

**PART 81—DESIGNATION OF AREAS FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING PURPOSES**

■ 3. The authority citation for part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401, *et seq.*

■ 4. Section 81.336 is amended by revising the entry “Cleveland, OH” in the table entitled “Ohio—2012 Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS” to read as follows:

**OHIO—2012 ANNUAL PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS**  
[Primary]

**§ 81.336 Ohio.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Designated area <sup>1</sup>	Designation		Classification	
	Date <sup>2</sup>	Type	Date <sup>2</sup>	Type
Cleveland, OH:				
Cuyahoga County .....	4/12/2019	Attainment		Moderate
Lorain County .....	4/12/2019	Attainment		Moderate
* * * * *				

<sup>1</sup> Includes areas of Indian country located in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.

<sup>2</sup> This date is April 15, 2015, unless otherwise noted.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2019-07334 Filed 4-11-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0546; FRL-9987-46]

### Polyvinyl Acetate—Polyvinyl Alcohol Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer; when used as an inert ingredient in a pesticide chemical formulation. Keller and Heckman LLP, on behalf of Synthomer USA LLC submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer on food or feed commodities.

**DATES:** This regulation is effective April 12, 2019. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before June 11, 2019 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-2018-0546, 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:** Michael Goodis, 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: [RDfRNNotices@epa.gov](mailto:RDfRNNotices@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 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at [http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab\\_02.tpl](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl).

###### **C. 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-2018-0546 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 June 11, 2019. 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-2018-0546, 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. Background and Statutory Findings

In the **Federal Register** of October 18, 2018 (83 FR 52787) (FRL-9984-21), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the receipt of a pesticide petition (PP IN-11189) filed by Keller and Heckman LLP, on behalf of Synthomer USA LLC, 200 Railroad Street, Roebuck, SC 29376. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.960 be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer; CAS Reg. No. 25213-24-5. That document included a summary of the petition prepared by the petitioner and solicited comments on the petitioner's request. The Agency did not receive any comments.

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the exemption is “safe.” Section 408(c)(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 use 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 an exemption from the requirement of 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 . . .” and specifies factors EPA is to consider in establishing an exemption.

## III. Risk Assessment and Statutory Findings

EPA establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance only in those cases where it can be shown that the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide chemical residues under reasonably foreseeable circumstances will pose no appreciable risks to human health. In order to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide inert ingredients, the Agency considers the toxicity of the inert in conjunction with possible exposure to residues of the inert ingredient through food, drinking water, and through other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings. If EPA is able to determine that a finite tolerance is not necessary to ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the inert ingredient, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance may be established.

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action and considered its validity, completeness and reliability and the relationship of this information 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 the case of certain chemical substances that are defined as polymers, the Agency has established a set of criteria to identify categories of polymers expected to present minimal or no risk. The definition of a polymer is given in 40 CFR 723.250(b) and the exclusion criteria for identifying these low-risk polymers are described in 40 CFR 723.250(d). Polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer conforms to the definition of a polymer given in 40 CFR 723.250(b) and meets the following criteria that are used to identify low-risk polymers.

1. The polymer is not a cationic polymer nor is it reasonably anticipated to become a cationic polymer in a natural aquatic environment.

2. The polymer does contain as an integral part of its composition the atomic elements carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen.

3. The polymer does not contain as an integral part of its composition, except as impurities, any element other than those listed in 40 CFR 723.250(d)(2)(ii).

4. The polymer is neither designed nor can it be reasonably anticipated to substantially degrade, decompose, or depolymerize.

5. The polymer is manufactured or imported from monomers and/or reactants that are already included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory or manufactured under an applicable TSCA section 5 exemption.

6. The polymer is not a water absorbing polymer with a number average molecular weight (MW) greater than or equal to 10,000 daltons.

Additionally, the polymer also meets as required the following exemption criteria specified in 40 CFR 723.250(e).

7. The polymer's minimum number average MW of 14,000 is greater than or equal to 10,000 daltons. The polymer contains less than 2% oligomeric material below MW 500 and less than 5% oligomeric material below MW 1,000.

Thus, polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer meets the criteria for a polymer to be considered low risk under 40 CFR 723.250. Based on its conformance to the criteria in this unit, no mammalian toxicity is anticipated from dietary, inhalation, or dermal exposure to polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer.

## IV. Aggregate Exposures

For the purposes of assessing potential exposure under this exemption, EPA considered that polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer could be present in all raw and processed agricultural commodities and drinking water, and that non-occupational non-dietary exposure was possible. The minimum number average MW of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer is 14,000 daltons. Generally, a polymer of this size would be poorly absorbed through the intact gastrointestinal tract or through intact human skin. Since polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer conform to the criteria that identify a low-risk polymer, there are no concerns for risks associated with any potential exposure scenarios that are reasonably foreseeable. The Agency has determined that a tolerance is not necessary to protect the public health.

## V. 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 polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer to share a common mechanism of toxicity

with any other substances, and polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer 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 website at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/cumulative>.

#### VI. Additional Safety Factor for the Protection of Infants and Children

Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold 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 data base unless EPA concludes that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. Due to the expected low toxicity of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer, EPA has not used a safety factor analysis to assess the risk. For the same reasons the additional tenfold safety factor is unnecessary.

