons. |
| | | | Dakota Growers Pasta. |
| | | | Foulds. |
| | | | Gilster-Mary Lee. |
| | | | Gooch Foods. |
| | | | Hershey Foods. |
| | | | LaRinascente Macaroni Co. |
| | | | Pasta USA. |
| | | | Philadelphia Macaroni. |
| | | | ST Specialty Foods. |
| A–489–807 | 731–TA–745 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Turkey | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Auburn Steel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Commercial Metals. |
| | | | Marion Steel. |
| | | | New Jersey Steel. |
| A–507–502 | 731–TA–287 | Raw In-Shell Pistachios/Iran | Blackwell Land. |
| | | | California Pistachio Orchard. |
| | | | Keenan Farms. |
| | | | Kern Pistachio Hulling & Drying. |
| | | | Los Ranchos de Poco Pedro. |
| | | | Pistachio Producers of California. |
| | | | TM Duche Nut. |
| A–508–604 | 731–TA–366 | Industrial Phosphoric Acid/Israel | Albright & Wilson. |
| | | | FMC. |
| | | | Hydrite Chemical. |
| | | | Monsanto. |
| | | | Stauffer Chemical. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–533–502 | 731–TA–271 | Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube/India | Allied Tube & Conduit.<br>American Tube.<br>Bernard Epps.<br>Bock Industries.<br>Bull Moose Tube.<br>Central Steel Tube.<br>Century Tube.<br>Copperweld Tubing.<br>Cyclops.<br>Hughes Steel & Tube.<br>Kaiser Steel.<br>Laclede Steel.<br>Maruichi American.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Merchant Metals.<br>Phoenix Steel.<br>Pittsburgh Tube.<br>Quanex.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Southwestern Pipe.<br>UNR-Leavitt.<br>Welded Tube.<br>Western Tube & Conduit.<br>Wheatland Tube. |
| A–533–806 | 731–TA–561 | Sulfanilic Acid/India | R–M Industries. |
| A–533–808 | 731–TA–638 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/India | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–533–809 | 731–TA–639 | Forged Stainless Steel Flanges/India | Gerlin.<br>Ideal Forging.<br>Maass Flange.<br>Markovitz Enterprises. |
| A–533–810 | 731–TA–679 | Stainless Steel Bar/India | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Slater Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–533–813 | 731–TA–778 | Preserved Mushrooms/India | LK Bowman.<br>Modern Mushroom Farms.<br>Monterey Mushrooms.<br>Mount Laurel Canning.<br>Mushroom Canning.<br>Southwood Farms.<br>Sunny Dell Foods.<br>United Canning. |
| A–533–817 | 731–TA–817 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/India | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–533–820 | 731–TA–900 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/India | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–533–823 | 731–TA–929 | Silicomanganese/India | Eramet Marietta.<br>Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, Local 5–0639. |
| A–533–824 | 731–TA–933 | Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip (PET Film)/India. | DuPont Teijin Films.<br>Mitsubishi Polyester Film LLC.<br>SKC America Inc.<br>Toray Plastics (America). |
| A–533–828 | 731–TA–1025 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/India | American Spring Wire Corp.<br>Insteel Wire Products Co.<br>Sivaco Georgia LLC.<br>Strand Tech Martin Inc.<br>Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |
| A–533–838 | 731–TA–1061 | Carbazole Violet Pigment 23/India | Allegheny Color Corp.<br>Barker Fine Color Inc.<br>Clariant Corp.<br>Nation Ford Chemical Co.<br>Sun Chemical Co. |
| A–533–843 | 731–TA–1096 | Certain Lined Paper School Supplies/India | Fay Paper Products Inc.<br>MeadWestvaco Consumer & Office Products.<br>Norcom Inc.<br>Pacon Corp.<br>Roaring Spring Blank Book Co.<br>Top Flight Inc.<br>United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO–CLC (USW). |
| A–538–802 | 731–TA–514 | Cotton Shop Towels/Bangladesh | Milliken. |
| A–549–502 | 731–TA–252 | Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube/Thailand | Allied Tube & Conduit.<br>American Tube.<br>Bernard Epps.<br>Bock Industries.<br>Bull Moose Tube.<br>Central Steel Tube.<br>Century Tube.<br>Copperweld Tubing.<br>Cyclops.<br>Hughes Steel & Tube.<br>Kaiser Steel.<br>Laclede Steel.<br>Maruichi American.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Merchant Metals.<br>Phoenix Steel.<br>Pittsburgh Tube.<br>Quanex.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Southwestern Pipe.<br>UNR-Leavitt.<br>Welded Tube.<br>Western Tube & Conduit.<br>Wheatland Tube. |
| A–549–601 | 731–TA–348 | Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/Thailand | Grinnell.<br>Stanley G Flagg.<br>Stockham Valves & Fittings.<br>U-Brand.<br>Ward Manufacturing. |
| A–549–807 | 731–TA–521 | Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Thailand | Hackney.<br>Ladish.<br>Mills Iron Works.<br>Steel Forgings.<br>Tube Forgings of America. |
| A–549–812 | 731–TA–705 | Furfuryl Alcohol/Thailand | QO Chemicals. |
| A–549–813 | 731–TA–706 | Canned Pineapple/Thailand | International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union.<br>Maui Pineapple. |
| A–549–817 | 731–TA–907 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Thailand | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–549–820 | 731–TA–1028 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/Thailand. | American Spring Wire Corp.<br>Insteel Wire Products Co.<br>Sivaco Georgia LLC.<br>Strand Tech Martin Inc.<br>Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |
| A–549–821 | 731–TA–1045 | Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags/Thailand | Aargus Plastics Inc.<br>Advance Polybags Inc.<br>Advance Polybags (Nevada) Inc.<br>Advance Polybags (Northeast) Inc.<br>Alpha Industries Inc.<br>Alpine Plastics Inc.<br>Ampac Packaging LLC.<br>API Enterprises Inc.<br>Command Packaging.<br>Continental Poly Bags Inc.<br>Durabag Co Inc.<br>Europackaging LLC.<br>Genpak LLC (formerly Continental Superbag LLC).<br>Genpak LLC (formerly Strout Plastics).<br>Hilex Poly Co LLC.<br>Inteplast Group Ltd.<br>PCL Packaging Inc.<br>Poly-Pak Industries Inc.<br>Roplast Industries Inc.<br>Superbag Corp.<br>Unistar Plastics LLC.<br>Vanguard Plastics Inc.<br>VS Plastics LLC. |
| A–552–801 | 731–TA–1012 | Certain Frozen Fish Fillets/Vietnam | America's Catch Inc.<br>Aquafarms Catfish Inc.<br>Carolina Classics Catfish Inc.<br>Catfish Farmers of America.<br>Consolidated Catfish Companies Inc.<br>Delta Pride Catfish Inc.<br>Fish Processors Inc.<br>Guidry's Catfish Inc.<br>Haring's Pride Catfish.<br>Harvest Select Catfish (Alabama Catfish Inc).<br>Heartland Catfish Co (TT&W Farm Products Inc).<br>Prairie Lands Seafood (Illinois Fish Farmers Cooperative).<br>Pride of the Pond.<br>Pride of the South Catfish Inc.<br>Prime Line Inc.<br>Seabrook Seafood Inc.<br>Seacat (Arkansas Catfish Growers).<br>Simmons Farm Raised Catfish Inc.<br>Southern Pride Catfish LLC.<br>Verret Fisheries Inc. |
| A–557–805 | 731–TA–527 | Extruded Rubber Thread/Malaysia | Globe Manufacturing.<br>North American Rubber Thread. |
| A–557–809 | 731–TA–866 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Malaysia. | Flo-Mac Inc.<br>Gerlin.<br>Markovitz Enterprises.<br>Shaw Alloy Piping Products.<br>Taylor Forge Stainless. |
| A–557–813 | 731–TA–1044 | Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags/Malaysia | Aargus Plastics Inc.<br>Advance Polybags Inc.<br>Advance Polybags (Nevada) Inc.<br>Advance Polybags (Northeast) Inc.<br>Alpha Industries Inc.<br>Alpine Plastics Inc.<br>Ampac Packaging LLC.<br>API Enterprises Inc.<br>Command Packaging.<br>Continental Poly Bags Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Durabag Co Inc.<br>Europackaging LLC.<br>Genpak LLC (formerly Continental Superbag LLC).<br>Genpak LLC (formerly Strout Plastics).<br>Hilex Poly Co LLC.<br>Inteplast Group Ltd.<br>PCL Packaging Inc.<br>Poly-Pak Industries Inc.<br>Roplast Industries Inc.<br>Superbag Corp.<br>Unistar Plastics LLC.<br>Vanguard Plastics Inc.<br>VS Plastics LLC. |
| A–559–502 | 731–TA–296 | Small Diameter Standard and Rectangular Pipe and Tube/Singapore. | Allied Tube & Conduit.<br>American Tube.<br>Bull Moose Tube.<br>Cyclops.<br>Hannibal Industries.<br>Laclede Steel.<br>Pittsburgh Tube.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Western Tube & Conduit.<br>Wheatland Tube. |
| A–559–601 | 731–TA–370 | Color Picture Tubes/Singapore | Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.<br>International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Technical, Salaried and Machine Workers.<br>Philips Electronic Components Group.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zenith Electronics. |
| A–559–801 | 731–TA–396 | Ball Bearings/Singapore | Barden Corp.<br>Emerson Power Transmission.<br>Kubar Bearings.<br>McGill Manufacturing Co.<br>MPB.<br>Rexnord Inc.<br>Rollway Bearings.<br>Torrington. |
| A–559–802 | 731–TA–415 | Industrial Belts/Singapore | The Gates Rubber Company.<br>The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. |
| A–560–801 | 731–TA–742 | Melamine Institutional Dinnerware/Indonesia | Carlisle Food Service Products.<br>Lexington United.<br>Plastics Manufacturing. |
| A–560–802 | 731–TA–779 | Preserved Mushrooms/Indonesia | LK Bowman.<br>Modern Mushroom Farms.<br>Monterey Mushrooms.<br>Mount Laurel Canning.<br>Mushroom Canning.<br>Southwood Farms.<br>Sunny Dell Foods.<br>United Canning. |
| A–560–803 | 731–TA–787 | Extruded Rubber Thread/Indonesia | North American Rubber Thread. |
| A–560–805 | 731–TA–818 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Indonesia | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–560–811 | 731–TA–875 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Indonesia | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc.<br>CMC Steel Group.<br>Co-Steel Inc.<br>Marion Steel.<br>North Star Steel Co. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–560–812 | 731–TA–901 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Indonesia | Nucor Steel.<br>Rebar Trade Action Coalition.<br>Riverview Steel.<br>Sheffield Steel.<br>TAMCO.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel Co.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–560–815 | 731–TA–957 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/Indonesia. | AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills.<br>Connecticut Steel Corp.<br>Co-Steel Raritan.<br>GS Industries.<br>Keystone Consolidated Industries.<br>North Star Steel Texas.<br>Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp).<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–560–818 | 731–TA–1097 | Certain Lined Paper School Supplies/Indonesia. | Fay Paper Products Inc.<br>MeadWestvaco Consumer & Office Products.<br>Norcom Inc.<br>Pacon Corp.<br>Roaring Spring Blank Book Co.<br>Top Flight Inc.<br>United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO–CLC (USW). |
| A–565–801 | 731–TA–867 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Philippines. | Flo-Mac Inc.<br>Gerlin.<br>Markovitz Enterprises.<br>Shaw Alloy Piping Products.<br>Taylor Forge Stainless. |
| A–570–001 | 731–TA–125 | Potassium Permanganate/China | Carus Chemical. |
| A–570–002 | 731–TA–130 | Chloropicrin/China | LCP Chemicals & Plastics.<br>Niklor Chemical. |
| A–570–003 | 731–TA–103 | Cotton Shop Towels/China | Milliken.<br>Texel Industries.<br>Wikit. |
| A–570–007 | 731–TA–149 | Barium Chloride/China | Chemical Products. |
| A–570–101 | 731–TA–101 | Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth/China | Alice Manufacturing.<br>Clinton Mills.<br>Dan River.<br>Greenwood Mills.<br>Hamrick Mills.<br>M Lowenstein.<br>Mayfair Mills.<br>Mount Vernon Mills. |
| A–570–501 | 731–TA–244 | Natural Bristle Paint Brushes/China | Baltimore Brush.<br>Bestt Liebco.<br>Elder & Jenks.<br>EZ Paintr.<br>H&G Industries.<br>Joseph Lieberman & Sons.<br>Purdy.<br>Rubberset.<br>Thomas Paint Applicators.<br>Wooster Brush. |
| A–570–502 | 731–TA–265 | Iron Construction Castings/China | Alhambra Foundry.<br>Allegheny Foundry. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Bingham & Taylor. |
| | | | Campbell Foundry. |
| | | | Charlotte Pipe & Foundry. |
| | | | Deeter Foundry. |
| | | | East Jordan Foundry. |
| | | | Le Baron Foundry. |
| | | | Municipal Castings. |
| | | | Neenah Foundry. |
| | | | Opelika Foundry. |
| | | | Pinkerton Foundry. |
| | | | Tyler Pipe. |
| | | | US Foundry & Manufacturing. |
| | | | Vulcan Foundry. |
| A–570–504 | 731–TA–282 | Petroleum Wax Candles/China | The AI Root Company. |
| | | | Candle Artisans Inc. |
| | | | Candle-Lite. |
| | | | Cathedral Candle. |
| | | | Colonial Candle of Cape Cod. |
| | | | General Wax & Candle. |
| | | | Lenox Candles. |
| | | | Lumi-Lite Candle. |
| | | | Meuch-Kreuzer Candle. |
| | | | National Candle Association. |
| | | | Will & Baumer. |
| | | | WNS. |
| A–570–506 | 731–TA–298 | Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware/China | General Housewares. |
| A–570–601 | 731–TA–344 | Tapered Roller Bearings/China | L&S Bearing. |
| | | | Timken. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–570–802 | 731–TA–441 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/China | Hercules. |
| A–570–803 | 731–TA–457–A | Axes and Adzes/China | Council Tool Co Inc. |
| | | | Warwood Tool. |
| | | | Woodings-Verona. |
| A–570–803 | 731–TA–457–B | Bars and Wedges/China | Council Tool Co Inc. |
| | | | Warwood Tool. |
| | | | Woodings-Verona. |
| A–570–803 | 731–TA–457–C | Hammers and Sledges/China | Council Tool Co Inc. |
| | | | Warwood Tool. |
| | | | Woodings-Verona. |
| A–570–803 | 731–TA–457–D | Picks and Mattocks/China | Council Tool Co Inc. |
| | | | Warwood Tool. |
| | | | Woodings-Verona. |
| A–570–804 | 731–TA–464 | Sparklers/China | BJ Alan. |
| | | | Diamond Sparkler. |
| | | | Elkton Sparkler. |
| A–570–805 | 731–TA–466 | Sodium Thiosulfate/China | Calabrian. |
| A–570–806 | 731–TA–472 | Silicon Metal/China | American Alloys. |
| | | | Elkem Metals. |
| | | | Globe Metallurgical. |
| | | | International Union of Electronics, Electrical, Machine and Furniture Workers (Local 693). |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389). |
| | | | Silicon Metaltech. |
| | | | SiMETCO. |
| | | | SKW Alloys. |
| | | | Textile Processors, Service Trades, Health Care Professional and Technical Employees (Local 60). |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Locals 5171, 8538 and 12646). |
| A–570–808 | 731–TA–474 | Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts/China | Consolidated International Automotive. |
| | | | Key Manufacturing. |
| | | | McGard. |
| A–570–811 | 731–TA–497 | Tungsten Ore Concentrates/China | Curtis Tungsten. |
| | | | US Tungsten. |
| A–570–814 | 731–TA–520 | Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/China | Hackney. |
| | | | Ladish. |
| | | | Mills Iron Works. |
| | | | Steel Forgings. |
| | | | Tube Forgings of America. |
| A–570–815 | 731–TA–538 | Sulfanilic Acid/China | R–M Industries. |
| A–570–819 | 731–TA–567 | Ferrosilicon/China | AIMCOR. |
| | | | Alabama Silicon. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | American Alloys. |
| | | | Globe Metallurgical. |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389). |
| | | | Silicon Metaltech. |
| | | | United Autoworkers of America (Local 523). |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–570–822 | 731–TA–624 | Helical Spring Lock Washers/China | Illinois Tool Works. |
| A–570–825 | 731–TA–653 | Sebacic Acid/China | Union Camp. |
| A–570–826 | 731–TA–663 | Paper Clips/China | ACCO USA. |
| | | | Labelon/Noesting. |
| | | | TRICO Manufacturing. |
| A–570–827 | 731–TA–669 | Cased Pencils/China | Blackfeet Indian Writing Instrument. |
| | | | Dixon-Ticonderoga. |
| | | | Empire Berol. |
| | | | Faber-Castell. |
| | | | General Pencil. |
| | | | JR Moon Pencil. |
| | | | Musgrave Pen & Pencil. |
| | | | Panda. |
| | | | Writing Instrument Manufacturers Association, Pencil Section. |
| A–570–828 | 731–TA–672 | Silicomanganese/China | Elkem Metals. |
| | | | Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 3–639). |
| A–570–830 | 731–TA–677 | Coumarin/China | Rhone-Poulenc. |
| A–570–831 | 731–TA–683 | Fresh Garlic/China | A&D Christopher Ranch. |
| | | | Belridge Packing. |
| | | | Colusa Produce. |
| | | | Denice & Filice Packing. |
| | | | El Camino Packing. |
| | | | The Garlic Company. |
| | | | Vessey and Company. |
| A–570–832 | 731–TA–696 | Pure Magnesium/China | Dow Chemical. |
| | | | International Union of Operating Engineers (Local 564). |
| | | | Magnesium Corporation of America. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Local 8319). |
| A–570–835 | 731–TA–703 | Furfuryl Alcohol/China | QO Chemicals. |
| A–570–836 | 731–TA–718 | Glycine/China | Chattem. |
| | | | Hampshire Chemical. |
| A–570–840 | 731–TA–724 | Manganese Metal/China | Elkem Metals. |
| | | | Kerr-McGee. |
| A–570–842 | 731–TA–726 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/China | Air Products and Chemicals. |
| A–570–844 | 731–TA–741 | Melamine Institutional Dinnerware/China | Carlisle Food Service Products. |
| | | | Lexington United. |
| | | | Plastics Manufacturing. |
| A–570–846 | 731–TA–744 | Brake Rotors/China | Brake Parts. |
| | | | Coalition for the Preservation of American Brake Drum and Rotor Aftermarket Manufacturers. |
| | | | Iroquois Tool Systems. |
| | | | Kelsey Hayes. |
| | | | Kinetic Parts Manufacturing. |
| | | | Overseas Auto Parts. |
| | | | Wagner Brake. |
| A–570–847 | 731–TA–749 | Persulfates/China | FMC. |
| A–570–848 | 731–TA–752 | Crawfish Tail Meat/China | A&S Crawfish. |
| | | | Acadiana Fisherman's Co-Op. |
| | | | Arnaudville Seafood. |
| | | | Atchafalaya Crawfish Processors. |
| | | | Basin Crawfish Processors. |
| | | | Bayou Land Seafood. |
| | | | Becnel's Meat & Seafood. |
| | | | Bellard's Poultry & Crawfish. |
| | | | Bonanza Crawfish Farm. |
| | | | Cajun Seafood Distributors. |
| | | | Carl's Seafood. |
| | | | Catahoula Crawfish. |
| | | | Choplin SFD. |
| | | | CJ's Seafood & Purged Crawfish. |
| | | | Clearwater Crawfish. |
| | | | Crawfish Processors Alliance. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Harvey's Seafood. |
| | | | Lawtell Crawfish Processors. |
| | | | Louisiana Premium Seafoods. |
| | | | Louisiana Seafood. |
| | | | LT West. |
| | | | Phillips Seafood. |
| | | | Prairie Cajun Wholesale Seafood Dist. |
| | | | Riceland Crawfish. |
| | | | Schexnider Crawfish. |
| | | | Seafood International Distributors. |
| | | | Sylvester's Processors. |
| | | | Teche Valley Seafood. |
| A–570–849 | 731–TA–753 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/China | Acme Metals Inc. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Inc. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–570–850 | 731–TA–757 | Collated Roofing Nails/China | Illinois Tool Works. |
| | | | International Staple and Machines. |
| | | | Stanley-Bostitch. |
| A–570–851 | 731–TA–777 | Preserved Mushrooms/China | LK Bowman. |
| | | | Modern Mushroom Farms. |
| | | | Monterey Mushrooms. |
| | | | Mount Laurel Canning. |
| | | | Mushroom Canning. |
| | | | Southwood Farms. |
| | | | Sunny Dell Foods. |
| | | | United Canning. |
| A–570–852 | 731–TA–814 | Creatine Monohydrate/China | Pfanstiehl Laboratories. |
| A–570–853 | 731–TA–828 | Aspirin/China | Rhodia. |
| A–570–855 | 731–TA–841 | Non-Frozen Apple Juice Concentrate/China | Coloma Frozen Foods. |
| | | | Green Valley Apples of California. |
| | | | Knouse Foods Coop. |
| | | | Mason County Fruit Packers Coop. |
| | | | Tree Top. |
| A–570–856 | 731–TA–851 | Synthetic Indigo/China | Buffalo Color. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–570–860 | 731–TA–874 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/China | AB Steel Mill Inc. |
| | | | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Auburn Steel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Border Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc. |
| | | | CMC Steel Group. |
| | | | Co-Steel Inc. |
| | | | Marion Steel. |
| | | | North Star Steel Co. |
| | | | Nucor Steel. |
| | | | Rebar Trade Action Coalition. |
| | | | Riverview Steel. |
| | | | Sheffield Steel. |
| | | | TAMCO. |
| | | | TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–570–862 | 731–TA–891 | Foundry Coke/China | ABC Coke. |
| | | | Citizens Gas and Coke Utility. |
| | | | Erie Coke. |
| | | | Sloss Industries Corp. |
| | | | Tonawanda Coke. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–570–863 | 731–TA–893 | Honey/China | AH Meyer & Sons. |
| | | | Adee Honey Farms. |
| | | | Althoff Apiaries. |
| | | | American Beekeeping Federation. |
| | | | American Honey Producers Association. |
| | | | Anderson Apiaries. |
| | | | Arroyo Apiaries. |
| | | | Artesian Honey Producers. |
| | | | B Weaver Apiaries. |
| | | | Bailey Enterprises. |
| | | | Barkman Honey. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Basler Honey Apiary.<br>Beals Honey.<br>Bears Paw Apiaries.<br>Beaverhead Honey.<br>Bee Biz.<br>Bee Haven Honey.<br>Belliston Brothers Apiaries.<br>Big Sky Honey.<br>Bill Rhodes Honey.<br>Richard E Blake.<br>Curt Bronnenbery.<br>Brown's Honey Farms.<br>Brumley's Bees.<br>Buhmann Apiaries.<br>Carys Honey Farms.<br>Chaparrel Honey.<br>Charles Apiaries.<br>Mitchell Charles.<br>Collins Honey.<br>Conor Apiaries.<br>Coy's Honey Farm.<br>Dave Nelson Apiaries.<br>Delta Bee.<br>Eisele's Pollination & Honey.<br>Ellingsoa's.<br>Elliott Curtis & Sons.<br>Charles L Emmons, Sr.<br>Gause Honey.<br>Gene Brandi Apiaries.<br>Griffith Honey.<br>Haff Apiaries.<br>Hamilton Bee Farms.<br>Hamilton Honey.<br>Happie Bee.<br>Harvest Honey.<br>Harvey's Honey.<br>Hiatt Honey.<br>Hoffman Honey.<br>Hollman Apiaries.<br>Honey House.<br>Honeybee Apiaries.<br>Gary M Honl.<br>Rand William Honl and Sydney Jo Honl.<br>James R & Joann Smith Trust.<br>Jaynes Bee Products.<br>Johnston Honey Farms.<br>Larry Johnston.<br>Ke-An Honey.<br>Kent Honeybees.<br>Lake-Indianhead Honey Farms.<br>Lamb's Honey Farm.<br>Las Flores Apiaries.<br>Mackrill Honey Farms & Sales.<br>Raymond Marquette.<br>Mason & Sons Honey.<br>McCoy's Sunny South Apiaries.<br>Merrimack Valley Apiaries & Evergreen Honey.<br>Met 2 Honey Farm.<br>Missouri River Honey.<br>Mitchell Brothers Honey.<br>Monda Honey Farm.<br>Montana Dakota Honey.<br>Northern Bloom Honey.<br>Noye's Apiaries.<br>Oakes Honey.<br>Oakley Honey Farms.<br>Old Mill Apiaries.<br>Opp Honey.<br>Oro Dulce.<br>Peterson's "Naturally Sweet" Honey.<br>Potoczak Bee Farms.<br>Price Apiaries.<br>Pure Sweet Honey Farms. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Robertson Pollination Service. |
| | | | Robson Honey. |
| | | | William Robson. |
| | | | Rosedale Apiaries. |
| | | | Ryan Apiaries. |
| | | | Schmidt Honey Farms. |
| | | | Simpson Apiaries. |
| | | | Sioux Honey Association. |
| | | | Smoot Honey. |
| | | | Solby Honey. |
| | | | Stahlman Apiaries. |
| | | | Steve E Parks Apiaries. |
| | | | Stroope Bee & Honey. |
| | | | T&D Honey Bee. |
| | | | Talbott's Honey. |
| | | | Terry Apiaries. |
| | | | Thompson Apiaries. |
| | | | Triple A Farm. |
| | | | Tropical Blossom Honey. |
| | | | Tubbs Apiaries. |
| | | | Venable Wholesale. |
| | | | Walter L Wilson Buzz 76 Apiaries. |
| | | | Wiebersiek Honey Farms. |
| | | | Wilmer Farms. |
| | | | Brent J Woodworth. |
| | | | Wooten's Golden Queens. |
| | | | Yaddof Apiaries. |
| A–570–864 | 731–TA–895 | Pure Magnesium (Granular)/China | Concerned Employees of Northwest Alloys. |
| | | | Magnesium Corporation of America. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America (Local 8319). |
| A–570–865 | 731–TA–899 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/China | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Gallatin Steel. |
| | | | Independent Steelworkers. |
| | | | IPSCO. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nucor. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Steel Dynamics. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel Inc. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| | | | Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–570–866 | 731–TA–921 | Folding Gift Boxes/China | Field Container. |
| | | | Harvard Folding Box. |
| | | | Sterling Packaging. |
| | | | Superior Packaging. |
| A–570–867 | 731–TA–922 | Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields/China. | PPG Industries. |
| | | | Safelite Glass. |
| | | | Viracon/Curvlite Inc. |
| | | | Visteon Corporation. |
| A–570–868 | 731–TA–932 | Folding Metal Tables and Chairs/China | Krueger International. |
| | | | McCourt Manufacturing. |
| | | | Meco. |
| | | | Virco Manufacturing. |
| A–570–873 | 731–TA–986 | Ferrovanadium/China | Bear Metallurgical Co. |
| | | | Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corp. |
| A–570–875 | 731–TA–990 | Non-Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/China | Anvil International Inc. |
| | | | Buck Co Inc. |
| | | | Frazier & Frazier Industries. |
| | | | Ward Manufacturing Inc. |
| A–570–877 | 731–TA–1010 | Lawn and Garden Steel Fence Posts/China | Steel City Corp. |
| A–570–878 | 731–TA–1013 | Saccharin/China | PMC Specialties Group Inc. |
| A–570–879 | 731–TA–1014 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/China | Celanese Ltd. |
| | | | E I du Pont de Nemours & Co. |
| A–570–880 | 731–TA–1020 | Barium Carbonate/China | Chemical Products Corp. |
| A–570–881 | 731–TA–1021 | Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings/China | Anvil International Inc. |
| | | | Buck Co Inc. |
| | | | Ward Manufacturing Inc. |
| A–570–882 | 731–TA–1022 | Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide/China | C–E Minerals. |
| | | | Treibacher Schleifmittel North America Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Washington Mills Co Inc. |
| A–570–884 | 731–TA–1034 | Certain Color Television Receivers/China | Five Rivers Electronic Innovations LLC. |
| | | | Industrial Division of the Communications Workers of America (IUECWA). |
| | | | International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW). |
| A–570–886 | 731–TA–1043 | Polyethylene Retail Carrier Bags/China | Aargus Plastics Inc. |
| | | | Advance Polybags Inc. |
| | | | Advance Polybags (Nevada) Inc. |
| | | | Advance Polybags (Northeast) Inc. |
| | | | Alpha Industries Inc. |
| | | | Alpine Plastics Inc. |
| | | | Ampac Packaging LLC. |
| | | | API Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Command Packaging. |
| | | | Continental Poly Bags Inc. |
| | | | Durabag Co Inc. |
| | | | Europackaging LLC. |
| | | | Genpak LLC (formerly Continental Superbag LLC). |
| | | | Genpak LLC (formerly Strout Plastics). |
| | | | Hilex Poly Co LLC. |
| | | | Inteplast Group Ltd. |
| | | | PCL Packaging Inc. |
| | | | Poly-Pak Industries Inc. |
| | | | Roplast Industries Inc. |
| | | | Superbag Corp. |
| | | | Unistar Plastics LLC. |
| | | | Vanguard Plastics Inc. |
| | | | VS Plastics LLC. |
| A–570–887 | 731–TA–1046 | Tetrahydrofurfuryl Alcohol/China | Penn Specialty Chemicals Inc. |
| A–570–888 | 731–TA–1047 | Ironing Tables and Certain Parts Thereof/China. | Home Products International Inc. |
| A–570–890 | 731–TA–1058 | Wooden Bedroom Furniture/China | American Drew. |
| | | | American of Martinsville. |
| | | | Bassett Furniture Industries Inc. |
| | | | Bebe Furniture. |
| | | | Carolina Furniture Works Inc. |
| | | | Carpenters Industrial Union Local 2093. |
| | | | Century Furniture Industries. |
| | | | Country Craft Furniture Inc. |
| | | | Craftique. |
| | | | Crawford Furniture Mfg Corp. |
| | | | EJ Victor Inc. |
| | | | Forest Designs. |
| | | | Harden Furniture Inc. |
| | | | Hart Furniture. |
| | | | Higdon Furniture Co. |
| | | | IUE Industrial Division of CWA Local 82472. |
| | | | Johnston Tombigbee Furniture Mfg Co. |
| | | | Kincaid Furniture Co Inc. |
| | | | L & J G Stickley Inc. |
| | | | Lea Industries. |
| | | | Michels & Co. |
| | | | MJ Wood Products Inc. |
| | | | Mobel Inc. |
| | | | Modern Furniture Manufacturers Inc. |
| | | | Moosehead Mfg Co. |
| | | | Oakwood Interiors. |
| | | | O'Sullivan Industries Inc. |
| | | | Pennsylvania House Inc. |
| | | | Perdues Inc. |
| | | | Sandberg Furniture Mfg Co Inc. |
| | | | Stanley Furniture Co Inc. |
| | | | Statton Furniture Mfg Assoc. |
| | | | T Copeland & Sons. |
| | | | Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Local 991. |
| | | | Tom Seely Furniture. |
| | | | UBC Southern Council of Industrial Workers Local Union 2305. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America Local 193U. |
| | | | Vaughan Furniture Co Inc. |
| | | | Vaughan-Bassett Furniture Co Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Vermont Tubbs. |
| | | | Webb Furniture Enterprises Inc. |
| A–570–891 | 731–TA–1059 | Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof/China | B&P Manufacturing. |
| | | | Gleason Industrial Products Inc. |
| | | | Harper Trucks Inc. |
| | | | Magline Inc. |
| | | | Precision Products Inc. |
| | | | Wesco Industrial Products Inc. |
| A–570–892 | 731–TA–1060 | Carbazole Violet Pigment 23/China | Allegheny Color Corp. |
| | | | Barker Fine Color Inc. |
| | | | Clariant Corp. |
| | | | Nation Ford Chemical Co. |
| | | | Sun Chemical Co. |
| A–570–894 | 731–TA–1070 | Certain Tissue Paper Products/China | American Crepe Corp. |
| | | | Cindus Corp. |
| | | | Eagle Tissue LLC. |
| | | | Flower City Tissue Mills Co and Subsidiary. |
| | | | Garlock Printing & Converting Corp. |
| | | | Green Mtn Specialties Inc. |
| | | | Hallmark Cards Inc. |
| | | | Pacon Corp. |
| | | | Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union AFL–CIO (“PACE”). |
| | | | Paper Service LTD. |
| | | | Putney Paper. |
| | | | Seaman Paper Co of MA Inc. |
| A–570–895 | 731–TA–1069 | Certain Crepe Paper Products/China | American Crepe Corp. |
| | | | Cindus Corp. |
| | | | Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union AFL–CIO (“PACE”). |
| | | | Seaman Paper Co of MA Inc. |
| A–570–896 | 731–TA–1071 | Alloy Magnesium/China | Garfield Alloys Inc. |
| | | | Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics & Allied Workers International Local 374. |
| | | | Halaco Engineering. |
| | | | MagReTech Inc. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America Local 8319. |
| | | | US Magnesium LLC. |
| A–570–899 | 731–TA–1091 | Artists’ Canvas/China | Duro Art Industries. |
| | | | ICG/Holliston Mills Inc. |
| | | | Signature World Class Canvas LLC. |
| | | | Tara Materials Inc. |
| A–570–898 | 731–TA–1082 | Chlorinated Isocyanurates/China | BioLab Inc. |
| | | | Clearon Corp. |
| | | | Occidental Chemical Corp. |
| A–570–901 | 731–TA–1095 | Certain Lined Paper School Supplies/China | Fay Paper Products Inc. |
| | | | MeadWestvaco Consumer & Office Products. |
| | | | Norcom Inc. |
| | | | Pacon Corp. |
| | | | Roaring Spring Blank Book Co. |
| | | | Top Flight Inc. |
| | | | United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO–CLC (USW). |
| A–570–904 | 731–TA–1103 | Certain Activated Carbon/China | Calgon Carbon Corp. |
| | | | Norit Americas Inc. |
| A–570–905 | 731–TA–1104 | Certain Polyester Staple Fiber/China | DAK Americas LLC. |
| | | | Formed Fiber Technologies LLC. |
| | | | Nan Ya Plastics Corp America. |
| | | | Palmetto Synthetics LLC. |
| | | | United Synthetics Inc (USI). |
| | | | Wellman Inc. |
| A–570–908 | 731–TA–1110 | Sodium Hexametaphosphate (SHMP)/China | ICL Performance Products LP. |
| | | | Innophos Inc. |
| A–580–008 | 731–TA–134 | Color Television Receivers/Korea | Committee to Preserve American Color Television. |
| | | | Independent Radionic Workers of America. |
| | | | Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO. |
| | | | International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. |
| A–580–507 | 731–TA–279 | Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/Korea | Grinnell.<br>Stanley G Flagg.<br>Stockham Valves & Fittings.<br>U-Brand.<br>Ward Manufacturing. |
| A–580–601 | 731–TA–304 | Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cooking Ware/Korea. | Farberware.<br>Regal Ware.<br>Revere Copper & Brass.<br>WearEver/Proctor Silex. |
| A–580–603 | 731–TA–315 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Korea | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>Olin.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–605 | 731–TA–369 | Color Picture Tubes/Korea | Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.<br>International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Technical, Salaried and Machine Workers.<br>Philips Electronic Components Group.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zenith Electronics. |
| A–580–803 | 731–TA–427 | Small Business Telephone Systems/Korea | American Telephone & Telegraph.<br>Comdial.<br>Eagle Telephonic. |
| A–580–805 | 731–TA–442 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/Korea | Hercules. |
| A–580–807 | 731–TA–459 | Polyethylene Terephthalate Film/Korea | E I du Pont de Nemours.<br>Hoechst Celanese.<br>ICI Americas. |
| A–580–809 | 731–TA–533 | Circular Welded Nonalloy Steel Pipe/Korea | Allied Tube & Conduit.<br>American Tube.<br>Bull Moose Tube.<br>Century Tube.<br>CSI Tubular Products.<br>Cyclops.<br>Laclede Steel.<br>LTV Tubular Products.<br>Maruichi American.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>USX.<br>Western Tube & Conduit.<br>Wheatland Tube. |
| A–580–810 | 731–TA–540 | Welded ASTM A–312 Stainless Steel Pipe/Korea. | Avesta Sandvik Tube.<br>Bristol Metals.<br>Crucible Materials.<br>Damascus Tubular Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–811 | 731–TA–546 | Carbon Steel Wire Rope/Korea | Bridon American.<br>Macwhyte.<br>Paulsen Wire Rope.<br>The Rochester Corporation.<br>United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers (Local 960).<br>Williamsport.<br>Wire-rope Works.<br>Wire Rope Corporation of America. |
| A–580–812 | 731–TA–556 | DRAMs of 1 Megabit and Above/Korea | Micron Technology.<br>NEC Electronics.<br>Texas Instruments. |
| A–580–813 | 731–TA–563 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Korea | Flo-Mac Inc.<br>Gerlin.<br>Markovitz Enterprises. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–580–815 | 731–TA–607 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Korea | Shaw Alloy Piping Products.<br>Taylor Forge Stainless.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| A–580–816 | 731–TA–618 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Korea. | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| A–580–825 | 731–TA–715 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Korea | Bellville Tube.<br>IPSCO.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Lone Star Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Newport Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–580–829 | 731–TA–772 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Korea | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Republic Engineered Steels.<br>Talley Metals Technology.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–831 | 731–TA–791 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Korea | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–834 | 731–TA–801 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Korea | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–580–836 | 731–TA–821 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Korea | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–580–839 | 731–TA–825 | Polyester Staple Fiber/Korea | Arteva Specialties Sarl.<br>E I du Pont de Nemours.<br>Intercontinental Polymers.<br>Wellman. |
| A–580–841 | 731–TA–854 | Structural Steel Beams/Korea | Northwestern Steel and Wire.<br>Nucor.<br>Nucor-Yamato Steel.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–844 | 731–TA–877 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Korea | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Auburn Steel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc.<br>CMC Steel Group.<br>Co-Steel Inc.<br>Marion Steel.<br>North Star Steel Co.<br>Nucor Steel.<br>Rebar Trade Action Coalition.<br>Riverview Steel.<br>Sheffield Steel.<br>TAMCO.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–580–846 | 731–TA–889 | Stainless Steel Angle/Korea | Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–847 | 731–TA–916 | Stainless Steel Bar/Korea | Carpenter Technology.<br>Crucible Specialty Metals.<br>Electralloy.<br>Empire Specialty Steel.<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–580–850 | 731–TA–1017 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/Korea | Celanese Ltd.<br>E I du Pont de Nemours & Co. |
| A–580–852 | 731–TA–1026 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/ Korea. | American Spring Wire Corp.<br>Insteel Wire Products Co.<br>Sivaco Georgia LLC.<br>Strand Tech Martin Inc.<br>Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |
| A–583–008 | 731–TA–132 | Small Diameter Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube/ Tawian. | Allied Tube & Conduit.<br>American Tube.<br>Bull Moose Tube.<br>Copperweld Tubing.<br>J&L Steel.<br>Kaiser Steel.<br>Merchant Metals.<br>Pittsburgh Tube.<br>Southwestern Pipe.<br>Western Tube & Conduit. |
| A–583–009 | 731–TA–135 | Color Television Receivers/Taiwan | Committee to Preserve American Color Television.<br>Independent Radionic Workers of America.<br>Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.<br>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.<br>International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. |
| A–583–080 | AA1921–197 | Carbon Steel Plate/Taiwan | No Petition (self-initiated by Treasury); Commerce service list identifies:<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>China Steel.<br>US Steel. |
| A–583–505 | 731–TA–277 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Taiwan | CF&I Steel.<br>Copperweld Tubing.<br>Cyclops.<br>KPC.<br>Lone Star Steel.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Quanex.<br>US Steel. |
| A–583–507 | 731–TA–280 | Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/Taiwan | Grinnell. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stanley G Flagg. |
| | | | Stockham Valves & Fittings. |
| | | | U-Brand. |
| | | | Ward Manufacturing. |
| A–583–508 | 731–TA–299 | Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware/Taiwan | General Housewares. |
| A–583–603 | 731–TA–305 | Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cooking Ware/Taiwan. | Farberware. |
| | | | Regal Ware. |
| | | | Revere Copper & Brass. |
| | | | WearEver/Proctor Silex. |
| A–583–605 | 731–TA–310 | Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Taiwan | Ladish. |
| | | | Mills Iron Works. |
| | | | Steel Forgings. |
| | | | Tube Forgings of America. |
| | | | Weldbend. |
| A–583–803 | 731–TA–410 | Light-Walled Rectangular Tube/Taiwan | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Hannibal Industries. |
| | | | Harris Tube. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Searing Industries. |
| | | | Southwestern Pipe. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| A–583–806 | 731–TA–428 | Small Business Telephone Systems/Taiwan | American Telephone & Telegraph. |
| | | | Comdial. |
| | | | Eagle Telephonic. |
| A–583–810 | 731–TA–475 | Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts/Taiwan | Consolidated International Automotive. |
| | | | Key Manufacturing. |
| | | | McGard. |
| A–583–814 | 731–TA–536 | Circular Welded Nonalloy Steel Pipe/Taiwan | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | CSI Tubular Products. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | LTV Tubular Products. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | USX. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | Wheatland Tube. |
| A–583–815 | 731–TA–541 | Welded ASTM A–312 Stainless Steel Pipe/Taiwan. | Avesta Sandvik Tube. |
| | | | Bristol Metals. |
| | | | Crucible Materials. |
| | | | Damascus Tubular Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–583–816 | 731–TA–564 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Taiwan | Flo-Mac Inc. |
| | | | Gerlin. |
| | | | Markovitz Enterprises. |
| | | | Shaw Alloy Piping Products. |
| | | | Taylor Forge Stainless. |
| A–583–820 | 731–TA–625 | Helical Spring Lock Washers/Taiwan | Illinois Tool Works. |
| A–583–821 | 731–TA–640 | Forged Stainless Steel Flanges/Taiwan | Gerlin. |
| | | | Ideal Forging. |
| | | | Maass Flange. |
| | | | Markovitz Enterprises. |
| A–583–824 | 731–TA–729 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/Taiwan | Air Products and Chemicals. |
| A–583–825 | 731–TA–743 | Melamine Institutional Dinnerware/Taiwan | Carlisle Food Service Products. |
| | | | Lexington United. |
| | | | Plastics Manufacturing. |
| A–583–826 | 731–TA–759 | Collated Roofing Nails/Taiwan | Illinois Tool Works. |
| | | | International Staple and Machines. |
| | | | Stanley-Bostitch. |
| A–583–827 | 731–TA–762 | SRAMs/Taiwan | Micron Technology. |
| A–583–828 | 731–TA–775 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Taiwan | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–583–830 | 731–TA–793 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Taiwan | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | J&L Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–583–831 | 731–TA–803 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Taiwan | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–583–833 | 731–TA–826 | Polyester Staple Fiber/Taiwan | Arteva Specialties Sarl.<br>Intercontinental Polymers.<br>Wellman. |
| A–583–835 | 731–TA–906 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Taiwan | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–583–837 | 731–TA–934 | Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip (PET Film)/Taiwan. | DuPont Teijin Films.<br>Mitsubishi Polyester Film LLC.<br>SKC America Inc.<br>Toray Plastics (America). |
| A–588–005 | 731–TA–48 | High Power Microwave Amplifiers/Japan | Aydin.<br>MCL. |
| A–588–015 | AA1921–66 | Television Receivers/Japan | AGIV (USA).<br>Casio Computer.<br>CBM America.<br>Citizen Watch.<br>Funai Electric.<br>Hitachi.<br>Industrial Union Department.<br>JC Penny.<br>Matsushita.<br>Mitsubishi Electric.<br>Montgomery Ward.<br>NEC.<br>Orion Electric.<br>PT Imports.<br>Philips Electronics.<br>Philips Magnavox.<br>Sanyo.<br>Sharp.<br>Toshiba.<br>Toshiba America Consumer Products.<br>Victor Company of Japan.<br>Zenith Electronics. |
| A–588–028 | AA1921–111 | Roller Chain/Japan | Acme Chain Division, North American Rockwell.<br>American Chain Association.<br>Atlas Chain & Precision Products.<br>Diamond Chain.<br>Link-Belt Chain Division, FMC.<br>Morse Chain Division, Borg Warner.<br>Rex Chainbelt. |
| A–588–029 | AA1921–85 | Fish Netting of Man-Made Fiber/Japan | Jovanovich Supply.<br>LFSI.<br>Trans-Pacific Trading. |
| A–588–038 | AA1921–98 | Bicycle Speedometers/Japan | Avocet.<br>Cat Eye.<br>Diversified Products.<br>NS International.<br>Sanyo Electric.<br>Stewart-Warner. |
| A–588–041 | AA1921–115 | Synthetic Methionine/Japan | Monsanto. |
| A–588–045 | AA1921–124 | Steel Wire Rope/Japan | AMSTED Industries. |
| A–588–046 | AA1921–129 | Polychloroprene Rubber/Japan | E I du Pont de Nemours. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| A–588–054 | AA1921–143 | Tapered Roller Bearings 4 Inches and Under/Japan. | No companies identified as petitioners at the Commission; Commerce service list identifies:<br>American Honda Motor.<br>Federal Mogul.<br>Ford Motor.<br>General Motors.<br>Honda.<br>Hoover-NSK Bearing.<br>Isuzu.<br>Itocho.<br>ITOCHU International.<br>Kanematsu-Goshu USA.<br>Kawasaki Heavy Duty Industries.<br>Komatsu America.<br>Koyo Seiko.<br>Kubota Tractor.<br>Mitsubishi.<br>Motorambar.<br>Nachi America.<br>Nachi Western.<br>Nachi-Fujikoshi.<br>Nippon Seiko.<br>Nissan Motor.<br>Nissan Motor USA.<br>NSK.<br>NTN.<br>Subaru of America.<br>Sumitomo.<br>Suzuki Motor.<br>Timken.<br>Toyota Motor Sales.<br>Yamaha Motors. |
| A–588–055 | AA1921–154 | Acrylic Sheet/Japan | Polycast Technology. |
| A–588–056 | AA1921–162 | Melamine/Japan | Melamine Chemical. |
| A–588–068 | AA1921–188 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/Japan. | American Spring Wire.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>CF&I Steel.<br>Florida Wire & Cable. |
| A–588–405 | 731–TA–207 | Cellular Mobile Telephones/Japan | EF Johnson.<br>Motorola. |
| A–588–602 | 731–TA–309 | Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Japan | Ladish.<br>Mills Iron Works.<br>Steel Forgings.<br>Tube Forgings of America.<br>Weldbend. |
| A–588–604 | 731–TA–343 | Tapered Roller Bearings Over 4 Inches/Japan | L&S Bearing.<br>Timken.<br>Torrington. |
| A–588–605 | 731–TA–347 | Malleable Cast Iron Pipe Fittings/Japan | Grinnell.<br>Stanley G Flagg.<br>Stockham Valves & Fittings.<br>U-Brand.<br>Ward Manufacturing. |
| A–588–609 | 731–TA–368 | Color Picture Tubes/Japan | Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.<br>International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Technical, Salaried and Machine Workers.<br>Philips Electronic Components Group.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zenith Electronics. |
| A–588–702 | 731–TA–376 | Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings/Japan | Flo-Mac Inc.<br>Flowline.<br>Shaw Alloy Piping Products.<br>Taylor Forge Stainless. |
