

received and acted upon prior to the date.

Based on the above, DHS finds that pre-promulgation notice and comment for this rule would be impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest. For this same reason, good cause exists to make this rule effective immediately upon publication in the **Federal Register**. See 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

B. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review)

This rule constitutes a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866, and therefore has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. Under Executive Order 12866, a significant regulatory action is subject to an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and to the requirements of the Executive Order. The Executive Order defines “significant regulatory action” as one that is likely to result in a rule that may (1) have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights or obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order. Because this rule eliminates the material compliance date and is part of a previously published rule that received considerable public attention, this rule raises novel policy issues and, thereby, is subject to OMB review.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), requires Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small businesses, small governmental jurisdictions, and small organizations during the development of their rules. This final rule, however, makes changes for which notice and comment are not necessary. Accordingly, DHS is not required to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis. 5 U.S.C. 603, 604.

D. Paperwork Reduction Act

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

E. Executive Order 13132 (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 rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

F. 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 Unfunded Mandates Reform 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 million (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. This final rule will not result in such an expenditure.

G. Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation)

This rule does not have Tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments,” because it does 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.

H. Executive Order 13211 (Energy Impact Analysis)

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.” We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that Order and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

List of Subjects in 6 CFR Part 37

Document security, driver’s licenses, identification cards, incorporation by reference, motor vehicle administrations, physical security.

The Amendments

■ For the reasons set forth above, the Department of Homeland Security amends 6 CFR part 37 as follows:

PART 37—REAL ID DRIVER’S LICENSES AND IDENTIFICATION CARDS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 37 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30301 note; 6 U.S.C. 111, 112.

§ 37.51 [Amended]

■ 2. In Section 37.51, paragraph (b) is stayed from January 1, 2010 until further notice.

Janet Napolitano,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9–30638 Filed 12–24–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–9M–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 94

[Docket No. APHIS-2008-0147]

Change in Disease Status of the Republic of Korea With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Rinderpest

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the regulations to add the Republic of Korea to the list of regions that are considered free of rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease (FMD). We are taking this action because we have conducted an evaluation and determined that the Republic of Korea is free of rinderpest and FMD. We are also adding the Republic of Korea to the list of regions that are subject to certain import restrictions on meat and meat products because of their proximity to or trading relationships with rinderpest- or FMD-affected countries. These actions will update the disease status of the Republic of Korea with regard to rinderpest and FMD while continuing to protect the United States from an introduction of those diseases by providing additional requirements for meat and other animal products imported into the United States from the Republic of Korea.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 12, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Julia Punderson, Senior Staff

Veterinarian, Regionalization Evaluation Services, National Center for Import and Export, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; (301) 734-4356.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 94 (referred to below as the regulations) govern the importation of certain animals and animal products into the United States in order to prevent the introduction of various communicable diseases, including rinderpest, foot-and-mouth disease (FMD), African swine fever, classical swine fever, and swine vesicular disease. These are dangerous and destructive communicable diseases of ruminants and swine. Section 94.1 of the regulations lists regions of the world that are declared free of rinderpest or free of both rinderpest and FMD. Rinderpest or FMD is considered to exist in all other parts of the world not listed. Section 94.11 of the regulations lists regions of the world that have been determined to be free of rinderpest and FMD, but are subject to certain restrictions because of their proximity to or trading relationships with rinderpest or FMD-affected regions.

On March 30, 2009, we published in the **Federal Register** a proposal¹ (74 FR 14093–14097, Docket No. APHIS-2008-0147) to amend the regulations by adding the Republic of Korea (South Korea) to the list in § 94.1 of regions declared free of FMD and rinderpest. We also proposed to add the Republic of Korea to the list in § 94.11 of regions that are declared to be free of these diseases, but that are subject to certain restrictions because of their proximity to or trading relationships with rinderpest or FMD-affected regions. In addition, we published a notice of availability of an environmental assessment (74 FR 17115) on April 14, 2009 (see footnote 1).

We solicited comments concerning our proposal for 60 days ending May 29, 2009. We did not receive any comments. Therefore, for the reasons given in the proposed rule, we are adopting the proposed rule as a final rule, without change.

Effective Date

This is a substantive rule that relieves restrictions and, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, may be made effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

¹ To view the proposed rule, the risk evaluation, the environmental assessment and notice, and the finding of no significant impact, go to (<http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocketDetail&d=APHIS-2008-0147>).

This rule relieves certain rinderpest and FMD-related restrictions on the importation into the United States of ruminants, or fresh (chilled or frozen) meat or other products of ruminants, from the Republic of Korea. We have determined that approximately 2 weeks are needed to ensure that APHIS and Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, personnel at ports of entry receive official notice of this change in the regulations. Therefore, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this rule should be effective 15 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review under Executive Order 12866.

This rule amends the regulations by adding the Republic of Korea to the list of regions considered to be free of rinderpest and FMD. This action, which was requested by the Republic of Korea, follows a risk assessment conducted by APHIS concluding that the Republic of Korea is free of both diseases and has the veterinary infrastructure in place to detect and effectively eradicate the diseases if necessary. The effect of the rule will be to remove certain rinderpest and FMD-related prohibitions and restrictions on the importation into the United States of ruminants, or fresh (chilled or frozen) meat or other products of ruminants, from the Republic of Korea. APHIS imposes such restrictions because an FMD or rinderpest outbreak in the United States has the potential for severe economic consequences. Although imports of swine and swine products typically would be allowed under APHIS' FMD and rinderpest regulations, those commodities are not eligible for importation from the Republic of Korea due to USDA regulations designed to prevent the introduction of diseases other than FMD and rinderpest.²