#### VII. Determination of Safety

Based on the conformance to the criteria used to identify a low-risk polymer, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer.

#### VIII. Other Considerations

##### A. Existing Exemptions From a Tolerance

Not Available.

##### B. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes since the Agency is establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance without any numerical limitation.

##### C. 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 polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer.

#### IX. Conclusion

Accordingly, EPA finds that exempting residues of polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer from the requirement of a tolerance will be safe.

#### X. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes a tolerance 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).

#### XI. 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: April 8, 2019.

**Michael Goodis,**

*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 § 180.960, add alphabetically the polymer "Polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer, minimum number average molecular weight (in amu), 14,000" to the table to read as follows:

**§ 180.960 Polymers; exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Polymer	CAS No.
Polyvinyl acetate—polyvinyl alcohol copolymer, minimum number average molecular weight (in amu), 14,000 .....	25213–24–5

[FR Doc. 2019–07273 Filed 4–11–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****50 CFR Part 600**

[Docket No. 160908833–9240–02]

RIN 0648–BG34

**Requirements of the Vessel Monitoring System Type-Approval**

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** All owners of vessels participating in a NOAA Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) program are required to acquire a NMFS-approved Enhanced Mobile Transmitting Unit (EMTU) or Mobile Transmitting Unit (MTU) to comply with the Vessel Monitoring System requirements. This final action amends the existing VMS Type-Approval regulations by removing the requirement for VMS vendors to periodically renew their EMTU/MTU type-approvals. This renewal process has proven to be unnecessary, has cost fishermen and approved VMS vendors additional time and expense, and has imposed unnecessary costs on the government. Removing the type-approval renewal requirement will spare fishermen, VMS vendors and the government the time and expense associated with the renewal process.

**DATES:** The final rule will be effective April 12, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kelly Spalding, Vessel Monitoring System Program Manager, Headquarters: 301–427–8269 or [Kelly.spalding@noaa.gov](mailto:Kelly.spalding@noaa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

In December 2014, NMFS published a final rule to codify national VMS type-approval standards for the approval by NMFS of an EMTU/MTU, any associated software, and mobile communications service (MCS; collectively referred to as a VMS) before they are authorized for use in the NMFS VMS program. See 79 FR 77399 (December 24, 2014). Those standards are set out in 50 CFR part 600, subpart Q, *Vessel Monitoring System Type-Approval*.

Fishers must comply with applicable Federal fishery VMS regulations, and in doing so, may select from a variety of EMTU/MTU vendors that have been approved by NMFS to participate in the VMS program for specific fisheries. The NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) maintains the list of type-approved VMS units at [http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ole/about/our\\_programs/vessel\\_monitoring.html](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/ole/about/our_programs/vessel_monitoring.html). The EMTU/MTU allows OLE to determine the geographic position of the vessel at specified intervals or during specific events, via mobile communications services between NMFS OLE and the vessel using a NMFS-approved MCS provider. These communications are secure and the information is only made available to authorized personnel.

This action removes the two sections of 50 CFR part 600, subpart Q, that require VMS type-approval holders (VMS vendors) to periodically renew their type-approvals. Section 600.1512 of the VMS type approval regulations previously provided that type-approvals were valid for three years from the date on which NMFS publishes a notice in the **Federal Register** of the approval; and that prior to the expiration of that three-year type-approval period, the VMS vendor was required to apply for a type-approval renewal. NMFS found that the renewal process is unnecessary, has cost fishermen and approved VMS vendors additional time and expense, and imposed unnecessary cost on the government. Removing the type-approval renewal requirement spares fishermen, VMS vendors and the government the time and expense

associated with the renewal process without impairing the effectiveness of the VMS program.

Section 600.1513 of Subpart Q set out the type-approval renewal process. A VMS vendor seeking renewal of a VMS type-approval was required to submit a written renewal request and supporting materials to NOAA OLE at least 30 days, but not more than six months, prior to the end of the three-year type-approval period. To do so, the type-approval holder was required to submit a written request letter containing the information and documentation regarding their continued compliance with their Vessel Monitoring System Type-Approval.

The type-approval renewal provisions were designed to provide for an in-depth look at the type-approval holder's overall record of compliance with type-approval requirements. However, NMFS' experience with the renewal process showed it to be cumbersome for both type-approval holders and NMFS OLE. In some cases, type-approval holders opted to apply for type-approval of newer VMS units rather than seek renewal of their older VMS units. When a type-approval lapsed due to non-renewal, fishermen were required to replace their VMS units that were no longer type approved, despite the fact that the unit may still have been functional and compliant with all current VMS standards. Doing so imposed unnecessary cost on fishermen who had to purchase a new VMS unit and may have led to lost fishing opportunities while the VMS unit was being replaced.

In addition to being costly and burdensome for type-approval holders, fishermen and NMFS, the renewal process was not necessary because 50 CFR 600.1514 (re-designated as § 600.1512 by this final rule) sets out an EMTU type-approval revocation process. In the event that a type-approved EMTU model fails to meet the VMS EMTU specifications, NMFS can remove it from the VMS program through this revocation process. With this action, the type-approval will remain valid indefinitely unless NMFS initiates the revocation process pursuant