| A–588–703 | 731–TA–377 | Internal Combustion Industrial Forklift Trucks/Japan. | Ad-Hoc Group of Workers from Hyster's Berea, Kentucky and Sulligent, Alabama Facilities.<br>Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>Hyster. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Independent Lift Truck Builders Union. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | United Shop & Service Employees. |
| A–588–704 | 731–TA–379 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Japan | Allied Industrial Workers of America. |
| | | | American Brass. |
| | | | Bridgeport Brass. |
| | | | Chase Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Hussey Copper. |
| | | | International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers. |
| | | | Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56). |
| | | | The Miller Company. |
| | | | North Coast Brass & Copper. |
| | | | Olin. |
| | | | Pegg Metals. |
| | | | Revere Copper Products. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–706 | 731–TA–384 | Nitrile Rubber/Japan | Uniroyal Chemical. |
| A–588–707 | 731–TA–386 | Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene/Japan | E I du Pont de Nemours. |
| | | | ICI Americas. |
| A–588–802 | 731–TA–389 | 3.5” Microdisks/Japan | Verbatim. |
| A–588–804 | 731–TA–394–A | Ball Bearings/Japan | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | McGill Manufacturing Co. |
| | | | MPB. |
| | | | Rexnord Inc. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–588–804 | 731–TA–394–B | Cylindrical Roller Bearings/Japan | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | MPB. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–588–804 | 731–TA–394–C | Spherical Plain Bearings/Japan | Barden Corp. |
| | | | Emerson Power Transmission. |
| | | | Kubar Bearings. |
| | | | Rollway Bearings. |
| | | | Torrington. |
| A–588–806 | 731–TA–408 | Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide/Japan | Chemetals. |
| | | | Kerr-McGee. |
| | | | Rayovac. |
| A–588–807 | 731–TA–414 | Industrial Belts/Japan | The Gates Rubber Company. |
| | | | The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. |
| A–588–809 | 731–TA–426 | Small Business Telephone Systems/Japan | American Telephone & Telegraph. |
| | | | Comdial. |
| | | | Eagle Telephonic. |
| A–588–810 | 731–TA–429 | Mechanical Transfer Presses/Japan | Allied Products. |
| | | | United Autoworkers of America. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–811 | 731–TA–432 | Drafting Machines/Japan | Vemco. |
| A–588–812 | 731–TA–440 | Industrial Nitrocellulose/Japan | Hercules. |
| A–588–815 | 731–TA–461 | Gray Portland Cement and Clinker/Japan | Calaveras Cement. |
| | | | Hanson Permanente Cement. |
| | | | Independent Workers of North America (Locals 49, 52, 89, 192 and 471). |
| | | | International Union of Operating Engineers (Local 12). |
| | | | National Cement Co Inc. |
| | | | National Cement Company of California. |
| | | | Southdown. |
| A–588–817 | 731–TA–469 | Electroluminescent Flat-Panel Displays/Japan | The Cherry Corporation. |
| | | | Electro Plasma. |
| | | | Magnascreen. |
| | | | OIS Optical Imaging Systems. |
| | | | Photonics Technology. |
| | | | Planar Systems. |
| | | | Plasmaco. |
| A–588–823 | 731–TA–571 | Professional Electric Cutting Tools/Japan | Black & Decker. |
| A–588–826 | 731–TA–617 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Japan. | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| A–588–831 | 731–TA–660 | Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel/Japan | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–833 | 731–TA–681 | Stainless Steel Bar/Japan | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Crucible Specialty Metals. |
| | | | Electralloy. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Slater Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–835 | 731–TA–714 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Japan | IPSCO. |
| | | | Koppel Steel. |
| | | | Lone Star Steel Co. |
| | | | Maverick Tube. |
| | | | Newport Steel. |
| | | | North Star Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| A–588–836 | 731–TA–727 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/Japan | Air Products and Chemicals. |
| A–588–837 | 731–TA–737 | Large Newspaper Printing Presses/Japan | Rockwell Graphics Systems. |
| A–588–838 | 731–TA–739 | Clad Steel Plate/Japan | Lukens Steel. |
| A–588–839 | 731–TA–740 | Sodium Azide/Japan | American Azide. |
| A–588–840 | 731–TA–748 | Gas Turbo-Compressor Systems/Japan | Demag Delaval. |
| | | | Dresser-Rand. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–841 | 731–TA–750 | Vector Supercomputers/Japan | Cray Research. |
| A–588–843 | 731–TA–771 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Japan | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–845 | 731–TA–800 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Japan | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Butler Armco Independent Union. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology Corp. |
| | | | J&L Specialty Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| A–588–846 | 731–TA–807 | Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Japan | Acme Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | Gallatin Steel. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Independent Steelworkers. |
| | | | IPSCO. |
| | | | Ispat/Inland. |
| | | | LTV Steel. |
| | | | Nucor. |
| | | | Rouge Steel Co. |
| | | | Steel Dynamics. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | WCI Steel. |
| | | | Weirton Steel. |
| | | | Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–588–847 | 731–TA–820 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Japan | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | IPSCO Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–850 | 731–TA–847 | Large-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/Japan. | North Star Steel.<br>Timken.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>USS/Kobe. |
| A–588–851 | 731–TA–847 | Small-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/Japan. | Koppel Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Timken.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>USS/Kobe.<br>Vision Metals' Gulf States Tube. |
| A–588–852 | 731–TA–853 | Structural Steel Beams/Japan | Northwestern Steel and Wire.<br>Nucor.<br>Nucor-Yamato Steel.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–854 | 731–TA–860 | Tin-Mill Products/Japan | Independent Steelworkers.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| A–588–856 | 731–TA–888 | Stainless Steel Angle/Japan | Slater Steels.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–588–857 | 731–TA–919 | Welded Large Diameter Line Pipe/Japan | American Cast Iron Pipe.<br>Berg Steel Pipe.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Napa Pipe/Oregon Steel Mills.<br>Saw Pipes USA.<br>Stupp.<br>US Steel. |
| A–588–861 | 731–TA–1016 | Polyvinyl Alcohol/Japan | Celenex Ltd.<br>E I du Pont de Nemours & Co. |
| A–588–862 | 731–TA–1023 | Certain Ceramic Station Post Insulators/Japan | Lapp Insulator Co LLC.<br>Newell Porcelain Co Inc.<br>Victor Insulators Inc. |
| A–588–866 | 731–TA–1090 | Superalloy Degassed Chromium/Japan | Eramet Marietta Inc. |
| A–602–803 | 731–TA–612 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Australia. | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| A–791–805 | 731–TA–792 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/South Africa | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| A–791–808 | 731–TA–850 | Small-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/South Africa. | Koppel Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>Sharon Tube.<br>Timken.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>USS/Kobe.<br>Vision Metals' Gulf States Tube. |
| A–791–809 | 731–TA–905 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/South Africa | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–791–815 | 731–TA–987 | Ferrovanadium/South Africa | Bear Metallurgical Co.<br>Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corp. |
| A–821–801 | 731–TA–340E | Solid Urea/Russia | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–821–802 | 731–TA–539–C | Uranium/Russia | Ferret Exploration.<br>First Holding.<br>Geomex Minerals.<br>IMC Fertilizer.<br>Malapai Resources.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers.<br>Pathfinder Mines.<br>Power Resources.<br>Rio Algom Mining.<br>Solution Mining.<br>Total Minerals.<br>Umetco Minerals.<br>Uranium Resources. |
| A–821–804 | 731–TA–568 | Ferrosilicon/Russia | AIMCOR.<br>Alabama Silicon.<br>American Alloys.<br>Globe Metallurgical.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389).<br>Silicon Metaltech.<br>United Autoworkers of America (Local 523).<br>United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–821–805 | 731–TA–697 | Pure Magnesium/Russia | Dow Chemical.<br>International Union of Operating Engineers (Local 564).<br>Magnesium Corporation of America.<br>United Steelworkers of America (Local 8319). |
| A–821–807 | 731–TA–702 | Ferrovanadium and Nitrided Vanadium/Russia | Shieldalloy Metallurgical. |
| A–821–809 | 731–TA–808 | Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Russia | Acme Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>Ispat/Inland.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–821–811 | 731–TA–856 | Ammonium Nitrate/Russia | Agrium.<br>Air Products and Chemicals.<br>El Dorado Chemical.<br>LaRoche.<br>Mississippi Chemical. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nitram.<br>Wil-Gro Fertilizer. |
| A–821–817 | 731–TA–991 | Silicon Metal/Russia | Globe Metallurgical Inc.<br>SIMCALA Inc. |
| A–821–819 | 731–TA–1072 | Pure and Alloy Magnesium/Russia | Garfield Alloys Inc.<br>Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics & Allied Workers International Local 374.<br>Halaco Engineering.<br>MagReTech Inc.<br>United Steelworkers of America Local 8319.<br>US Magnesium LLC. |
| A–822–801 | 731–TA–340B | Solid Urea/Belarus | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–822–804 | 731–TA–873 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Belarus | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Auburn Steel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc.<br>CMC Steel Group.<br>Co-Steel Inc.<br>Marion Steel.<br>North Star Steel Co.<br>Nucor Steel.<br>Rebar Trade Action Coalition.<br>Riverview Steel.<br>Sheffield Steel.<br>TAMCO.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–823–801 | 731–TA–340H | Solid Urea/Ukraine | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–823–802 | 731–TA–539–E | Uranium/Ukraine | Ferret Exploration.<br>First Holding.<br>Geomex Minerals.<br>IMC Fertilizer.<br>Malapai Resources.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers.<br>Pathfinder Mines.<br>Power Resources.<br>Rio Algom Mining.<br>Solution Mining.<br>Total Minerals.<br>Umetco Minerals.<br>Uranium Resources. |
| A–823–804 | 731–TA–569 | Ferrosilicon/Ukraine | AIMCOR.<br>Alabama Silicon.<br>American Alloys.<br>Globe Metallurgical.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389).<br>Silicon Metaltech.<br>United Autoworkers of America (Local 523).<br>United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–823–805 | 731–TA–673 | Silicomanganese/Ukraine | Elkem Metals.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 3–639). |
| A–823–809 | 731–TA–882 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Ukraine | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Auburn Steel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc.<br>CMC Steel Group. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Co-Steel Inc.<br>Marion Steel.<br>North Star Steel Co.<br>Nucor Steel.<br>Rebar Trade Action Coalition.<br>Riverview Steel.<br>Sheffield Steel.<br>TAMCO.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–823–810 | 731–TA–894 | Ammonium Nitrate/Ukraine | Agrium.<br>Air Products and Chemicals.<br>Committee for Fair Ammonium Nitrate Trade.<br>El Dorado Chemical.<br>LaRoche Industries.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Nitram.<br>Prodica. |
| A–823–811 | 731–TA–908 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Ukraine | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–823–812 | 731–TA–962 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/ Ukraine. | AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills.<br>Connecticut Steel Corp.<br>Co-Steel Raritan.<br>GS Industries.<br>Keystone Consolidated Industries.<br>North Star Steel Texas.<br>Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp).<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–831–801 | 731–TA–340A | Solid Urea/Armenia | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–834–806 | 731–TA–902 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Kazakhstan | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dymanics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–834–807 | 731–TA–930 | Silicomanganese/Kazakhstan | Eramet Marietta.<br>Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, Local 5–0639. |
| A–841–804 | 731–TA–879 | Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bar/Moldova | AB Steel Mill Inc.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Auburn Steel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Border Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills Inc.<br>CMC Steel Group. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Co-Steel Inc.<br>Marion Steel.<br>North Star Steel Co.<br>Nucor Steel.<br>Rebar Trade Action Coalition.<br>Riverview Steel.<br>Sheffield Steel.<br>TAMCO.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel Co. |
| A–841–805 | 731–TA–959 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/ Moldova. | AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills.<br>Connecticut Steel Corp.<br>Co-Steel Raritan.<br>GS Industries.<br>Keystone Consolidated Industries.<br>North Star Steel Texas.<br>Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp).<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| A–842–801 | 731–TA–340F | Solid Urea/Tajikistan | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–843–801 | 731–TA–340G | Solid Urea/Turkmenistan | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–843–802 | 731–TA–539 | Uranium/Kazakhstan | Ferret Exploration.<br>First Holding.<br>Geomex Minerals.<br>IMC Fertilizer.<br>Malapai Resources.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers.<br>Pathfinder Mines.<br>Power Resources.<br>Rio Algom Mining.<br>Solution Mining.<br>Total Minerals.<br>Umetco Minerals.<br>Uranium Resources. |
| A–843–804 | 731–TA–566 | Ferrosilicon/Kazakhstan | AIMCOR.<br>Alabama Silicon.<br>American Alloys.<br>Globe Metallurgical.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389).<br>Silicon Metaltech.<br>United Autoworkers of America (Local 523).<br>United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| A–844–801 | 731–TA–340I | Solid Urea/Uzbekistan | Agrico Chemical.<br>American Cyanamid.<br>CF Industries.<br>First Mississippi.<br>Mississippi Chemical.<br>Terra International.<br>WR Grace. |
| A–844–802 | 731–TA–539–F | Uranium/Uzbekistan | Ferret Exploration.<br>First Holding.<br>Geomex Minerals.<br>IMC Fertilizer.<br>Malapai Resources.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers.<br>Pathfinder Mines.<br>Power Resources.<br>Rio Algom Mining. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Solution Mining. |
| | | | Total Minerals. |
| | | | Umetco Minerals. |
| | | | Uranium Resources. |
| A–851–802 | 731–TA–846 | Small-Diameter Carbon Steel Seamless Pipe/ Czech Republic. | Koppel Steel. |
| | | | North Star Steel. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | Timken. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | USS/Kobe. |
| | | | Vision Metals' Gulf States Tube. |
| C–122–404 | 701–TA–224 | Live Swine/Canada | National Pork Producers Council. |
| | | | Wilson Foods. |
| C–122–805 | 701–TA–297 | Steel Rails/Canada | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | CF&I Steel. |
| C–122–815 | 701–TA–309–A | Alloy Magnesium/Canada | Magnesium Corporation of America. |
| C–122–815 | 701–TA–309–B | Pure Magnesium/Canada | Magnesium Corporation of America. |
| C–122–839 | 701–TA–414 | Softwood Lumber/Canada | 71 Lumber Co. |
| | | | Almond Bros Lbr Co. |
| | | | Anthony Timberlands. |
| | | | Balfour Lbr Co. |
| | | | Ball Lumber. |
| | | | Banks Lumber Company. |
| | | | Barge Forest Products Co. |
| | | | Beadles Lumber Co. |
| | | | Bearden Lumber. |
| | | | Bennett Lumber. |
| | | | Big Valley Band Mill. |
| | | | Bighorn Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Blue Mountain Lumber. |
| | | | Buddy Bean Lumber. |
| | | | Burgin Lumber Co Ltd. |
| | | | Burt Lumber Company. |
| | | | C&D Lumber Co. |
| | | | Ceda-Pine Veneer. |
| | | | Cersosimo Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Charles Ingram Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Charleston Heart Pine. |
| | | | Chesterfield Lumber. |
| | | | Chips. |
| | | | Chocorua Valley Lumber Co. |
| | | | Claude Howard Lumber. |
| | | | Clearwater Forest Industries. |
| | | | CLW Inc. |
| | | | CM Tucker Lumber Corp. |
| | | | Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports Executive Committee. |
| | | | Cody Lumber Co. |
| | | | Collins Pine Co. |
| | | | Collums Lumber. |
| | | | Columbus Lumber Co. |
| | | | Contoocook River Lumber. |
| | | | Conway Guiteau Lumber. |
| | | | Cornwright Lumber Co. |
| | | | Crown Pacific. |
| | | | Daniels Lumber Inc. |
| | | | Dean Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Deltic Timber Corporation. |
| | | | Devils Tower Forest Products. |
| | | | DiPrizio Pine Sales. |
| | | | Dorchester Lumber Co. |
| | | | DR Johnson Lumber. |
| | | | East Brainerd Lumber Co. |
| | | | East Coast Lumber Company. |
| | | | Eas-Tex Lumber. |
| | | | ECK Wood Products. |
| | | | Ellingson Lumber Co. |
| | | | Elliott Sawmilling. |
| | | | Empire Lumber Co. |
| | | | Evergreen Forest Products. |
| | | | Excalibur Shelving Systems Inc. |
| | | | Exley Lumber Co. |
| | | | FH Stoltze Land & Lumber Co. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | FL Turlington Lbr Co Inc.<br>Fleming Lumber.<br>Flippo Lumber.<br>Floragen Forest Products.<br>Frank Lumber Co.<br>Franklin Timber Co.<br>Fred Tebb & Sons.<br>Fremont Sawmill.<br>Frontier Resources.<br>Garrison Brothers Lumber Co and Subsidiaries.<br>Georgia Lumber.<br>Gilman Building Products.<br>Godfrey Lumber.<br>Granite State Forest Prod Inc.<br>Great Western Lumber Co.<br>Greenville Molding Inc.<br>Griffin Lumber Company.<br>Guess Brothers Lumber.<br>Gulf Lumber.<br>Gulf States Paper.<br>Guy Bennett Lumber.<br>Hampton Resources.<br>Hancock Lumber.<br>Hankins Inc.<br>Hankins Lumber Co.<br>Harrigan Lumber.<br>Harwood Products.<br>Haskell Lumber Inc.<br>Hatfield Lumber.<br>Hedstrom Lumber.<br>Herrick Millwork Inc.<br>HG Toler & Son Lumber Co Inc.<br>HG Wood Industries LLC.<br>Hogan & Storey Wood Prod.<br>Hogan Lumber Co.<br>Hood Industries.<br>HS Hofler & Sons Lumber Co Inc.<br>Hubbard Forest Ind Inc.<br>HW Culp Lumber Co.<br>Idaho Veneer Co.<br>Industrial Wood Products.<br>Intermountain Res LLC.<br>International Paper.<br>J Franklin Jones Lumber Co Inc.<br>Jack Batte & Sons Inc.<br>Jasper Lumber Company.<br>JD Martin Lumber Co.<br>JE Jones Lumber Co.<br>Jerry G Williams & Sons.<br>JH Knighton Lumber Co.<br>Johnson Lumber Company.<br>Jordan Lumber & Supply.<br>Joseph Timber Co.<br>JP Haynes Lbr Co Inc.<br>JV Wells Inc.<br>JW Jones Lumber.<br>Keadle Lumber Enterprises.<br>Keller Lumber.<br>King Lumber Co.<br>Konkolville Lumber.<br>Langdale Forest Products.<br>Laurel Lumber Company.<br>Leavitt Lumber Co.<br>Leesville Lumber Co.<br>Limington Lumber Co.<br>Longview Fibre Co.<br>Lovell Lumber Co Inc.<br>M Kendall Lumber Co.<br>Manke Lumber Co.<br>Marriner Lumber Co.<br>Mason Lumber.<br>MB Heath & Sons Lumber Co.<br>MC Dixon Lumber Co Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Mebane Lumber Co Inc.<br>Metcalf Lumber Co Inc.<br>Millry Mill Co Inc.<br>Moose Creek Lumber Co.<br>Moose River Lumber.<br>Morgan Lumber Co Inc.<br>Mount Yonah Lumber Co.<br>Nagel Lumber.<br>New Kearsarge Corp.<br>New South.<br>Nicolet Hardwoods.<br>Nieman Sawmills SD.<br>Nieman Sawmills WY.<br>North Florida.<br>Northern Lights Timber & Lumber.<br>Northern Neck Lumber Co.<br>Ochoco Lumber Co.<br>Olon Belcher Lumber Co.<br>Owens and Hurst Lumber.<br>Packaging Corp of America.<br>Page & Hill Forest Products.<br>Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union.<br>Parker Lumber.<br>Pate Lumber Co Inc.<br>PBS Lumber.<br>Pedigo Lumber Co.<br>Piedmont Hardwood Lumber Co.<br>Pine River Lumber Co.<br>Pinecrest Lumber Co.<br>Pleasant River Lumber Co.<br>Pleasant Western Lumber Inc.<br>Plum Creek Timber.<br>Pollard Lumber.<br>Portac.<br>Potlatch.<br>Potomac Supply.<br>Precision Lumber Inc.<br>Pruitt Lumber Inc.<br>R Leon Williams Lumber Co.<br>RA Yancey Lumber.<br>Rajala Timber Co.<br>Ralph Hamel Forest Products.<br>Randy D Miller Lumber.<br>Rappahannock Lumber Co.<br>Regulus Stud Mills Inc.<br>Riley Creek Lumber.<br>Roanoke Lumber Co.<br>Robbins Lumber.<br>Robertson Lumber.<br>Roseburg Forest Products Co.<br>Rough & Ready.<br>RSG Forest Products.<br>Rushmore Forest Products.<br>RY Timber Inc.<br>Sam Mabry Lumber Co.<br>Scotch Lumber.<br>SDS Lumber Co.<br>Seacoast Mills Inc.<br>Seago Lumber.<br>Seattle-Snohomish.<br>Seneca Sawmill.<br>Shaver Wood Products.<br>Shearer Lumber Products.<br>Shuqualak Lumber.<br>SI Storey Lumber.<br>Sierra Forest Products.<br>Sierra Pacific Industries.<br>Sigfridson Wood Products.<br>Silver City Lumber Inc.<br>Somers Lbr & Mfg Inc.<br>South & Jones.<br>South Coast.<br>Southern Forest Industries Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Southern Lumber. |
| | | | St Laurent Forest Products. |
| | | | Starfire Lumber Co. |
| | | | Steely Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Stimson Lumber. |
| | | | Summit Timber Co. |
| | | | Sundance Lumber. |
| | | | Superior Lumber. |
| | | | Swanson Superior Forest Products Inc. |
| | | | Swift Lumber. |
| | | | Tamarack Mill. |
| | | | Taylor Lumber & Treating Inc. |
| | | | Temple-Inland Forest Products. |
| | | | Thompson River Lumber. |
| | | | Three Rivers Timber. |
| | | | Thrift Brothers Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Timco Inc. |
| | | | Tolleson Lumber. |
| | | | Toney Lumber. |
| | | | TR Miller Mill Co. |
| | | | Tradewinds of Virginia Ltd. |
| | | | Travis Lumber Co. |
| | | | Tree Source Industries Inc. |
| | | | Tri-State Lumber. |
| | | | TTT Studs. |
| | | | United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners. |
| | | | Viking Lumber Co. |
| | | | VP Kiser Lumber Co. |
| | | | Walton Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Warm Springs Forest Products. |
| | | | Westvaco Corp. |
| | | | Wilkins, Kaiser & Olsen Inc. |
| | | | WM Shepherd Lumber Co. |
| | | | WR Robinson Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Wrenn Brothers Inc. |
| | | | Wyoming Sawmills. |
| | | | Yakama Forest Products. |
| | | | Younce & Ralph Lumber Co Inc. |
| | | | Zip-O-Log Mills Inc. |
| C–122–841 | 701–TA–418 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/Canada. | AmeriSteel. |
| | | | Birmingham Steel. |
| | | | Cascade Steel Rolling Mills. |
| | | | Connecticut Steel Corp. |
| | | | Co-Steel Raritan. |
| | | | GS Industries. |
| | | | Keystone Consolidated Industries. |
| | | | North Star Steel Texas. |
| | | | Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp). |
| | | | Republic Technologies International. |
| | | | Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| C–122–848 | 701–TA–430B | Hard Red Spring Wheat/Canada | North Dakota Wheat Commission. |
| C–201–505 | 701–TA–265 | Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware/Mexico | General Housewares. |
| C–201–810 | 701–TA–325 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Mexico | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | California Steel Industries. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | Inland Steel Industries. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | Nextech. |
| | | | Sharon Steel. |
| | | | Theis Precision Steel. |
| | | | Thompson Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–307–804 | 303–TA–21 | Gray Portland Cement and Clinker/Venezuela | Florida Crushed Stone. |
| | | | Southdown. |
| | | | Tarmac America. |
| C–307–808 | 303–TA–23 | Ferrosilicon/Venezuela | AIMCOR. |
| | | | Alabama Silicon. |
| | | | American Alloys. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Globe Metallurgical.<br>Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (Local 389).<br>Silicon Metaltech.<br>United Autoworkers of America (Local 523).<br>United Steelworkers of America (Locals 2528, 3081, 5171 and 12646). |
| C–333–401 | 701–TA–E | Cotton Shop Towels/Peru | No case at the Commission; Commerce service list identifies:<br>Durafab.<br>Kleen-Tex Industries.<br>Lewis Eckert Robb.<br>Milliken.<br>Pavis & Harcourt. |
| C–351–037 | 104–TAA–21 | Cotton Yarn/Brazil | American Yarn Spinners Association.<br>Harriet & Henderson Yarns.<br>LaFar Industries. |
| C–351–504 | 701–TA–249 | Heavy Iron Construction Castings/Brazil | Alhambra Foundry.<br>Allegheny Foundry.<br>Bingham & Taylor.<br>Campbell Foundry.<br>Charlotte Pipe & Foundry.<br>Deeter Foundry.<br>East Jordan Foundry.<br>Le Baron Foundry.<br>Municipal Castings.<br>Neenah Foundry.<br>Opelika Foundry.<br>Pinkerton Foundry.<br>Tyler Pipe.<br>US Foundry & Manufacturing.<br>Vulcan Foundry. |
| C–351–604 | 701–TA–269 | Brass Sheet and Strip/Brazil | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>Olin.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–351–818 | 701–TA–320 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Brazil | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–351–829 | 701–TA–384 | Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Brazil | Acme Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>Ispat/Inland.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| C–351–833 | 701–TA–417 | Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod/ Brazil. | United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp.<br>AmeriSteel.<br>Birmingham Steel.<br>Cascade Steel Rolling Mills.<br>Connecticut Steel Corp.<br>Co-Steel Raritan.<br>GS Industries.<br>Keystone Consolidated Industries.<br>North Star Steel Texas.<br>Nucor Steel-Nebraska (a division of Nucor Corp).<br>Republic Technologies International.<br>Rocky Mountain Steel Mills. |
| C–357–004 | 701–TA–A | Carbon Steel Wire Rod/Argentina | Atlantic Steel.<br>Continental Steel.<br>Georgetown Steel.<br>North Star Steel.<br>Raritan River Steel. |
| C–357–813 | 701–TA–402 | Honey/Argentina | AH Meyer & Sons.<br>Adee Honey Farms.<br>Althoff Apiaries.<br>American Beekeeping Federation.<br>American Honey Producers Association.<br>Anderson Apiaries.<br>Arroyo Apiaries.<br>Artesian Honey Producers.<br>B Weaver Apiaries.<br>Bailey Enterprises.<br>Barkman Honey.<br>Basler Honey Apiary.<br>Beals Honey.<br>Bears Paw Apiaries.<br>Beaverhead Honey.<br>Bee Biz.<br>Bee Haven Honey.<br>Belliston Brothers Apiaries.<br>Big Sky Honey.<br>Bill Rhodes Honey.<br>Richard E Blake.<br>Curt Bronnenbery.<br>Brown's Honey Farms.<br>Brumley's Bees.<br>Buhmann Apiaries.<br>Carys Honey Farms.<br>Chaparrel Honey.<br>Charles Apiaries.<br>Mitchell Charles.<br>Collins Honey.<br>Conor Apiaries.<br>Coy's Honey Farm.<br>Dave Nelson Apiaries.<br>Delta Bee.<br>Eisele's Pollination & Honey.<br>Ellingsoa's.<br>Elliott Curtis & Sons.<br>Charles L Emmons, Sr.<br>Gause Honey.<br>Gene Brandi Apiaries.<br>Griffith Honey.<br>Haff Apiaries.<br>Hamilton Bee Farms.<br>Hamilton Honey.<br>Happie Bee.<br>Harvest Honey.<br>Harvey's Honey.<br>Hiatt Honey.<br>Hoffman Honey.<br>Hollman Apiaries.<br>Honey House.<br>Honeybee Apiaries.<br>Gary M Honl. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Rand William Honl and Sydney Jo Honl.<br>James R & Joann Smith Trust.<br>Jaynes Bee Products.<br>Johnston Honey Farms.<br>Larry Johnston.<br>Ke-An Honey.<br>Kent Honeybees.<br>Lake-Indianhead Honey Farms.<br>Lamb's Honey Farm.<br>Las Flores Apiaries.<br>Mackrill Honey Farms & Sales.<br>Raymond Marquette.<br>Mason & Sons Honey.<br>McCoy's Sunny South Apiaries.<br>Merrimack Valley Apiaries & Evergreen Honey.<br>Met 2 Honey Farm.<br>Missouri River Honey.<br>Mitchell Brothers Honey.<br>Monda Honey Farm.<br>Montana Dakota Honey.<br>Northern Bloom Honey.<br>Noye's Apiaries.<br>Oakes Honey.<br>Oakley Honey Farms.<br>Old Mill Apiaries.<br>Opp Honey.<br>Oro Dulce.<br>Peterson's "Naturally Sweet" Honey.<br>Potoczak Bee Farms.<br>Price Apiaries.<br>Pure Sweet Honey Farms.<br>Robertson Pollination Service.<br>Robson Honey.<br>William Robson.<br>Rosedale Apiaries.<br>Ryan Apiaries.<br>Schmidt Honey Farms.<br>Simpson Apiaries.<br>Sioux Honey Association.<br>Smoot Honey.<br>Solby Honey.<br>Stahlman Apiaries.<br>Steve E Parks Apiaries.<br>Stroope Bee & Honey.<br>T&D Honey Bee.<br>Talbott's Honey.<br>Terry Apiaries.<br>Thompson Apiaries.<br>Triple A Farm.<br>Tropical Blossom Honey.<br>Tubbs Apiaries.<br>Venable Wholesale.<br>Walter L Wilson Buzz 76 Apiaries.<br>Wiebersiek Honey Farms.<br>Wilmer Farms.<br>Brent J Woodworth.<br>Wooten's Golden Queens.<br>Yaddof Apiaries. |
| C–357–815 | 701–TA–404 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Argentina | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| C–401–401 | 701–TA–231 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Sweden. | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Chaparral. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | US Steel. |
| C–401–804 | 701–TA–327 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Sweden | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–403–802 | 701–TA–302 | Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon/Norway | Heritage Salmon.<br>The Coalition for Fair Atlantic Salmon Trade. |
| C–408–046 | 104–TAA–7 | Sugar/EU | No petition at the Commission; Commerce service list identifies:<br>AJ Yates.<br>Alexander & Baldwin.<br>American Farm Bureau Federation.<br>American Sugar Cane League.<br>American Sugarbeet Growers Association.<br>Amstar Sugar.<br>Florida Sugar Cane League.<br>Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association.<br>H&R Brokerage.<br>Hawaiian Agricultural Research Center.<br>Leach Farms.<br>Michigan Farm Bureau.<br>Michigan Sugar.<br>Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers Association.<br>Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida.<br>Talisman Sugar.<br>US Beet Sugar Association.<br>United States Beet Sugar Association.<br>United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association. |
| C–412–815 | 701–TA–328 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/United Kingdom. | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–412–821 | 701–TA–412 | Low Enriched Uranium/United Kingdom | United States Enrichment Corp.<br>USEC Inc. |
| C–421–601 | 701–TA–278 | Fresh Cut Flowers/Netherlands | Burdette Coward.<br>California Floral Council.<br>Floral Trade Council.<br>Florida Flower Association.<br>Gold Coast Uanko Nursery.<br>Hollandia Wholesale Florist.<br>Manatee Fruit.<br>Monterey Flower Farms.<br>Topstar Nursery. |
| C–421–809 | 701–TA–411 | Low Enriched Uranium/Netherlands | United States Enrichment Corp.<br>USEC Inc. |
| C–423–806 | 701–TA–319 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Belgium | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–423–809 | 701–TA–376 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Belgium | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–427–603 | 701–TA–270 | Brass Sheet and Strip/France | Allied Industrial Workers of America.<br>American Brass.<br>Bridgeport Brass.<br>Chase Brass & Copper.<br>Hussey Copper.<br>International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers.<br>Mechanics Educational Society of America (Local 56).<br>The Miller Company.<br>Olin.<br>Revere Copper Products.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–427–805 | 701–TA–315 | Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products/France. | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>USS/Kobe Steel. |
| C–427–810 | 701–TA–348 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/France. | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| C–427–815 | 701–TA–380 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/France | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| C–427–817 | 701–TA–387 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/France | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–427–819 | 701–TA–409 | Low Enriched Uranium/France | United States Enrichment Corp.<br>USEC Inc. |
| C–428–817 | 701–TA–340 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Germany. | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| C–428–817 | 701–TA–349 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Germany. | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |
| C–428–817 | 701–TA–322 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Germany | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel. |
| C–428–829 | 701–TA–410 | Low Enriched Uranium/Germany | US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>United States Enrichment Corp.<br>USEC Inc. |
| C–437–805 | 701–TA–426 | Sulfanilic Acid/Hungary | Nation Ford Chemical. |
| C–469–004 | 701–TA–178 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Spain | AL Tech Specialty Steel.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Carpenter Technology.<br>Colt Industries.<br>Cyclops.<br>Guterl Special Steel.<br>Joslyn Stainless Steels.<br>Republic Steel. |
| C–469–804 | 701–TA–326 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Spain | Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–475–812 | 701–TA–355 | Grain-Oriented Silicon Electrical Steel/Italy | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Union. |
| C–475–815 | 701–TA–362 | Seamless Pipe/Italy | Koppel Steel.<br>Quanex.<br>Timken.<br>United States Steel. |
| C–475–817 | 701–TA–364 | Oil Country Tubular Goods/Italy | IPSCO.<br>Koppel Steel.<br>Lone Star Steel.<br>Maverick Tube.<br>Newport Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | North Star Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | USS/Kobe. |
| C–475–819 | 701–TA–365 | Pasta/Italy | A Zerega's Sons. |
| | | | American Italian Pasta. |
| | | | Borden. |
| | | | D Merlino & Sons. |
| | | | Dakota Growers Pasta. |
| | | | Foulds. |
| | | | Gilster-Mary Lee. |
| | | | Gooch Foods. |
| | | | Hershey Foods. |
| | | | LaRinascente Macaroni Co. |
| | | | Pasta USA. |
| | | | Philadelphia Macaroni. |
| | | | ST Specialty Foods. |
| C–475–821 | 701–TA–373 | Stainless Steel Wire Rod/Italy | AL Tech Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Republic Engineered Steels. |
| | | | Talley Metals Technology. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–475–823 | 701–TA–377 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/Italy | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | J&L Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Lukens Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–475–825 | 701–TA–381 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Italy | Allegheny Ludlum. |
| | | | Armco Steel. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | Butler Armco Independent Union. |
| | | | Carpenter Technology Corp. |
| | | | J&L Specialty Steel. |
| | | | North American Stainless. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| C–475–827 | 701–TA–390 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Italy | Bethlehem Steel. |
| | | | CitiSteel USA Inc. |
| | | | Geneva Steel. |
| | | | Gulf States Steel. |
| | | | IPSCO Steel. |
| | | | National Steel. |
| | | | US Steel. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–475–830 | 701–TA–413 | Stainless Steel Bar/Italy | Carpenter Technology. |
| | | | Crucible Specialty Metals. |
| | | | Electralloy. |
| | | | Empire Specialty Steel. |
| | | | Republic Technologies International. |
| | | | Slater Steels. |
| | | | United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–489–502 | 701–TA–253 | Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube/Turkey | Allied Tube & Conduit. |
| | | | American Tube. |
| | | | Bernard Epps. |
| | | | Bock Industries. |
| | | | Bull Moose Tube. |
| | | | Central Steel Tube. |
| | | | Century Tube. |
| | | | Copperweld Tubing. |
| | | | Cyclops. |
| | | | Hughes Steel & Tube. |
| | | | Kaiser Steel. |
| | | | Laclede Steel. |
| | | | Maruichi American. |
| | | | Maverick Tube. |
| | | | Merchant Metals. |
| | | | Phoenix Steel. |
| | | | Pittsburgh Tube. |
| | | | Quanex. |
| | | | Sharon Tube. |
| | | | Southwestern Pipe. |
| | | | UNR-Leavitt. |
| | | | Welded Tube. |
| | | | Western Tube & Conduit. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| C–489–806 | 701–TA–366 | Pasta/Turkey | Wheatland Tube.<br>A Zerega's Sons.<br>American Italian Pasta.<br>Borden.<br>D Merlino & Sons.<br>Dakota Growers Pasta.<br>Foulds.<br>Gilster-Mary Lee.<br>Gooch Foods.<br>Hershey Foods.<br>LaRinascente Macaroni Co.<br>Pasta USA.<br>Philadelphia Macaroni.<br>ST Specialty Foods. |
| C–507–501 | N/A | Raw In-Shell Pistachios/Iran | Blackwell Land Co.<br>Cal Pure Pistachios Inc.<br>California Pistachio Commission.<br>California Pistachio Orchards.<br>Keenan Farms Inc.<br>Kern Pistachio Hulling & Drying Co-Op.<br>Los Rancheros de Poco Pedro.<br>Pistachio Producers of California.<br>TM Duche Nut Co Inc. |
| C–507–601 | N/A | Roasted In-Shell Pistachios/Iran | Cal Pure Pistachios Inc.<br>California Pistachio Commission.<br>Keenan Farms Inc.<br>Kern Pistachio Hulling & Drying Co-Op.<br>Pistachio Producers of California.<br>TM Duche Nut Co Inc. |
| C–508–605 | 701–TA–286 | Industrial Phosphoric Acid/Israel | Albright & Wilson.<br>FMC.<br>Hydrite Chemical.<br>Monsanto.<br>Stauffer Chemical. |
| C–533–063 | 303–TA–13 | Iron Metal Castings/India | Campbell Foundry.<br>Le Baron Foundry.<br>Municipal Castings.<br>Neenah Foundry.<br>Pinkerton Foundry.<br>US Foundry & Manufacturing.<br>Vulcan Foundry. |
| C–533–807 | 701–TA–318 | Sulfanilic Acid/India | R–M Industries. |
| C–533–818 | 701–TA–388 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/India | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–533–821 | 701–TA–405 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/India | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| C–533–825 | 701–TA–415 | Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip (PET Film)/India. | DuPont Teijin Films.<br>Mitsubishi Polyester Film LLC.<br>SKC America Inc.<br>Toray Plastics (America). |
| C–533–829 | 701–TA–432 | Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand/India | American Spring Wire Corp.<br>Insteel Wire Products Co.<br>Sivaco Georgia LLC.<br>Strand Tech Martin Inc.<br>Sumiden Wire Products Corp. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| C–533–839 | 701–TA–437 | Carbazole Violet Pigment 23/India | Allegheny Color Corp.<br>Barker Fine Color Inc.<br>Clariant Corp.<br>Nation Ford Chemical Co.<br>Sun Chemical Co. |
| C–533–844 | 701–TA–442 | Certain Lined Paper School Supplies/India | Fay Paper Products Inc.<br>MeadWestvaco Consumer & Office Products.<br>Norcom Inc.<br>Pacon Corp.<br>Roaring Spring Blank Book Co.<br>Top Flight Inc.<br>United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO–CLC (USW). |
| C–535–001 | 701–TA–202 | Cotton Shop Towels/Pakistan | Milliken. |
| C–549–818 | 701–TA–408 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Thailand | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| C–560–806 | 701–TA–389 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Indonesia | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–560–813 | 701–TA–406 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/Indonesia | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| C–560–819 | 701–TA–443 | Certain Lined Paper School Supplies/Indonesia. | Fay Paper Products Inc.<br>MeadWestvaco Consumer & Office Products.<br>Norcom Inc.<br>Pacon Corp.<br>Roaring Spring Blank Book Co.<br>Top Flight Inc.<br>United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO–CLC (USW). |
| C–580–602 | 701–TA–267 | Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cooking Ware/Korea. | Farberware.<br>Regal Ware.<br>Revere Copper & Brass.<br>WearEver/Proctor Silex. |
| C–580–818 | 701–TA–342 | Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products/Korea | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| C–580–818 | 701–TA–350 | Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products/Korea. | Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| C–580–835 | 701–TA–382 | Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip/Korea | Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>California Steel Industries.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>Inland Steel Industries.<br>LTV Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nextech.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Sharon Steel.<br>Theis Precision Steel.<br>Thompson Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel.<br>Weirton Steel. |
| C–580–837 | 701–TA–391 | Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate/Korea | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>Bethlehem Steel.<br>Butler Armco Independent Union.<br>Carpenter Technology Corp.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America.<br>Zanesville Armco Independent Organization. |
| C–580–842 | 701–TA–401 | Structural Steel Beams/Korea | Bethlehem Steel.<br>CitiSteel USA Inc.<br>Geneva Steel.<br>Gulf States Steel.<br>IPSCO Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Tuscaloosa Steel.<br>US Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–580–851 | 701–TA–431 | DRAMs and DRAM Modules/Korea | Northwestern Steel and Wire.<br>Nucor.<br>Nucor-Yamato Steel.<br>TXI-Chaparral Steel.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| C–583–604 | 701–TA–268 | Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cooking Ware/Taiwan. | Dominion Semiconductor LLC/Micron Technology Inc.<br>Infineon Technologies Richmond LP.<br>Micron Technology Inc. |
| C–791–806 | 701–TA–379 | Stainless Steel Plate in Coils/South Africa | Farberware.<br>Regal Ware.<br>Revere Copper & Brass.<br>WearEver/Proctor Silex. |
| C–791–810 | 701–TA–407 | Hot-Rolled Steel Products/South Africa | Allegheny Ludlum.<br>Armco Steel.<br>J&L Specialty Steel.<br>Lukens Steel.<br>North American Stainless.<br>United Steelworkers of America. |
| | | | Bethlehem Steel.<br>Gallatin Steel.<br>Independent Steelworkers.<br>IPSCO.<br>LTV Steel.<br>National Steel.<br>Nucor.<br>Rouge Steel Co.<br>Steel Dynamics.<br>US Steel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | United Steelworkers of America.<br>WCI Steel Inc.<br>Weirton Steel.<br>Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp. |
| A–331–802 | 731–TA–1065 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/Ecuador. | |
| A–351–838 | 731–TA–1063 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/Brazil. | |
| A–533–840 | 731–TA–1066 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/India. | |
| A–549–822 | 731–TA–1067 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/Thailand. | |
| A–552–802 | 731–TA–1068 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/Vietnam. | |
| A–570–893 | 731–TA–1064 | Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp and Prawns/China. | Petitioners/Supporters for all six cases listed:<br>Abadie, Al J.<br>Abadie, Anthony.<br>Abner, Charles.<br>Abraham, Steven.<br>Abshire, Gabriel J.<br>Ackerman, Dale J.<br>Acosta, Darryl L.<br>Acosta, Jerry J Sr.<br>Acosta, Leonard C.<br>Acosta, Wilson Pula Sr.<br>Adam, Denise T.<br>Adam, Michael A.<br>Adam, Richard B Jr.<br>Adam, Sherry P.<br>Adam, William E.<br>Adam, Alcide J Jr.<br>Adams, Dudley.<br>Adams, Elizabeth L.<br>Adams, Ervin.<br>Adams, Ervin.<br>Adams, George E.<br>Adams, Hursy J.<br>Adams, James Arthur.<br>Adams, Kelly.<br>Adams, Lawrence J Jr.<br>Adams, Randy.<br>Adams, Ritchie.<br>Adams, Steven A.<br>Adams, Ted J.<br>Adams, Tim.<br>Adams, Whitney P Jr.<br>Agoff, Ralph J.<br>Aguilar, Rikardo.<br>Aguillard, Roddy G.<br>Alario, Don Ray.<br>Alario, Nat.<br>Alario, Pete J.<br>Alario, Timmy.<br>Albert, Craig J.<br>Albert, Junior J.<br>Alexander, Everett O.<br>Alexander, Robert F Jr.<br>Alexie, Benny J.<br>Alexie, Corkey A.<br>Alexie, Dolphy.<br>Alexie, Felix Jr.<br>Alexie, Gwendolyn.<br>Alexie, John J.<br>Alexie, John V.<br>Alexie, Larry J Sr.<br>Alexie, Larry Jr.<br>Alexie, Vincent L Jr.<br>Alexis, Barry S.<br>Alexis, Craig W.<br>Alexis, Micheal.<br>Alexis, Monique.<br>Alfonso, Anthony E Jr.<br>Alfonso, Jesse.<br>Alfonso, Nicholas. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Alfonso, Paul Anthony. |
| | | | Alfonso, Randy. |
| | | | Alfonso, Terry S Jr. |
| | | | Alfonso, Vernon Jr. |
| | | | Alfonso, Yvette. |
| | | | Alimia, Angelo A Jr. |
| | | | Allemand, Dean J. |
| | | | Allen, Annie. |
| | | | Allen, Carolyn Sue. |
| | | | Allen, Jackie. |
| | | | Allen, Robin. |
| | | | Allen, Wayne. |
| | | | Allen, Wilbur L. |
| | | | Allen, Willie J III. |
| | | | Allen, Willie Sr. |
| | | | Alphonso, John. |
| | | | Ancalade, Leo J. |
| | | | Ancar, Claudene. |
| | | | Ancar, Jerry T. |
| | | | Ancar, Joe C. |
| | | | Ancar, Merlin Sr. |
| | | | Ancar, William Sr. |
| | | | Ancelet, Gerald Ray. |