We do not anticipate that changing the FMD and rinderpest status of the Republic of Korea will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of U.S. entities, large or small, because the volume of currently prohibited/restricted animals and

² APHIS' risk evaluation states that the animal health status of swine for diseases other than FMD has not been evaluated. In the absence of a favorable evaluation, live swine and swine-derived products will not be eligible to be imported from the Republic of Korea.

animal products imported into the United States from the Republic of Korea is likely to be very small relative to overall U.S. supply of those commodities (production and net imports from all foreign sources). There are several reasons for this. First, the volume of U.S. imports from the Republic of Korea prior to March 20, 2000 (the date the Republic of Korea was removed from the list of regions considered to be free of FMD and rinderpest) was negligible. During the 3-year period from 1997 to 1999, the United States did not import any reportable amounts of ruminants or fresh (chilled or frozen) meat or other products of ruminants from the Republic of Korea, other than 1.3 metric tons of dairy products in 1998.

Second, the Republic of Korea produces less beef, milk, and pork than it consumes, and is therefore a net importer of these commodities. Given this fact, there will likely not be a significant volume of exports of those commodities to the United States.

Finally, APHIS' staff expects that Hanwoo beef, a premium-priced specialty meat produced from Korean native cattle, is likely to be the Republic of Korea's primary export to the United States. Because of its premium price, the market for Hanwoo beef is limited; it is likely to be sold to a niche market, such as Korean restaurants in the United States.

Importers, brokers, and others interested in importing Hanwoo beef, as well as restaurants intending to serve that product, are the U.S. entities most likely to be affected by the rule. They stand to benefit from the increased business activity. The number of these entities is unknown but it is likely to be very small, given the expected limited market for Hanwoo beef in the United States. The size of these entities is also unknown, although it is reasonable to assume that, as with U.S. businesses in general, most are small under the standards of the U.S. Small Business Administration. Therefore, this action should have no noticeable effect on U.S. beef producers, given the expected limited demand for Hanwoo beef.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12988

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Has no retroactive effect and (2) does not require administrative proceedings

before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

National Environmental Policy Act

An environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact have been prepared for this final rule. The environmental assessment provides a basis for the conclusion that the removal of certain rinderpest and FMD-related prohibitions and restrictions on the importation into the United States of ruminants, or fresh (chilled or frozen) meat or other products of ruminants, from the Republic of Korea will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Based on the finding of no significant impact, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that an environmental impact statement need not be prepared.

The environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact were prepared in accordance with: (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372).

The environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact may be viewed on the Regulations.gov Web site.³ Copies of the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact are also available for public inspection at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect copies are requested to call ahead on (202) 690-2817 to facilitate entry into the reading room. In addition, copies may be obtained by writing to the individual listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 94

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Meat and meat products, Milk, Poultry and poultry products, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR part 94 as follows:

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, EXOTIC NEWCASTLE DISEASE, AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER, SWINE VESICULAR DISEASE, AND BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 94 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 450, 7701-7772, 7781-7786, and 8301-8317; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

§ 94.1 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 94.1, paragraph (a)(2) is amended by adding the words "Republic of Korea," after the word "Japan,".

§ 94.11 [Amended]

■ 3. In § 94.11, paragraph (a) is amended by adding the words "Republic of Korea," after the word "Japan,".

Done in Washington, DC, this 16th day of December 2009.

Kevin Shea

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. E9-30668 Filed 12-24-09; 12:36 pm]

BILLING CODE: 3410-34-S

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farm Service Agency

7 CFR Part 760

RIN 0560-AH90

Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments Program

AGENCY: Farm Service Agency, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule implements specific requirements for the new Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments Program (SURE) authorized by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (the 2008 Farm Bill). SURE provides disaster assistance to eligible participants who have experienced qualifying crop production losses, or crop quality losses, or both, occurring in crop year 2008 through September 30, 2011. All crops for which crop insurance or noninsured crop disaster assistance program (NAP) coverage is available are eligible crops for SURE. To be eligible for SURE payments, participants must meet a risk management purchase requirement, with some exceptions, and have

suffered a qualifying loss due to disaster. A qualifying loss is a loss of at least 10 percent of a crop of economic significance on a participant's farm in a disaster county (a county for which a Secretarial disaster declaration has been issued or a county contiguous to such a county), or on a participant's farm with an overall loss greater than 50 percent of normal production (expected revenue for all crops on the farm) due to disaster. This rule specifies how a qualifying loss is determined, how SURE payments are calculated, and how and when participants may apply for payment.

DATES: *Effective Date:* December 22, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Steven J. Peterson, Branch Chief, Disaster Assistance Branch, Production, Emergencies, and Compliance Division; Farm Service Agency; United States Department of Agriculture, STOP 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-0517; telephone (202) 720-5172; e-mail

Steve.Peterson@wdc.usda.gov. Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication (Braille, large print, audio tape, *etc.*) should contact the USDA Target Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This rule implements specific requirements for the SURE program authorized by the 2008 Farm Bill (Pub. L. 110-246) and amendments to the 2008 Farm Bill contained in the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Pub. L. 110-329), an Act to Amend the Commodity Provisions of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 and for other purposes (Pub. L. 110-398), and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Pub. L. 111-005, the Recovery Act). The basic core of the SURE program is specified in the 2008 Farm Bill. With the exception of the Recovery Act, the subsequent amendments were technical in nature; the amendments are discussed below.

Sections 12033 and 15101 of the 2008 Farm Bill authorize the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) to provide assistance to eligible participants with certain crop losses. Under this authority, FSA is establishing SURE, a new permanent disaster assistance program, providing payments to eligible participants who suffered a qualifying loss and who met the risk management purchase requirement.

FSA will administer SURE using funds from the Agricultural Disaster

³ See footnote 1.