| | | | Anderson, Andrew David. |
| | | | Anderson, Ernest W. |
| | | | Anderson, Jerry. |
| | | | Anderson, John. |
| | | | Anderson, Lynwood. |
| | | | Anderson, Melinda Rene. |
| | | | Anderson, Michael Brian. |
| | | | Anderson, Ronald L Sr. |
| | | | Anderson, Ronald Louis Jr. |
| | | | Andonie, Miguel. |
| | | | Andrews, Anthony R. |
| | | | Andry, Janice M. |
| | | | Andry, Rondey S. |
| | | | Angelle, Louis. |
| | | | Anglada, Eugene Sr. |
| | | | Ansardi, Lester. |
| | | | Anselmi, Darren. |
| | | | Aparicio, Alfred. |
| | | | Aparicio, David. |
| | | | Aparicio, Ernest. |
| | | | Arabie, Georgia P. |
| | | | Arabie, Joseph. |
| | | | Arcement, Craig J. |
| | | | Arcement, Lester C. |
| | | | Arcemont, Donald Sr. |
| | | | Arceneaux, Matthew J. |
| | | | Arceneaux, Michael K. |
| | | | Areas, Christopher J. |
| | | | Armbruster, John III. |
| | | | Armbruster, Paula D. |
| | | | Armstrong, Jude Jr. |
| | | | Arnesen, George. |
| | | | Arnold, Lonnie L Jr. |
| | | | Arnona, Joseph T. |
| | | | Arnondin, Robert. |
| | | | Arthur, Brenda J. |
| | | | Assavedo, Floyd. |
| | | | Atwood, Gregory Kenneth. |
| | | | Au, Chow D. |
| | | | Au, Robert. |
| | | | Aucoin, Dewey F. |
| | | | Aucoin, Earl. |
| | | | Aucoin, Laine A. |
| | | | Aucoin, Perry J. |
| | | | Austin, Dennis. |
| | | | Austin, Dennis J. |
| | | | Authement, Brice. |
| | | | Authement, Craig L. |
| | | | Authement, Dion J. |
| | | | Authement, Gordon. |
| | | | Authement, Lance M. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Authement, Larry. |
| | | | Authement, Larry Sr. |
| | | | Authement, Roger J. |
| | | | Authement, Sterling P. |
| | | | Autin, Bobby. |
| | | | Autin, Bruce J. |
| | | | Autin, Kenneth D. |
| | | | Autin, Marvin J. |
| | | | Autin, Paul F Jr. |
| | | | Autin, Roy. |
| | | | Avenel, Albert J Jr. |
| | | | Ba Wells, Tran Thi. |
| | | | Babb, Conny. |
| | | | Babin, Brad. |
| | | | Babin, Joey L. |
| | | | Babin, Klint. |
| | | | Babin, Molly. |
| | | | Babin, Norman J. |
| | | | Babineaux, Kirby. |
| | | | Babineaux, Vicki. |
| | | | Bach, Ke Van. |
| | | | Bach, Reo Long. |
| | | | Backman, Benny. |
| | | | Badeaux, Todd. |
| | | | Baham, Dewayne. |
| | | | Bailey, Albert. |
| | | | Bailey, Antoine III. |
| | | | Bailey, David B Sr. |
| | | | Bailey, Don. |
| | | | Baker, Clarence. |
| | | | Baker, Donald Earl. |
| | | | Baker, James. |
| | | | Baker, Kenneth. |
| | | | Baker, Ronald J. |
| | | | Balderas, Antonio. |
| | | | Baldwin, Richard Prentiss. |
| | | | Ballard, Albert. |
| | | | Ballas, Barbara A. |
| | | | Ballas, Charles J. |
| | | | Baltz, John F. |
| | | | Ban, John. |
| | | | Bang, Bruce K. |
| | | | Barbaree, Joe W. |
| | | | Barbe, Mark A and Cindy. |
| | | | Barber, Louie W Jr. |
| | | | Barber, Louie W Sr. |
| | | | Barbier, Percy T. |
| | | | Barbour, Raymond A. |
| | | | Bargainear, James E. |
| | | | Barisich, George A. |
| | | | Barisich, Joseph J. |
| | | | Barnette, Earl. |
| | | | Barnhill, Nathan. |
| | | | Barrios, Clarence. |
| | | | Barrios, Corbert J. |
| | | | Barrios, Corbert M. |
| | | | Barrios, David. |
| | | | Barrios, John. |
| | | | Barrios, Shane James. |
| | | | Barrois, Angela Gail. |
| | | | Barrois, Dana A. |
| | | | Barrois, Tracy James. |
| | | | Barrois, Wendell Jude Jr. |
| | | | Barthe, Keith Sr. |
| | | | Barthelemy, Allen M. |
| | | | Barthelemy, John A. |
| | | | Barthelemy, Rene T Sr. |
| | | | Barthelemy, Walter A Jr. |
| | | | Bartholomew, Mitchell. |
| | | | Bartholomew, Neil W. |
| | | | Bartholomew, Thomas E. |
| | | | Bartholomew, Wanda C. |
| | | | Basse, Donald J Sr. |
| | | | Bates, Mark. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Bates, Ted Jr. |
| | | | Bates, Vernon Jr. |
| | | | Battle, Louis. |
| | | | Baudoin, Drake J. |
| | | | Baudoin, Murphy A. |
| | | | Baudouin, Stephen. |
| | | | Bauer, Gary. |
| | | | Baye, Glen P. |
| | | | Bean, Charles A. |
| | | | Beazley, William E. |
| | | | Becnel, Glenn J. |
| | | | Becnel, Kent. |
| | | | Beecher, Carold F. |
| | | | Beechler, Ronald. |
| | | | Bell, James E. |
| | | | Bell, Ronald A. |
| | | | Bellanger, Arnold. |
| | | | Bellanger, Clifton. |
| | | | Bellanger, Scott J. |
| | | | Belsome, Derrell M. |
| | | | Belsome, Karl M. |
| | | | Bennett, Cecil A Jr. |
| | | | Bennett, Gary Lynn. |
| | | | Bennett, Irin Jr. |
| | | | Bennett, James W Jr. |
| | | | Bennett, Louis. |
| | | | Benoit, Francis J. |
| | | | Benoit, Nicholas L. |
| | | | Benoit, Paula T. |
| | | | Benoit, Tenna J Jr. |
| | | | Benton, Walter T. |
| | | | Berger, Ray W. |
| | | | Bergeron, Alfred Scott. |
| | | | Bergeron, Jeff. |
| | | | Bergeron, Nolan A. |
| | | | Bergeron, Ulysses J. |
| | | | Bernard, Lamont L. |
| | | | Berner, Mark J. |
| | | | Berthelot, Gerard J Sr. |
| | | | Berthelot, James A. |
| | | | Berthelot, Myron J. |
| | | | Bertrand, Jerl C. |
| | | | Beverung, Keith J. |
| | | | Bianchini, Raymond W. |
| | | | Bickham, Leo E. |
| | | | Bienvenu, Charles. |
| | | | Biggs, Jerry W Sr. |
| | | | Bigler, Delbert. |
| | | | Billington, Richard. |
| | | | Billiot, Alfredia. |
| | | | Billiot, Arthur. |
| | | | Billiot, Aubrey. |
| | | | Billiot, Barell J. |
| | | | Billiot, Betty. |
| | | | Billiot, Bobby J. |
| | | | Billiot, Brian K. |
| | | | Billiot, Cassidy. |
| | | | Billiot, Charles Sr. |
| | | | Billiot, Chris J Sr. |
| | | | Billiot, E J E. |
| | | | Billiot, Earl W Sr. |
| | | | Billiot, Ecton L. |
| | | | Billiot, Emary. |
| | | | Billiot, Forest Jr. |
| | | | Billiot, Gerald. |
| | | | Billiot, Harold J. |
| | | | Billiot, Jacco A. |
| | | | Billiot, Jake A. |
| | | | Billiot, James Jr. |
| | | | Billiot, Joseph S Jr. |
| | | | Billiot, Laurence V. |
| | | | Billiot, Leonard F Jr. |
| | | | Billiot, Lisa. |
| | | | Billiot, Mary L. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Billiot, Paul J Sr. |
| | | | Billiot, Shirley L. |
| | | | Billiot, Steve M. |
| | | | Billiot, Thomas Adam. |
| | | | Billiot, Thomas Sr. |
| | | | Billiot, Wenceslaus Jr. |
| | | | Billiott, Alexander J. |
| | | | Biron, Yale. |
| | | | Black, William C. |
| | | | Blackston, Larry E. |
| | | | Blackwell, Wade H III. |
| | | | Blackwell, Wade H Jr. |
| | | | Blanchard, Albert. |
| | | | Blanchard, Andrew J. |
| | | | Blanchard, Billy J. |
| | | | Blanchard, Cyrus. |
| | | | Blanchard, Daniel A. |
| | | | Blanchard, Dean. |
| | | | Blanchard, Douglas Jr. |
| | | | Blanchard, Dwayne. |
| | | | Blanchard, Elgin. |
| | | | Blanchard, Gilbert. |
| | | | Blanchard, Jade. |
| | | | Blanchard, James. |
| | | | Blanchard, John F Jr. |
| | | | Blanchard, Katie. |
| | | | Blanchard, Kelly. |
| | | | Blanchard, Matt Joseph. |
| | | | Blanchard, Michael. |
| | | | Blanchard, Quentin Timothy. |
| | | | Blanchard, Roger Sr. |
| | | | Blanchard, Walton H Jr. |
| | | | Bland, Quyen T. |
| | | | Blouin, Roy A. |
| | | | Blume, Jack Jr. |
| | | | Bodden, Arturo. |
| | | | Bodden, Jasper. |
| | | | Bollinger, Donald E. |
| | | | Bolotte, Darren W. |
| | | | Bolton, Larry F. |
| | | | Bondi, Paul J. |
| | | | Bonvillain, Jimmy J. |
| | | | Bonvillian, Donna M. |
| | | | Boone, Clifton Felix. |
| | | | Boone, Donald F II. |
| | | | Boone, Donald F III (Ricky). |
| | | | Boone, Gregory T. |
| | | | Boquet, Noriss P Jr. |
| | | | Boquet, Wilfred Jr. |
| | | | Bordelon, Glenn Sr. |
| | | | Bordelon, James P. |
| | | | Bordelon, Shelby P. |
| | | | Borden, Benny. |
| | | | Borne, Crystal. |
| | | | Borne, Dina L. |
| | | | Borne, Edward Joseph Jr. |
| | | | Borne, Edward Sr. |
| | | | Bosarge, Hubert Lawrence. |
| | | | Bosarge, Robert. |
| | | | Bosarge, Sandra. |
| | | | Bosarge, Steve. |
| | | | Boudlauch, Durel A Jr. |
| | | | Boudoin, Larry Terrell. |
| | | | Boudoin, Nathan. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Brent J. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Elvin J III. |
| | | | Boudreaux, James C Jr. |
| | | | Boudreaux, James N. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Jessie. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Leroy A. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Mark. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Paul Sr. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Richard D. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Ronald Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boudreaux, Sally. |
| | | | Boudreaux, Veronica. |
| | | | Boudwin, Dwayne. |
| | | | Boudwin, Jewel James Sr. |
| | | | Boudwin, Wayne. |
| | | | Bouise, Norman. |
| | | | Boulet, Irwin J Jr. |
| | | | Boullion, Debra. |
| | | | Bourg, Allen T. |
| | | | Bourg, Benny. |
| | | | Bourg, Chad J. |
| | | | Bourg, Channon. |
| | | | Bourg, Chris. |
| | | | Bourg, Douglas. |
| | | | Bourg, Glenn A. |
| | | | Bourg, Jearmie Sr. |
| | | | Bourg, Kent A. |
| | | | Bourg, Mark. |
| | | | Bourg, Nolan P. |
| | | | Bourg, Ricky J. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Albert P. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Brian J Jr. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Daniel. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Dwayne. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Jake. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Johnny M. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Johnny M Jr. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Leon A. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Louis A. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Merrie E. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Randy P. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Reed. |
| | | | Bourgeois, Webley. |
| | | | Bourn, Chris. |
| | | | Bourque, Murphy Paul. |
| | | | Bourque, Ray. |
| | | | Bousegard, Duvic Jr. |
| | | | Boutte, Manuel J Jr. |
| | | | Bouvier, Colbert A II. |
| | | | Bouzigard, Dale J. |
| | | | Bouzigard, Edgar J III. |
| | | | Bouzigard, Eeris. |
| | | | Bowers, Harold. |
| | | | Bowers, Tommy. |
| | | | Boyd, David E Sr. |
| | | | Boyd, Elbert. |
| | | | Boykin, Darren L. |
| | | | Boykin, Thomas Carol. |
| | | | Bradley, James. |
| | | | Brady, Brian. |
| | | | Brandhurst, Kay. |
| | | | Brandhurst, Ray E Sr. |
| | | | Brandhurst, Raymond J. |
| | | | Braneff, David G. |
| | | | Brannan, William P. |
| | | | Branom, Donald James Jr. |
| | | | Braud, James M. |
| | | | Brazan, Frank J. |
| | | | Breaud, Irvin F Jr. |
| | | | Breaux, Barbara. |
| | | | Breaux, Brian J. |
| | | | Breaux, Charlie M. |
| | | | Breaux, Clifford. |
| | | | Breaux, Colin E. |
| | | | Breaux, Daniel Jr. |
| | | | Breaux, Larry J. |
| | | | Breaux, Robert J Jr. |
| | | | Breaux, Shelby. |
| | | | Briscoe, Robert F Jr. |
| | | | Britsch, L D Jr. |
| | | | Broussard, Dwayne E. |
| | | | Broussard, Eric. |
| | | | Broussard, Keith. |
| | | | Broussard, Larry. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Broussard, Mark A. |
| | | | Broussard, Roger David. |
| | | | Broussard, Roger R. |
| | | | Broussard, Steve P. |
| | | | Brown, Cindy B. |
| | | | Brown, Colleen. |
| | | | Brown, Donald G. |
| | | | Brown, John W. |
| | | | Brown, Paul R. |
| | | | Brown, Ricky. |
| | | | Brown, Toby H. |
| | | | Bruce, Adam J. |
| | | | Bruce, Adam J Jr. |
| | | | Bruce, Bob R. |
| | | | Bruce, Daniel M Sr. |
| | | | Bruce, Eli T Sr. |
| | | | Bruce, Emelda L. |
| | | | Bruce, Gary J Sr. |
| | | | Bruce, James P. |
| | | | Bruce, Lester J Jr. |
| | | | Bruce, Margie L. |
| | | | Bruce, Mary P. |
| | | | Bruce, Nathan. |
| | | | Bruce, Robert. |
| | | | Bruce, Russell. |
| | | | Brudnock, Peter Sr. |
| | | | Brunet, Elton J. |
| | | | Brunet, Joseph A. |
| | | | Brunet, Joseph A. |
| | | | Brunet, Levy J Jr. |
| | | | Brunet, Raymond Sr. |
| | | | Bryan, David N. |
| | | | Bryant, Ina Fay V. |
| | | | Bryant, Jack D Sr. |
| | | | Bryant, James Larry. |
| | | | Buford, Ernest. |
| | | | Bui, Ben. |
| | | | Bui, Dich. |
| | | | Bui, Dung Thi. |
| | | | Bui, Huong T. |
| | | | Bui, Ngan. |
| | | | Bui, Nhuan. |
| | | | Bui, Nuoi Van. |
| | | | Bui, Tai. |
| | | | Bui, Tieu. |
| | | | Bui, Tommy. |
| | | | Bui, Xuan and De Nguyen. |
| | | | Bui, Xuanmai. |
| | | | Bull, Delbert E. |
| | | | Bundy, Belvina (Kenneth). |
| | | | Bundy, Kenneth Sr. |
| | | | Bundy, Nicky. |
| | | | Bundy, Ronald J. |
| | | | Bundy, Ronnie J. |
| | | | Buquet, John Jr. |
| | | | Buras, Clayton M. |
| | | | Buras, Leander. |
| | | | Buras, Robert M Jr. |
| | | | Buras, Waylon J. |
| | | | Burlett, Elliott C. |
| | | | Burlett, John C Jr. |
| | | | Burnell, Charles B. |
| | | | Burnell, Charles R. |
| | | | Burnham, Deanna Lea. |
| | | | Burns, Stuart E. |
| | | | Burroughs, Lindsey Hilton Jr. |
| | | | Burton, Ronnie. |
| | | | Busby, Hardy E. |
| | | | Busby, Tex H. |
| | | | Busch, RC. |
| | | | Bush, Robert A. |
| | | | Bussey, Tyler. |
| | | | Butcher, Dorothy. |
| | | | Butcher, Rocky J. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Butler, Albert A. |
| | | | Butler, Aline M. |
| | | | Bychurch, Johnny. |
| | | | Bychurch, Johnny Jr. |
| | | | Cabanilla, Alex. |
| | | | Caboz, Jose Santos. |
| | | | Cacioppo, Anthony Jr. |
| | | | Caddell, David. |
| | | | Cadiere, Mae Quick. |
| | | | Cadiere, Ronald J. |
| | | | Cahill, Jack. |
| | | | Caillouet, Stanford Jr. |
| | | | Caison, Jerry Lane Jr. |
| | | | Calcagno, Stephen Paul Sr. |
| | | | Calderone, John S. |
| | | | Callahan, Gene P Sr. |
| | | | Callahan, Michael J. |
| | | | Callahan, Russell. |
| | | | Callais, Ann. |
| | | | Callais, Franklin D. |
| | | | Callais, Gary D. |
| | | | Callais, Michael. |
| | | | Callais, Michael. |
| | | | Callais, Sandy. |
| | | | Callais, Terrence. |
| | | | Camardelle, Anna M. |
| | | | Camardelle, Chris J. |
| | | | Camardelle, David. |
| | | | Camardelle, Edward J III. |
| | | | Camardelle, Edward J Jr. |
| | | | Camardelle, Harris A. |
| | | | Camardelle, Knowles. |
| | | | Camardelle, Noel T. |
| | | | Camardelle, Tilman J. |
| | | | Caminita, John A III. |
| | | | Campo, Donald Paul. |
| | | | Campo, Kevin. |
| | | | Campo, Nicholas J. |
| | | | Campo, Roy. |
| | | | Campo, Roy Sr. |
| | | | Camus, Ernest M Jr. |
| | | | Canova, Carl. |
| | | | Cantrelle, Alvin. |
| | | | Cantrelle, Eugene J. |
| | | | Cantrelle, Otis A Sr. |
| | | | Cantrelle, Otis Jr (Buddy). |
| | | | Cantrelle, Philip A. |
| | | | Cantrelle, Tate Joseph. |
| | | | Canty, Robert Jamies. |
| | | | Cao, Anna. |
| | | | Cao, Billy. |
| | | | Cao, Billy Viet. |
| | | | Cao, Binh Quang. |
| | | | Cao, Chau. |
| | | | Cao, Dan Dien. |
| | | | Cao, Dung Van. |
| | | | Cao, Gio Van. |
| | | | Cao, Heip A. |
| | | | Cao, Linh Huyen. |
| | | | Cao, Nghia Thi. |
| | | | Cao, Nhieu V. |
| | | | Cao, Si-Van. |
| | | | Cao, Thanh Kim. |
| | | | Cao, Tuong Van. |
| | | | Carinhas, Jack G Jr. |
| | | | Carl, Joseph Allen. |
| | | | Carlos, Gregory. |
| | | | Carlos, Irvin. |
| | | | Carmadelle, David J. |
| | | | Carmadelle, Larry G. |
| | | | Carmadelle, Rudy J. |
| | | | Carrere, Anthony T Jr. |
| | | | Carrier, Larry J. |
| | | | Caruso, Michael. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Casanova, David W Sr. |
| | | | Cassagne, Alphonse G III. |
| | | | Cassagne, Alphonse G IV. |
| | | | Cassidy, Mark. |
| | | | Casso, Joseph. |
| | | | Castelin, Gilbert. |
| | | | Castelin, Sharon. |
| | | | Castellanos, Raul L. |
| | | | Castelluccio, John A Jr. |
| | | | Castille, Joshua. |
| | | | Caulfield, Adolph Jr. |
| | | | Caulfield, Hope. |
| | | | Caulfield, James M Jr. |
| | | | Caulfield, Jean. |
| | | | Cepriano, Salvador. |
| | | | Cerdes, Julius W Jr. |
| | | | Cerise, Marla. |
| | | | Chabert, John. |
| | | | Chaisson, Dean J. |
| | | | Chaisson, Henry. |
| | | | Chaisson, Vincent A. |
| | | | Chaix, Thomas B III. |
| | | | Champagne, Brian. |
| | | | Champagne, Harold P. |
| | | | Champagne, Kenton. |
| | | | Champagne, Leon J. |
| | | | Champagne, Leroy A. |
| | | | Champagne, Lori. |
| | | | Champagne, Timmy D. |
| | | | Champagne, Willard. |
| | | | Champlin, Kim J. |
| | | | Chance, Jason R. |
| | | | Chancey, Jeff. |
| | | | Chapa, Arturo. |
| | | | Chaplin Robert G Sr. |
| | | | Chaplin, Saxby Stowe. |
| | | | Charles, Christopher. |
| | | | Charpentier, Allen J. |
| | | | Charpentier, Alvin J. |
| | | | Charpentier, Daniel J. |
| | | | Charpentier, Lawrence. |
| | | | Charpentier, Linton. |
| | | | Charpentier, Melanie. |
| | | | Charpentier, Murphy Jr. |
| | | | Charpentier, Robert J. |
| | | | Chartier, Michelle. |
| | | | Chau, Minh Huu. |
| | | | Chauvin, Anthony. |
| | | | Chauvin, Anthony P Jr. |
| | | | Chauvin, Carey M. |
| | | | Chauvin, David James. |
| | | | Chauvin, James E. |
| | | | Chauvin, Kimberly Kay. |
| | | | Cheeks, Alton Bruce. |
| | | | Cheers, Elwood. |
| | | | Chenier, Ricky. |
| | | | Cheramie, Alan. |
| | | | Cheramie, Alan J Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Alton J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Berwick Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Berwick Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Daniel James Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Danny. |
| | | | Cheramie, David J. |
| | | | Cheramie, David P. |
| | | | Cheramie, Dickey J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Donald. |
| | | | Cheramie, Enola. |
| | | | Cheramie, Flint. |
| | | | Cheramie, Harold L. |
| | | | Cheramie, Harry J Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Harry Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Harvey Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Harvey Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cheramie, Henry J Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, James A. |
| | | | Cheramie, James P. |
| | | | Cheramie, Jody P. |
| | | | Cheramie, Joey J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Johnny. |
| | | | Cheramie, Joseph A. |
| | | | Cheramie, Lee Allen. |
| | | | Cheramie, Linton J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Mark A. |
| | | | Cheramie, Murphy J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Nathan A Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Neddy P. |
| | | | Cheramie, Nicky J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Ojess M. |
| | | | Cheramie, Paris P. |
| | | | Cheramie, Robbie. |
| | | | Cheramie, Rodney E Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Ronald. |
| | | | Cheramie, Roy. |
| | | | Cheramie, Roy A. |
| | | | Cheramie, Sally K. |
| | | | Cheramie, Terry J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Terry Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Timmy. |
| | | | Cheramie, Tina. |
| | | | Cheramie, Todd M. |
| | | | Cheramie, Tommy. |
| | | | Cheramie, Wayne A. |
| | | | Cheramie, Wayne A Jr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Wayne F Sr. |
| | | | Cheramie, Wayne J. |
| | | | Cheramie, Webb Jr. |
| | | | Chevalier, Mitch. |
| | | | Chew, Thomas J. |
| | | | Chhun, Samantha. |
| | | | Chiasson, Jody J. |
| | | | Chiasson, Manton P Jr. |
| | | | Chiasson, Michael P. |
| | | | Childress, Gordon. |
| | | | Chisholm, Arthur. |
| | | | Chisholm, Henry Jr. |
| | | | Christen, David Jr. |
| | | | Christen, Vernon. |
| | | | Christmas, John T Jr. |
| | | | Chung, Long V. |
| | | | Ciaccio, Vance. |
| | | | Cibilic, Bozidar. |
| | | | Cieutat, John. |
| | | | Cisneros, Albino. |
| | | | Ciuffi, Michael L. |
| | | | Clark, James M. |
| | | | Clark, Jennings. |
| | | | Clark, Mark A. |
| | | | Clark, Ricky L. |
| | | | Cobb, Michael A. |
| | | | Cochran, Jimmy. |
| | | | Coleman, Ernest. |
| | | | Coleman, Freddie Jr. |
| | | | Colletti, Rodney A. |
| | | | Collier, Ervin J. |
| | | | Collier, Wade. |
| | | | Collins, Bernard J. |
| | | | Collins, Bruce J Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Donald. |
| | | | Collins, Earline. |
| | | | Collins, Eddie F Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Jack. |
| | | | Collins, Jack. |
| | | | Collins, Julius. |
| | | | Collins, Lawson Bruce Sr. |
| | | | Collins, Lindy S Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Logan A Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Robert. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Collins, Timmy P. |
| | | | Collins, Vendon Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Wilbert Jr. |
| | | | Collins, Woodrow. |
| | | | Colson, Chris and Michelle. |
| | | | Comardelle, Michael J. |
| | | | Comeaux, Allen J. |
| | | | Compeaux, Curtis J. |
| | | | Compeaux, Gary P. |
| | | | Compeaux, Harris. |
| | | | Cone, Jody. |
| | | | Contreras, Mario. |
| | | | Cook, Edwin A Jr. |
| | | | Cook, Edwin A Sr. |
| | | | Cook, Joshua. |
| | | | Cook, Larry R Sr. |
| | | | Cook, Scott. |
| | | | Cook, Theodore D. |
| | | | Cooksey, Ernest Neal. |
| | | | Cooper, Acy J III. |
| | | | Cooper, Acy J Jr. |
| | | | Cooper, Acy Sr. |
| | | | Cooper, Christopher W. |
| | | | Cooper, Jon C. |
| | | | Cooper, Marla F. |
| | | | Cooper, Vincent J. |
| | | | Copeman, John R. |
| | | | Corley, Ronald E. |
| | | | Cornett, Eddie. |
| | | | Cornwall, Roger. |
| | | | Cortez, Brenda M. |
| | | | Cortez, Cathy. |
| | | | Cortez, Curtis. |
| | | | Cortez, Daniel P. |
| | | | Cortez, Edgar. |
| | | | Cortez, Keith J. |
| | | | Cortez, Leslie J. |
| | | | Cosse, Robert K. |
| | | | Coston, Clayton. |
| | | | Cotsovolos, John Gordon. |
| | | | Coulon, Allen J Jr. |
| | | | Coulon, Allen J Sr. |
| | | | Coulon, Amy M. |
| | | | Coulon, Cleveland F. |
| | | | Coulon, Darrin M. |
| | | | Coulon, Don. |
| | | | Coulon, Earline N. |
| | | | Coulon, Ellis Jr. |
| | | | Coursey, John W. |
| | | | Courville, Ronnie P. |
| | | | Cover, Darryl L. |
| | | | Cowdrey, Michael Dudley. |
| | | | Cowdrey, Michael Nelson. |
| | | | Crain, Michael T. |
| | | | Crawford, Bryan D. |
| | | | Crawford, Steven J. |
| | | | Creamer, Quention. |
| | | | Credeur, Todd A Sr. |
| | | | Credeur, Tony J. |
| | | | Creppel, Carlton. |
| | | | Creppel, Catherine. |
| | | | Creppel, Craig Anthony. |
| | | | Creppel, Freddy. |
| | | | Creppel, Isadore Jr. |
| | | | Creppel, Julinne G III. |
| | | | Creppel, Kenneth. |
| | | | Creppel, Kenneth. |
| | | | Creppel, Nathan J Jr. |
| | | | Creppell, Michel P. |
| | | | Cristina, Charles J. |
| | | | Crochet, Sterling James. |
| | | | Crochet, Tony J. |
| | | | Crosby, Benjy J. |
| | | | Crosby, Darlene. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Crosby, Leonard W Jr. |
| | | | Crosby, Ted J. |
| | | | Crosby, Thomas. |
| | | | Crum, Lonnie. |
| | | | Crum, Tommy Lloyd. |
| | | | Cruz, Jesus. |
| | | | Cubbage, Melinda T. |
| | | | Cuccia, Anthony J. |
| | | | Cuccia, Anthony J Jr. |
| | | | Cuccia, Kevin. |
| | | | Cumbie, Bryan E. |
| | | | Cure, Mike. |
| | | | Curole, Keith J. |
| | | | Curole, Kevin P. |
| | | | Curole, Margaret B. |
| | | | Curole, Willie P Jr. |
| | | | Cutrer, Jason C. |
| | | | Cvitanovich, T. |
| | | | Daigle, Alfred. |
| | | | Daigle, Cleve and Nona. |
| | | | Daigle, David John. |
| | | | Daigle, EJ. |
| | | | Daigle, Glenn. |
| | | | Daigle, Jamie J. |
| | | | Daigle, Jason. |
| | | | Daigle, Kirk. |
| | | | Daigle, Leonard P. |
| | | | Daigle, Lloyd. |
| | | | Daigle, Louis J. |
| | | | Daigle, Melanie. |
| | | | Daigle, Michael J. |
| | | | Daigle, Michael Wayne and JoAnn. |
| | | | Daisy, Jeff. |
| | | | Dale, Cleveland L. |
| | | | Dang, Ba. |
| | | | Dang, Dap. |
| | | | Dang, David. |
| | | | Dang, Duong. |
| | | | Dang, Khang. |
| | | | Dang, Khang and Tam Phan. |
| | | | Dang, Loan Thi. |
| | | | Dang, Minh. |
| | | | Dang, Minh Van. |
| | | | Dang, Son. |
| | | | Dang, Tao Kevin. |
| | | | Dang, Thang Duc. |
| | | | Dang, Thien Van. |
| | | | Dang, Thuong. |
| | | | Dang, Thuy. |
| | | | Dang, Van D. |
| | | | Daniels, David. |
| | | | Daniels, Henry. |
| | | | Daniels, Leslie. |
| | | | Danos, Albert Sr. |
| | | | Danos, James A. |
| | | | Danos, Jared. |
| | | | Danos, Oliver J. |
| | | | Danos, Ricky P. |
| | | | Danos, Rodney. |
| | | | Danos, Timothy A. |
| | | | d'Antignac, Debi. |
| | | | d'Antignac, Jack. |
| | | | Dantin, Archie A. |
| | | | Dantin, Mark S Sr. |
| | | | Dantin, Stephen Jr. |
| | | | Dao, Paul. |
| | | | Dao, Vang. |
| | | | Dao-Nguyen, Chrysti. |
| | | | Darda, Albert L Jr. |
| | | | Darda, Gertrude. |
| | | | Darda, Herbert. |
| | | | Darda, J C. |
| | | | Darda, Jeremy. |
| | | | Darda, Tammy. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Darda, Trudy. |
| | | | Dardar, Alvin. |
| | | | Dardar, Basile J. |
| | | | Dardar, Basile Sr. |
| | | | Dardar, Cindy. |
| | | | Dardar, David. |
| | | | Dardar, Donald S. |
| | | | Dardar, Edison J Sr. |
| | | | Dardar, Gayle Picou. |
| | | | Dardar, Gilbert B. |
| | | | Dardar, Gilbert Sr. |
| | | | Dardar, Isadore J Jr. |
| | | | Dardar, Jacqueline. |
| | | | Dardar, Jonathan M. |
| | | | Dardar, Lanny. |
| | | | Dardar, Larry J. |
| | | | Dardar, Many. |
| | | | Dardar, Neal A. |
| | | | Dardar, Norbert. |
| | | | Dardar, Patti V. |
| | | | Dardar, Percy B Sr. |
| | | | Dardar, Rose. |
| | | | Dardar, Rusty J. |
| | | | Dardar, Samuel. |
| | | | Dardar, Summersgill. |
| | | | Dardar, Terry P. |
| | | | Dardar, Toney M Jr. |
| | | | Dardar, Toney Sr. |
| | | | Dargis, Stephen M. |
| | | | Dassau, Louis. |
| | | | David, Philip J Jr. |
| | | | Davis, Cliff. |
| | | | Davis, Daniel A. |
| | | | Davis, Danny A. |
| | | | Davis, James. |
| | | | Davis, John W. |
| | | | Davis, Joseph D. |
| | | | Davis, Michael Steven. |
| | | | Davis, Ronald B. |
| | | | Davis, William T Jr. |
| | | | Davis, William Theron. |
| | | | Dawson, JT. |
| | | | de la Cruz, Avery T. |
| | | | Dean, Ilene L. |
| | | | Dean, John N. |
| | | | Dean, Stephen. |
| | | | DeBarge, Brian K. |
| | | | DeBarge, Sherry. |
| | | | DeBarge, Thomas W. |
| | | | Decoursey, John. |
| | | | Dedon, Walter. |
| | | | Deere, Daryl. |
| | | | Deere, David E. |
| | | | Deere, Dennis H. |
| | | | Defelice, Robin. |
| | | | Defelice, Tracie L. |
| | | | DeHart, Ashton J Sr. |
| | | | Dehart, Bernard J. |
| | | | Dehart, Blair. |
| | | | Dehart, Clevis. |
| | | | Dehart, Clevis Jr. |
| | | | DeHart, Curtis P Sr. |
| | | | Dehart, Eura Sr. |
| | | | Dehart, Ferrell John. |
| | | | Dehart, Leonard M. |
| | | | DeHart, Troy. |
| | | | DeJean, Chris N Jr. |
| | | | DeJean, Chris N Sr. |
| | | | Dekemel, Bonnie D. |
| | | | Dekemel, Wm J Jr. |
| | | | Delande, Paul. |
| | | | Delande, Ten Chie. |
| | | | Delatte, Michael J Sr. |
| | | | Delaune, Kip M. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Delaune, Thomas J. |
| | | | Delaune, Todd J. |
| | | | Delcambre, Carroll A. |
| | | | Delgado, Jesse. |
| | | | Delino, Carlton. |
| | | | Delino, Lorene. |
| | | | Deloach, Stephen W Jr. |
| | | | DeMoll, Herman J Jr. |
| | | | DeMoll, Herman J Sr. |
| | | | DeMoll, James C Jr. |
| | | | DeMoll, Ralph. |
| | | | DeMoll, Robert C. |
| | | | DeMoll, Terry R. |
| | | | DeMolle, Freddy. |
| | | | DeMolle, Otis. |
| | | | Dennis, Fred. |
| | | | Denty, Steve. |
| | | | Deroche, Barbara H. |
| | | | Derouen, Caghe. |
| | | | Deshotel, Rodney. |
| | | | DeSilvey, David. |
| | | | Despaux, Byron J. |
| | | | Despaux, Byron J Jr. |
| | | | Despaux, Glen A. |
| | | | Despaux, Ken. |
| | | | Despaux, Kerry. |
| | | | Despaux, Suzanna. |
| | | | Detillier, David E. |
| | | | DeVaney, Bobby C Jr. |
| | | | Dickey, Wesley Frank. |
| | | | Diep, Vu. |
| | | | Dinger, Anita. |
| | | | Dinger, Corbert Sr. |
| | | | Dinger, Eric. |
| | | | Dingler, Mark H. |
| | | | Dinh, Chau Thanh. |
| | | | Dinh, Khai Duc. |
| | | | Dinh, Lien. |
| | | | Dinh, Toan. |
| | | | Dinh, Vincent. |
| | | | Dion, Ernest. |
| | | | Dion, Paul A. |
| | | | Dion, Thomas Autry. |
| | | | Disalvo, Paul A. |
| | | | Dismuke, Robert E Sr. |
| | | | Ditcharo, Dominick III. |
| | | | Dixon, David. |
| | | | Do, Cuong V. |
| | | | Do, Dan C. |
| | | | Do, Dung V. |
| | | | Do, Hai Van. |
| | | | Do, Hieu. |
| | | | Do, Hung V. |
| | | | Do, Hung V. |
| | | | Do, Johnny. |
| | | | Do, Kiet Van. |
| | | | Do, Ky Hong. |
| | | | Do, Ky Quoc. |
| | | | Do, Lam. |
| | | | Do, Liet Van. |
| | | | Do, Luong Van. |
| | | | Do, Minh Van. |
| | | | Do, Nghiep Van. |
| | | | Do, Ta. |
| | | | Do, Ta Phon. |
| | | | Do, Than Viet. |
| | | | Do, Thanh V. |
| | | | Do, Theo Van. |
| | | | Do, Thien Van. |
| | | | Do, Tinh A. |
| | | | Do, Tri. |
| | | | Do, Vi V. |
| | | | Doan, Anh Thi. |
| | | | Doan, Joseph. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Doan, Mai. |
| | | | Doan, Minh. |
| | | | Doan, Ngoc. |
| | | | Doan, Tran Van. |
| | | | Domangue, Darryl. |
| | | | Domangue, Emile. |
| | | | Domangue, Mary. |
| | | | Domangue, Michael. |
| | | | Domangue, Paul. |
| | | | Domangue, Ranzell Sr. |
| | | | Domangue, Stephen. |
| | | | Domangue, Westley. |
| | | | Domingo, Carolyn. |
| | | | Dominique, Amy R. |
| | | | Dominque, Gerald R. |
| | | | Donini, Ernest N. |
| | | | Donnelly, David C. |
| | | | Donohue, Holly M. |
| | | | Dooley, Denise F. |
| | | | Dopson, Craig B. |
| | | | Dore, Presley J. |
| | | | Dore, Preston J Jr. |
| | | | Dorr, Janthan C Jr. |
| | | | Doucet, Paul J Sr. |
| | | | Downey, Colleen. |
| | | | Doxey, Robert Lee Sr. |
| | | | Doxey, Ruben A. |
| | | | Doxey, William L. |
| | | | Doyle, John T. |
| | | | Drawdy, John Joseph. |
| | | | Drury, Bruce W Jr. |
| | | | Drury, Bruce W Sr. |
| | | | Drury, Bryant J. |
| | | | Drury, Eric S. |
| | | | Drury, Helen M. |
| | | | Drury, Jeff III. |
| | | | Drury, Kevin. |
| | | | Drury, Kevin S Sr. |
| | | | Drury, Steve R. |
| | | | Drury, Steven J. |
| | | | Dubberly, James F. |
| | | | Dubberly, James Michael. |
| | | | Dubberly, James Michael Jr. |
| | | | Dubberly, John J. |
| | | | Dubois, Euris A. |
| | | | Dubois, John D Jr. |
| | | | Dubois, Lonnie J. |
| | | | Duck, Kermit Paul. |
| | | | Dudenhefer, Anthony. |
| | | | Dudenhefer, Connie S. |
| | | | Dudenhefer, Eugene A. |
| | | | Dudenhefer, Milton J Jr. |
| | | | Duet, Brad J. |
| | | | Duet, Darrel A. |
| | | | Duet, Guy J. |
| | | | Duet, Jace J. |
| | | | Duet, Jay. |
| | | | Duet, John P. |
| | | | Duet, Larson. |
| | | | Duet, Ramie. |
| | | | Duet, Raymond J. |
| | | | Duet, Tammy B. |
| | | | Duet, Tyrone. |
| | | | Dufrene, Archie. |
| | | | Dufrene, Charles. |
| | | | Dufrene, Curt F. |
| | | | Dufrene, Elson A. |
| | | | Dufrene, Eric F. |
| | | | Dufrene, Eric F Jr. |
| | | | Dufrene, Eric John. |
| | | | Dufrene, Golden J. |
| | | | Dufrene, Jeremy M. |
| | | | Dufrene, Juliette B. |
| | | | Dufrene, Leroy J. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Dufrene, Milton J. |
| | | | Dufrene, Ronald A Jr. |
| | | | Dufrene, Ronald A Sr. |
| | | | Dufrene, Scottie M. |
| | | | Dufrene, Toby. |
| | | | Dugar, Edward A II. |
| | | | Dugas, Donald John. |
| | | | Dugas, Henri J IV. |
| | | | Duhe, Greta. |
| | | | Duhe, Robert. |
| | | | Duhon, Charles. |
| | | | Duhon, Douglas P. |
| | | | Duncan, Faye E. |
| | | | Duncan, Gary. |
| | | | Duncan, Loyde C. |
| | | | Dunn, Bob. |
| | | | Duong, Billy. |
| | | | Duong, Chamroeun. |
| | | | Duong, EM. |
| | | | Duong, Ho Tan Phi. |
| | | | Duong, Kong. |
| | | | Duong, Mau. |
| | | | Duplantis, Blair P. |
| | | | Duplantis, David. |
| | | | Duplantis, Frankie J. |
| | | | Duplantis, Maria. |
| | | | Duplantis, Teddy W. |
| | | | Duplantis, Wedgir J Jr. |
| | | | Duplessis, Anthony James Sr. |
| | | | Duplessis, Bonnie S. |
| | | | Duplessis, Clarence R. |
| | | | Dupre, Brandon P. |
| | | | Dupre, Cecile. |
| | | | Dupre, David A. |
| | | | Dupre, Davis J Jr. |
| | | | Dupre, Easton J. |
| | | | Dupre, Jimmie Sr. |
| | | | Dupre, Linward P. |
| | | | Dupre, Mary L. |
| | | | Dupre, Michael J. |
| | | | Dupre, Michael J Jr. |
| | | | Dupre, Randall P. |
| | | | Dupre, Richard A. |
| | | | Dupre, Rudy P. |
| | | | Dupre, Ryan A. |
| | | | Dupre, Tony J. |
| | | | Dupre, Troy A. |
| | | | Dupree, Bryan. |
| | | | Dupree, Derrick. |
| | | | Dupree, Malcolm J Sr. |
| | | | Dupuis, Clayton J. |
| | | | Durand, Walter Y. |
| | | | Dusang, Melvin A. |
| | | | Duval, Denval H Sr. |
| | | | Duval, Wayne. |
| | | | Dyer, Nadine D. |
| | | | Dyer, Tony. |
| | | | Dykes, Bert L. |
| | | | Dyson, Adley L Jr. |
| | | | Dyson, Adley L Sr. |
| | | | Dyson, Amy. |
| | | | Dyson, Casandra. |
| | | | Dyson, Clarence III. |
| | | | Dyson, Jimmy Jr. |
| | | | Dyson, Jimmy L Sr. |
| | | | Dyson, Kathleen. |
| | | | Dyson, Maricela. |
| | | | Dyson, Phillip II. |
| | | | Dyson, Phillip Sr. |
| | | | Dyson, William. |
| | | | Eckerd, Bill. |
| | | | Edens, Angela Blake. |
| | | | Edens, Donnie. |
| | | | Edens, Jeremy Donald. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Edens, Nancy M. |
| | | | Edens, Steven L. |
| | | | Edens, Timothy Dale. |
| | | | Edgar, Daniel. |
| | | | Edgar, Joey. |
| | | | Edgerson, Roosevelt. |
| | | | Edwards,Tommy W III. |
| | | | Ellerbee, Jody Duane. |
| | | | Ellison, David Jr. |
| | | | Encalade, Alfred Jr. |
| | | | Encalade, Anthony T. |
| | | | Encalade, Cary. |
| | | | Encalade, Joshua C. |
| | | | Encalade, Stanley A. |
| | | | Enclade, Joseph L. |
| | | | Enclade, Michael Sr and Jeannie Pitre. |
| | | | Enclade, Rodney J. |
| | | | Englade, Alfred. |
| | | | Ennis, A L Jr. |
| | | | Erickson, Grant G. |
| | | | Erlinger, Carroll. |
| | | | Erlinger, Gary R. |
| | | | Eschete, Keith A. |
| | | | Esfeller, Benny A. |
| | | | Eskine, Kenneth. |
| | | | Esponge, Ernest J. |
| | | | Estaves, David Sr. |
| | | | Estaves, Ricky Joseph. |
| | | | Estay, Allen J. |
| | | | Estay, Wayne. |
| | | | Esteves, Anthony E Jr. |
| | | | Estrada, Orestes. |
| | | | Evans, Emile J Jr. |
| | | | Evans, Kevin J. |
| | | | Evans, Lester. |
| | | | Evans, Lester J Jr. |
| | | | Evans, Tracey J Sr. |
| | | | Everson, George C. |
| | | | Eymard, Brian P Sr. |
| | | | Eymard, Jervis J and Carolyn B. |
| | | | Fabiano, Morris C. |
| | | | Fabra, Mark. |
| | | | Fabre, Alton Jr. |
| | | | Fabre, Ernest J. |
| | | | Fabre, Kelly V. |
| | | | Fabre, Peggy B. |
| | | | Fabre, Sheron. |
| | | | Fabre, Terry A. |
| | | | Fabre, Wayne M. |
| | | | Falcon, Mitchell J. |
| | | | Falgout, Barney. |
| | | | Falgout, Jerry P. |
| | | | Falgout, Leroy J. |
| | | | Falgout, Timothy J. |
| | | | Fanguy, Barry G. |
| | | | Fanning, Paul Jr. |
| | | | Farris, Thomas J. |
| | | | Fasone, Christopher J. |
| | | | Fasone, William J. |
| | | | Faulk, Lester J. |
| | | | Favaloro, Thomas J. |
| | | | Favre, Michael Jr. |
| | | | Fazende, Jeffery. |
| | | | Fazende, Thomas. |
| | | | Fazende, Thomas G. |
| | | | Fazzio, Anthony. |
| | | | Fazzio, Douglas P. |
| | | | Fazzio, Maxine J. |
| | | | Fazzio, Steve. |
| | | | Felarise, EJ. |
| | | | Felarise, Wayne A Sr. |
| | | | Fernandez, John. |
| | | | Fernandez, Laudelino. |
| | | | Ferrara, Audrey B. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Ficarino, Dominick Jr.<br>Fields, Bryan.<br>Fillinich, Anthony.<br>Fillinich, Anthony Sr.<br>Fillinich, Jack.<br>Fincher, Penny.<br>Fincher, William.<br>Fisch, Burton E.<br>Fisher, Kelly.<br>Fisher, Kirk.<br>Fisher, Kirk A.<br>Fitch, Adam.<br>Fitch, Clarence J Jr.<br>Fitch, Hanson.<br>Fitzgerald, Burnell.<br>Fitzgerald, Kirk.<br>Fitzgerald, Kirk D.<br>Fitzgerald, Ricky J Jr.<br>Fleming, John M.<br>Fleming, Meigs F.<br>Fleming, Mike.<br>Flick, Dana.<br>Flores, Helena D.<br>Flores, Thomas.<br>Flowers, Steve W.<br>Flowers, Vincent F.<br>Folse, David M.<br>Folse, Heath.<br>Folse, Mary L.<br>Folse, Ronald B.<br>Fonseca, Francis Sr.<br>Fontaine, William S.<br>Fontenot, Peggy D.<br>Ford, Judy.<br>Ford, Warren Wayne.<br>Foreman, Ralph Jr.<br>Foret, Alva J.<br>Foret, Billy J.<br>Foret, Brent J.<br>Foret, Glenn.<br>Foret, Houston.<br>Foret, Jackie P.<br>Foret, Kurt J Sr.<br>Foret, Lovelace A Sr.<br>Foret, Loveless A Jr.<br>Foret, Mark M.<br>Foret, Patricia C.<br>Forrest, David P.<br>Forsyth, Hunter.<br>Forsythe, John.<br>Fortune, Michael A.<br>France, George J.<br>Francis, Albert.<br>Franklin, James K.<br>Frankovich, Anthony.<br>Franks, Michael.<br>Frauenberger, Richard Wayne.<br>Frazier, David J.<br>Frazier, David M.<br>Frazier, James.<br>Frazier, Michael.<br>Frederick, Davis.<br>Frederick, Johnnie and Jeannie.<br>Fredrick, Michael.<br>Freeman, Arthur D.<br>Freeman, Darrel P Sr.<br>Freeman, Kenneth F.<br>Freeman, Larry Scott.<br>Frelich, Charles P.<br>Frelich, Floyd J.<br>Frelich, Kent.<br>Frerics, Doug.<br>Frerks, Albert R Jr.<br>Frickey, Darell. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Frickey, Darren. |
| | | | Frickey, Dirk I. |
| | | | Frickey, Eric J. |
| | | | Frickey, Harry J Jr. |
| | | | Frickey, Jimmy. |
| | | | Frickey, Rickey J. |
| | | | Frickey, Westley J. |
| | | | Friloux, Brad. |
| | | | Frisella, Jeanette M. |
| | | | Frisella, Jerome A Jr. |
| | | | Frost, Michael R. |
| | | | Fruge, Wade P. |
| | | | Gadson, James. |
| | | | Gaines, Dwayne. |
| | | | Gala, Christine. |
| | | | Galjour, Jess J. |
| | | | Galjour, Reed. |
| | | | Gallardo, John W. |
| | | | Gallardo, Johnny M. |
| | | | Galliano, Anthony. |
| | | | Galliano, Horace J. |
| | | | Galliano, Joseph Sr. |
| | | | Galliano, Logan J. |
| | | | Galliano, Lynne L. |
| | | | Galliano, Moise Jr. |
| | | | Galloway, AT Jr. |
| | | | Galloway, Jimmy D. |
| | | | Galloway, Judy L. |
| | | | Galloway, Mark D. |
| | | | Galt, Giles F. |
| | | | Gambarella, Luvencie J. |
| | | | Ganoi, Kristine. |
| | | | Garcia, Ana Maria. |
| | | | Garcia, Anthony. |
| | | | Garcia, Edward. |
| | | | Garcia, Kenneth. |
| | | | Garner, Larry S. |
| | | | Gary, Dalton J. |
| | | | Gary, Ernest J. |
| | | | Gary, Leonce Jr. |
| | | | Garza, Andrew. |
| | | | Garza, Jose H. |
| | | | Gaskill, Elbert Clinton and Sandra. |
| | | | Gaspar, Timothy. |
| | | | Gaspard, Aaron and Hazel C. |
| | | | Gaspard, Dudley A Jr. |
| | | | Gaspard, Leonard J. |
| | | | Gaspard, Michael A. |
| | | | Gaspard, Michael Sr. |
| | | | Gaspard, Murry. |
| | | | Gaspard, Murry A Jr. |
| | | | Gaspard, Murry Sr. |
| | | | Gaspard, Murvin. |
| | | | Gaspard, Ronald Sr. |
| | | | Gaspard, Ronald Wayne Jr. |
| | | | Gaubert, Elizabeth. |
| | | | Gaubert, Gregory M. |
| | | | Gaubert, Melvin. |
| | | | Gaudet, Allen J IV. |
| | | | Gaudet, Ricky Jr. |
| | | | Gauthier, Hewitt J Sr. |
| | | | Gautreaux, William A. |
| | | | Gay, Norman F. |
| | | | Gay, Robert G. |
| | | | Gazzier, Daryl G. |
| | | | Gazzier, Emanuel A. |
| | | | Gazzier, Wilfred E. |
| | | | Gegenheimer, William F. |
| | | | Geiling, James. |
| | | | Geisman, Tony. |
| | | | Gentry, Robert. |
| | | | Gentry, Samuel W Jr. |
| | | | George, James J Jr. |
| | | | Gerica, Clara. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Gerica, Peter. |
| | | | Giambrone, Corey P. |
| | | | Gibson, Eddie E. |
| | | | Gibson, Joseph. |
| | | | Gibson, Ronald F. |
| | | | Gilden, Eddie Jr. |
| | | | Gilden, Eddie Sr. |
| | | | Gilden, Inez W. |
| | | | Gilden, Wayne. |
| | | | Gillikin, James D. |
| | | | Girard, Chad Paul. |
| | | | Giroir, Mark S. |
| | | | Gisclair, Anthony J. |
| | | | Gisclair, Anthony Joseph Sr. |
| | | | Gisclair, August. |
| | | | Gisclair, Dallas J Sr. |
| | | | Gisclair, Doyle A. |
| | | | Gisclair, Kip J. |
| | | | Gisclair, Ramona D. |
| | | | Gisclair, Wade. |
| | | | Gisclair, Walter. |
| | | | Glover, Charles D. |
| | | | Glynn, Larry. |
| | | | Goetz, George. |
| | | | Goings, Robert Eugene. |
| | | | Golden, George T. |
| | | | Golden, William L. |
| | | | Gollot, Brian. |
| | | | Gollot, Edgar R. |
| | | | Gonzales, Arnold Jr. |
| | | | Gonzales, Mrs Cyril E Jr. |
| | | | Gonzales, Rene R. |
| | | | Gonzales, Rudolph S Jr. |
| | | | Gonzales, Rudolph S Sr. |
| | | | Gonzales, Sylvia A. |
| | | | Gonzales, Tim J. |
| | | | Gonzalez, Jorge Jr. |
| | | | Gonzalez, Julio. |
| | | | Gordon, Donald E. |
| | | | Gordon, Patrick Alvin. |
| | | | Gore, Henry H. |
| | | | Gore, Isabel. |
| | | | Gore, Pam. |
| | | | Gore, Thomas L. |
| | | | Gore, Timothy Ansel. |
| | | | Gottschalk, Gregory. |
| | | | Gourgues, Harold C Jr. |
| | | | Goutierrez, Tony C. |
| | | | Govea, Joaquin. |
| | | | Graham, Darrell. |
| | | | Graham, Steven H. |
| | | | Granger, Albert J Sr. |
| | | | Granich, James. |
| | | | Granier, Stephen J. |
| | | | Grass, Michael. |
| | | | Graves, Robert N Sr. |
| | | | Gray, Jeannette. |
| | | | Gray, Monroe. |
| | | | Gray, Shirley E. |
| | | | Gray, Wayne A Sr. |
| | | | Graybill, Ruston. |
| | | | Green, Craig X. |
| | | | Green, James W. |
| | | | Green, James W Jr. |
| | | | Green, Shaun. |
| | | | Greenlaw, W C Jr. |
| | | | Gregoire, Ernest L. |
| | | | Gregoire, Rita M. |
| | | | Gregory, Curtis B. |
| | | | Gregory, Mercedes E. |
| | | | Grice, Raymond L Jr. |
| | | | Griffin, Alden J Sr. |
| | | | Griffin, Craig. |
| | | | Griffin, David D. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Griffin, Elvis Joseph Jr. |
| | | | Griffin, Faye. |
| | | | Griffin, Faye Ann. |
| | | | Griffin, Jimmie J. |
| | | | Griffin, Nolty J. |
| | | | Griffin, Rickey. |
| | | | Griffin, Sharon. |
| | | | Griffin, Timothy. |
| | | | Griffin, Troy D. |
| | | | Groff, Alfred A. |
| | | | Groff, John A. |
| | | | Groover, Hank. |
| | | | Gros, Brent J Sr. |
| | | | Gros, Craig J. |
| | | | Gros, Danny A. |
| | | | Gros, Gary Sr. |
| | | | Gros, Junius A Jr. |
| | | | Gros, Keven. |
| | | | Gros, Michael A. |
| | | | Gross, Homer. |
| | | | Grossie, Janet M. |
| | | | Grossie, Shane A. |
| | | | Grossie, Tate. |
| | | | Grow, Jimmie C. |
| | | | Guenther, John J. |
| | | | Guenther, Raphael. |
| | | | Guerra, Bruce. |
| | | | Guerra, Chad L. |
| | | | Guerra, Fabian C. |
| | | | Guerra, Guy A. |
| | | | Guerra, Jerry V Sr. |
| | | | Guerra, Kurt P Sr. |
| | | | Guerra, Ricky J Sr. |
| | | | Guerra, Robert. |
| | | | Guerra, Ryan. |
| | | | Guerra, Troy A. |
| | | | Guerra, William Jr. |
| | | | Guidroz, Warren J. |
| | | | Guidry, Alvin A. |
| | | | Guidry, Andy J. |
| | | | Guidry, Arthur. |
| | | | Guidry, Bud. |
| | | | Guidry, Calvin P. |
| | | | Guidry, Carl J. |
| | | | Guidry, Charles J. |
| | | | Guidry, Chris J. |
| | | | Guidry, Clarence P. |
| | | | Guidry, Clark. |
| | | | Guidry, Clint. |
| | | | Guidry, Clinton P Jr. |
| | | | Guidry, Clyde A. |
| | | | Guidry, David. |
| | | | Guidry, Dobie. |
| | | | Guidry, Douglas J Sr. |
| | | | Guidry, Elgy III. |
| | | | Guidry, Elgy Jr. |
| | | | Guidry, Elwin A Jr. |
| | | | Guidry, Gerald A. |
| | | | Guidry, Gordon Jr. |
| | | | Guidry, Guillaume A. |
| | | | Guidry, Harold. |
| | | | Guidry, Jason. |
| | | | Guidry, Jessie J. |
| | | | Guidry, Jessie Joseph. |
| | | | Guidry, Jonathan B. |
| | | | Guidry, Joseph T Jr. |
| | | | Guidry, Keith M. |
| | | | Guidry, Kenneth J. |
| | | | Guidry, Kerry A. |
| | | | Guidry, Marco. |
| | | | Guidry, Maurin T and Tamika. |
| | | | Guidry, Michael J. |
| | | | Guidry, Nolan J Sr. |
| | | | Guidry, Randy Peter Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Guidry, Rhonda S. |
| | | | Guidry, Robert C. |
| | | | Guidry, Robert Joseph. |
| | | | Guidry, Robert Wayne. |
| | | | Guidry, Roger. |
| | | | Guidry, Ronald. |
| | | | Guidry, Roy Anthony. |
| | | | Guidry, Roy J. |
| | | | Guidry, Tammy. |
| | | | Guidry, Ted. |
| | | | Guidry, Thomas P. |
| | | | Guidry, Timothy. |
| | | | Guidry, Troy. |
| | | | Guidry, Troy. |
| | | | Guidry, Ulysses. |
| | | | Guidry, Vicki. |
| | | | Guidry, Wayne J. |
| | | | Guidry, Wyatt. |
| | | | Guidry, Yvonne. |
| | | | Guidry-Calva, Holly A. |
| | | | Guilbeaux, Donald J. |
| | | | Guilbeaux, Lou. |
| | | | Guillie, Shirley. |
| | | | Guillory, Horace H. |
| | | | Guillot, Benjamin J Jr. |
| | | | Guillot, Rickey A. |
| | | | Gulledge, Lee. |
| | | | Gutierrez, Anita. |
| | | | Guy, Jody. |
| | | | Guy, Kimothy Paul. |
| | | | Guy, Wilson. |
| | | | Ha, Cherie Lan. |
| | | | Ha, Co Dong. |
| | | | Ha, Lai Thuy Thi. |
| | | | Ha, Lyanna. |
| | | | Hadwall, John R. |
| | | | Hafford, Johnny. |
| | | | Hagan, Jules. |
| | | | Hagan, Marianna. |
| | | | Haiglea, Robbin Richard. |
| | | | Hales, William E. |
| | | | Halili, Rhonda L. |
| | | | Hall, Byron S. |
| | | | Hall, Darrel T Sr. |
| | | | Hall, Lorrie A. |
| | | | Hammer, Michael P. |
| | | | Hammock, Julius Michael. |
| | | | Hancock, Jimmy L. |
| | | | Handlin, William Sr. |
| | | | Hang, Cam T. |
| | | | Hansen, Chris. |
| | | | Hansen, Eric P. |
| | | | Hanson, Edmond A. |
| | | | Harbison, Louis. |
| | | | Hardee, William P. |
| | | | Hardison, Louis. |
| | | | Hardy John C. |
| | | | Hardy, Sharon. |
| | | | Harmon, Michelle. |
| | | | Harrington, George J. |
| | | | Harrington, Jay. |
| | | | Harris, Bobby D. |
| | | | Harris, Buster. |
| | | | Harris, Jimmy Wayne Sr. |
| | | | Harris, Johnny Ray. |
| | | | Harris, Kenneth A. |
| | | | Harris, Ronnie. |
| | | | Harris, Susan D. |
| | | | Harris, William. |
| | | | Harrison, Daniel L. |
| | | | Hartmann, Leon M Jr. |
| | | | Hartmann, Walter Jr. |
| | | | Hattaway, Errol Henry. |
| | | | Haycock, Kenneth. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Haydel, Gregory. |
| | | | Hayes, Clinton. |
| | | | Hayes, Katherine F. |
| | | | Hayes, Lod Jr. |
| | | | Hean, Hong. |
| | | | Heathcock, Walter Jr. |
| | | | Hebert, Albert Joseph. |
| | | | Hebert, Bernie. |
| | | | Hebert, Betty Jo. |
| | | | Hebert, Chris. |
| | | | Hebert, Craig J. |
| | | | Hebert, David. |
| | | | Hebert, David Jr. |
| | | | Hebert, Earl J. |
| | | | Hebert, Eric J. |
| | | | Hebert, Jack M. |
| | | | Hebert, Johnny Paul. |
| | | | Hebert, Jonathan. |
| | | | Hebert, Jules J. |
| | | | Hebert, Kim M. |
| | | | Hebert, Lloyd S III. |
| | | | Hebert, Michael J. |
| | | | Hebert, Myron A. |
| | | | Hebert, Norman. |
| | | | Hebert, Patrick. |
| | | | Hebert, Patrick A. |
| | | | Hebert, Pennington Jr. |
| | | | Hebert, Philip. |
| | | | Hebert, Robert A. |
| | | | Hebert, Terry W. |
| | | | Hedrick, Gerald J Jr. |
| | | | Helmer, Claudia A. |
| | | | Helmer, Gerry J. |
| | | | Helmer, Herman C Jr. |
| | | | Helmer, Kenneth. |
| | | | Helmer, Larry J Sr. |
| | | | Helmer, Michael A Sr. |
| | | | Helmer, Rusty L. |
| | | | Helmer, Windy. |
| | | | Hemmenway, Jack. |
| | | | Henderson, Brad. |
| | | | Henderson, Curtis. |
| | | | Henderson, David A Jr. |
| | | | Henderson, David A Sr. |
| | | | Henderson, Johnny. |
| | | | Henderson, Olen. |
| | | | Henderson, P Loam. |
| | | | Henry, Joanne. |
| | | | Henry, Rodney. |
| | | | Herbert, Patrick and Terry. |
| | | | Hereford, Rodney O Jr. |
| | | | Hereford, Rodney O Sr. |
| | | | Hernandez, Corey. |
| | | | Herndon, Mark. |
| | | | Hertel, Charles W. |
| | | | Hertz, Edward C Sr. |
| | | | Hess, Allen L Sr. |
| | | | Hess, Henry D Jr. |
| | | | Hess, Jessica R. |
| | | | Hess, Wayne B. |
| | | | Hewett, Emma. |
| | | | Hewett, James. |
| | | | Hickman, John. |
| | | | Hickman, Marvin. |
| | | | Hicks, Billy M. |
| | | | Hicks, James W. |
| | | | Hicks, Larry W. |
| | | | Hicks, Walter R. |
| | | | Hien, Nguyen. |
| | | | Higgins, Joseph J III. |
| | | | Hill, Darren S. |
| | | | Hill, Joseph R. |
| | | | Hill, Sharon. |
| | | | Hill, Willie E Jr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Hills, Herman W. |
| | | | Hingle, Barbara E. |
| | | | Hingle, Rick A. |
| | | | Hingle, Roland T Jr. |
| | | | Hingle, Roland T Sr. |
| | | | Hingle, Ronald J. |
| | | | Hinojosa, R. |
| | | | Hinojosa, Randy. |
| | | | Hinojosa, Ricky A. |
| | | | Hipps, Nicole Marie. |
| | | | Ho, Dung Tan. |
| | | | Ho, Hung. |
| | | | Ho, Jennifer. |
| | | | Ho, Jimmy. |
| | | | Ho, Lam. |
| | | | Ho, Nam. |
| | | | Ho, Nga T. |
| | | | Ho, O. |
| | | | Ho, Sang N. |
| | | | Ho, Thanh Quoc. |
| | | | Ho, Thien Dang. |
| | | | Ho, Tien Van. |
| | | | Ho, Tri Tran. |
| | | | Hoang, Dung T. |
| | | | Hoang, Hoa T and Tam Hoang. |
| | | | Hoang, Huy Van. |
| | | | Hoang, Jennifer Vu. |
| | | | Hoang, John. |
| | | | Hoang, Julie. |
| | | | Hoang, Kimberly. |
| | | | Hoang, Linda. |
| | | | Hoang, Loan. |
| | | | Hoang, San Ngoc. |
| | | | Hoang, Tro Van. |
| | | | Hoang, Trung Kim. |
| | | | Hoang, Trung Tuan. |
| | | | Hoang, Vincent Huynh. |
| | | | Hodges, Ralph W. |
| | | | Hoffpaviiz, Harry K. |
| | | | Holland, Vidal. |
| | | | Holler, Boyce Dwight Jr. |
| | | | Hollier, Dennis J. |
| | | | Holloway, Carl D. |
| | | | Hong, Tai Van. |
| | | | Hood, Malcolm. |
| | | | Hopton, Douglas. |
| | | | Horaist, Shawn P. |
| | | | Hostetler, Warren L II. |
| | | | Hotard, Claude. |
| | | | Hotard, Emile J Jr. |
| | | | Howard, Jeff. |
| | | | Howerin, Billy Sr. |
| | | | Howerin, Wendell Sr. |
| | | | Hubbard, Keith. |
| | | | Hubbard, Perry III. |
| | | | Huber, Berry T. |
| | | | Huber, Charles A. |
| | | | Huck, Irma Elaine. |
| | | | Huck, Steven R. |
| | | | Huckabee, Harold. |
| | | | Hue, Patrick A. |
| | | | Hughes, Brad J. |
| | | | Hults, Thomas. |
| | | | Hutcherson, Daniel J. |
| | | | Hutchinson, Douglas. |
| | | | Hutchinson, George D. |
| | | | Hutchinson, William H. |
| | | | Hutto, Cynthia E. |
| | | | Hutto, Henry G Jr. |
| | | | Huynh, Chien Thi. |
| | | | Huynh, Dong Xuan. |
| | | | Huynh, Dung. |
| | | | Huynh, Dung V. |
| | | | Huynh, Hai. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Huynh, Hai. |
| | | | Huynh, Hai Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Hoang D. |
| | | | Huynh, Hoang Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Hung. |
| | | | Huynh, James N. |
| | | | Huynh, Johhny Hiep. |
| | | | Huynh, Johnnie. |
| | | | Huynh, Kim. |
| | | | Huynh, Lay. |
| | | | Huynh, Long. |
| | | | Huynh, Mack Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Mau Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Minh. |
| | | | Huynh, Minh Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Nam Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Thai. |
| | | | Huynh, Tham Thi. |
| | | | Huynh, Thanh. |
| | | | Huynh, The V. |
| | | | Huynh, Tri. |
| | | | Huynh, Truc. |
| | | | Huynh, Tu. |
| | | | Huynh, Tu. |
| | | | Huynh, Tung Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Van X. |
| | | | Huynh, Viet Van. |
| | | | Huynh, Vuong Van. |
| | | | Hymel, Joseph Jr. |
| | | | Hymel, Michael D. |
| | | | Hymel, Nolan J Sr. |
| | | | Ingham, Herbert W. |
| | | | Inglis, Richard M. |
| | | | Ingraham, Joseph S. |
| | | | Ingraham, Joyce. |
| | | | Ipock, Billy. |
| | | | Ipock, William B. |
| | | | Ireland, Arthur Allen. |
| | | | Iver, George Jr. |
| | | | Jackson, Alfred M. |
| | | | Jackson, Carl John. |
| | | | Jackson, David. |
| | | | Jackson, Eugene O. |
| | | | Jackson, Glenn C Jr. |
| | | | Jackson, Glenn C Sr. |
| | | | Jackson, James Jerome. |
| | | | Jackson, John D. |
| | | | Jackson, John Elton Sr. |
| | | | Jackson, Levi. |
| | | | Jackson, Nancy L. |
| | | | Jackson, Robert W. |
| | | | Jackson, Shannon. |
| | | | Jackson, Shaun C. |
| | | | Jackson, Steven A. |
| | | | Jacob, Ronald R. |
| | | | Jacob, Warren J Jr. |
| | | | Jacobs, L Anthony. |
| | | | Jacobs, Lawrence F. |
| | | | Jarreau, Billy and Marilyn. |
| | | | Jarvis, James D. |
| | | | Jaye, Emma. |
| | | | Jeanfreau, Vincent R. |
| | | | Jefferies, William. |
| | | | Jemison, Timothy Michael Sr. |
| | | | Jennings, Jacob. |
| | | | Joffrion, Harold J Jr. |
| | | | Johnson, Albert F. |
| | | | Johnson, Ashley Lamar. |
| | | | Johnson, Bernard Jr. |
| | | | Johnson, Brent W. |
| | | | Johnson, Bruce Warem. |
| | | | Johnson, Carl S. |
| | | | Johnson, Carolyn. |
| | | | Johnson, Clyde Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Johnson, David G. |
| | | | Johnson, David Paul. |
| | | | Johnson, Gary Allen Sr. |
| | | | Johnson, George D. |
| | | | Johnson, Michael A. |
| | | | Johnson, Randy J. |
| | | | Johnson, Regenia. |
| | | | Johnson, Robert. |
| | | | Johnson, Ronald Ray Sr. |
| | | | Johnson, Steve. |
| | | | Johnson, Thomas Allen Jr. |
| | | | Johnston, Ronald. |
| | | | Joly, Nicholas J Jr. |
| | | | Jones, Charles. |
| | | | Jones, Clinton. |
| | | | Jones, Daisy Mae. |
| | | | Jones, Jeffery E. |
| | | | Jones, Jerome N Sr. |
| | | | Jones, John W. |
| | | | Jones, Larry. |
| | | | Jones, Len. |
| | | | Jones, Michael G Sr. |
| | | | Jones, Paul E. |
| | | | Jones, Perry T Sr. |
| | | | Jones, Ralph William. |
| | | | Jones, Richard G Sr. |
| | | | Jones, Stephen K. |
| | | | Jones, Wayne. |
| | | | Joost, Donald F. |
| | | | Jordan, Dean. |
| | | | Jordan, Hubert William III (Bert). |
| | | | Jordan, Hurbert W Jr. |
| | | | Judalet, Ramon G. |
| | | | Judy, William Roger. |
| | | | Julian, Ida. |
| | | | Julian, John I Sr. |
| | | | Juneau, Anthony Sr. |
| | | | Juneau, Bruce. |
| | | | Juneau, Robert A Jr and Laura K. |
| | | | Jurjevich, Leander J. |
| | | | Kain, Jules B Sr. |
| | | | Kain, Martin A. |
| | | | Kalliainen, Dale. |
| | | | Kalliainen, Richard. |
| | | | Kang, Chamroeun. |
| | | | Kang, Sambo. |
| | | | Kap, Brenda. |
| | | | Keen, Robert Steven. |
| | | | Keenan, Robert M. |
| | | | Kellum, Kenneth Sr. |
| | | | Kellum, Larry Gray Sr. |
| | | | Kellum, Roxanne. |
| | | | Kelly, Roger B. |
| | | | Kelly, Thomas E. |
| | | | Kendrick, Chuck J. |
| | | | Kennair, Michael S. |
| | | | Kennedy, Dothan. |
| | | | Kenney, David Jr. |
| | | | Kenney, Robert W. |
| | | | Kent, Michael A. |
| | | | Keo, Bunly. |
| | | | Kerchner, Steve. |
| | | | Kern, Thurmond. |
| | | | Khin, Sochenda. |
| | | | Khui, Lep and Nga Ho. |
| | | | Kidd, Frank. |
| | | | Kiesel, Edward C and Lorraine T. |
| | | | Kiff, Hank J. |
| | | | Kiff, Melvin. |
| | | | Kiffe, Horace. |
| | | | Kim, Puch. |
| | | | Kimbrough, Carson. |
| | | | Kim-Tun, Soeun. |
| | | | King, Andy A. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | King, Donald Jr.<br>King, James B.<br>King, Thornell.<br>King, Wesley.<br>Kit, An.<br>Kizer, Anthony J.<br>Kleimann, Robert.<br>Knapp, Alton P Jr.<br>Knapp, Alton P Sr.<br>Knapp, Ellis L Jr.<br>Knapp, Melvin L.<br>Knapp, Theresa.<br>Knecht, Frederick Jr.<br>Knezek, Lee.<br>Knight, George.<br>Knight, Keith B.<br>Knight, Robert E.<br>Koch, Howard J.<br>Kong, Seng.<br>Konitz, Bobby.<br>Koo, Herman.<br>Koonce, Curtis S.<br>Koonce, Howard N.<br>Kopszywa, Mark L.<br>Kopszywa, Stanley J.<br>Kotulja, Stejepan.<br>Kraemer, Bridget.<br>Kraemer, Wilbert J.<br>Kraemer, Wilbert Jr.<br>Kramer, David.<br>Krantz, Arthur Jr.<br>Krantz, Lori.<br>Kraver, C W.<br>Kreger, Ronald A Sr.<br>Kreger, Roy J Sr.<br>Kreger, Ryan A.<br>Krennerich, Raymond A.<br>Kroke, Stephen E.<br>Kruth, Frank D.<br>Kuchler, Alphonse L III.<br>Kuhn, Bruce A Sr.<br>Kuhn, Gerard R Jr.<br>Kuhn, Gerard R Sr.<br>Kuhns, Deborah.<br>LaBauve, Kerry.<br>LaBauve, Sabrina.<br>LaBauve, Terry.<br>LaBiche, Todd A.<br>LaBove, Carroll.<br>LaBove, Frederick P.<br>Lachica, Jacqueline.<br>Lachico, Douglas.<br>Lacobon, Tommy W Jr.<br>Lacobon, Tony C.<br>LaCoste, Broddie.<br>LaCoste, Carl.<br>LaCoste, Dennis E.<br>LaCoste, Grayland J.<br>LaCoste, Malcolm Jr.<br>LaCoste, Melvin.<br>LaCoste, Melvin W Jr.<br>LaCoste, Ravin J Jr.<br>LaCoste, Ravin Sr.<br>Ladner, Clarence J III.<br>Ladson, Earlene G.<br>LaFont, Douglas A Sr.<br>LaFont, Edna S.<br>LaFont, Jackin.<br>LaFont, Noces J Jr.<br>LaFont, Weyland J Sr.<br>LaFrance, Joseph T.<br>Lagarde, Frank N.<br>Lagarde, Gary Paul.<br>Lagasse, Michael F. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lai, Hen K. |
| | | | Lai, Then. |
| | | | Lam, Cang Van. |
| | | | Lam, Cui. |
| | | | Lam, Dong Van. |
| | | | Lam, Hiep Tan. |
| | | | Lam, Lan Van. |
| | | | Lam, Lee Phenh. |
| | | | Lam, Phan. |
| | | | Lam, Qui. |
| | | | Lam, Sochen. |
| | | | Lam, Tai. |
| | | | Lam, Tinh Huu. |
| | | | Lambas, Jessie J Sr. |
| | | | Lanclos, Paul. |
| | | | Landry, David A. |
| | | | Landry, Dennis J. |
| | | | Landry, Edward N Jr. |
| | | | Landry, George. |
| | | | Landry, George M. |
| | | | Landry, James F. |
| | | | Landry, Jude C. |
| | | | Landry, Robert E. |
| | | | Landry, Ronald J. |
| | | | Landry, Samuel J Jr. |
| | | | Landry, Tracy. |
| | | | Lane, Daniel E. |
| | | | Lapeyrouse, Lance M. |
| | | | Lapeyrouse, Rosalie. |
| | | | Lapeyrouse, Tillman Joseph. |
| | | | LaRive, James L Jr. |
| | | | LaRoche, Daniel S. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Betty. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Blake. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Floyd. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Frank. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Harris Jr. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Ivy Jr. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Jefferson. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Jefferson P Jr. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Johnny J. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Marlene. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Nolan J. |
| | | | Lasseigne, Trent. |
| | | | Lat, Chhiet. |
| | | | Latapie, Charlotte A. |
| | | | Latapie, Crystal. |
| | | | Latapie, Jerry. |
| | | | Latapie, Joey G. |
| | | | Latapie, Joseph. |
| | | | Latapie, Joseph F Sr. |
| | | | Latapie, Travis. |
| | | | Latiolais, Craig J. |
| | | | Latiolais, Joel. |
| | | | Lau, Ho Thanh. |
| | | | Laughlin, James G. |
| | | | Laughlin, James Mitchell. |
| | | | Laurent, Yvonne M. |
| | | | Lavergne, Roger. |
| | | | Lawdros, Terrance Jr. |
| | | | Layrisson, Michael A III. |
| | | | Le, Amanda. |
| | | | Le, An Van. |
| | | | Le, Ben. |
| | | | Le, Binh T. |
| | | | Le, Cheo Van. |
| | | | Le, Chinh Thanh. |
| | | | Le, Chinh Thanh and Yen Vo. |
| | | | Le, Cu Thi. |
| | | | Le, Dai M. |
| | | | Le, Dale. |
| | | | Le, David Rung. |
| | | | Le, Du M. |
| | | | Le, Duc V. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Le, Duoc M. |
| | | | Le, Hien V. |
| | | | Le, Houston T. |
| | | | Le, Hung. |
| | | | Le, Jimmy. |
| | | | Le, Jimmy and Hoang. |
| | | | Le, Khoa. |
| | | | Le, Kim. |
| | | | Le, Ky Van. |
| | | | Le, Lang Van. |
| | | | Le, Lily. |
| | | | Le, Lisa Tuyet Thi. |
| | | | Le, Loi. |
| | | | Le, Minh Van. |
| | | | Le, Muoi Van. |
| | | | Le, My. |
| | | | Le, My V. |
| | | | Le, Nam and Xhan-Minh Le. |
| | | | Le, Nam Van. |
| | | | Le, Nhieu T. |
| | | | Le, Nhut Hoang. |
| | | | Le, Nu Thi. |
| | | | Le, Phuc Van. |
| | | | Le, Que V. |
| | | | Le, Quy. |
| | | | Le, Robert. |
| | | | Le, Sam Van. |
| | | | Le, Sau V. |
| | | | Le, Son. |
| | | | Le, Son. |
| | | | Le, Son H. |
| | | | Le, Son Quoc. |
| | | | Le, Son Van. |
| | | | Le, Su. |
| | | | Le, Tam V. |
| | | | Le, Thanh Huong. |
| | | | Le, Tong Minh. |
| | | | Le, Tony. |
| | | | Le, Tracy Lan Chi. |
| | | | Le, Tuan Nhu. |
| | | | Le, Viet Hoang. |
| | | | Le, Vui. |
| | | | Leaf, Andrew Scott. |
| | | | Leary, Roland. |
| | | | LeBeauf, Thomas. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Donnie. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Edwin J. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Enoch P. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Gareth R III. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Gareth R Jr. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Gerald E. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Hubert C. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Jerald. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Jesse Jr. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Keenon Anthony. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Lanvin J. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Luke A. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Marty J. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Marty J Jr. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Mickel J. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Robert Patrick. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Scotty M. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Shelton. |
| | | | LeBlanc, Terry J. |
| | | | LeBoeuf, Brent J. |
| | | | LeBoeuf, Emery J. |
| | | | LeBoeuf, Joseph R. |
| | | | LeBoeuf, Tammy Y. |
| | | | LeBouef, Dale. |
| | | | LeBouef, Edward J. |
| | | | LeBouef, Ellis J Jr. |
| | | | LeBouef, Gillis. |
| | | | LeBouef, Jimmie. |
| | | | LeBouef, Leslie. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | LeBouef, Lindy J. |
| | | | LeBouef, Micheal J. |
| | | | LeBouef, Raymond. |
| | | | LeBouef, Tommy J. |
| | | | LeBouef, Wiley Sr. |
| | | | LeBourgeois, Stephen A. |
| | | | LeCompte, Alena. |
| | | | LeCompte, Aubrey J. |
| | | | LeCompte, Etha. |
| | | | LeCompte, Jesse C Jr. |
| | | | LeCompte, Jesse Jr. |
| | | | LeCompte, Jesse Sr. |
| | | | LeCompte, Lyle. |
| | | | LeCompte, Patricia F. |
| | | | LeCompte, Todd. |
| | | | LeCompte, Troy A Sr. |
| | | | Ledet, Brad. |
| | | | Ledet, Bryan. |
| | | | Ledet, Carlton. |
| | | | Ledet, Charles J. |
| | | | Ledet, Jack A. |
| | | | Ledet, Kenneth A. |
| | | | Ledet, Mark. |
| | | | Ledet, Maxine B. |
| | | | Ledet, Mervin. |
| | | | Ledet, Phillip John. |
| | | | Ledoux, Dennis. |
| | | | Ledwig, Joe J. |
| | | | Lee, Carl. |
| | | | Lee, James K. |
| | | | Lee, Marilyn. |
| | | | Lee, Otis M Jr. |
| | | | Lee, Raymond C. |
| | | | Lee, Robert E. |
| | | | Lee, Steven J. |
| | | | Leek, Mark A. |
| | | | LeGaux, Roy J Jr. |
| | | | Legendre, Kerry. |
| | | | Legendre, Paul. |
| | | | Leger, Andre. |
| | | | LeGros, Alex M. |
| | | | LeJeune, Philip Jr. |
| | | | LeJeune, Philip Sr. |
| | | | LeJeune, Ramona V. |
| | | | LeJeunee, Debbie. |
| | | | LeJuine, Eddie R. |
| | | | LeLand, Allston Bochet. |
| | | | Leland, Rutledge B III. |
| | | | Leland, Rutledge B Jr. |
| | | | LeLeaux, David. |
| | | | Leleux, Kevin J. |
| | | | Lemoine, Jeffery Jr. |
| | | | Leonard, Dan. |
| | | | Leonard, Dexter J Jr. |
| | | | Leonard, Micheal A. |
| | | | Lepine, Leroy L. |
| | | | Lesso, Rudy Jr. |
| | | | Lester, Shawn. |
| | | | Levron, Dale T. |
| | | | Levy, Patrick T. |
| | | | Lewis, Kenneth. |
| | | | Lewis, Mark Steven. |
| | | | Libersat, Anthony R. |
| | | | Libersat, Kim. |
| | | | Licatino, Daniel Jr. |
| | | | Lichenstein, Donald L. |
| | | | Lilley, Douglas P. |
| | | | Lim, Chhay. |
| | | | Lim, Koung. |
| | | | Lim, Tav Seng. |
| | | | Linden, Eric L. |
| | | | Liner, Claude J Jr. |
| | | | Liner, Harold. |
| | | | Liner, Jerry. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Liner, Kevin. |
| | | | Liner, Michael B Sr. |
| | | | Liner, Morris T Jr. |
| | | | Liner, Morris T Sr. |
| | | | Liner, Tandy M. |
| | | | Linh, Pham. |
| | | | Linwood, Dolby. |
| | | | Lirette, Alex J Sr. |
| | | | Lirette, Bobby and Sheri. |
| | | | Lirette, Chester Patrick. |
| | | | Lirette, Daniel J. |
| | | | Lirette, Dean J. |
| | | | Lirette, Delvin J Jr. |
| | | | Lirette, Delvin Jr. |
| | | | Lirette, Desaire J. |
| | | | Lirette, Eugis P Sr. |
| | | | Lirette, Guy A. |
| | | | Lirette, Jeannie. |
| | | | Lirette, Kern A. |
| | | | Lirette, Ron C. |
| | | | Lirette, Russell (Chico) Jr. |
| | | | Lirette, Shaun Patrick. |
| | | | Lirette, Terry J Sr. |
| | | | Little, William A. |
| | | | Little, William Boyd. |
| | | | Liv, Niem S. |
| | | | Livaudais, Ernest J. |
| | | | Liverman, Harry R. |
| | | | LoBue, Michael Anthony Sr. |
| | | | Locascio, Dustin. |
| | | | Lockhart, William T. |
| | | | Lodrigue, Jimmy A. |
| | | | Lodrigue, Kerry. |
| | | | Lombardo, Joseph P. |
| | | | Lombas, James A Jr. |
| | | | Lombas, Kim D. |
| | | | Londrie, Harley. |
| | | | Long, Cao Thanh. |
| | | | Long, Dinh. |
| | | | Long, Robert. |
| | | | Longo, Ronald S Jr. |
| | | | Longwater, Ryan Heath. |
| | | | Loomer, Rhonda. |
| | | | Lopez, Celestino. |
| | | | Lopez, Evelio. |
| | | | Lopez, Harry N. |
| | | | Lopez, Ron. |
| | | | Lopez, Scott. |
| | | | Lopez, Stephen R Jr. |
| | | | Lord, Michael E Sr. |
| | | | Loupe, George Jr. |
| | | | Loupe, Ted. |
| | | | Lovell, Billy. |
| | | | Lovell, Bobby Jason. |
| | | | Lovell, Bradford John. |
| | | | Lovell, Charles J Jr. |
| | | | Lovell, Clayton. |
| | | | Lovell, Douglas P. |
| | | | Lovell, Jacob G. |
| | | | Lovell, Lois. |
| | | | Lovell, Slade M. |
| | | | Luke, Bernadette C. |
| | | | Luke, David. |
| | | | Luke, Dustan. |
| | | | Luke, Henry. |
| | | | Luke, Jeremy Paul. |
| | | | Luke, Keith J. |
| | | | Luke, Patrick A. |
| | | | Luke, Patrick J. |
| | | | Luke, Paul Leroy. |
| | | | Luke, Rudolph J. |
| | | | Luke, Samantha. |
| | | | Luke, Sidney Jr. |
| | | | Luke, Terry Patrick Jr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Luke, Terry Patrick Sr. |
| | | | Luke, Timothy. |
| | | | Luke, Wiltz J. |
| | | | Lund, Ora G. |
| | | | Luneau, Ferrell J. |
| | | | Luong, Kevin. |
| | | | Luong, Thu X. |
| | | | Luscy, Lydia. |
| | | | Luscy, Richard. |
| | | | Lutz, William A. |
| | | | Luu, Binh. |
| | | | Luu, Vinh. |
| | | | Luu, Vinh V. |
| | | | Ly, Bui. |
| | | | Ly, Hen. |
| | | | Ly, Hoc. |
| | | | Ly, Kelly D. |
| | | | Ly, Nu. |
| | | | Ly, Sa. |
| | | | Ly, Ven. |
| | | | Lyall, Rosalie. |
| | | | Lycett, James A. |
| | | | Lyons, Berton J. |
| | | | Lyons, Berton J Sr. |
| | | | Lyons, Jack. |
| | | | Lyons, Jerome M. |
| | | | Mackey, Marvin Sr. |
| | | | Mackie, Kevin L. |
| | | | Maggio, Wayne A. |
| | | | Magwood, Edwin Wayne. |
| | | | Mai, Danny V. |
| | | | Mai, Lang V. |
| | | | Mai, Tai. |
| | | | Mai, Trach Xuan. |
| | | | Maise, Rubin J. |
| | | | Maise, Todd. |
| | | | Majoue, Ernest J. |
| | | | Majoue, Nathan L. |
| | | | Malcombe, David. |
| | | | Mallett, Irvin Ray. |
| | | | Mallett, Jimmie. |
| | | | Mallett, Lawrence J. |
| | | | Mallett, Mervin B. |
| | | | Mallett, Rainbow. |
| | | | Mallett, Stephney. |
| | | | Malley, Ned F Jr. |
| | | | Mamolo, Charles H Sr. |
| | | | Mamolo, Romeo C Jr. |
| | | | Mamolo, Terry A. |
| | | | Mancera, Jesus. |
| | | | Manuel, Joseph R. |
| | | | Manuel, Shon. |
| | | | Mao, Chandarasy. |
| | | | Mao, Kim. |
| | | | Marcel, Michelle. |
| | | | Marchese, Joe Jr. |
| | | | Mareno, Ansley. |
| | | | Mareno, Brent J. |
| | | | Mareno, Kenneth L. |
| | | | Marie, Allen J. |
| | | | Marie, Marty. |
| | | | Marmande, Al. |
| | | | Marmande, Alidore. |
| | | | Marmande, Denise. |
| | | | Marquize, Heather. |
| | | | Marquize, Kip. |
| | | | Marris, Roy C Jr. |
| | | | Martin, Darren. |
| | | | Martin, Dean J. |
| | | | Martin, Dennis. |
| | | | Martin, Jody W. |
| | | | Martin, John F III. |
| | | | Martin, Michael A. |
| | | | Martin, Nora S. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Martin, Rod J.<br>Martin, Roland J Jr.<br>Martin, Russel J Sr.<br>Martin, Sharon J.<br>Martin, Tanna G.<br>Martin, Wendy.<br>Martinez, Carl R.<br>Martinez, Henry.<br>Martinez, Henry Joseph.<br>Martinez, Lupe.<br>Martinez, Michael.<br>Martinez, Rene J.<br>Mason, James F Jr.<br>Mason, Johnnie W.<br>Mason, Luther.<br>Mason, Mary Lois.<br>Mason, Percy D Jr.<br>Mason, Walter.<br>Matherne, Anthony.<br>Matherne, Blakland Sr.<br>Matherne, Bradley J.<br>Matherne, Claude I Jr.<br>Matherne, Clifford P.<br>Matherne, Curlis J.<br>Matherne, Forest J.<br>Matherne, George J.<br>Matherne, Glenn A.<br>Matherne, Grace L.<br>Matherne, James C.<br>Matherne, James J Jr.<br>Matherne, James J Sr.<br>Matherne, Joey A.<br>Matherne, Keith.<br>Matherne, Larry Jr.<br>Matherne, Louis M Sr.<br>Matherne, Louis Michael.<br>Matherne, Nelson.<br>Matherne, Thomas G.<br>Matherne, Thomas G Jr.<br>Matherne, Thomas Jr.<br>Matherne, Thomas M Sr.<br>Matherne, Wesley J.<br>Mathews, Patrick.<br>Mathurne, Barry.<br>Matte, Martin J Sr.<br>Mauldin, Johnny.<br>Mauldin, Mary.<br>Mauldin, Shannon.<br>Mavar, Mark D.<br>Mayeux, Lonies A Jr.<br>Mayeux, Roselyn P.<br>Mayfield, Gary.<br>Mayfield, Henry A Jr.<br>Mayfield, James J III.<br>Mayon, Allen J.<br>Mayon, Wayne Sr.<br>McAnespy, Henry.<br>McAnespy, Louis.<br>McCall, Marcus H.<br>McCall, R Terry Sr.<br>McCarthy, Carliss.<br>McCarthy, Michael.<br>McCauley, Byron Keith.<br>McCauley, Katrina.<br>McClantoc, Robert R and Debra.<br>McClellan, Eugene Gardner.<br>McCormick, Len.<br>McCuiston, Denny Carlton.<br>McDonald, Allan.<br>McElroy, Harry J.<br>McFarlain, Merlin J Jr.<br>McGuinn, Dennis.<br>McIntosh, James Richard.<br>McIntyre, Michael D. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | McIver, John H Jr. |
| | | | McKendree, Roy. |
| | | | McKenzie, George B. |
| | | | McKinzie, Bobby E. |
| | | | McKoin, Robert. |
| | | | McKoin, Robert F Jr. |
| | | | McLendon, Jonathon S. |
| | | | McNab, Robert Jr. |
| | | | McQuaig, Don W. |
| | | | McQuaig, Oliver J. |
| | | | Medine, David P. |
| | | | Mehaffey, John P. |
| | | | Melancon, Brent K. |
| | | | Melancon, Neva. |
| | | | Melancon, Rickey. |
| | | | Melancon, Roland Jr. |
| | | | Melancon, Roland T Jr. |
| | | | Melancon, Sean P. |
| | | | Melancon, Terral J. |
| | | | Melancon, Timmy J. |
| | | | Melanson, Ozimea J III. |
| | | | Melerine, Angela. |
| | | | Melerine, Brandon T. |
| | | | Melerine, Claude A. |
| | | | Melerine, Claude A Jr. |
| | | | Melerine, Dean J. |
| | | | Melerine, Eric W Jr. |
| | | | Melerine, John D Sr. |
| | | | Melerine, Linda C. |
| | | | Melerine, Raymond Joseph. |
| | | | Melford, Daniel W Sr. |
| | | | Mello, Nelvin. |
| | | | Men, Sophin. |
| | | | Menendez, Wade E. |
| | | | Menesses, Dennis. |
| | | | Menesses, James H. |
| | | | Menesses, Jimmy. |
| | | | Menesses, Louis. |
| | | | Menge, Lionel A. |
| | | | Menge, Vincent J. |
| | | | Mercy, Dempsey. |
| | | | Merrick, Harold A. |
| | | | Merrick, Kevin Sr. |
| | | | Merritt, Darren Sr. |
| | | | Messer, Chase. |
| | | | Meyers, Otis J. |
| | | | Miarm, Soeum. |
| | | | Michel, Steven D. |
| | | | Middleton, Dan Sr. |
| | | | Migues, Henry. |
| | | | Migues, Kevin L Sr. |
| | | | Milam, Ricky. |
| | | | Miles, Ricky David. |
| | | | Miley, Donna J. |
| | | | Militello, Joseph. |
| | | | Miller, David W. |
| | | | Miller, Fletcher N. |
| | | | Miller, James A. |
| | | | Miller, Larry B. |
| | | | Miller, Mabry Allen Jr. |
| | | | Miller, Michael E. |
| | | | Miller, Michele K. |
| | | | Miller, Randy A. |
| | | | Miller, Rhonda E. |
| | | | Miller, Wayne. |
| | | | Millet, Leon B. |
| | | | Millington, Donnie. |
| | | | Millington, Ronnie. |
| | | | Millis, Moses. |
| | | | Millis, Raeford. |
| | | | Millis, Timmie Lee. |
| | | | Mine, Derrick. |
| | | | Miner, Peter G. |
| | | | Minh, Kha. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Minh, Phuc-Truong. |
| | | | Mitchell, Ricky Allen. |
| | | | Mitchell, Todd. |
| | | | Mitchum, Francis Craig. |
| | | | Mixon, G C. |
| | | | Mobley, Bryan A. |
| | | | Mobley, Jimmy Sr. |
| | | | Mobley, Robertson. |
| | | | Mock, Frank Sr. |
| | | | Mock, Frankie E Jr. |
| | | | Mock, Jesse R II. |
| | | | Mock, Terry Lyn. |
| | | | Molero, Louis F III. |
| | | | Molero, Louis Frank. |
| | | | Molinere, Al L. |
| | | | Molinere, Floyd. |
| | | | Molinere, Roland Jr. |
| | | | Molinere, Stacey. |
| | | | Moll, Angela. |
| | | | Moll, Jerry J Jr. |
| | | | Moll, Jonathan P. |
| | | | Moll, Julius J. |
| | | | Moll, Randall Jr. |
| | | | Mollere, Randall. |
| | | | Mones, Philip J Jr. |
| | | | Mones, Tino. |
| | | | Moody, Guy D. |
| | | | Moore, Carl Stephen. |
| | | | Moore, Curtis L. |
| | | | Moore, Kenneth. |
| | | | Moore, Richard. |
| | | | Moore, Willis. |
| | | | Morales, Anthony. |
| | | | Morales, Clinton A. |
| | | | Morales, Daniel Jr. |
| | | | Morales, Daniel Sr. |
| | | | Morales, David. |
| | | | Morales, Elwood J Jr. |
| | | | Morales, Eugene J Jr. |
| | | | Morales, Eugene J Sr. |
| | | | Morales, Kimberly. |
| | | | Morales, Leonard L. |
| | | | Morales, Phil J Jr. |
| | | | Morales, Raul. |
| | | | Moran, Scott. |
| | | | Moreau, Allen Joseph. |
| | | | Moreau, Berlin J Sr. |
| | | | Moreau, Daniel R. |
| | | | Moreau, Hubert J. |
| | | | Moreau, Mary. |
| | | | Moreau, Rickey J Sr. |
| | | | Morehead, Arthur B Jr. |
| | | | Moreno, Ansley. |
| | | | Morgan, Harold R. |
| | | | Morici, John. |
| | | | Morris, Herbert Eugene. |
| | | | Morris, Jesse A. |
| | | | Morris, Jesse A Sr. |
| | | | Morris, Preston. |
| | | | Morrison, Stephen D Jr. |
| | | | Morton, Robert A. |
| | | | Morvant, Keith M. |
| | | | Morvant, Patsy Lishman. |
| | | | Moschettieri, Chalam. |
| | | | Moseley, Kevin R. |
| | | | Motley, Michele. |
| | | | Mouille, William L. |
| | | | Mouton, Ashton J. |
| | | | Moveront, Timothy. |
| | | | Mund, Mark. |
| | | | Murphy, Denis R. |
| | | | Muth, Gary J Sr. |
| | | | Myers, Joseph E Jr. |
| | | | Na, Tran Van. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Naccio, Andrew. |
| | | | Nacio, Lance M. |
| | | | Nacio, Noel. |
| | | | Nacio, Philocles J Sr. |
| | | | Naquin, Alton J. |
| | | | Naquin, Andrew J Sr. |
| | | | Naquin, Antoine Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Autry James. |
| | | | Naquin, Bobby J and Sheila. |
| | | | Naquin, Bobby Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Christine. |
| | | | Naquin, Dean J. |
| | | | Naquin, Donna P. |
| | | | Naquin, Earl. |
| | | | Naquin, Earl L. |
| | | | Naquin, Freddie. |
| | | | Naquin, Gerald. |
| | | | Naquin, Henry. |
| | | | Naquin, Irvin J. |
| | | | Naquin, Jerry Joseph Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Kenneth J Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Kenneth J Sr. |
| | | | Naquin, Linda L. |
| | | | Naquin, Lionel A Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Mark D Jr. |
| | | | Naquin, Marty J Sr. |
| | | | Naquin, Milton H IV. |
| | | | Naquin, Oliver A. |
| | | | Naquin, Robert. |
| | | | Naquin, Roy A. |
| | | | Naquin, Vernon. |
| | | | Navarre, Curtis J. |
| | | | Navero, Floyd G Jr. |
| | | | Neal, Craig A. |
| | | | Neal, Roy J Jr. |
| | | | Neely, Bobby H. |
| | | | Nehlig, Raymond E Sr. |
| | | | Neil, Dean. |
| | | | Neil, Jacob. |
| | | | Neil, Julius. |
| | | | Neil, Robert J Jr. |
| | | | Neil, Tommy Sr. |
| | | | Nelson, Billy J Sr. |
| | | | Nelson, Deborah. |
| | | | Nelson, Elisha W. |
| | | | Nelson, Ernest R. |
| | | | Nelson, Faye. |
| | | | Nelson, Fred H Sr. |
| | | | Nelson, Gordon Kent Sr. |
| | | | Nelson, Gordon W III. |
| | | | Nelson, Gordon W Jr. |
| | | | Nelson, John Andrew. |
| | | | Nelson, William Owen Jr. |
| | | | Nelton, Aaron J Jr. |
| | | | Nelton, Steven J. |
| | | | Nettleton, Cody. |
| | | | Newell, Ronald B. |
| | | | Newsome, Thomas E. |
| | | | Newton, Paul J. |
| | | | Nghiem, Billy. |
| | | | Ngo, Chuong Van. |
| | | | Ngo, Duc. |
| | | | Ngo, Hung V. |
| | | | Ngo, Liem Thanh. |
| | | | Ngo, Maxie. |
| | | | Ngo, The T. |
| | | | Ngo, Truong Dinh. |
| | | | Ngo, Van Lo. |
| | | | Ngo, Vu Hoang. |
| | | | Ngoc, Lam Lam. |
| | | | Ngu,Thoi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Amy. |
| | | | Nguyen, An Hoang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Andy Dung. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nguyen, Andy T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Anh and Thanh D Tiet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ba. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ba Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bac Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bao Q. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bay Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Be. |
| | | | Nguyen, Be. |
| | | | Nguyen, Be. |
| | | | Nguyen, Be Em. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bich Thao. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bien V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh Cong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Binh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Bui Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ca Em. |
| | | | Nguyen, Can. |
| | | | Nguyen, Can Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Canh V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Charlie. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chien. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chien Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chin. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chinh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Christian. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chuc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chung Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chuong Hoang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chuong V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Chuyen. |
| | | | Nguyen, Coolly Dinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Cuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dan T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dan Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dan Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Danny. |
| | | | Nguyen, David. |
| | | | Nguyen, Day Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, De Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Den. |
| | | | Nguyen, Diem. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dien. |
| | | | Nguyen, Diep. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dinh V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dong T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dong Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dong X. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duc Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dung Anh and Xuan Duong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dung Ngoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dung Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Dung Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duong V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duong Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Duong Xuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Francis N. |
| | | | Nguyen, Frank. |
| | | | Nguyen, Gary. |
| | | | Nguyen, Giang T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Giang Truong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Giau Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ha T. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nguyen, Ha Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hai Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hai Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Han Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Han Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hanh T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hao Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Harry H. |
| | | | Nguyen, Henri Hiep. |
| | | | Nguyen, Henry-Trang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hien. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hien V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hiep. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ho. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ho V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoa. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoa. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoa N. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoa Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoang T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hoi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hon Xuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Huan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung M. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung Manh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hung-Joseph. |
| | | | Nguyen, Huu Nghia. |
| | | | Nguyen, Hy Don N. |
| | | | Nguyen, Jackie Tin. |
| | | | Nguyen, James. |
| | | | Nguyen, James N. |
| | | | Nguyen, Jefferson. |
| | | | Nguyen, Jennifer. |
| | | | Nguyen, Jimmy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Jimmy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Joachim. |
| | | | Nguyen, Joe. |
| | | | Nguyen, John R. |
| | | | Nguyen, John Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Johnny. |
| | | | Nguyen, Joseph Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kenny Hung Mong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kevin. |
| | | | Nguyen, Khai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Khanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Khanh and Viet Dinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Khanh Q. |
| | | | Nguyen, Khiem. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kien Phan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kim. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kim Mai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kim Thoa. |
| | | | Nguyen, Kinh V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lai Tan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lam. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lap Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lap Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Le. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nguyen, Lien and Hang Luong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lien Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Linda Oan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Linh Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Linh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lintt Danny. |
| | | | Nguyen, Lluu. |
| | | | Nguyen, Loc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Loi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Loi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Long Phi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Long T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Long Viet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Luom T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mai Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Man. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mao-Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mary. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mary. |
| | | | Nguyen, Melissa. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh Ngoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Minh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Moot. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mui Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Mung T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Muoi. |
| | | | Nguyen, My Le Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, My Tan. |
| | | | Nguyen, My V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nancy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nancy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nghi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nghi Q. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nghia. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nghiep. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ngoc Tim. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ngoc Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nguyet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nhi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nho Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nina. |
| | | | Nguyen, Nuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Peter. |
| | | | Nguyen, Peter Thang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Peter V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phe. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phong Ngoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phong T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phong Xuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phu Huu. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phuc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phuoc H. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phuoc Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Phuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quang Dang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quang Dinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quang Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quoc Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quyen Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quyen T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Quyen-Van. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nguyen, Ran T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Randon. |
| | | | Nguyen, Richard. |
| | | | Nguyen, Richard Nghia. |
| | | | Nguyen, Rick Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ricky Tinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Roe Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Rose. |
| | | | Nguyen, Sam. |
| | | | Nguyen, Sandy Ha. |
| | | | Nguyen, Sang Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Sau V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Si Ngoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Son. |
| | | | Nguyen, Son Thanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Son Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Song V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Steve. |
| | | | Nguyen, Steve Q. |
| | | | Nguyen, Steven Giap. |
| | | | Nguyen, Sung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tai. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tai The. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tai Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tam. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tam Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tam Thanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tam V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tam Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ten Tan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thach. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh Phuc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thao. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thi Bich Hang. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thiet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thiet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tho Duke. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thoa D. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thoa Thi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thomas. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thu. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thu and Rose. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thu Duc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thu Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuong Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuyen. |
| | | | Nguyen, Thuyen. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tinh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tinh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Toan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Toan Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tommy. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony D. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony Hong. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tony Si. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tra. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tra. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Nguyen, Tracy T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tri D. |
| | | | Nguyen, Trich Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Trung Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tu Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan A. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan H. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan Ngoc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan Q. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuan Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tung. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuyen Duc. |
| | | | Nguyen, Tuyen Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Ty and Ngoc Ngo. |
| | | | Nguyen, Van H. |
| | | | Nguyen, Van Loi. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vang Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Viet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Viet. |
| | | | Nguyen, Viet V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Viet Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vinh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vinh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vinh Van. |
| | | | Nguyen, VT. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vu Minh. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vu T. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vu Xuan. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vui. |
| | | | Nguyen, Vuong V. |
| | | | Nguyen, Xuong Kim. |
| | | | Nhan, Tran Quoc. |
| | | | Nhon, Seri. |
| | | | Nichols, Steve Anna. |
| | | | Nicholson, Gary. |
| | | | Nixon, Leonard. |
| | | | Noble, Earl. |
| | | | Noland, Terrel W. |
| | | | Normand, Timothy. |
| | | | Norris, Candace P. |
| | | | Norris, John A. |
| | | | Norris, Kenneth L. |
| | | | Norris, Kevin J. |
| | | | Nowell, James E. |
| | | | Noy, Phen. |
| | | | Nunez, Conrad. |
| | | | Nunez, Jody. |
| | | | Nunez, Joseph Paul. |
| | | | Nunez, Randy. |
| | | | Nunez, Wade Joseph. |
| | | | Nyuyen, Toan. |
| | | | Oberling, Darryl. |
| | | | O'Blance, Adam. |
| | | | O'Brien, Gary S. |
| | | | O'Brien, Mark. |
| | | | O'Brien, Michele. |
| | | | Ogden, John M. |
| | | | Oglesby, Henry. |
| | | | Oglesby, Phyllis. |
| | | | O'Gwynn, Michael P Sr. |
| | | | Ohmer, Eva G. |
| | | | Ohmer, George J. |
| | | | Olander, Hazel. |
| | | | Olander, Rodney. |
| | | | Olander, Roland J. |
| | | | Olander, Russell J. |
| | | | Olander, Thomas. |
| | | | Olano, Kevin. |
| | | | Olano, Owen J. |
| | | | Olano, Shelby F. |
| | | | Olds, Malcolm D Jr. |
| | | | Olinde, Wilfred J Jr. |
| | | | Oliver, Charles. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | O'Neil, Carey. |
| | | | Oracoy, Brad R. |
| | | | Orage, Eugene. |
| | | | Orlando, Het. |
| | | | Oteri, Robert F. |
| | | | Oubre, Faron P. |
| | | | Oubre, Thomas W. |
| | | | Ourks, SokHoms K. |
| | | | Owens, Larry E. |
| | | | Owens, Sheppard. |
| | | | Owens, Timothy. |
| | | | Pacaccio, Thomas Jr. |
| | | | Padgett, Kenneth J. |
| | | | Palmer, Gay Ann P. |
| | | | Palmer, John W. |
| | | | Palmer, Mack. |
| | | | Palmisano, Daniel P. |
| | | | Palmisano, Dwayne Jr. |
| | | | Palmisano, Kim. |
| | | | Palmisano, Larry J. |
| | | | Palmisano, Leroy J. |
| | | | Palmisano, Robin G. |
| | | | Pam, Phuong Bui. |
| | | | Parfait, Antoine C Jr. |
| | | | Parfait, Jerry Jr. |
| | | | Parfait, John C. |
| | | | Parfait, Joshua K. |
| | | | Parfait, Mary F. |
| | | | Parfait, Mary S. |
| | | | Parfait, Olden G Jr. |
| | | | Parfait, Robert C Jr. |
| | | | Parfait, Robert C Sr. |
| | | | Parfait, Rodney. |
| | | | Parfait, Shane A. |
| | | | Parfait, Shelton J. |
| | | | Parfait, Timmy J. |
| | | | Parker, Clyde A. |
| | | | Parker, Franklin L. |
| | | | Parker, Paul A. |
| | | | Parker, Percy Todd. |
| | | | Parks, Daniel Duane. |
| | | | Parks, Ellery Doyle Jr. |
| | | | Parrett, Joseph D Jr. |
| | | | Parria, Danny. |
| | | | Parria, Gavin C Sr. |
| | | | Parria, Gillis F Jr. |
| | | | Parria, Gillis F Sr. |
| | | | Parria, Jerry D. |
| | | | Parria, Kip G. |
| | | | Parria, Lionel J Sr. |
| | | | Parria, Louis III. |
| | | | Parria, Louis J Sr. |
| | | | Parria, Louis Jr. |
| | | | Parria, Michael. |
| | | | Parria, Ronald. |
| | | | Parria, Ross. |
| | | | Parria, Troy M. |
| | | | Parrish, Charles. |
| | | | Parrish, Walter L. |
| | | | Passmore, Penny. |
| | | | Pate, Shane. |
| | | | Paterbaugh, Richard. |
| | | | Patingo, Roger D. |
| | | | Paul, Robert Emmett. |
| | | | Payne, John Francis. |
| | | | Payne, Stuart. |
| | | | Peatross, David A. |
| | | | Pelas, James Curtis. |
| | | | Pelas, Jeffery. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Corey P. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Curlynn. |
| | | | Pellegrin, James A Jr. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Jordey. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Karl. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Pellegrin, Karl J. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Randy. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Randy Sr. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Rodney J Sr. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Samuel. |
| | | | Pellegrin, Troy Sr. |
| | | | Peltier, Clyde. |
| | | | Peltier, Rodney J. |
| | | | Pena, Bartolo Jr. |
| | | | Pena, Israel. |
| | | | Pendarvis, Gracie. |
| | | | Pennison, Elaine. |
| | | | Pennison, Milton G. |
| | | | Pequeno, Julius. |
| | | | Percle, David P. |
| | | | Perez, Allen M. |
| | | | Perez, David J. |
| | | | Perez, David P. |
| | | | Perez, Derek. |
| | | | Perez, Edward Jr. |
| | | | Perez, Henry Jr. |
| | | | Perez, Joe B. |
| | | | Perez, Tilden A Jr. |
| | | | Perez, Warren A Jr. |
| | | | Perez, Warren A Sr. |
| | | | Perez, Wesley. |
| | | | Perrin, Dale. |
| | | | Perrin, David M. |
| | | | Perrin, Edward G Sr. |
| | | | Perrin, Errol Joseph Jr. |
| | | | Perrin, Jerry J. |
| | | | Perrin, Kenneth V. |
| | | | Perrin, Kevin. |
| | | | Perrin, Kline J Sr. |
| | | | Perrin, Kurt M. |
| | | | Perrin, Michael. |
| | | | Perrin, Michael A. |
| | | | Perrin, Murphy P. |
| | | | Perrin, Nelson C Jr. |
| | | | Perrin, Pershing J Jr. |
| | | | Perrin, Robert. |
| | | | Perrin, Tim J. |
| | | | Perrin, Tony. |
| | | | Persohn, William T. |
| | | | Peshoff, Kirk Lynn. |
| | | | Pete, Alfred F Jr. |
| | | | Pete, Alfred F Sr. |
| | | | Pfleeger, William A. |
| | | | Pham, An V. |
| | | | Pham, Anh My. |
| | | | Pham, Bob. |
| | | | Pham, Cho. |
| | | | Pham, Cindy. |
| | | | Pham, David. |
| | | | Pham, Dung. |
| | | | Pham, Dung Phuoc. |
| | | | Pham, Dung Phuoc. |
| | | | Pham, Duong Van. |
| | | | Pham, Gai. |
| | | | Pham, Hai. |
| | | | Pham, Hai Hong. |
| | | | Pham, Hien. |
| | | | Pham, Hien C. |
| | | | Pham, Hiep. |
| | | | Pham, Hieu. |
| | | | Pham, Huan Van. |
| | | | Pham, Hung. |
| | | | Pham, Hung V. |
| | | | Pham, Hung V. |
| | | | Pham, Huynh. |
| | | | Pham, John. |
| | | | Pham, Johnny. |
| | | | Pham, Joseph S. |
| | | | Pham, Kannin. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Pham, Nga T. |
| | | | Pham, Nhung T. |
| | | | Pham, Osmond. |
| | | | Pham, Paul P. |
| | | | Pham, Phong-Thanh. |
| | | | Pham, Phung. |
| | | | Pham, Quoc V. |
| | | | Pham, Steve Ban. |
| | | | Pham, Steve V. |
| | | | Pham, Thai Van. |
| | | | Pham, Thai Van. |
| | | | Pham, Thanh. |
| | | | Pham, Thanh. |
| | | | Pham, Thanh V. |
| | | | Pham, Thinh. |
| | | | Pham, Thinh V. |
| | | | Pham, Tommy V. |
| | | | Pham, Tran and Thu Quang. |
| | | | Pham, Ut Van. |
| | | | Phan, Anh Thi. |
| | | | Phan, Banh Van. |
| | | | Phan, Cong Van. |
| | | | Phan, Dan T. |
| | | | Phan, Hoang. |
| | | | Phan, Hung Thanh. |
| | | | Phan, Johnny. |
| | | | Phan, Lam. |
| | | | Phan, Luyen Van. |
| | | | Phan, Nam V. |
| | | | Phan, Thong. |
| | | | Phan, Tien V. |
| | | | Phan, Toan. |
| | | | Phan, Tu Van. |
| | | | Phat, Lam Mau. |
| | | | Phelps, John D. |
| | | | Phillips, Bruce A. |
| | | | Phillips, Danny D. |
| | | | Phillips, Gary. |
| | | | Phillips, Harry Louis. |
| | | | Phillips, James C Jr. |
| | | | Phillips, Kristrina W. |
| | | | Phipps, AW. |
| | | | Phonthaasa, Khaolop. |
| | | | Phorn, Phen. |
| | | | Pickett, Kathy. |
| | | | Picou, Calvin Jr. |
| | | | Picou, Gary M. |
| | | | Picou, Jennifer. |
| | | | Picou, Jerome J. |
| | | | Picou, Jordan J. |
| | | | Picou, Randy John. |
| | | | Picou, Ricky Sr. |
| | | | Picou, Terry. |
| | | | Pierce, Aaron. |
| | | | Pierce, Dean. |
| | | | Pierce, Elwood. |
| | | | Pierce, Imogene. |
| | | | Pierce, Stanley. |
| | | | Pierce, Taffie Boone. |
| | | | Pierre, Ivy. |
| | | | Pierre, Joseph. |
| | | | Pierre, Joseph C Jr. |
| | | | Pierre, Paul J. |
| | | | Pierre, Ronald J. |
| | | | Pierron, Jake. |
| | | | Pierron, Patsy H. |
| | | | Pierron, Roger D. |
| | | | Pinell, Ernie A. |
| | | | Pinell, Harry J Jr. |
| | | | Pinell, Jody J. |
| | | | Pinell, Randall James. |
| | | | Pinnell, Richard J. |
| | | | Pinnell, Robert. |
| | | | Pitre, Benton J. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Pitre, Carol. |
| | | | Pitre, Claude A Sr. |
| | | | Pitre, Elrod. |
| | | | Pitre, Emily B. |
| | | | Pitre, Glenn P. |
| | | | Pitre, Herbert. |
| | | | Pitre, Jeannie. |
| | | | Pitre, Leo P. |
| | | | Pitre, Robert Jr. |
| | | | Pitre, Robin. |
| | | | Pitre, Ryan P. |
| | | | Pitre, Ted J. |
| | | | Pittman, Roger. |
| | | | Pizani, Bonnie. |
| | | | Pizani, Craig. |
| | | | Pizani, Jane. |
| | | | Pizani, Terrill J. |
| | | | Pizani, Terry M. |
| | | | Pizani, Terry M Jr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Arthur E. |
| | | | Plaisance, Burgess. |
| | | | Plaisance, Darren. |
| | | | Plaisance, Dean J Sr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Dorothy B. |
| | | | Plaisance, Dwayne. |
| | | | Plaisance, Earl J Jr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Errance H. |
| | | | Plaisance, Evans P. |
| | | | Plaisance, Eves A III. |
| | | | Plaisance, Gideons. |
| | | | Plaisance, Gillis S. |
| | | | Plaisance, Henry A Jr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Jacob. |
| | | | Plaisance, Jimmie J. |
| | | | Plaisance, Joyce. |
| | | | Plaisance, Keith. |
| | | | Plaisance, Ken G. |
| | | | Plaisance, Lawrence J. |
| | | | Plaisance, Lucien Jr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Peter A Sr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Peter Jr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Richard J. |
| | | | Plaisance, Russel P. |
| | | | Plaisance, Russell P Sr. |
| | | | Plaisance, Thomas. |
| | | | Plaisance, Thomas J. |
| | | | Plaisance, Wayne P. |
| | | | Plaisance, Whitney III. |
| | | | Plork, Phan. |
| | | | Poche, Glenn J Jr. |
| | | | Poche, Glenn J Sr. |
| | | | Pockrus, Gerald. |
| | | | Poiencot, Russell Jr. |
| | | | Poillion, Charles A. |
| | | | Polito, Gerald. |
| | | | Polkey, Gary J. |
| | | | Polkey, Richard R Jr. |
| | | | Polkey, Ronald. |
| | | | Polkey, Shawn Michael. |
| | | | Pollet, Lionel J Sr. |
| | | | Pomgoria, Mario. |
| | | | Ponce, Ben. |
| | | | Ponce, Lewis B. |
| | | | Poon, Raymond. |
| | | | Pope, Robert. |
| | | | Popham, Winford A. |
| | | | Poppell, David M. |
| | | | Porche, Ricky J. |
| | | | Portier, Bobby. |
| | | | Portier, Chad. |
| | | | Portier, Corinne L. |
| | | | Portier, Penelope J. |
| | | | Portier, Robbie. |
| | | | Portier, Russel A Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Portier, Russell. |
| | | | Potter, Hubert Edward Jr. |
| | | | Potter, Robert D. |
| | | | Potter, Robert J. |
| | | | Pounds, Terry Wayne. |
| | | | Powers, Clyde T. |
| | | | Prejean, Dennis J. |
| | | | Price, Carl. |
| | | | Price, Curtis. |
| | | | Price, Edwin J. |
| | | | Price, Franklin J. |
| | | | Price, George J Sr. |
| | | | Price, Norris J Sr. |
| | | | Price, Steve J Jr. |
| | | | Price, Timmy T. |
| | | | Price, Wade J. |
| | | | Price, Warren J. |
| | | | Prihoda, Steve. |
| | | | Primeaux, Scott. |
| | | | Pritchard, Dixie J. |
| | | | Pritchard, James Ross Jr. |
| | | | Prosperie, Claude J Jr. |
| | | | Prosperie, Myron. |
| | | | Prout, Rollen. |
| | | | Prout, Sharonski K. |
| | | | Prum, Thou. |
| | | | Pugh, Charles D Jr. |
| | | | Pugh, Charles Sr. |
| | | | Pugh, Cody. |
| | | | Pugh, Deanna. |
| | | | Pugh, Donald. |
| | | | Pugh, Nickolas. |
| | | | Punch, Alvin Jr. |
| | | | Punch, Donald J. |
| | | | Punch, Todd M. |
| | | | Punch, Travis J. |
| | | | Purata, Maria. |
| | | | Purse, Emil. |
| | | | Purvis, George. |
| | | | Quach, Duc. |
| | | | Quach, James D. |
| | | | Quach, Joe. |
| | | | Quach, Si Tan. |
| | | | Quinn, Dora M. |
| | | | Racca, Charles. |
| | | | Racine, Sylvan P Jr. |
| | | | Radulic, Igor. |
| | | | Ragas, Albert G. |
| | | | Ragas, Gene. |
| | | | Ragas, John D. |
| | | | Ragas, Jonathan. |
| | | | Ragas, Richard A. |
| | | | Ragas, Ronda S. |
| | | | Ralph, Lester B. |
| | | | Ramirez, Alfred J Jr. |
| | | | Randazzo, John A Jr. |
| | | | Randazzo, Rick A. |
| | | | Rando, Stanley D. |
| | | | Ranko, Ellis Gerald. |
| | | | Rapp, Dwayne. |
| | | | Rapp, Leroy and Sedonia. |
| | | | Rawlings, John H Sr. |
| | | | Rawlings, Ralph E. |
| | | | Rawls, Norman E. |
| | | | Ray, Leo. |
| | | | Ray, William C Jr. |
| | | | Raynor, Steven Earl. |
| | | | Readenour, Kelty O. |
| | | | Reagan, Roy. |
| | | | Reason, Patrick W. |
| | | | Reaux, Paul S Sr. |
| | | | Reaves, Craig A. |
| | | | Reaves, Laten. |
| | | | Rebert, Paul J Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Rebert, Steve M Jr. |
| | | | Rebstock, Charles. |
| | | | Recter, Lance Jr. |
| | | | Rector, Warren L. |
| | | | Redden, Yvonne. |
| | | | Regnier, Leoncea B. |
| | | | Remondet, Garland Jr. |
| | | | Renard, Lanny. |
| | | | Reno, Edward. |
| | | | Reno, George C. |
| | | | Reno, George H. |
| | | | Reno, George T. |
| | | | Reno, Harry. |
| | | | Revell, Ben David. |
| | | | Reyes, Carlton. |
| | | | Reyes, Dwight D Sr. |
| | | | Reynon, Marcello Jr. |
| | | | Rhodes, Randolph N. |
| | | | Rhoto, Christopher L. |
| | | | Ribardi, Frank A. |
| | | | Rich, Wanda Heafner. |
| | | | Richard, Bruce J. |
| | | | Richard, David L. |
| | | | Richard, Edgar J. |
| | | | Richard, James Ray. |
| | | | Richard, Melissa. |
| | | | Richard, Randall K. |
| | | | Richardson, James T. |
| | | | Richert, Daniel E. |
| | | | Richo, Earl Sr. |
| | | | Richoux, Dudley Donald Jr. |
| | | | Richoux, Irvin J Jr. |
| | | | Richoux, Judy. |
| | | | Richoux, Larry. |
| | | | Richoux, Mary A. |
| | | | Riego, Raymond A. |
| | | | Riffle, Josiah B. |
| | | | Rigaud, Randall Ryan. |
| | | | Riggs, Jeffrey B. |
| | | | Riley, Jackie Sr. |
| | | | Riley, Raymond. |
| | | | Rinkus, Anthony J III. |
| | | | Rios, Amado. |
| | | | Ripp, Norris M. |
| | | | Robbins, Tony. |
| | | | Robert, Dan S. |
| | | | Roberts, Michael A. |
| | | | Robertson, Kevin. |
| | | | Robeson, Richard S Jr. |
| | | | Robichaux, Craig J. |
| | | | Robin, Alvin G. |
| | | | Robin, Cary Joseph. |
| | | | Robin, Charles R III. |
| | | | Robin, Danny J. |
| | | | Robin, Donald. |
| | | | Robin, Floyd A. |
| | | | Robin, Kenneth J Sr. |
| | | | Robin, Ricky R. |
| | | | Robinson, Johnson P III. |
| | | | Robinson, Walter. |
| | | | Roccaforte, Clay. |
| | | | Rodi, Dominick R. |
| | | | Rodi, Rhonda. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Brent J. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Carrol Sr. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Glenn. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Lerlene. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Reggie Sr. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Sonya. |
| | | | Rodrigue, Wayne. |
| | | | Rodriguez, Barry. |
| | | | Rodriguez, Charles V Sr. |
| | | | Rodriguez, Gregory. |
| | | | Rodriguez, Jesus. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Rodriguez, Joseph C Jr. |
| | | | Roeum, Orn. |
| | | | Rogers, Barry David. |
| | | | Rogers, Chad. |
| | | | Rogers, Chad M. |
| | | | Rogers, Kevin J. |
| | | | Rogers, Nathan J. |
| | | | Rojas, Carlton J Sr. |
| | | | Rojas, Curtis Sr. |
| | | | Rojas, Dennis J Jr. |
| | | | Rojas, Dennis J Sr. |
| | | | Rojas, Gordon V. |
| | | | Rojas, Kerry D. |
| | | | Rojas, Kerry D Jr. |
| | | | Rojas, Randy J Sr. |
| | | | Rojas, Raymond J Jr. |
| | | | Roland, Brad. |
| | | | Roland, Mathias C. |
| | | | Roland, Vincent. |
| | | | Rollins, Theresa. |
| | | | Rollo, Wayne A. |
| | | | Rome, Victor J IV. |
| | | | Romero, D H. |
| | | | Romero, Kardel J. |
| | | | Romero, Norman. |
| | | | Romero, Philip J. |
| | | | Ronquille, Glenn. |
| | | | Ronquille, Norman C. |
| | | | Ronquillo, Earl. |
| | | | Ronquillo, Richard J. |
| | | | Ronquillo, Timothy. |
| | | | Roseburrough, Charles R Jr. |
| | | | Ross, Dorothy. |
| | | | Ross, Edward Danny Jr. |
| | | | Ross, Leo L. |
| | | | Ross, Robert A. |
| | | | Roth, Joseph F Jr. |
| | | | Roth, Joseph M Jr. |
| | | | Rotolo, Carolyn. |
| | | | Rotolo, Feliz. |
| | | | Rouse, Jimmy. |
| | | | Roussel, Michael D Jr. |
| | | | Roy, Henry Lee Jr. |
| | | | Rudolph, Chad A. |
| | | | Ruiz, Donald W. |
| | | | Ruiz, James L. |
| | | | Ruiz, Paul E. |
| | | | Ruiz, Paul R. |
| | | | Russell, Bentley R. |
| | | | Russell, Casey. |
| | | | Russell, Daniel. |
| | | | Russell, James III. |
| | | | Russell, Julie Ann. |
| | | | Russell, Michael J. |
| | | | Russell, Nicholas M. |
| | | | Russell, Paul. |
| | | | Rustick, Kenneth. |
| | | | Ruttley, Adrian K. |
| | | | Ruttley, Ernest T Jr. |
| | | | Ruttley, JT. |
| | | | Ryan, James C Sr. |
| | | | Rybiski, Rhebb R. |
| | | | Ryder, Luther V. |
| | | | Sadler, Stewart. |
| | | | Sagnes, Everett. |
| | | | Saha, Amanda K. |
| | | | Saling, Don M. |
| | | | Saltalamacchia, Preston J. |
| | | | Saltalamacchia, Sue A. |
| | | | Salvato, Lawrence Jr. |
| | | | Samanie, Caroll J. |
| | | | Samanie, Frank J. |
| | | | Samsome, Don. |
| | | | Sanamo, Troy P. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sanchez, Augustine. |
| | | | Sanchez, Jeffery A. |
| | | | Sanchez, Juan. |
| | | | Sanchez, Robert A. |
| | | | Sanders, William Shannon. |
| | | | Sandras, R J. |
| | | | Sandras, R J Jr. |
| | | | Sandrock, Roy R III. |
| | | | Santini, Lindberg W Jr. |
| | | | Santiny, James. |
| | | | Santiny, Patrick. |
| | | | Sapia, Carroll J Jr. |
| | | | Sapia, Eddie J Jr. |
| | | | Sapia, Willard. |
| | | | Saturday, Michael Rance. |
| | | | Sauce, Carlton Joseph. |
| | | | Sauce, Joseph C Jr. |
| | | | Saucier, Houston J. |
| | | | Sauls, Russell. |
| | | | Savage, Malcolm H. |
| | | | Savant, Raymond. |
| | | | Savoie, Allen. |
| | | | Savoie, Brent T. |
| | | | Savoie, James. |
| | | | Savoie, Merlin F Jr. |
| | | | Savoie, Reginald M II. |
| | | | Sawyer, Gerald. |
| | | | Sawyer, Rodney. |
| | | | Scarabin, Clifford. |
| | | | Scarabin, Michael J. |
| | | | Schaffer, Kelly. |
| | | | Schaubhut, Curry A. |
| | | | Schellinger, Lester B Jr. |
| | | | Schexnaydre, Michael. |
| | | | Schirmer, Robert Jr. |
| | | | Schjott, Joseph J Sr. |
| | | | Schlindwein, Henry. |
| | | | Schmit, Paul A Jr. |
| | | | Schmit, Paul A Sr. |
| | | | Schmit, Victor J Jr. |
| | | | Schouest, Ellis J III. |
| | | | Schouest, Ellis Jr. |
| | | | Schouest, Juston. |
| | | | Schouest, Mark. |
| | | | Schouest, Noel. |
| | | | Schrimpf, Robert H Jr. |
| | | | Schultz, Troy A. |
| | | | Schwartz, Sidney. |
| | | | Scott, Aaron J. |
| | | | Scott, Audie B. |
| | | | Scott, James E III. |
| | | | Scott, Milford P. |
| | | | Scott, Paul. |
| | | | Seabrook, Terry G. |
| | | | Seal, Charles T. |
| | | | Seal, Joseph G. |
| | | | Seaman, Garry. |
| | | | Seaman, Greg. |
| | | | Seaman, Ollie L Jr. |
| | | | Seaman, Ollie L Sr. |
| | | | Seang, Meng. |
| | | | Sehon, Robert Craig. |
| | | | Sekul, Morris G. |
| | | | Sekul, S George. |
| | | | Sellers, Isaac Charles. |
| | | | Seng, Sophan. |
| | | | Serigne, Adam R. |
| | | | Serigne, Elizabeth. |
| | | | Serigne, James J III. |
| | | | Serigne, Kimmie J. |
| | | | Serigne, Lisa M. |
| | | | Serigne, Neil. |
| | | | Serigne, O'Neil N. |
| | | | Serigne, Richard J Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Serigne, Rickey N. |
| | | | Serigne, Ronald Raymond. |
| | | | Serigne, Ronald Roch. |
| | | | Serigne, Ross. |
| | | | Serigny, Gail. |
| | | | Serigny, Wayne A. |
| | | | Serpas, Lenny Jr. |
| | | | Sessions, William O III. |
| | | | Sessions, William O Jr. |
| | | | Sevel, Michael D. |
| | | | Sevin, Carl Anthony. |
| | | | Sevin, Earline. |
| | | | Sevin, Janell A. |
| | | | Sevin, Joey. |
| | | | Sevin, Nac J. |
| | | | Sevin, O'Neil and Symantha. |
| | | | Sevin, Phillip T. |
| | | | Sevin, Shane. |
| | | | Sevin, Shane Anthony. |
| | | | Sevin, Stanley J. |
| | | | Sevin, Willis. |
| | | | Seymour, Janet A. |
| | | | Shackelford, David M. |
| | | | Shaffer, Curtis E. |
| | | | Shaffer, Glynnon D. |
| | | | Shay, Daniel A. |
| | | | Shilling, Jason. |
| | | | Shilling, L E. |
| | | | Shugars, Robert L. |
| | | | Shutt, Randy. |
| | | | Sifuentes, Esteban. |
| | | | Sifuentes, Fernando. |
| | | | Silver, Curtis A Jr. |
| | | | Simon, Curnis. |
| | | | Simon, John. |
| | | | Simon, Leo. |
| | | | Simpson, Mark. |
| | | | Sims, Donald L. |
| | | | Sims, Mike. |
| | | | Singley, Charlie Sr. |
| | | | Singley, Glenn. |
| | | | Singley, Robert Joseph. |
| | | | Sirgo, Jace. |
| | | | Sisung, Walter. |
| | | | Sisung, Walter Jr. |
| | | | Skinner, Gary M Sr. |
| | | | Skinner, Richard. |
| | | | Skipper, Malcolm W. |
| | | | Skrmetta, Martin J. |
| | | | Smelker, Brian H. |
| | | | Smith, Brian. |
| | | | Smith, Carl R Jr. |
| | | | Smith, Clark W. |
| | | | Smith, Danny. |
| | | | Smith, Danny M Jr. |
| | | | Smith, Donna. |
| | | | Smith, Elmer T Jr. |
| | | | Smith, Glenda F. |
| | | | Smith, James E. |
| | | | Smith, Margie T. |
| | | | Smith, Mark A. |
| | | | Smith, Nancy F. |
| | | | Smith, Raymond C Sr. |
| | | | Smith, Tim. |
| | | | Smith, Walter M Jr. |
| | | | Smith, William T. |
| | | | Smithwick, Ted Wayne. |
| | | | Smoak, Bill. |
| | | | Smoak, William W III. |
| | | | Snell, Erick. |
| | | | Snodgrass, Sam. |
| | | | Soeung, Phat. |
| | | | Soileau, John C Sr. |
| | | | Sok, Kheng. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sok, Montha. |
| | | | Sok, Nhip. |
| | | | Solet, Darren. |
| | | | Solet, Donald M. |
| | | | Solet, Joseph R. |
| | | | Solet, Raymond J. |
| | | | Solorzano, Marilyn. |
| | | | Son, Kim. |
| | | | Son, Sam Nang. |
| | | | Son, Samay. |
| | | | Son, Thuong Cong. |
| | | | Soprano, Daniel. |
| | | | Sork, William. |
| | | | Sou, Mang. |
| | | | Soudelier, Louis Jr. |
| | | | Soudelier, Shannon. |
| | | | Sour, Yem Kim. |
| | | | Southerland, Robert. |
| | | | Speir, Barbara Kay. |
| | | | Spell, Jeffrey B. |
| | | | Spell, Mark A. |
| | | | Spellmeyer, Joel F Sr. |
| | | | Spencer, Casey. |
| | | | Spiers, Donald A. |
| | | | Sprinkle, Avery M. |
| | | | Sprinkle, Emery Shelton Jr. |
| | | | Sprinkle, Joseph Warren. |
| | | | Squarsich, Kenneth J. |
| | | | Sreiy, Siphan. |
| | | | St Amant, Dana A. |
| | | | St Ann, Mr and Mrs Jerome K. |
| | | | St Pierre, Darren. |
| | | | St Pierre, Scott A. |
| | | | Staves, Patrick. |
| | | | Stechmann, Chad. |
| | | | Stechmann, Karl J. |
| | | | Stechmann, Todd. |
| | | | Steele, Arnold D Jr. |
| | | | Steele, Henry H III. |
| | | | Steen, Carl L. |
| | | | Steen, James D. |
| | | | Steen, Kathy G. |
| | | | Stein, Norris J Jr. |
| | | | Stelly, Adlar. |
| | | | Stelly, Carl A. |
| | | | Stelly, Chad P. |
| | | | Stelly, Delores. |
| | | | Stelly, Sandrus J Sr. |
| | | | Stelly, Sandrus Jr. |
| | | | Stelly, Toby J. |
| | | | Stelly, Veronica G. |
| | | | Stelly, Warren. |
| | | | Stephenson, Louis. |
| | | | Stevens, Alvin. |
| | | | Stevens, Curtis D. |
| | | | Stevens, Donald. |
| | | | Stevens, Glenda. |
| | | | Stewart, Chester Jr. |
| | | | Stewart, Derald. |
| | | | Stewart, Derek. |
| | | | Stewart, Fred. |
| | | | Stewart, Jason F. |
| | | | Stewart, Ronald G. |
| | | | Stewart, William C. |
| | | | Stiffler, Thanh. |
| | | | Stipelcovich, Lawrence L. |
| | | | Stipelcovich, Todd J. |
| | | | Stockfett, Brenda. |
| | | | Stokes, Todd. |
| | | | Stone-Rinkus, Pamela. |
| | | | Strader, Steven R. |
| | | | Strickland, Kenneth. |
| | | | Strickland, Rita G. |
| | | | Stuart, James Vernon. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stutes, Rex E.<br>Sulak, Billy W.<br>Sun, Hong Sreng.<br>Surmik, Donald D.<br>Swindell, Keith M.<br>Sylve, Dennis A.<br>Sylve, James L.<br>Sylve, Nathan.<br>Sylve, Scott.<br>Sylvesr, Paul A.<br>Ta, Ba Van.<br>Ta, Chris.<br>Tabb, Calvin.<br>Taliancich, Andrew.<br>Taliancich, Ivan.<br>Taliancich, Joseph M.<br>Taliancich, Srecka.<br>Tan, Ho Dung.<br>Tan, Hung.<br>Tan, Lan T.<br>Tan, Ngo The.<br>Tang, Thanh.<br>Tanner, Robert Charles.<br>Taravella, Raymond.<br>Tassin, Alton J.<br>Tassin, Keith P.<br>Tate, Archie P.<br>Tate, Terrell.<br>Tauzier, Kevin M.<br>Taylor, Doyle L.<br>Taylor, Herman R.<br>Taylor, Herman R Jr.<br>Taylor, J P Jr.<br>Taylor, John C.<br>Taylor, Leander J Sr.<br>Taylor, Leo Jr.<br>Taylor, Lewis.<br>Taylor, Nathan L.<br>Taylor, Robert L.<br>Taylor, Robert M.<br>Teap, Phal.<br>Tek, Heng.<br>Templat, Paul.<br>Terluin, John L III.<br>Terrebonne, Adrein Scott.<br>Terrebonne, Alphonse J.<br>Terrebonne, Alton S Jr.<br>Terrebonne, Alton S Sr.<br>Terrebonne, Carol.<br>Terrebonne, Carroll.<br>Terrebonne, Chad.<br>Terrebonne, Chad Sr.<br>Terrebonne, Daniel J.<br>Terrebonne, Donavon J.<br>Terrebonne, Gary J Sr.<br>Terrebonne, Jimmy Jr.<br>Terrebonne, Jimmy Sr.<br>Terrebonne, Kline A.<br>Terrebonne, Lanny.<br>Terrebonne, Larry F Jr.<br>Terrebonne, Scott.<br>Terrebonne, Steven.<br>Terrebonne, Steven.<br>Terrebonne, Toby J.<br>Terrel, Chad J Sr.<br>Terrell, C Todd.<br>Terrio, Brandon James.<br>Terrio, Harvey J Jr.<br>Terry, Eloise P.<br>Tesvich, Kuzma D.<br>Thac, Dang Van.<br>Thach, Phuong.<br>Thai, Huynh Tan.<br>Thai, Paul. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Thai, Thomas. |
| | | | Thanh, Thien. |
| | | | Tharpe, Jack. |
| | | | Theriot, Anthony. |
| | | | Theriot, Carroll A Jr. |
| | | | Theriot, Clay J Jr. |
| | | | Theriot, Craig A. |
| | | | Theriot, Dean P. |
| | | | Theriot, Donnie. |
| | | | Theriot, Jeffery C. |
| | | | Theriot, Larry J. |
| | | | Theriot, Lynn. |
| | | | Theriot, Mark A. |
| | | | Theriot, Roland P Jr. |
| | | | Theriot, Wanda J. |
| | | | Thibodaux, Jared. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Bart James. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Brian A. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Brian M. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Calvin A Jr. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Fay F. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Glenn P. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Jeffrey. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Jonathan. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Josephine. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Keith. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Tony J. |
| | | | Thibodeaux, Warren J. |
| | | | Thidobaux, James V Sr. |
| | | | Thiet, Tran. |
| | | | Thomas, Alvin. |
| | | | Thomas, Brent. |
| | | | Thomas, Dally S. |
| | | | Thomas, Janie G. |
| | | | Thomas, John Richard. |
| | | | Thomas, Kenneth Ward. |
| | | | Thomas, Monica P. |
| | | | Thomas, Ralph L Jr. |
| | | | Thomas, Ralph Lee Jr. |
| | | | Thomas, Randall. |
| | | | Thomas, Robert W. |
| | | | Thomas, Willard N Jr. |
| | | | Thomassie, Gerard. |
| | | | Thomassie, Nathan A. |
| | | | Thomassie, Philip A. |
| | | | Thomassie, Ronald J. |
| | | | Thomassie, Tracy Joseph. |
| | | | Thompson, Bobbie. |
| | | | Thompson, David W. |
| | | | Thompson, Edwin A. |
| | | | Thompson, George. |
| | | | Thompson, James D Jr. |
| | | | Thompson, James Jr. |
| | | | Thompson, John E. |
| | | | Thompson, John R. |
| | | | Thompson, Randall. |
| | | | Thompson, Sammy. |
| | | | Thompson, Shawn. |
| | | | Thong, R. |
| | | | Thonn, John J Jr. |
| | | | Thonn, Victor J. |
| | | | Thorpe, Robert Lee Jr. |
| | | | Thurman, Charles E. |
| | | | Tiet, Thanh Duc. |
| | | | Tilghman, Gene E. |
| | | | Tillett, Billy Carl. |
| | | | Tillman, Lewis A Jr. |
| | | | Tillman, Timothy P and Yvonne M. |
| | | | Tillotson, Pat. |
| | | | Tinney, Mark A. |
| | | | Tisdale, Georgia W. |
| | | | Tiser, Oscar. |
| | | | Tiser, Thomas C Jr. |
| | | | Tiser, Thomas C Sr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | To, Cang Van. |
| | | | To, Du Van. |
| | | | Todd, Fred Noel. |
| | | | Todd, Patricia J. |
| | | | Todd, Rebecca G. |
| | | | Todd, Robert C and Patricia J. |
| | | | Todd, Vonnie Frank Jr. |
| | | | Tompkins, Gerald Paul II. |
| | | | Toney, George Jr. |
| | | | Tong, Hai V. |
| | | | Tony, Linh C. |
| | | | Toomer, Christina Abbott. |
| | | | Toomer, Christy. |
| | | | Toomer, Frank G Jr. |
| | | | Toomer, Jeffrey E. |
| | | | Toomer, Kenneth. |
| | | | Toomer, Lamar K. |
| | | | Toomer, Larry Curtis and Tina. |
| | | | Toomer, William Kemp. |
| | | | Torrible, David P. |
| | | | Torrible, Jason. |
| | | | Touchard, Anthony H. |
| | | | Touchard, John B Jr. |
| | | | Touchard, Paul V Jr. |
| | | | Touchet, Eldridge III. |
| | | | Touchet, Eldridge Jr. |
| | | | Toups, Anthony G. |
| | | | Toups, Bryan. |
| | | | Toups, Jeff. |
| | | | Toups, Jimmie J. |
| | | | Toups, Kim. |
| | | | Toups, Manuel. |
| | | | Toups, Ted. |
| | | | Toups, Tommy. |
| | | | Toureau, James. |
| | | | Tower, H Melvin. |
| | | | Townsend, Harmon Lynn. |
| | | | Townsend, Marion Brooks. |
| | | | Tra, Hop T. |
| | | | Trabeau, James D. |
| | | | Trahan, Allen A Jr. |
| | | | Trahan, Alvin Jr. |
| | | | Trahan, Druby. |
| | | | Trahan, Dudley. |
| | | | Trahan, Elie J. |
| | | | Trahan, Eric J. |
| | | | Trahan, James. |
| | | | Trahan, Karen C. |
| | | | Trahan, Lynn P Sr. |
| | | | Trahan, Ricky. |
| | | | Trahan, Ronald J. |
| | | | Trahan, Tracey L. |
| | | | Trahan, Wayne Paul. |
| | | | Tran, Allen Hai. |
| | | | Tran, Andana. |
| | | | Tran, Anh. |
| | | | Tran, Anh. |
| | | | Tran, Anh N. |
| | | | Tran, Bay V. |
| | | | Tran, Bay Van. |
| | | | Tran, Binh. |
| | | | Tran, Binh Van. |
| | | | Tran, Ca Van. |
| | | | Tran, Cam Van. |
| | | | Tran, Chau V. |
| | | | Tran, Chau Van. |
| | | | Tran, Chau Van. |
| | | | Tran, Chi T. |
| | | | Tran, Christina Phuong. |
| | | | Tran, Chu V. |
| | | | Tran, Cuong. |
| | | | Tran, Cuong. |
| | | | Tran, Danny Duc. |
| | | | Tran, Den. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Tran, Dien. |
| | | | Tran, Dinh M. |
| | | | Tran, Dinh Q. |
| | | | Tran, Doan. |
| | | | Tran, Dung Van. |
| | | | Tran, Duoc. |
| | | | Tran, Duoc. |
| | | | Tran, Duong. |
| | | | Tran, Eric. |
| | | | Tran, Francis. |
| | | | Tran, Francis. |
| | | | Tran, Giang. |
| | | | Tran, Giao. |
| | | | Tran, Ha Mike. |
| | | | Tran, Hai. |
| | | | Tran, Hien H. |
| | | | Tran, Hiep Phuoc. |
| | | | Tran, Hieu. |
| | | | Tran, Hoa. |
| | | | Tran, Hoa. |
| | | | Tran, Hue T. |
| | | | Tran, Huey. |
| | | | Tran, Hung. |
| | | | Tran, Hung. |
| | | | Tran, Hung. |
| | | | Tran, Hung P. |
| | | | Tran, Hung Van. |
| | | | Tran, Hung Van. |
| | | | Tran, Hung Viet. |
| | | | Tran, James N. |
| | | | Tran, John. |
| | | | Tran, Johnny Dinh. |
| | | | Tran, Joseph. |
| | | | Tran, Joseph T. |
| | | | Tran, Khan Van. |
| | | | Tran, Khanh. |
| | | | Tran, Kim. |
| | | | Tran, Kim Chi Thi. |
| | | | Tran, Lan Tina. |
| | | | Tran, Le and Phat Le. |
| | | | Tran, Leo Van. |
| | | | Tran, Loan. |
| | | | Tran, Long. |
| | | | Tran, Long Van. |
| | | | Tran, Luu Van. |
| | | | Tran, Ly. |
| | | | Tran, Ly Van. |
| | | | Tran, Mai Thi. |
| | | | Tran, Mary. |
| | | | Tran, Miel Van. |
| | | | Tran, Mien. |
| | | | Tran, Mike. |
| | | | Tran, Mike Dai. |
| | | | Tran, Minh Huu. |
| | | | Tran, Muoi. |
| | | | Tran, My T. |
| | | | Tran, Nam Van. |
| | | | Tran, Nang Van. |
| | | | Tran, Nghia and T Le Banh. |
| | | | Tran, Ngoc. |
| | | | Tran, Nhanh Van. |
| | | | Tran, Nhieu T. |
| | | | Tran, Nhieu Van. |
| | | | Tran, Nho. |
| | | | Tran, Peter. |
| | | | Tran, Phu Van. |
| | | | Tran, Phuc D. |
| | | | Tran, Phuc V. |
| | | | Tran, Phung. |
| | | | Tran, Quan Van. |
| | | | Tran, Quang Quang. |
| | | | Tran, Quang T. |
| | | | Tran, Quang Van. |
| | | | Tran, Qui V. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Tran, Quy Van. |
| | | | Tran, Ran Van. |
| | | | Tran, Sarah T. |
| | | | Tran, Sau. |
| | | | Tran, Scotty. |
| | | | Tran, Son. |
| | | | Tran, Son Van. |
| | | | Tran, Steven Tuan. |
| | | | Tran, Tam. |
| | | | Tran, Te Van. |
| | | | Tran, Than. |
| | | | Tran, Thang Van. |
| | | | Tran, Thanh. |
| | | | Tran, Thanh. |
| | | | Tran, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Tran, Theresa. |
| | | | Tran, Thi. |
| | | | Tran, Thich Van. |
| | | | Tran, Thien. |
| | | | Tran, Thien Van. |
| | | | Tran, Thiet. |
| | | | Tran, Tommy. |
| | | | Tran, Tony. |
| | | | Tran, Tri. |
| | | | Tran, Trinh. |
| | | | Tran, Trung. |
| | | | Tran, Trung Van. |
| | | | Tran, Tu. |
| | | | Tran, Tuan. |
| | | | Tran, Tuan. |
| | | | Tran, Tuan Minh. |
| | | | Tran, Tuong Van. |
| | | | Tran, Tuyet Thi. |
| | | | Tran, Van T. |
| | | | Tran, Victor. |
| | | | Tran, Vinh. |
| | | | Tran, Vinh Q. |
| | | | Tran, Vinh Q. |
| | | | Tran, Vui Kim. |
| | | | Trang, Tan. |
| | | | Trapp, Tommy. |
| | | | Treadaway, Michael. |
| | | | Tregle, Curtis. |
| | | | Treloar, William Paul. |
| | | | Treuil, Gary J. |
| | | | Trevino, Manuel. |
| | | | Treybig, E H ''Buddy'' Jr. |
| | | | Triche, Donald G. |
| | | | Trieu, Hiep and Jackie. |
| | | | Trieu, Hung Hoa. |
| | | | Trieu, Jasmine and Ly. |
| | | | Trieu, Lorie and Tam. |
| | | | Trieu, Tam. |
| | | | Trinh, Christopher B. |
| | | | Trinh, Philip P. |
| | | | Trosclair, Clark K. |
| | | | Trosclair, Clark P. |
| | | | Trosclair, Eugene P. |
| | | | Trosclair, James J. |
| | | | Trosclair, Jerome. |
| | | | Trosclair, Joseph. |
| | | | Trosclair, Lori. |
| | | | Trosclair, Louis V. |
| | | | Trosclair, Patricia. |
| | | | Trosclair, Randy. |
| | | | Trosclair, Ricky. |
| | | | Trosclair, Wallace Sr. |
| | | | Truong, Andre. |
| | | | Truong, Andre V. |
| | | | Truong, Be Van. |
| | | | Truong, Benjamin. |
| | | | Truong, Dac. |
| | | | Truong, Huan. |
| | | | Truong, Kim. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Truong, Nhut Van. |
| | | | Truong, Steve. |
| | | | Truong, Tham T. |
| | | | Truong, Thanh Minh. |
| | | | Truong, Them Van. |
| | | | Truong, Thom. |
| | | | Truong, Timmy. |
| | | | Trutt, George W Sr. |
| | | | Trutt, Wanda. |
| | | | Turlich, Mervin A. |
| | | | Turner, Calvin L. |
| | | | Tyre, John. |
| | | | Upton, Terry R. |
| | | | Valentino, J G Jr. |
| | | | Valentino, James. |
| | | | Vallot, Christopher A. |
| | | | Vallot, Nancy H. |
| | | | Valure, Hugh P. |
| | | | Van Alsburg, Charles. |
| | | | Van Gordstnoven, Jean J. |
| | | | Van Nguyen, Irving. |
| | | | Van, Than. |
| | | | Van, Vui. |
| | | | Vanacor, Kathy D. |
| | | | Vanacor, Malcolm J Sr. |
| | | | Vanicor, Bobbie. |
| | | | VanMeter, Matthew T. |
| | | | VanMeter, William Earl. |
| | | | Varney, Randy L. |
| | | | Vath, Raymond S. |
| | | | Veasel, William E III. |
| | | | Vegas, Brien J. |
| | | | Vegas, Percy J. |
| | | | Vegas, Terry J. |
| | | | Vegas, Terry J Jr. |
| | | | Vegas, Terry Jr. |
| | | | Vela, Peter. |
| | | | Verdin, Aaron. |
| | | | Verdin, Av. |
| | | | Verdin, Bradley J. |
| | | | Verdin, Brent A. |
| | | | Verdin, Charles A. |
| | | | Verdin, Charles E. |
| | | | Verdin, Coy P. |
| | | | Verdin, Curtis A Jr. |
| | | | Verdin, Delphine. |
| | | | Verdin, Diana A. |
| | | | Verdin, Ebro W. |
| | | | Verdin, Eric P. |
| | | | Verdin, Ernest Joseph Sr. |
| | | | Verdin, Jeff C. |
| | | | Verdin, Jeffrey A. |
| | | | Verdin, Jessie J. |
| | | | Verdin, John P. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph A Jr. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph Cleveland. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph D Jr. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph S. |
| | | | Verdin, Joseph W Jr. |
| | | | Verdin, Justilien G. |
| | | | Verdin, Matthew W Sr. |
| | | | Verdin, Michel A. |
| | | | Verdin, Paul E. |
| | | | Verdin, Perry Anthony. |
| | | | Verdin, Rodney. |
| | | | Verdin, Rodney P. |
| | | | Verdin, Rodney P. |
| | | | Verdin, Skylar. |
| | | | Verdin, Timmy J. |
| | | | Verdin, Toby. |
| | | | Verdin, Tommy P. |
| | | | Verdin, Tony J. |
| | | | Verdin, Troy. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Verdin, Vincent. |
| | | | Verdin, Viness Jr. |
| | | | Verdin, Wallace P. |
| | | | Verdin, Webb A Sr. |
| | | | Verdin, Wesley D Sr. |
| | | | Verdine, Jimmy R. |
| | | | Vermeulen, Joseph Thomas. |
| | | | Verret, Darren L. |
| | | | Verret, Donald J. |
| | | | Verret, Ernest J Sr. |
| | | | Verret, James A. |
| | | | Verret, Jean E. |
| | | | Verret, Jimmy J Sr. |
| | | | Verret, Johnny R. |
| | | | Verret, Joseph L. |
| | | | Verret, Paul L. |
| | | | Verret, Preston. |
| | | | Verret, Quincy. |
| | | | Verret, Ronald Paul Sr. |
| | | | Versaggi, Joseph A. |
| | | | Versaggi, Salvatore J. |
| | | | Vicknair, Brent J Sr. |
| | | | Vicknair, Duane P. |
| | | | Vicknair, Henry Dale. |
| | | | Vicknair, Ricky A. |
| | | | Vidrine, Bill and Kathi. |
| | | | Vidrine, Corey. |
| | | | Vidrine, Richard. |
| | | | Vila, William F. |
| | | | Villers, Joseph A. |
| | | | Vincent, Gage Tyler. |
| | | | Vincent, Gene. |
| | | | Vincent, Gene B. |
| | | | Vincent, Robert N. |
| | | | Vise, Charles E III. |
| | | | Vizier, Barry A. |
| | | | Vizier, Christopher. |
| | | | Vizier, Clovis J III. |
| | | | Vizier, Douglas M. |
| | | | Vizier, Tommie Jr. |
| | | | Vo, Anh M. |
| | | | Vo, Chin Van. |
| | | | Vo, Dam. |
| | | | Vo, Dan M. |
| | | | Vo, Dany. |
| | | | Vo, Day V. |
| | | | Vo, Duong V. |
| | | | Vo, Dustin. |
| | | | Vo, Hai Van. |
| | | | Vo, Hanh Xuan. |
| | | | Vo, Hien Van. |
| | | | Vo, Hoang The. |
| | | | Vo, Hong. |
| | | | Vo, Hung Thanh. |
| | | | Vo, Huy K. |
| | | | Vo, Johnny. |
| | | | Vo, Kent. |
| | | | Vo, Lien Van. |
| | | | Vo, Man. |
| | | | Vo, Mark Van. |
| | | | Vo, Minh Hung. |
| | | | Vo, Minh Ngoc. |
| | | | Vo, Minh Ray. |
| | | | Vo, Mong V. |
| | | | Vo, My Dung Thi. |
| | | | Vo, My Lynn. |
| | | | Vo, Nga. |
| | | | Vo, Nhon Tai. |
| | | | Vo, Nhu Thanh. |
| | | | Vo, Quang Minh. |
| | | | Vo, Sang M. |
| | | | Vo, Sanh M. |
| | | | Vo, Song V. |
| | | | Vo, Tan Thanh. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Vo, Tan Thanh. |
| | | | Vo, Thanh Van. |
| | | | Vo, Thao. |
| | | | Vo, Thuan Van. |
| | | | Vo, Tien Van. |
| | | | Vo, Tom. |
| | | | Vo, Tong Ba. |
| | | | Vo, Trao Van. |
| | | | Vo, Truong. |
| | | | Vo, Van Van. |
| | | | Vo, Vi Viet. |
| | | | Vodopija, Benjamin S. |
| | | | Vogt, James L. |
| | | | Voisin, Eddie James. |
| | | | Voisin, Joyce. |
| | | | Voison, Jamie. |
| | | | Von Harten, Harold L. |
| | | | Vona, Michael A. |
| | | | Vongrith, Richard. |
| | | | Vossler, Kirk. |
| | | | Vu, Hung. |
| | | | Vu, John H. |
| | | | Vu, Khanh. |
| | | | Vu, Khoi Van. |
| | | | Vu, Quan Quoc. |
| | | | Vu, Ruyen Viet. |
| | | | Vu, Sac. |
| | | | Vu, Sean. |
| | | | Vu, Tam. |
| | | | Vu, Thiem Ngoc. |
| | | | Vu, Thuy. |
| | | | Vu, Tom. |
| | | | Vu, Tu Viet. |
| | | | Vu, Tuyen Jack. |
| | | | Vu, Tuyen Viet. |
| | | | Wade, Calvin J Jr. |
| | | | Wade, Gerard. |
| | | | Waguespack, David M Sr. |
| | | | Waguespack, Randy P II. |
| | | | Wainwright, Vernon. |
| | | | Walker, Jerry. |
| | | | Walker, Rogers H. |
| | | | Wallace, Dennis. |
| | | | Wallace, Edward. |
| | | | Wallace, John A. |
| | | | Wallace, John K. |
| | | | Wallace, Trevis L. |
| | | | Waller, Jack Jr. |
| | | | Waller, John M. |
| | | | Waller, Mike. |
| | | | Wallis, Craig A. |
| | | | Wallis, Keith. |
| | | | Walters, Samuel G. |
| | | | Walton, Marion M. |
| | | | Wannage, Edward Joseph. |
| | | | Wannage, Fred Jr. |
| | | | Wannage, Frederick W Sr. |
| | | | Ward, Clarence Jr. |
| | | | Ward, Olan B. |
| | | | Ward, Walter M. |
| | | | Washington, Clifford. |
| | | | Washington, John Emile III. |
| | | | Washington, Kevin. |
| | | | Washington, Louis N. |
| | | | Wattigney, Cecil K Jr. |
| | | | Wattigney, Michael. |
| | | | Watts, Brandon A. |
| | | | Watts, Warren. |
| | | | Webb, Bobby. |
| | | | Webb, Bobby N. |
| | | | Webb, Josie M. |
| | | | Webre, Donald. |
| | | | Webre, Dudley A. |
| | | | Webster, Harold. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Weeks, Don Franklin. |
| | | | Weems, Laddie E. |
| | | | Weinstein, Barry C. |
| | | | Weiskopf, Rodney. |
| | | | Weiskopf, Rodney Sr. |
| | | | Weiskopf, Todd. |
| | | | Welch, Amos J. |
| | | | Wells, Douglas E. |
| | | | Wells, Stephen Ray. |
| | | | Wendling, Steven W. |
| | | | Wescovich, Charles W. |
| | | | Wescovich, Wesley Darryl. |
| | | | Whatley, William J. |
| | | | White, Allen Sr. |
| | | | White, Charles. |
| | | | White, Charles Fulton. |
| | | | White, David L. |
| | | | White, Gary Farrell. |
| | | | White, James Hugh. |
| | | | White, Perry J. |
| | | | White, Raymond. |
| | | | White, Robert Sr. |
| | | | Wicher, John. |
| | | | Wiggins, Chad M Sr. |
| | | | Wiggins, Ernest. |
| | | | Wiggins, Harry L. |
| | | | Wiggins, Kenneth A. |
| | | | Wiggins, Matthew. |
| | | | Wilbur, Gerald Anthony. |
| | | | Wilcox, Robert. |
| | | | Wiles, Alfred Adam. |
| | | | Wiles, Glen Gilbert. |
| | | | Wiles, Sonny Joel Sr. |
| | | | Wilkerson, Gene Dillard and Judith. |
| | | | Wilkinson, William Riley. |
| | | | Williams, Allen Jr. |
| | | | Williams, Andrew. |
| | | | Williams, B Dean. |
| | | | Williams, Clyde L. |
| | | | Williams, Dale A. |
| | | | Williams, Emmett J. |
| | | | Williams, Herman J Jr. |
| | | | Williams, J T. |
| | | | Williams, John A. |
| | | | Williams, Johnny Paul. |
| | | | Williams, Joseph H. |
| | | | Williams, Kirk. |
| | | | Williams, Leopold A. |
| | | | Williams, Mark A. |
| | | | Williams, Mary Ann C. |
| | | | Williams, Melissa A. |
| | | | Williams, Nina. |
| | | | Williams, Oliver Kent. |
| | | | Williams, Parish. |
| | | | Williams, Roberto. |
| | | | Williams, Ronnie. |
| | | | Williams, Scott A. |
| | | | Williams, Steven. |
| | | | Williams, Thomas D. |
| | | | Williamson, Richard L Sr. |
| | | | Willyard, Derek C. |
| | | | Willyard, Donald R. |
| | | | Wilson, Alward. |
| | | | Wilson, Hosea. |
| | | | Wilson, Joe R. |
| | | | Wilson, Jonathan. |
| | | | Wilson, Katherine. |
| | | | Wiltz, Allen. |
| | | | Wing, Melvin. |
| | | | Wiseman, Allen. |
| | | | Wiseman, Clarence J Jr. |
| | | | Wiseman, Jean P. |
| | | | Wiseman, Joseph A. |
| | | | Wiseman, Michael T Jr. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Wiseman, Michael T Sr. |
| | | | Wolfe, Charles. |
| | | | Woods, John T III. |
| | | | Wright, Curtis. |
| | | | Wright, Leonard. |
| | | | Wright, Randy D. |
| | | | Yeamans, Douglas. |
| | | | Yeamans, Neil. |
| | | | Yeamans, Ronnie. |
| | | | Yoeuth, Peon. |
| | | | Yopp, Harold. |
| | | | Yopp, Jonathon. |
| | | | Yopp, Milton Thomas. |
| | | | Young, James. |
| | | | Young, Taing. |
| | | | Young, Willie. |
| | | | Yow, Patricia D. |
| | | | Yow, Richard C. |
| | | | Zanca, Anthony V Sr. |
| | | | Zar, Ashley A. |
| | | | Zar, Carl J. |
| | | | Zar, John III. |
| | | | Zar, Steve. |
| | | | Zar, Steven. |
| | | | Zar, Troy A. |
| | | | Zerinque, John S Jr. |
| | | | Zirlott, Curtis. |
| | | | Zirlott, Jason D. |
| | | | Zirlott, Jeremy. |
| | | | Zirlott, Kimberly. |
| | | | Zirlott, Milton. |
| | | | Zirlott, Perry. |
| | | | Zirlott, Rosa H. |
| | | | Zito, Brian C. |
| | | | Zuvich, Michael A Jr. |
| | | | Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee. |
| | | | Bryan Fishermens' Co-Op Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Shrimp Association. |
| | | | South Carolina Shrimpers Association. |
| | | | Vietnamese-American Commerical Fisherman's Union. |
| | | | 3–G Enterprize dba Griffin's Seafood. |
| | | | A & G Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | A & T Shrimping. |
| | | | A Ford Able Seafood. |
| | | | A J Horizon Inc. |
| | | | A&M Inc. |
| | | | A&R Shrimp Co. |
| | | | A&T Shrimping. |
| | | | AAH Inc. |
| | | | AC Christopher Sea Food Inc. |
| | | | Ace of Trade LLC. |
| | | | Adriana Corp. |
| | | | AJ Boats Inc. |
| | | | AJ Horizon Inc. |
| | | | AJ's Seafood. |
| | | | Alario Inc. |
| | | | Alcide J Adams Jr. |
| | | | Aldebaran Inc. |
| | | | Aldebran Inc. |
| | | | Alexander and Dola. |
| | | | Alfred Englade Inc. |
| | | | Alfred Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Allen Hai Tran dba Kien Giang. |
| | | | Al's Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Al's Shrimp Co LLC. |
| | | | Al's Shrimp Co LLC. |
| | | | Al's Whosale & Retail. |
| | | | Alton Cheeks. |
| | | | Amada Inc. |
| | | | Amber Waves. |
| | | | Amelia Isle. |
| | | | American Beauty. |
| | | | American Beauty Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | American Eagle Enterprise Inc. |
| | | | American Girl. |
| | | | American Seafood. |
| | | | Americana Shrimp. |
| | | | Amvina II. |
| | | | Amvina II. |
| | | | Amy D Inc. |
| | | | Amy's Seafood Mart. |
| | | | An Kit. |
| | | | Andy Boy. |
| | | | Andy's SFD. |
| | | | Angel Annie Inc. |
| | | | Angel Leigh. |
| | | | Angel Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Angela Marie Inc. |
| | | | Angela Marie Inc. |
| | | | Angelina Inc. |
| | | | Anna Grace LLC. |
| | | | Anna Grace LLC. |
| | | | Annie Thornton Inc. |
| | | | Annie Thornton Inc. |
| | | | Anthony Boy I. |
| | | | Anthony Boy I. |
| | | | Anthony Fillinich Sr. |
| | | | Apalachee Girl Inc. |
| | | | Aparicio Trawlers Inc dba Marcosa. |
| | | | Apple Jack Inc. |
| | | | Aquila Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Aquillard Seafood. |
| | | | Argo Marine. |
| | | | Arnold's Seafood. |
| | | | Arroya Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Art & Red Inc. |
| | | | Arthur Chisholm. |
| | | | A-Seafood Express. |
| | | | Ashley Deeb Inc. |
| | | | Ashley W 648675. |
| | | | Asian Gulf Corp. |
| | | | Atlantic. |
| | | | Atocha Troy A LeCompte Sr. |
| | | | Atwood Enterprises. |
| | | | B & B Boats Inc. |
| | | | B & B Seafood. |
| | | | B&J Seafood. |
| | | | BaBe Inc. |
| | | | Baby Ruth. |
| | | | Bailey, David B Sr—Bailey's Seafood. |
| | | | Bailey's Seafood of Cameron Inc. |
| | | | Bait Inc. |
| | | | Bait Inc. |
| | | | Baker Shrimp. |
| | | | Bama Love Inc. |
| | | | Bama Sea Products Inc. |
| | | | Bao Hung Inc. |
| | | | Bao Hung Inc. |
| | | | Bar Shrimp. |
| | | | Barbara Brooks Inc. |
| | | | Barbara Brooks Inc. |
| | | | Barisich Inc. |
| | | | Barisich Inc. |
| | | | Barnacle-Bill Inc. |
| | | | Barney's Bait & Seafood. |
| | | | Barrios Seafood. |
| | | | Bay Boy. |
| | | | Bay Islander Inc. |
| | | | Bay Sweeper Nets. |
| | | | Baye's Seafood 335654. |
| | | | Bayou Bounty Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Bayou Caddy Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Bayou Carlin Fisheries. |
| | | | Bayou Carlin Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Bayou Shrimp Processors Inc. |
| | | | BBC Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | BBS Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Beachcomber Inc. |
| | | | Beachcomber Inc. |
| | | | Bea's Corp. |
| | | | Beecher's Seafood. |
| | | | Believer Inc. |
| | | | Bennett's Seafood. |
| | | | Benny Alexie. |
| | | | Bergeron's Seafood. |
| | | | Bertileana Corp. |
| | | | Best Sea-Pack of Texas Inc. |
| | | | Beth Lomonte Inc. |
| | | | Beth Lomonte Inc. |
| | | | Betty B. |
| | | | Betty H Inc. |
| | | | Bety Inc. |
| | | | BF Millis & Sons Seafood. |
| | | | Big Daddy Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Big Grapes Inc. |
| | | | Big Kev. |
| | | | Big Oak Seafood. |
| | | | Big Oak Seafood. |
| | | | Big Oaks Seafood. |
| | | | Big Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | Billy J Foret—BJF Inc. |
| | | | Billy Sue Inc. |
| | | | Billy Sue Inc. |
| | | | Biloxi Freezing & Processing. |
| | | | Binh Duong. |
| | | | BJB LLC. |
| | | | Blain & Melissa Inc. |
| | | | Blanca Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Blanchard & Cheramie Inc. |
| | | | Blanchard Seafood. |
| | | | Blazing Sun Inc. |
| | | | Blazing Sun Inc. |
| | | | Blue Water Seafood. |
| | | | Bluewater Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Bluffton Oyster Co. |
| | | | Boat Josey Wales. |
| | | | Boat Josey Wales LLC. |
| | | | Boat Monica Kiff. |
| | | | Boat Warrior. |
| | | | Bob-Rey Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Bodden Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Bolillo Prieto Inc. |
| | | | Bon Secour Boats Inc. |
| | | | Bon Secour Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Bon Secur Boats Inc. |
| | | | Bonnie Lass Inc. |
| | | | Boone Seafood. |
| | | | Bosarge Boats. |
| | | | Bosarge Boats. |
| | | | Bosarge Boats Inc. |
| | | | Bottom Verification LLC. |
| | | | Bowers Shrimp. |
| | | | Bowers Shrimp Farm. |
| | | | Bowers Valley Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | Brad Friloux. |
| | | | Brad Nicole Seafood. |
| | | | Bradley John Inc. |
| | | | Bradley's Seafood Mkt. |
| | | | Brava Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Brenda Darlene Inc. |
| | | | Brett Anthony. |
| | | | Bridgeside Marina. |
| | | | Bridgeside Seafood. |
| | | | Bridget's Seafood Service Inc. |
| | | | Bridget's Seafood Service Inc. |
| | | | BRS Seafood. |
| | | | BRS Seafood. |
| | | | Bruce W Johnson Inc. |
| | | | Bubba Daniels Inc. |
| | | | Bubba Tower Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Buccaneer Shrimp Co. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Buchmer Inc. |
| | | | Buck & Peed Inc. |
| | | | Buddy Boy Inc. |
| | | | Buddy's Seafood. |
| | | | Bumble Bee Seafoods LLC. |
| | | | Bumble Bee Seafoods LLC. |
| | | | Bundy Seafood. |
| | | | Bundy's Seafood. |
| | | | Bunny's Shrimp. |
| | | | Burgbe Gump Seafood. |
| | | | Burnell Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Burnell Trawlers Inc/Mamacita/Swamp Irish. |
| | | | Buster Brown Inc. |
| | | | By You Seafood. |
| | | | C & R Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | CA Magwood Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Cajun Queen of LA LLC. |
| | | | Calcasien Point Bait N More Inc. |
| | | | Cam Ranh Bay. |
| | | | Camardelle's Seafood. |
| | | | Candy Inc. |
| | | | Cao Family Inc. |
| | | | Cap Robear. |
| | | | Cap'n Bozo Inc. |
| | | | Capn Jasper's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Capt Aaron. |
| | | | Capt Adam. |
| | | | Capt Anthony Inc. |
| | | | Capt Bean (Richard A Ragas). |
| | | | Capt Beb Inc. |
| | | | Capt Bill Jr Inc. |
| | | | Capt Brother Inc. |
| | | | Capt Bubba. |
| | | | Capt Buck. |
| | | | Capt Carl. |
| | | | Capt Carlos Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Capt Chance Inc. |
| | | | Capt Christopher Inc. |
| | | | Capt Chuckie. |
| | | | Capt Craig. |
| | | | Capt Craig Inc. |
| | | | Capt Crockett Inc. |
| | | | Capt Darren Hill Inc. |
| | | | Capt Dennis Inc. |
| | | | Capt Dickie Inc. |
| | | | Capt Dickie V Inc. |
| | | | Capt Doug. |
| | | | Capt Eddie Inc. |
| | | | Capt Edward Inc. |
| | | | Capt Eli's. |
| | | | Capt Elroy Inc. |
| | | | Capt Ernest LLC. |
| | | | Capt Ernest LLC. |
| | | | Capt GDA Inc. |
| | | | Capt George. |
| | | | Capt H & P Corp. |
| | | | Capt Havey Seafood. |
| | | | Capt Henry Seafood Dock. |
| | | | Capt Huy. |
| | | | Capt JDL Inc. |
| | | | Capt Jimmy Inc. |
| | | | Capt Joe. |
| | | | Capt Johnny II. |
| | | | Capt Jonathan. |
| | | | Capt Jonathan Inc. |
| | | | Capt Joshua Inc. |
| | | | Capt Jude 520556 13026. |
| | | | Capt Ken. |
| | | | Capt Kevin Inc. |
| | | | Capt Ko Inc. |
| | | | Capt Koung Lim. |
| | | | Capt Larry Seafood Market. |
| | | | Capt Larry's Inc. |
| | | | Capt LC Corp. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Capt LD Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Capt Linton Inc. |
| | | | Capt Mack Inc. |
| | | | Capt Marcus Inc. |
| | | | Capt Morris. |
| | | | Capt Opie. |
| | | | Capt P Inc. |
| | | | Capt Pappie Inc. |
| | | | Capt Pat. |
| | | | Capt Paw Paw. |
| | | | Capt Pete Inc. |
| | | | Capt Peter Long Inc. |
| | | | Capt Pool Bear II's Seafood. |
| | | | Capt Quang. |
| | | | Capt Quina Inc. |
| | | | Capt Richard. |
| | | | Capt Ross Inc. |
| | | | Capt Roy. |
| | | | Capt Russell Jr Inc. |
| | | | Capt Ryan Inc. |
| | | | Capt Ryan's. |
| | | | Capt Sam. |
| | | | Capt Sang. |
| | | | Capt Scar Inc. |
| | | | Capt Scott. |
| | | | Capt Scott 5. |
| | | | Capt Scott Seafood. |
| | | | Capt Sparkers Shrimp. |
| | | | Capt St Peter. |
| | | | Capt T&T Corp. |
| | | | Capt Thien. |
| | | | Capt Tommy Inc. |
| | | | Capt Two Inc. |
| | | | Capt Van's Seafood. |
| | | | Capt Walley Inc. |
| | | | Capt Zoe Inc. |
| | | | Captain Allen's Bait & Tackle. |
| | | | Captain Arnulfo Inc. |
| | | | Captain Blair Seafood. |
| | | | Captain Dexter Inc. |
| | | | Captain D's. |
| | | | Captain Homer Inc. |
| | | | Captain Jeff. |
| | | | Captain JH III Inc. |
| | | | Captain Joshua. |
| | | | Captain Larry'O. |
| | | | Captain Miss Cammy Nhung. |
| | | | Captain Regis. |
| | | | Captain Rick. |
| | | | Captain T/Thiet Nguyen. |
| | | | Captain Tony. |
| | | | Captain Truong Phi Corp. |
| | | | Captain Vinh. |
| | | | Cap't-Brandon. |
| | | | Captian Thomas Trawler Inc. |
| | | | Carlino Seafood. |
| | | | Carly Sue Inc. |
| | | | Carmelita Inc. |
| | | | Carolina Lady Inc. |
| | | | Carolina Sea Foods Inc. |
| | | | Caroline and Calandra Inc. |
| | | | Carson & Co. |
| | | | Carson & Co Inc. |
| | | | Cary Encalade Trawling. |
| | | | Castellano's Corp. |
| | | | Cathy Cheramie Inc. |
| | | | CBS Seafood & Catering LLC. |
| | | | CBS Seafood & Catering LLC. |
| | | | Cecilia Enterprise Inc. |
| | | | CF Gollot & Son Sfd Inc. |
| | | | CF Gollott and Son Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Chackbay Lady. |
| | | | Chad & Chaz LLC. |
| | | | Challenger Shrimp Co Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Chalmette Marine Supply Co Inc. |
| | | | Chalmette Net & Trawl. |
| | | | Chapa Shrimp Trawlers. |
| | | | Chaplin Seafood. |
| | | | Charlee Girl. |
| | | | Charles Guidry Inc. |
| | | | Charles Sellers. |
| | | | Charles White. |
| | | | Charlotte Maier Inc. |
| | | | Charlotte Maier Inc. |
| | | | Chef Seafood Ent LLC. |
| | | | Cheramies Landing. |
| | | | Cherry Pt Seafood. |
| | | | Cheryl Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Chez Francois Seafood. |
| | | | Chilling Pride Inc. |
| | | | Chin Nguyen Co. |
| | | | Chin Nguyen Co. |
| | | | Chinatown Seafood Co Inc. |
| | | | Chines Cajun Net Shop. |
| | | | Chris Hansen Seafood. |
| | | | Christian G Inc. |
| | | | Christina Leigh Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Christina Leigh Shrimp Company Inc. |
| | | | Christina Leigh Shrimp Company Inc. |
| | | | Cieutat Trawlers. |
| | | | Cinco de Mayo Inc. |
| | | | Cindy Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Cindy Mae Inc. |
| | | | City Market Inc. |
| | | | CJ Seafood. |
| | | | CJs Seafood. |
| | | | Clifford Washington. |
| | | | Clinton Hayes—C&S Enterprises of Brandon Inc. |
| | | | Cochran's Boat Yard. |
| | | | Colorado River Seafood. |
| | | | Colson Marine. |
| | | | Comm Fishing. |
| | | | Commercial Fishing Service CFS Seafoods. |
| | | | Cong Son. |
| | | | Cong-An Inc. |
| | | | Country Girl Inc. |
| | | | Country Inc. |
| | | | Courtney & Ory Inc. |
| | | | Cowdrey Fish. |
| | | | Cptn David. |
| | | | Crab-Man Bait Shop. |
| | | | Craig A Wallis, Keith Wallis dba W&W Dock & 10 boats. |
| | | | Cristina Seafood. |
| | | | CRJ Inc. |
| | | | Cruillas Inc. |
| | | | Crusader Inc. |
| | | | Crustacean Frustration. |
| | | | Crystal Gayle Inc. |
| | | | Crystal Light Inc. |
| | | | Crystal Light Inc. |
| | | | Curtis Henderson. |
| | | | Custom Pack Inc. |
| | | | Custom Pack Inc. |
| | | | Cyril's Ice House & Supplies. |
| | | | D & A Seafood. |
| | | | D & C Seafood Inc. |
| | | | D & J Shrimping LLC. |
| | | | D & M Seafood & Rental LLC. |
| | | | D Ditcharo Jr Seafoods. |
| | | | D G & R C Inc. |
| | | | D S L & R Inc. |
| | | | D&T Marine Inc. |
| | | | Daddys Boys. |
| | | | DaHa Inc/Cat'Sass. |
| | | | DAHAPA Inc. |
| | | | Dale's Seafood Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Dang Nguyen. |
| | | | Daniel E Lane. |
| | | | Danny Boy Inc. |
| | | | Danny Max. |
| | | | David & Danny Inc. |
| | | | David C Donnelly. |
| | | | David Daniels. |
| | | | David Ellison Jr. |
| | | | David Gollott Sfd Inc. |
| | | | David W Casanova's Seafood. |
| | | | David White. |
| | | | David's Shrimping Co. |
| | | | Davis Seafood. |
| | | | Davis Seafood. |
| | | | Davis Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Dawn Marie. |
| | | | Deana Cheramie Inc. |
| | | | Deanna Lea. |
| | | | Dean's Seafood. |
| | | | Deau Nook. |
| | | | Debbe Anne Inc. |
| | | | Deep Sea Foods Inc/Jubilee Foods Inc. |
| | | | Delcambre Seafood. |
| | | | Dell Marine Inc. |
| | | | Dennis Menesses Seafood. |
| | | | Dennis' Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Dennis Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Desperado. |
| | | | DFS Inc. |
| | | | Diamond Reef Seafood. |
| | | | Diem Inc. |
| | | | Dinh Nguyen. |
| | | | Dixie General Store LLC. |
| | | | Dixie Twister. |
| | | | Dominick's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Don Paco Inc. |
| | | | Donald F Boone II. |
| | | | Dong Nguyen. |
| | | | Donini Seafoods Inc. |
| | | | Donna Marie. |
| | | | Donovan Tien I & II. |
| | | | Dopson Seafood. |
| | | | Dorada Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Double Do Inc. |
| | | | Double Do Inc. |
| | | | Doug and Neil Inc. |
| | | | Douglas Landing. |
| | | | Doxey's Oyster & Shrimp. |
| | | | Dragnet II. |
| | | | Dragnet Inc. |
| | | | Dragnet Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Dubberly's Mobile Seafood. |
| | | | Dudenhefer Seafood. |
| | | | Dugas Shrimp Co LLC. |
| | | | Dunamis Towing Inc. |
| | | | Dupree's Seafood. |
| | | | Duval & Duval Inc. |
| | | | Dwayne's Dream Inc. |
| | | | E & M Seafood. |
| | | | E & T Boating. |
| | | | E Gardner McClellan. |
| | | | E&E Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | East Coast Seafood. |
| | | | East Coast Seafood. |
| | | | East Coast Seafood. |
| | | | East Coast Seafood. |
| | | | Edisto Queen LLC. |
| | | | Edward Garcia Trawlers. |
| | | | EKV Inc. |
| | | | El Pedro Fishing & Trading Co Inc. |
| | | | Eliminator Inc. |
| | | | Elizabeth Nguyen. |
| | | | Ellerbee Seafoods. |
| | | | Ellie May. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Elmira Pflueckhahn Inc. |
| | | | Elmira Pflueckhahn Inc. |
| | | | Elvira G Inc. |
| | | | Emily's SFD. |
| | | | Emmanuel Inc. |
| | | | Ensenada Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Enterprise. |
| | | | Enterprise Inc. |
| | | | Equalizer Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Eric F Dufrene Jr LLC. |
| | | | Erica Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Erickson & Jensen Seafood Packers. |
| | | | Ethan G Inc. |
| | | | Excalibur LLC. |
| | | | F/V Apalachee Warrior. |
| | | | F/V Atlantis I. |
| | | | F/V Capt Walter B. |
| | | | F/V Captain Andy. |
| | | | F/V Eight Flags. |
| | | | F/V Mary Ann. |
| | | | F/V Miss Betty. |
| | | | F/V Morning Star. |
| | | | F/V Nam Linh. |
| | | | F/V Olivia B. |
| | | | F/V Phuoc Thanh Mai II. |
| | | | F/V Sea Dolphin. |
| | | | F/V Southern Grace. |
| | | | F/V Steven Mai. |
| | | | F/V Steven Mai II. |
| | | | Famer Boys Catfish Kitchens. |
| | | | Family Thing. |
| | | | Father Dan Inc. |
| | | | Father Lasimir Inc. |
| | | | Father Mike Inc. |
| | | | Fiesta Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Fine Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Fire Fox Inc. |
| | | | Fisherman's Reef Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Fishermen IX Inc. |
| | | | Fishing Vessel Enterprise Inc. |
| | | | Five Princesses Inc. |
| | | | FKM Inc. |
| | | | Fleet Products Inc. |
| | | | Flower Shrimp House. |
| | | | Flowers Seafood Co. |
| | | | Floyd's Wholesale Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Fly By Night Inc. |
| | | | Forest Billiot Jr. |
| | | | Fortune Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | FP Oubre. |
| | | | Francis Brothers Inc. |
| | | | Francis Brothers Inc. |
| | | | Francis III. |
| | | | Frank Toomer Jr. |
| | | | Fran-Tastic Too. |
| | | | Frederick-Dan. |
| | | | Freedom Fishing Inc. |
| | | | Freeman Seafood. |
| | | | Frelich Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Frenchie D–282226. |
| | | | Fripp Point Seafood. |
| | | | G & L Trawling Inc. |
| | | | G & O Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | G & O Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | G & S Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | G D Ventures II Inc. |
| | | | G G Seafood. |
| | | | G R LeBlanc Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Gail's Bait Shop. |
| | | | Gale Force Inc. |
| | | | Gambler Inc. |
| | | | Gambler Inc. |
| | | | Garijak Inc. |
| | | | Gary F White. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Gator's Seafood. |
| | | | Gay Fish Co. |
| | | | Gay Fish Co. |
| | | | GeeChee Fresh Seafood. |
| | | | Gemita Inc. |
| | | | Gene P Callahan Inc. |
| | | | George J Price Sr Ent Inc. |
| | | | Georgia Shrimp Co LLC. |
| | | | Gerica Marine. |
| | | | Gilden Enterprises. |
| | | | Gillikin Marine Railways Inc. |
| | | | Gina K Inc. |
| | | | Gisco Inc. |
| | | | Gisco Inc. |
| | | | Glenda Guidry Inc. |
| | | | Gloria Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Go Fish Inc. |
| | | | God's Gift. |
| | | | God's Gift Shrimp Vessel. |
| | | | Gogie. |
| | | | Gold Coast Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Golden Gulf Coast Pkg Co Inc. |
| | | | Golden Phase Inc. |
| | | | Golden Text Inc. |
| | | | Golden Text Inc. |
| | | | Golden Text Inc. |
| | | | Goldenstar. |
| | | | Gollott Brothers Sfd Co Inc. |
| | | | Gollott's Oil Dock & Ice House Inc. |
| | | | Gonzalez Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Gore Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Gore Enterprizes Inc. |
| | | | Gore Seafood Co. |
| | | | Gore Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Gove Lopez. |
| | | | Graham Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Graham Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Graham Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Gramps Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Grandma Inc. |
| | | | Grandpa's Dream. |
| | | | Grandpa's Dream. |
| | | | Granny's Garden and Seafood. |
| | | | Green Flash LLC. |
| | | | Greg Inc. |
| | | | Gregory Mark Gaubert. |
| | | | Gregory Mark Gaubert. |
| | | | Gregory T Boone. |
| | | | Gros Tete Trucking Inc. |
| | | | Guidry's Bait Shop. |
| | | | Guidry's Net Shop. |
| | | | Gulf Central Seaood Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Crown Seafood Co Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Fish Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Island Shrimp & Seafood II LLC. |
| | | | Gulf King Services Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Pride Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Seaway Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Shrimp. |
| | | | Gulf South Inc. |
| | | | Gulf Stream Marina LLC. |
| | | | Gulf Sweeper Inc (Trawler Gulf Sweeper). |
| | | | Gypsy Girl Inc. |
| | | | H & L Seafood. |
| | | | Hack Berry Seafood. |
| | | | Hagen & Miley Inc. |
| | | | Hailey Marie Inc. |
| | | | Hanh Lai Inc. |
| | | | Hannah Joyce Inc. |
| | | | Hardy Trawlers. |
| | | | Hardy Trawlers. |
| | | | Harrington Fish Co Inc. |
| | | | Harrington Seafood & Supply Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Harrington Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Harrington Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Harris Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Hazel's Hustler. |
| | | | HCP LLC. |
| | | | Heather Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Heavy Metal Inc. |
| | | | Hebert Investments Inc. |
| | | | Hebert's Mini Mart LLC. |
| | | | Helen E Inc. |
| | | | Helen Kay Inc. |
| | | | Helen Kay Inc. |
| | | | Helen W Smith Inc. |
| | | | Henderson Seafood. |
| | | | Henry Daniels Inc. |
| | | | Hermosa Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Hi Seas of Dulac Inc. |
| | | | Hien Le Van Inc. |
| | | | High Hope Inc. |
| | | | Hoang Anh. |
| | | | Hoang Long I, II. |
| | | | Holland Enterprises. |
| | | | Holly Beach Seafood. |
| | | | Holly Marie's Seafood Market. |
| | | | Hombre Inc. |
| | | | Home Loving Care Co. |
| | | | Hondumex Ent Inc. |
| | | | Hong Nga Inc. |
| | | | Hongri Inc. |
| | | | Houston Foret Seafood. |
| | | | Howerin Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | HTH Marine Inc. |
| | | | Hubbard Seafood. |
| | | | Hurricane Emily Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Hutcherson Christian Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | Huyen Inc. |
| | | | Icy Seafood II Inc. |
| | | | ICY Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Icy Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Ida's Seafood Rest & Market. |
| | | | Ike & Zack Inc. |
| | | | Independent Fish Company Inc. |
| | | | Inflation Inc. |
| | | | Integrity Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Integrity Fishing Inc. |
| | | | International Oceanic Ent. |
| | | | Interstate Vo LLC. |
| | | | Intracoastal Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Iorn Will Inc. |
| | | | Irma Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Iron Horse Inc. |
| | | | Isabel Maier Inc. |
| | | | Isabel Maier Inc. |
| | | | Isla Cruz Inc. |
| | | | J & J Rentals Inc. |
| | | | J & J Trawler's Inc. |
| | | | J & R Seafood. |
| | | | J Collins Trawlers. |
| | | | J D Land Co. |
| | | | Jackie & Hiep Trieu. |
| | | | Jacob A Inc. |
| | | | Jacquelin Marie Inc. |
| | | | Jacquelin Marie Inc. |
| | | | James D Quach Inc. |
| | | | James E Scott III. |
| | | | James F Dubberly. |
| | | | James Gadson. |
| | | | James J Matherne Jr. |
| | | | James J Matherne Sr. |
| | | | James Kenneth Lewis Sr. |
| | | | James LaRive Jr. |
| | | | James W Green Jr dba Miss Emilie Ann. |
| | | | James W Hicks. |
| | | | Janet Louise Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Jani Marie. |
| | | | JAS Inc. |
| | | | JBS Packing Co Inc. |
| | | | JBS Packing Inc. |
| | | | JCM. |
| | | | Jean's Bait. |
| | | | Jeff Chancey. |
| | | | Jemison Trawler's Inc. |
| | | | Jenna Dawn LLC. |
| | | | Jennifer Nguyen—Capt T. |
| | | | Jensen Seafood Pkg Co Inc. |
| | | | Jesse LeCompte Jr. |
| | | | Jesse LeCompte Sr. |
| | | | Jesse Shantelle Inc. |
| | | | Jessica Ann Inc. |
| | | | Jessica Inc. |
| | | | Jesus G Inc. |
| | | | Jimmy and Valerie Bonvillain. |
| | | | Jimmy Le Inc. |
| | | | Jim's Cajen Shrimp. |
| | | | Joan of Arc Inc. |
| | | | JoAnn and Michael W Daigle. |
| | | | Jody Martin. |
| | | | Joe Quach. |
| | | | Joel's Wild Oak Bait Shop & Fresh Seafood. |
| | | | John A Norris. |
| | | | John J Alexie. |
| | | | John Michael E Inc. |
| | | | John V Alexie. |
| | | | Johnny & Joyce's Seafood. |
| | | | Johnny O Co. |
| | | | Johnny's Seafood. |
| | | | John's Seafood. |
| | | | Joker's Wild. |
| | | | Jones—Kain Inc. |
| | | | Joni John Inc (Leon J Champagne). |
| | | | Jon's C Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Joseph Anthony. |
| | | | Joseph Anthony Inc. |
| | | | Joseph Garcia. |
| | | | Joseph Martino. |
| | | | Joseph Martino Corp. |
| | | | Joseph T Vermeulen. |
| | | | Josh & Jake Inc. |
| | | | Joya Cruz Inc. |
| | | | JP Fisheries. |
| | | | Julie Ann LLC. |
| | | | Julie Hoang. |
| | | | Julie Shrimp Co Inc (Trawler Julie). |
| | | | Julio Gonzalez Boat Builders Inc. |
| | | | Justin Dang. |
| | | | JW Enterprise. |
| | | | K & J Trawlers. |
| | | | K&D Boat Company. |
| | | | K&S Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Kalliainen Seafoods Inc. |
| | | | KAM Fishing. |
| | | | Kandi Sue Inc. |
| | | | Karl M Belsome LLC. |
| | | | KBL Corp. |
| | | | KDH Inc. |
| | | | Keith M Swindell. |
| | | | Kellum's Seafood. |
| | | | Kellum's Seafood. |
| | | | Kelly Marie Inc. |
| | | | Ken Lee's Dock LLC. |
| | | | Kenneth Guidry. |
| | | | Kenny-Nancy Inc. |
| | | | Kentucky Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Kentucky Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Kevin & Bryan (M/V). |
| | | | Kevin Dang. |
| | | | Khang Dang. |
| | | | Khanh Huu Vu. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Kheng Sok Shrimping. |
| | | | Kim & James Inc. |
| | | | Kim Hai II Inc. |
| | | | Kim Hai Inc. |
| | | | Kim's Seafood. |
| | | | Kingdom World Inc. |
| | | | Kirby Seafood. |
| | | | Klein Express. |
| | | | KMB Inc. |
| | | | Knight's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Knight's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Knowles Noel Camardelle. |
| | | | Kramer's Bait Co. |
| | | | Kris & Cody Inc. |
| | | | KTC Fishery LLC. |
| | | | L & M. |
| | | | L & N Friendship Corp. |
| | | | L & O Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | L & T Inc. |
| | | | L&M. |
| | | | LA—3184 CA. |
| | | | La Belle Idee. |
| | | | La Macarela Inc. |
| | | | La Pachita Inc. |
| | | | LA–6327–CA. |
| | | | LaBauve Inc. |
| | | | LaBauve Inc. |
| | | | Lade Melissa Inc. |
| | | | Lady Agnes II. |
| | | | Lady Agnes III. |
| | | | Lady Amelia Inc. |
| | | | Lady Anna I. |
| | | | Lady Anna II. |
| | | | Lady Barbara Inc. |
| | | | Lady Carolyn Inc. |
| | | | Lady Catherine. |
| | | | Lady Chancery Inc. |
| | | | Lady Chelsea Inc. |
| | | | Lady Danielle. |
| | | | Lady Debra Inc. |
| | | | Lady Dolcina Inc. |
| | | | Lady Gail Inc. |
| | | | Lady Katherine Inc. |
| | | | Lady Kelly Inc. |
| | | | Lady Kelly Inc. |
| | | | Lady Kristie. |
| | | | Lady Lavang LLC. |
| | | | Lady Liberty Seafood Co. |
| | | | Lady Lynn Ltd. |
| | | | Lady Marie Inc. |
| | | | Lady Melissa Inc. |
| | | | Lady Shelly. |
| | | | Lady Shelly. |
| | | | Lady Snow Inc. |
| | | | Lady Stephanie. |
| | | | Lady Susie Inc. |
| | | | Lady T Kim Inc. |
| | | | Lady TheLna. |
| | | | Lady Toni Inc. |
| | | | Lady Veronica. |
| | | | Lafitte Frozen Foods Corp. |
| | | | Lafont Inc. |
| | | | Lafourche Clipper Inc. |
| | | | Lafourche Clipper Inc. |
| | | | Lamarah Sue Inc. |
| | | | Lan Chi Inc. |
| | | | Lan Chi Inc. |
| | | | Lancero Inc. |
| | | | Lanny Renard and Daniel Bourque. |
| | | | Lapeyrouse Seafood Bar Groc Inc. |
| | | | Larry G Kellum Sr. |
| | | | Larry Scott Freeman. |
| | | | Larry W Hicks. |
| | | | Lasseigne & Sons Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Laura Lee. |
| | | | Lauren O. |
| | | | Lawrence Jacobs Sfd. |
| | | | Lazaretta Packing Inc. |
| | | | Le & Le Inc. |
| | | | Le Family Inc. |
| | | | Le Family Inc. |
| | | | Le Tra Inc. |
| | | | Leek & Millington Trawler Privateeer. |
| | | | Lee's Sales & Distribution. |
| | | | Leonard Shrimp Producers Inc. |
| | | | Leoncea B Regnier. |
| | | | Lerin Lane. |
| | | | Li Johnson. |
| | | | Liar Liar. |
| | | | Libertad Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Liberty I. |
| | | | Lighthouse Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Lil Aly. |
| | | | Lil Arthur Inc. |
| | | | Lil BJ LLC. |
| | | | Lil Robbie Inc. |
| | | | Lil Robbie Inc. |
| | | | Lil Robin. |
| | | | Lil Robin. |
| | | | Lilla. |
| | | | Lincoln. |
| | | | Linda & Tot Inc. |
| | | | Linda Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Linda Hoang Shrimp. |
| | | | Linda Lou Boat Corp. |
| | | | Linda Lou Boat Corp. |
| | | | Lisa Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Lisa Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Little Andrew Inc. |
| | | | Little Andy Inc. |
| | | | Little Arthur. |
| | | | Little David Gulf Trawler Inc. |
| | | | Little Ernie Gulf Trawler Inc. |
| | | | Little Ken Inc. |
| | | | Little Mark. |
| | | | Little William Inc. |
| | | | Little World. |
| | | | LJL Inc. |
| | | | Long Viet Nguyen. |
| | | | Longwater Seafood dba Ryan H Longwater. |
| | | | Louisiana Gulf Shrimp LLC. |
| | | | Louisiana Lady Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Man. |
| | | | Louisiana Newpack Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Pride Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Pride Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Seafood Dist LLC. |
| | | | Louisiana Shrimp & Packing Inc. |
| | | | Louisiana Shrimp and Packing Co Inc. |
| | | | Lovely Daddy II & III. |
| | | | Lovely Jennie. |
| | | | Low Country Lady (Randolph N Rhodes). |
| | | | Low County Lady. |
| | | | Luchador Inc. |
| | | | Lucky. |
| | | | Lucky I. |
| | | | Lucky Jack Inc. |
| | | | Lucky Lady. |
| | | | Lucky Lady II. |
| | | | Lucky Leven Inc. |
| | | | Lucky MV. |
| | | | Lucky Ocean. |
| | | | Lucky Sea Star Inc. |
| | | | Lucky Star. |
| | | | Lucky World. |
| | | | Lucky's Seafood Market & Poboys LLC. |
| | | | Luco Drew's. |
| | | | Luisa Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lupe Martinez Inc. |
| | | | LV Marine Inc. |
| | | | LW Graham Inc. |
| | | | Lyle LeCompte. |
| | | | Lynda Riley Inc. |
| | | | Lynda Riley Inc. |
| | | | M & M Seafood. |
| | | | M V Sherry D. |
| | | | M V Tony Inc. |
| | | | M&C Fisheries. |
| | | | M/V Baby Doll. |
| | | | M/V Chevo's Bitch. |
| | | | M/V Lil Vicki. |
| | | | M/V Loco-N Motion. |
| | | | M/V Patsy K #556871. |
| | | | M/V X L. |
| | | | Mabry Allen Miller Jr. |
| | | | Mad Max Seafood. |
| | | | Madera Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Madison Seafood. |
| | | | Madlin Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Malibu. |
| | | | Malolo LLC. |
| | | | Mamacita Inc. |
| | | | Man Van Nguyen. |
| | | | Manteo Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Marco Corp. |
| | | | Marcos A. |
| | | | Maria Elena Inc. |
| | | | Maria Sandi. |
| | | | Mariachi Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Mariah Jade Shrimp Company. |
| | | | Marie Teresa Inc. |
| | | | Marine Fisheries. |
| | | | Marisa Elida Inc. |
| | | | Mark and Jace. |
| | | | Marleann. |
| | | | Martin's Fresh Shrimp. |
| | | | Mary Bea Inc. |
| | | | Master Brandon Inc. |
| | | | Master Brock. |
| | | | Master Brock. |
| | | | Master Dylan. |
| | | | Master Gerald Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Master Hai. |
| | | | Master Hai II. |
| | | | Master Henry. |
| | | | Master Jared Inc. |
| | | | Master Jhy Inc. |
| | | | Master John Inc. |
| | | | Master Justin Inc. |
| | | | Master Justin Inc. |
| | | | Master Ken Inc. |
| | | | Master Kevin Inc. |
| | | | Master Martin Inc. |
| | | | Master Mike Inc. |
| | | | Master NT Inc. |
| | | | Master Pee-Wee. |
| | | | Master Ronald Inc. |
| | | | Master Scott. |
| | | | Master Scott II. |
| | | | Master Seelos Inc. |
| | | | Master T. |
| | | | Master Tai LLC. |
| | | | Master Tai LLC. |
| | | | Mat Roland Seafood Co. |
| | | | Maw Doo. |
| | | | Mayflower. |
| | | | McQuaig Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Me Kong. |
| | | | Melerine Seafood. |
| | | | Melody Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Mer Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | Michael Lynn. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Michael Nguyen. |
| | | | Michael Saturday's Fresh Every Day South Carolina Shrimp. |
| | | | Mickey Nelson Net Shop. |
| | | | Mickey's Net. |
| | | | Midnight Prowler. |
| | | | Mike's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Miley's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Militello and Son Inc. |
| | | | Miller & Son Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Miller Fishing. |
| | | | Milliken & Son's. |
| | | | Milton J Dufrene and Son Inc. |
| | | | Milton Yopp—Capt'n Nathan & Thomas Winfield. |
| | | | Minh & Liem Doan. |
| | | | Mis Quynh Chi II. |
| | | | Miss Adrianna Inc. |
| | | | Miss Alice Inc. |
| | | | Miss Ann Inc. |
| | | | Miss Ann Inc. |
| | | | Miss Ashleigh. |
| | | | Miss Ashleigh Inc. |
| | | | Miss Barbara. |
| | | | Miss Barbara Inc. |
| | | | Miss Bernadette A Inc. |
| | | | Miss Bertha (M/V). |
| | | | Miss Beverly Kay. |
| | | | Miss Brenda. |
| | | | Miss Candace. |
| | | | Miss Candace Nicole Inc. |
| | | | Miss Carla Jean Inc. |
| | | | Miss Caroline Inc. |
| | | | Miss Carolyn Louise Inc. |
| | | | Miss Caylee. |
| | | | Miss Charlotte Inc. |
| | | | Miss Christine III. |
| | | | Miss Cleda Jo Inc. |
| | | | Miss Courtney Inc. |
| | | | Miss Courtney Inc. |
| | | | Miss Cynthia. |
| | | | Miss Danielle Gulf Trawler Inc. |
| | | | Miss Danielle LLC. |
| | | | Miss Dawn. |
| | | | Miss Ellie Inc. |
| | | | Miss Faye LLC. |
| | | | Miss Fina Inc. |
| | | | Miss Georgia Inc. |
| | | | Miss Hannah. |
| | | | Miss Hannah Inc. |
| | | | Miss Hazel Inc. |
| | | | Miss Hilary Inc. |
| | | | Miss Jennifer Inc. |
| | | | Miss Joanna Inc. |
| | | | Miss Julia. |
| | | | Miss Kandy Tran LLC. |
| | | | Miss Kandy Tran LLC. |
| | | | Miss Karen. |
| | | | Miss Kathi Inc. |
| | | | Miss Kathy. |
| | | | Miss Kaylyn LLC. |
| | | | Miss Khayla. |
| | | | Miss Lil. |
| | | | Miss Lillie Inc. |
| | | | Miss Liz Inc. |
| | | | Miss Loraine. |
| | | | Miss Loraine Inc. |
| | | | Miss Lori Dawn IV Inc. |
| | | | Miss Lori Dawn V Inc. |
| | | | Miss Lori Dawn VI Inc. |
| | | | Miss Lori Dawn VII Inc. |
| | | | Miss Lorie Inc. |
| | | | Miss Luana D Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Miss Luana D Shrimp Co. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Miss Madeline Inc. |
| | | | Miss Madison. |
| | | | Miss Marie. |
| | | | Miss Marie Inc. |
| | | | Miss Marilyn Louis Inc. |
| | | | Miss Marilyn Louise. |
| | | | Miss Marilyn Louise Inc. |
| | | | Miss Marissa Inc. |
| | | | Miss Martha Inc. |
| | | | Miss Martha Inc. |
| | | | Miss Mary T. |
| | | | Miss Myle. |
| | | | Miss Narla. |
| | | | Miss Nicole. |
| | | | Miss Nicole Inc. |
| | | | Miss Plum Inc. |
| | | | Miss Quynh Anh I. |
| | | | Miss Quynh Anh I LLC. |
| | | | Miss Quynh Anh II LLC. |
| | | | Miss Redemption LLC. |
| | | | Miss Rhianna Inc. |
| | | | Miss Sambath. |
| | | | Miss Sandra II. |
| | | | Miss Sara Ann. |
| | | | Miss Savannah. |
| | | | Miss Savannah II. |
| | | | Miss Soriya. |
| | | | Miss Suzanne. |
| | | | Miss Sylvia. |
| | | | Miss Than. |
| | | | Miss Thom. |
| | | | Miss Thom Inc. |
| | | | Miss Tina Inc. |
| | | | Miss Trinh Trinh. |
| | | | Miss Trisha Inc. |
| | | | Miss Trisha Inc. |
| | | | Miss Verna Inc. |
| | | | Miss Vicki. |
| | | | Miss Victoria Inc. |
| | | | Miss Vivian Inc. |
| | | | Miss WillaDean. |
| | | | Miss Winnie Inc. |
| | | | Miss Yvette Inc. |
| | | | Miss Yvonne. |
| | | | Misty Morn Eat. |
| | | | Misty Star. |
| | | | MJM Seafood Inc. |
| | | | M'M Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Mom & Dad Inc. |
| | | | Mona-Dianne Seafood. |
| | | | Montha Sok and Tan No Le. |
| | | | Moon River Inc. |
| | | | Moon Tillett Fish Co Inc. |
| | | | Moonlight. |
| | | | Moonlight Mfg. |
| | | | Moore Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Morgan Creek Seafood. |
| | | | Morgan Rae Inc. |
| | | | Morning Star. |
| | | | Morrison Seafood. |
| | | | Mother Cabrini. |
| | | | Mother Teresa Inc. |
| | | | Mr & Mrs Inc. |
| | | | Mr & Mrs Inc. |
| | | | Mr Coolly. |
| | | | Mr Fox. |
| | | | Mr Fox. |
| | | | Mr G. |
| | | | Mr Gaget LLC. |
| | | | Mr Henry. |
| | | | Mr Natural Inc. |
| | | | Mr Neil. |
| | | | Mr Phil T Inc. |
| | | | Mr Sea Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Mr Verdin Inc. |
| | | | Mr Williams. |
| | | | Mrs Judy Too. |
| | | | Mrs Tina Lan Inc. |
| | | | Ms Alva Inc. |
| | | | Ms An. |
| | | | My Angel II. |
| | | | My Blues. |
| | | | My Dad Whitney Inc. |
| | | | My Girls LLC. |
| | | | My Thi Tran Inc. |
| | | | My Three Sons Inc. |
| | | | My V Le Inc. |
| | | | My-Le Thi Nguyen. |
| | | | Myron A Smith Inc. |
| | | | Nancy Joy. |
| | | | Nancy Joy Inc. |
| | | | Nancy Joy Inc. |
| | | | Nanny Granny Inc. |
| | | | Nanny Kat Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Napolean Seafoods. |
| | | | Napoleon II. |
| | | | Napoleon Seafood. |
| | | | Napoleon SF. |
| | | | Naquin's Seafood. |
| | | | Nautilus LLC. |
| | | | Nelma Y Lane. |
| | | | Nelson and Son. |
| | | | Nelson Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Nelson's Quality Shrimp Company. |
| | | | Nevgulmarco Co Inc. |
| | | | New Deal Comm Fishing. |
| | | | New Way Inc. |
| | | | Nguyen Day Van. |
| | | | Nguyen Express. |
| | | | Nguyen Int'l Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Nguyen Shipping Inc. |
| | | | NHU UYEN. |
| | | | Night Moves of Cut Off Inc. |
| | | | Night Shift LLC. |
| | | | Night Star. |
| | | | North Point Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | North Point Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Nuestra Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Nunez Seafood. |
| | | | Oasis. |
| | | | Ocean Bird Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Breeze Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Breeze Inc. |
| | | | Ocean City Corp. |
| | | | Ocean Emperor Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Harvest Wholesale Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Pride Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Seafood. |
| | | | Ocean Select Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Ocean Springs Seafood Market Inc. |
| | | | Ocean Wind Inc. |
| | | | Oceanica Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Odin LLC. |
| | | | Old Maw Inc. |
| | | | Ole Holbrook's Fresh Fish Market LLC. |
| | | | Ole Nelle. |
| | | | One Stop Bait & Ice. |
| | | | Open Sea Inc. |
| | | | Orage Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Orn Roeum Shrimping. |
| | | | Otis Cantrelle Jr. |
| | | | Otis M Lee Jr. |
| | | | Owens Shrimping. |
| | | | Palmetto Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Papa Rod Inc. |
| | | | Papa T. |
| | | | Pappy Inc. |
| | | | Pappy's Gold. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Parfait Enterprises Inc.<br>Paris/Asia.<br>Parramore Inc.<br>Parrish Shrimping Inc.<br>Pascagoula Ice & Freezer Co Inc.<br>Pat-Lin Enterprises Inc.<br>Patricia Foret.<br>Patrick Sutton Inc.<br>Patty Trish Inc.<br>Paul Piazza and Son Inc.<br>Paw Paw Allen.<br>Paw Paw Pride Inc.<br>Pearl Inc dba Indian Ridge Shrimp Co.<br>Pei Gratia Inc.<br>Pelican Point Seafood Inc.<br>Penny V LLC.<br>Perlita Inc.<br>Perseverance I LLC.<br>Pete & Queenie Inc.<br>Phat Le and Le Tran.<br>Phi Long Inc.<br>Phi-Ho LLC.<br>Pip's Place Marina Inc.<br>Plaisance Trawlers Inc.<br>Plata Cruz Inc.<br>Poc-Tal Trawlers Inc.<br>Pointe-Aux-Chene Marina.<br>Pontchautrain Blue Crab.<br>Pony Express.<br>Poppee.<br>Poppy's Pride Seafood.<br>Port Bolivar Fisheries Inc.<br>Port Marine Supplies.<br>Port Royal Seafood Inc.<br>Poteet Seafood Co Inc.<br>Potter Boats Inc.<br>Price Seafood Inc.<br>Prince of Tides.<br>Princess Ashley Inc.<br>Princess Celine Inc.<br>Princess Cindy Inc.<br>Princess Lorie LLC.<br>Princess Mary Inc.<br>Prosperity.<br>PT Fisheries Inc.<br>Punch's Seafood Mkt.<br>Purata Trawlers Inc.<br>Pursuer Inc.<br>Quality Seafood.<br>Quang Minh II Inc.<br>Queen Lily Inc.<br>Queen Mary.<br>Queen Mary Inc.<br>Quinta Cruz Inc.<br>Quoc Bao Inc.<br>Quynh NHU Inc.<br>Quynh Nhu Inc.<br>R & J Inc.<br>R & K Fisheries LLC.<br>R & L Shrimp Inc.<br>R & P Fisheries.<br>R & R Bait/Seafood.<br>R & S Shrimping.<br>R & T Atocha LLC.<br>R&D Seafood.<br>R&K Fisheries LLC.<br>R&R Seafood.<br>RA Lesso Brokerage Co Inc.<br>RA Lesso Seafood Co Inc.<br>Rachel-Jade.<br>Ralph Lee Thomas Jr.<br>Ralph W Jones.<br>Ramblin Man Inc.<br>Ranchero Trawlers Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Randall J Pinell Inc. |
| | | | Randall J Pinell Inc. |
| | | | Randall K and Melissa B Richard. |
| | | | Randall Pinell. |
| | | | Randy Boy Inc. |
| | | | Randy Boy Inc. |
| | | | Rang Dong. |
| | | | Raul L Castellanos. |
| | | | Raul's Seafood. |
| | | | Raul's Seafood. |
| | | | Rayda Cheramie Inc. |
| | | | Raymond LeBouef. |
| | | | RCP Seafood I II III. |
| | | | RDR Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | Reagan's Seafood. |
| | | | Rebecca Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Rebel Seafood. |
| | | | Regulus. |
| | | | Rejimi Inc. |
| | | | Reno's Sea Food. |
| | | | Res Vessel. |
| | | | Reyes Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Rick's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Ricky B LLC. |
| | | | Ricky G Inc. |
| | | | Riffle Seafood. |
| | | | Rigolets Bait & Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Riverside Bait & Tackle. |
| | | | RJ's. |
| | | | Roatex Ent Inc. |
| | | | Robanie C Inc. |
| | | | Robanie C Inc. |
| | | | Robanie C Inc. |
| | | | Robert E Landry. |
| | | | Robert H Schrimpf. |
| | | | Robert Johnson. |
| | | | Robert Keenan Seafood. |
| | | | Robert Upton or Terry Upton. |
| | | | Robert White Seafood. |
| | | | Rockin Robbin Fishing Boat Inc. |
| | | | Rodney Hereford Jr. |
| | | | Rodney Hereford Sr. |
| | | | Rodney Hereford Sr. |
| | | | Roger Blanchard Inc. |
| | | | Rolling On Inc. |
| | | | Romo Inc. |
| | | | Ronald Louis Anderson Jr. |
| | | | Rosa Marie Inc. |
| | | | Rose Island Seafood. |
| | | | RPM Enterprises LLC. |
| | | | Rubi Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Ruf-N-Redy Inc. |
| | | | Rutley Boys Inc. |
| | | | Sadie D Seafood. |
| | | | Safe Harbour Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Salina Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Sally Kim III. |
| | | | Sally Kim IV. |
| | | | Sam Snodgrass & Co. |
| | | | Samaira Inc. |
| | | | San Dia. |
| | | | Sand Dollar Inc. |
| | | | Sandy N. |
| | | | Sandy O Inc. |
| | | | Santa Fe Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Santa Maria I Inc. |
| | | | Santa Maria II. |
| | | | Santa Monica Inc. |
| | | | Scavanger. |
| | | | Scooby Inc. |
| | | | Scooby Inc. |
| | | | Scottie and Juliette Dufrene. |
| | | | Scottie and Juliette Dufrene. |
| | | | Sea Angel. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sea Angel Inc. |
| | | | Sea Bastion Inc. |
| | | | Sea Drifter Inc. |
| | | | Sea Durbin Inc. |
| | | | Sea Eagle. |
| | | | Sea Eagle Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Sea Frontier Inc. |
| | | | Sea Gold Inc. |
| | | | Sea Gulf Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Sea Gypsy Inc. |
| | | | Sea Hawk I Inc. |
| | | | Sea Horse Fisheries. |
| | | | Sea Horse Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Sea King Inc. |
| | | | Sea Pearl Seafood Company Inc. |
| | | | Sea Queen IV. |
| | | | Sea Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Sea World. |
| | | | Seabrook Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Seabrook Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Seafood & Us Inc. |
| | | | Seaman's Magic Inc. |
| | | | Seaman's Magic Inc. |
| | | | Seaside Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Seaweed 2000. |
| | | | Seawolf Seafood. |
| | | | Second Generation Seafood. |
| | | | Shark Co Seafood Inter Inc. |
| | | | Sharon—Ali Michelle Inc. |
| | | | Shelby & Barbara Seafood. |
| | | | Shelby & Barbara Seafood. |
| | | | Shelia Marie LLC. |
| | | | Shell Creek Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Shirley Elaine. |
| | | | Shirley Girl LLC. |
| | | | Shrimp Boat Patrice. |
| | | | Shrimp Boating Inc. |
| | | | Shrimp Express. |
| | | | Shrimp Man. |
| | | | Shrimp Networks Inc. |
| | | | Shrimp Trawler. |
| | | | Shrimper. |
| | | | Shrimper. |
| | | | Shrimpy's. |
| | | | Si Ky Lan Inc. |
| | | | Si Ky Lan Inc. |
| | | | Si Ky Lan Inc. |
| | | | Sidney Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Silver Fox. |
| | | | Silver Fox LLC. |
| | | | Simon. |
| | | | Sims Shrimping. |
| | | | Skip Toomer Inc. |
| | | | Skip Toomer Inc. |
| | | | Skyla Marie Inc. |
| | | | Smith & Sons Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Snowdrift. |
| | | | Snowdrift. |
| | | | Sochenda. |
| | | | Soeung Phat. |
| | | | Son T Le Inc. |
| | | | Son's Pride Inc. |
| | | | Sophie Marie Inc. |
| | | | Soul Mama Inc. |
| | | | Souther Obsession Inc. |
| | | | Southern Lady. |
| | | | Southern Nightmare Inc. |
| | | | Southern Star. |
| | | | Southshore Seafood. |
| | | | Spencers Seafood. |
| | | | Sprig Co Inc. |
| | | | St Anthony Inc. |
| | | | St Daniel Phillip Inc. |
| | | | St Dominic. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | St Joseph. |
| | | | St Joseph. |
| | | | St Joseph II Inc. |
| | | | St Joseph III Inc. |
| | | | St Joseph IV Inc. |
| | | | St Martin. |
| | | | St Martyrs VN. |
| | | | St Mary Seafood. |
| | | | St Mary Seven. |
| | | | St Mary Tai. |
| | | | St Michael Fuel & Ice Inc. |
| | | | St Michael's Ice & Fuel. |
| | | | St Peter. |
| | | | St Peter 550775. |
| | | | St Teresa Inc. |
| | | | St Vincent Andrew Inc. |
| | | | St Vincent Gulf Shrimp Inc. |
| | | | St Vincent One B. |
| | | | St Vincent One B Inc. |
| | | | St Vincent SF. |
| | | | St Vincent Sfd Inc. |
| | | | Start Young Inc. |
| | | | Steamboat Bills Seafood. |
| | | | Stella Mestre Inc. |
| | | | Stephen Dantin Jr. |
| | | | Stephney's Seafood. |
| | | | Stipelcovich Marine Wks. |
| | | | Stone-Co Farms LP. |
| | | | Stone-Co Farms LP. |
| | | | Stormy Sean Inc. |
| | | | Stormy Seas Inc. |
| | | | Sun Star Inc. |
| | | | Sun Swift Inc. |
| | | | Sunshine. |
| | | | Super Coon Inc. |
| | | | Super Cooper Inc. |
| | | | Swamp Irish Inc. |
| | | | Sylvan P Racine Jr—Capt Romain. |
| | | | T & T Seafood. |
| | | | T Brothers. |
| | | | T Cvitanovich Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Ta Do. |
| | | | Ta T Vo Inc. |
| | | | Ta T Vo Inc. |
| | | | Tana Inc. |
| | | | Tanya Lea Inc. |
| | | | Tanya Lea Inc. |
| | | | Tanya Lea Inc. |
| | | | Tasha Lou. |
| | | | T-Brown Inc. |
| | | | Tee Frank Inc. |
| | | | Tee Tigre Inc. |
| | | | Tercera Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Terrebonne Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Terri Monica. |
| | | | Terry Luke Corp. |
| | | | Terry Luke Corp. |
| | | | Terry Luke Corp. |
| | | | Terry Lynn Inc. |
| | | | Te-Sam Inc. |
| | | | Texas 1 Inc. |
| | | | Texas 18 Inc. |
| | | | Texas Lady Inc. |
| | | | Texas Pack Inc. |
| | | | Tex-Mex Cold Storage Inc. |
| | | | Tex-Mex Cold Storage Inc. |
| | | | Thai & Tran Inc. |
| | | | Thai Bao Inc. |
| | | | Thanh Phong. |
| | | | The Boat Phat Tai. |
| | | | The Fishermans Dock. |
| | | | The Last One. |
| | | | The Light House Bait & Seafood Shack LLC. |
| | | | The Mayporter Inc. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The NGO. |
| | | | The Seafood Shed. |
| | | | Thelma J Inc. |
| | | | Theresa Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Third Tower Inc. |
| | | | Thomas Winfield—Capt Nathan. |
| | | | Thompson Bros. |
| | | | Three C's. |
| | | | Three Dads. |
| | | | Three Sons. |
| | | | Three Sons Inc. |
| | | | Three Sons Inc. |
| | | | Thunder Roll. |
| | | | Thunderbolt Fisherman's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Thy Tra Inc. |
| | | | Thy Tra Inc. |
| | | | Tidelands Seafood Co Inc. |
| | | | Tiffani Claire Inc. |
| | | | Tiffani Claire Inc. |
| | | | Tiger Seafood. |
| | | | Tikede Inc. |
| | | | Timmy Boy Corp. |
| | | | Tina Chow. |
| | | | Tina T LLC. |
| | | | Tino Mones Seafood. |
| | | | TJ's Seafood. |
| | | | Toan Inc. |
| | | | Todd Co. |
| | | | Todd's Fisheries. |
| | | | Tom LE LLC. |
| | | | Tom Le LLC. |
| | | | Tom N & Bill N Inc. |
| | | | Tommy Bui dba Mana II. |
| | | | Tommy Cheramie Inc. |
| | | | Tommy Gulf Sea Food Inc. |
| | | | Tommy's Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Tonya Jane Inc. |
| | | | Tony-N. |
| | | | Tookie Inc. |
| | | | Tot & Linda Inc. |
| | | | T-Pops Inc. |
| | | | Tran Phu Van. |
| | | | Tran's Express Inc. |
| | | | Travis—Shawn. |
| | | | Travis—Shawn. |
| | | | Trawler Azteca. |
| | | | Trawler Becky Lyn Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Capt GC. |
| | | | Trawler Capt GC II. |
| | | | Trawler Dalia. |
| | | | Trawler Doctor Bill. |
| | | | Trawler Gulf Runner. |
| | | | Trawler HT Seaman. |
| | | | Trawler Joyce. |
| | | | Trawler Kristi Nicole. |
| | | | Trawler Kyle & Courtney. |
| | | | Trawler Lady Catherine. |
| | | | Trawler Lady Gwen Doe. |
| | | | Trawler Linda B Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Linda June. |
| | | | Trawler Little Brothers. |
| | | | Trawler Little Gavino. |
| | | | Trawler Little Rookie Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Mary Bea. |
| | | | Trawler Master Alston. |
| | | | Trawler Master Jeffery Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Michael Anthony Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Mildred Barr. |
| | | | Trawler Miss Alice Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Miss Jamie. |
| | | | Trawler Miss Kelsey. |
| | | | Trawler Miss Sylvia Inc. |
| | | | Trawler Mrs Viola. |
| | | | Trawler Nichols Dream. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Trawler Raindear Partnership. |
| | | | Trawler Rhonda Kathleen. |
| | | | Trawler Rhonda Lynn. |
| | | | Trawler Sandra Kay. |
| | | | Trawler Sarah Jane. |
| | | | Trawler Sea Wolf. |
| | | | Trawler Sea Wolf. |
| | | | Trawler SS Chaplin. |
| | | | Trawler The Mexican. |
| | | | Trawler Wallace B. |
| | | | Trawler Wylie Milam. |
| | | | Triple C Seafood. |
| | | | Triple T Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Triplets Production. |
| | | | Tropical SFD. |
| | | | Troy A LeCompte Sr. |
| | | | True World Foods Inc. |
| | | | T's Seafood. |
| | | | Tu Viet Vu. |
| | | | TVN Marine Inc. |
| | | | TVN Marine Inc. |
| | | | Two Flags Inc. |
| | | | Tyler James. |
| | | | Ultima Cruz Inc. |
| | | | UTK Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | V & B Shrimping LLC. |
| | | | Valona Sea Food. |
| | | | Valona Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Van Burren Shrimp Co. |
| | | | Vaquero Inc. |
| | | | Varon Inc. |
| | | | Venetian Isles Marina. |
| | | | Venice Seafood Exchange Inc. |
| | | | Venice Seafood LLC. |
| | | | Vera Cruz Inc. |
| | | | Veronica Inc. |
| | | | Versaggi Shrimp Corp. |
| | | | Victoria Rose Inc. |
| | | | Viet Giang Corp. |
| | | | Vigilante Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Village Creek Seafood. |
| | | | Villers Seafood Co Inc. |
| | | | Vina Enterprises Inc. |
| | | | Vincent L Alexie Jr. |
| | | | Vincent Piazza Jr & Sons Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Vin-Penny. |
| | | | Vivian Lee Inc. |
| | | | Von Harten Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | VT & L Inc. |
| | | | Vu NGO. |
| | | | Vu-Nguyen Partners. |
| | | | W L & O Inc. |
| | | | Waccamaw Producers. |
| | | | Wait-N-Sea Inc. |
| | | | Waller Boat Corp. |
| | | | Walter R Hicks. |
| | | | Ward Seafood Inc. |
| | | | Washington Seafood. |
| | | | Watermen Industries Inc. |
| | | | Watermen Industries Inc. |
| | | | Waymaker Inc. |
| | | | Wayne Estay Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | WC Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | We Three Inc. |
| | | | We Three Inc. |
| | | | Webster's Inc. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |

| Commerce case No. | Commission case No. | Product/Country | Petitioners/Supporters |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros. |
| | | | Weems Bros Seafood. |
| | | | Weems Bros Seafood Co. |
| | | | Weiskopf Fisheries LLC. |
| | | | Wendy & Eric Inc. |
| | | | Wescovich Inc. |
| | | | West Point Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Westley J Domangue. |
| | | | WH Blanchard Inc. |
| | | | Whiskey Joe Inc. |
| | | | White and Black. |
| | | | White Bird. |
| | | | White Foam. |
| | | | White Gold. |
| | | | Wilcox Shrimping Inc. |
| | | | Wild Bill. |
| | | | Wild Eagle Inc. |
| | | | William E Smith Jr Inc. |
| | | | William Lee Inc. |
| | | | William O Nelson Jr. |
| | | | William Patrick Inc. |
| | | | William Smith Jr Inc. |
| | | | Willie Joe Inc. |
| | | | Wind Song Inc. |
| | | | Wonder Woman. |
| | | | Woods Fisheries Inc. |
| | | | Woody Shrimp Co Inc. |
| | | | Yeaman's Inc. |
| | | | Yen Ta. |
| | | | Yogi's Shrimp. |
| | | | You & Me Shrimp. |
| | | | Ysclaskey Seafood. |
| | | | Zirlott Trawlers Inc. |
| | | | Zirlott Trawlers Inc. |

[FR Doc. 2015–11793 Filed 5–28–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

# Reader Aids

**Federal Register**

Vol. 80, No. 103

Friday, May 29, 2015

## CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| **Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations** | |
| General Information, indexes and other finding aids | **202–741–6000** |
| **Laws** | **741–6000** |
| **Presidential Documents** | |
| Executive orders and proclamations | **741–6000** |
| **The United States Government Manual** | **741–6000** |
| **Other Services** | |
| Electronic and on-line services (voice) | **741–6020** |
| Privacy Act Compilation | **741–6064** |
| Public Laws Update Service (numbers, dates, etc.) | **741–6043** |
| TTY for the deaf-and-hard-of-hearing | **741–6086** |

## ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

### World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **www.fdsys.gov.**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List, indexes, and Code of Federal Regulations are located at: **www.ofr.gov.**

### E-mail

**FEDREGTOC-L** (Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **http://listserv.access.gpo.gov** and select *Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

**PENS** (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html** and select *Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

**FEDREGTOC-L** and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

**Reference questions.** Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

**CFR Checklist.** Effective January 1, 2009, the CFR Checklist no longer appears in the Federal Register. This information can be found online at **http://bookstore.gpo.gov/.**

## FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, MAY

24779–25206 ..... 1
25207–25570 ..... 4
25571–25896 ..... 5
25897–26180 ..... 6
26181–26436 ..... 7
26437–26816 ..... 8
26817–27068 .....11
27069–27236 .....12
27237–27554 .....13
27555–27850 .....14
27851–28152 .....15
28153–28536 .....18
28537–28806 .....19
28807–29202 .....20
29203–29528 .....21
29529–29936 .....22
29937–30128 .....26
30129–30326 .....27
30327–30604 .....28
30605–30918 .....29

## CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING MAY

At the end of each month the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

**3 CFR**

**Proclamations:**
9129 (superseded by 9283) .....29199
9261 .....25571
9262 .....25573
9263 .....25575
9264 .....25577
9265 .....25579
9266 .....25889
9267 .....25891
9268 .....25893
9269 .....25895
9270 .....26177
9271 .....26179
9272 .....26433
9273 .....26435
9274 .....26817
9275 .....27235
9276 .....27237
9277 .....27239
9278 .....27241
9279 .....27849
9280 .....29193
9281 .....29195
9282 .....29197
9283 .....29199
9284 .....29525
9285 .....30127
9286 .....30327
9287 .....30329

**Execuritve Orders:**
13695 .....30331

**Administrative Orders:**
Memorandums:
Memorandum of April 16, 2015 .....25207
Memorandum of April 29, 2015 .....27555
Memorandum of May 15, 2015 .....29201
Notices:
Notice of May 6, 2015 .....26815
Notice of May 8, 2015 .....27067
Notice of May 13 2015 .....27851
Notice of May 15 2015 .....27805
Notice of May 19 2015 .....29527

**5 CFR**

890 .....29203
2418 .....24779

**7 CFR**

Ch. 0 .....25901
205 .....25897
210 .....26181
235 .....26181
925 .....27243
948 .....30129
985 .....27245, 30130
1450 .....28807
1924 .....30333
1980 .....28807
4284 .....26788

**Proposed Rules:**
210 .....26846
215 .....26846
220 .....26846
235 .....26846
319 .....24838
900 .....25969
1218 .....26469

**9 CFR**

107 .....26819
317 .....28153
417 .....27557

**Proposed Rules:**
3 .....24840
309 .....27269

**10 CFR**

**Proposed Rules:**
50 .....25237
429 .....28850
430 .....26198, 28850, 28851, 28852
431 .....24841, 26199, 26475, 27601, 28850

**12 CFR**

4 .....28346
5 .....28346
7 .....28346
14 .....28346
24 .....28346
32 .....28346
34 .....28346
100 .....28346
116 .....28346
143 .....28346
144 .....28346
145 .....28346
146 .....28346
150 .....28346
152 .....28346
159 .....28346
160 .....28346
161 .....28346
162 .....28346
163 .....28346
174 .....28346
192 .....28346
193 .....28346
611 .....30333
620 .....26822
701 .....25924
704 .....25932
1207 .....25209

1290 ....30336
1806 ....25581
**Proposed Rules:**
249 ....30383
704 ....27108
745 ....27109

**13 CFR**

**Proposed Rules:**
127 ....24846

**14 CFR**

Ch. I ....27853
23 ....29205
25 ....30132, 30134
39 ....24789, 24791, 25589, 25591, 27069, 27072, 27074, 27077, 27081, 28172, 29205, 30136, 30138, 30345, 30347, 30349, 30605, 30608
71 ....24793, 27563, 28537, 29937, 29938, 29939, 29940, 30612, 30613
73 ....29941
91 ....26822, 28538
97 ....25594, 25595, 29208, 29209, 29211, 29217
121 ....25215
135 ....25215
250 ....30144
254 ....30144
383 ....30144
401 ....30147
413 ....30147
414 ....30147
1216 ....30352
**Proposed Rules:**
33 ....30389
39 ....24850, 24852, 24854, 24856, 25247, 25249, 25254, 25627, 25630, 26484, 26487, 26490, 26492, 27114, 27116, 27601, 27605, 27607, 29224, 29988, 30391
71 ....24858, 24860, 24861, 26496, 26497, 26870, 26872, 27119, 29226, 30181, 30182, 30183, 30185, 30632
91 ....30394

**15 CFR**

30 ....27853
730 ....29529
736 ....29529
738 ....29432, 29530
740 ....29432, 29530
742 ....29432
743 ....29432
746 ....29529, 29530
772 ....29432
774 ....29432
801 ....28818
902 ....28539
922 ....30614
**Proposed Rules:**
4 ....26499
734 ....25798
740 ....25798, 28853
742 ....25798, 28853
744 ....25798
748 ....28853
758 ....29551, 29554
772 ....25798, 28853
774 ....25798, 28853

**16 CFR**

3 ....25940
4 ....25940
1120 ....25216
**Proposed Rules:**
1201 ....29555

**17 CFR**

232 ....29942
**Proposed Rules:**
32 ....26200
229 ....26330
240 ....26330, 27444
242 ....27444

**18 CFR**

**Proposed Rules:**
11 ....29562
40 ....29990
352 ....25633
410 ....28539

**19 CFR**

181 ....26828

**20 CFR**

404 ....28821
**Proposed Rules:**
655 ....25633

**21 CFR**

310 ....30151
314 ....30151
329 ....30151
600 ....30151
606 ....29842
610 ....29842
630 ....29842
640 ....29842
660 ....29842
820 ....29842
866 ....30153
876 ....30353
890 ....25226
1308 ....27854
**Proposed Rules:**
310 ....25166
514 ....28863
1308 ....27611, 29227

**22 CFR**

51 ....27856
126 ....30614
172 ....30155
**Proposed Rules:**
120 ....29565, 30001
121 ....25821
122 ....30001
123 ....29565
124 ....29565, 30001
125 ....29565, 30001
126 ....29565, 30001

**23 CFR**

172 ....29908

**24 CFR**

91 ....25901
93 ....25901
**Proposed Rules:**
Ch. IX ....30004

**25 CFR**

226 ....26994
**Proposed Rules:**
Ch. I ....30186
Ch. II ....30186
Ch. III ....30186
Ch. V ....30186
Ch. VI ....30186
Ch. VII ....30186

**26 CFR**

1 ....25230, 26437
53 ....25230
602 ....25230
**Proposed Rules:**
1 ....25970, 26500, 26873, 28872

**27 CFR**

447 ....30615
**Proposed Rules:**
555 ....30633

**28 CFR**

0 ....30617
**Proposed Rules:**
810 ....29569

**29 CFR**

18 ....28768
1926 ....25366
4022 ....27857
**Proposed Rules:**
1956 ....28890

**30 CFR**

1206 ....24794
1210 ....24794

**32 CFR**

243 ....30355
320 ....25230
635 ....28545
706 ....28555, 28832
**Proposed Rules:**
114 ....29571
1701 ....30187
2002 ....26501

**33 CFR**

100 ....27086, 27087, 27858, 28175, 28176, 28556, 30155
117 ....24814, 24815, 25232, 25233, 25598, 26182, 26183, 26442, 27099, 27563, 28184, 28185, 28558, 29220, 29533, 29534, 29944, 30157, 30360
165 ....24816, 25599, 26443, 26445, 27087, 27100, 27565, 28176, 28186, 28556, 28559, 28833, 29946, 29949, 29952, 29953, 30158, 30361
**Proposed Rules:**
100 ....27616, 28569
101 ....30189
105 ....30189
117 ....27619
147 ....24863, 25256
155 ....29582
165 ....24866, 24869, 25634, 26511, 26514, 28205, 28207, 29589, 30005, 30008, 30637

**34 CFR**

Ch. III ....26830
Ch. VI ....27036
**Proposed Rules:**
Ch. III ....27868, 27874, 30011, 30399
668 ....28484

**36 CFR**

242 ....28187
**Proposed Rules:**
1192 ....27275

**37 CFR**

42 ....28561

**38 CFR**

63 ....24819
77 ....25233
**Proposed Rules:**
17 ....27878
70 ....30190

**39 CFR**

20 ....26447
111 ....25528
**Proposed Rules:**
3001 ....26517

**40 CFR**

9 ....26448
49 ....25068
52 ....24821, 26183, 26189, 26461, 27102, 27251, 27255, 28193, 28835, 29535, 29953, 29959, 29964, 29968, 29970, 29972, 30161
80 ....26191, 26463
170 ....28838
174 ....25601, 25943, 25946
180 ....24824, 25950, 25953, 28201, 28839, 28843, 30619, 30625
228 ....29537
300 ....27859
450 ....25235
721 ....26448
1850 ....29539
**Proposed Rules:**
Ch. I ....30644
52 ....24872, 24874, 26210, 27121, 27127, 27275, 27276, 28209, 28215, 28893, 28901, 28906, 29230, 29237, 29250, 29592, 30015, 30019, 30020, 30200, 30404
60 ....28215, 28571
80 ....26212
81 ....24874, 28906, 29237, 29250
174 ....28925
180 ....28925, 30640
300 ....27883
704 ....26518
745 ....27621
1600 ....27276

**41 CFR**

300–3 ....27259
301–10 ....27259
301–70 ....27259

**42 CFR**

37 ....27862
86 ....26464
121 ....26464
401 ....29796
423 ....25958
488 ....29796
489 ....29796
**Proposed Rules:**
412 ....25012, 25637
418 ....25832

**43 CFR**

**Proposed Rules:**
2 ....27623
47 ....27134
48 ....27134

**44 CFR**

64 ....24830, 27261
67 ....27567, 27570

**45 CFR**

1355 ....27263

**Proposed Rules:**
98 ....25260
162 ....30646
170 ....25637
1206 ....25637
1210 ....25637
1211 ....25637
1216 ....25637
1217 ....25637
1218 ....25637
1220 ....25637
1222 ....25637
1226 ....25637
1610 ....29600
1627 ....29600
1630 ....29600
2556 ....25637

**46 CFR**

56 ....30630
401 ....29975

**47 CFR**

1 ....27572, 28203
2 ....27107
52 ....29978
73 ....27572, 28848, 30630
74 ....27862
90 ....25604

**Proposed Rules:**
1 ....27626, 30021
27 ....30021
20 ....25977
36 ....25989
42 ....25989
54 ....25989, 28928
63 ....25989
64 ....25989
73 ....30021

**48 CFR**

Ch. 1 ....26422, 26429
Ch. 2 ....29983
1 ....26423
4 ....26427
15 ....26424
22 ....26423, 26427, 30631
39 ....26427
42 ....26426
52 ....26423, 26427
212 ....30116, 30117
213 ....30117
216 ....29980
217 ....29981
219 ....30016
252 ....30016, 30017
511 ....28849
552 ....28849
1328 ....27266
1352 ....27266
1501 ....30631
1552 ....29984

**Proposed Rules:**
1 ....26883, 30548
Ch. 2 ....30030
2 ....26883
4 ....30548
7 ....26883
9 ....30548
11 ....26883
17 ....30548
22 ....30548
23 ....26883
25 ....26883, 30202
52 ....26883, 30202, 30548
204 ....30030
212 ....30019
225 ....30019
232 ....30030
239 ....30030
252 ....30119
501 ....25994
516 ....25994
538 ....25994
552 ....25994
1823 ....26519
1842 ....27278
1846 ....26519
1852 ....26519, 27278
2404 ....30416
2406 ....30416
2408 ....30416
2409 ....30416
2411 ....30416
2415 ....30416
2427 ....30416
2428 ....30416
2432 ....30416
2437 ....30416
2444 ....30416
2452 ....30416
5432 ....30648

**49 CFR**

27 ....26196
37 ....26196
171 ....26644
172 ....26644
173 ....26644
174 ....26644
179 ....26644
234 ....30364
383 ....30163
390 ....30164

**Proposed Rules:**
192 ....29263
391 ....25260
571 ....29458
Ch. X ....27281, 28928
1300 ....27280
1313 ....27280

**50 CFR**

10 ....26467
86 ....26150
100 ....28187
229 ....30367
300 ....29220
402 ....26832
622 ....24832, 25966
635 ....24836, 25609, 26196, 27863
648 ....25110, 25143, 25160, 30379
660 ....25611, 27588
679 ....25625, 25967
680 ....28539

**Proposed Rules:**
17 ....29394
20 ....30205
21 ....30032
36 ....29277
223 ....25272
224 ....25272
300 ....28572
424 ....29286
648 ....25656, 28217, 28575
660 ....29296

## LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

**Note:** No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's **List of Public Laws**.

**Last List May 28, 2015**

## Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

**PENS** is a free electronic mail notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html*

**Note:** This service is strictly for E-mail notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.