

an expanded HIN, but ultimately withdrew the rulemaking, stating: "There is no consensus on format for an expanded HIN and the Coast Guard lacks sufficient data to demonstrate that the benefits clearly outweigh the costs and burdens" 65 FR 40069 (June 29, 2000, Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking; termination); *see also* 59 FR 23651 (May 6, 1994, Notice of proposed rulemaking); 59 FR 55823 (November 9, 1994, Notice of workshop and reopening of comment period); 62 FR 7971 (February 21, 1997, Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking); 63 FR 63638 (November 16, 1998, Request for comments).

The Coast Guard again looked into the possibility of an expanded HIN with publication of the 2008 request for comments.

Discussion of Comments

The comments received covered a range of support and opposition to the Coast Guard's proposal for an expanded HIN. Several commenters addressed the Coast Guard's request for specific comments and data, although there was no consensus among commenters and the data and information provided was in an aggregate form with estimates which varied widely. For example, one commenter stated that certain recreational vessel manufacturers already use an expanded HIN format for their products (which include recreational vehicles as well as vessels), while several other commenters indicated by the substance of their comments that many recreational vessel manufacturers do not. Additionally, some commenters stated that the costs of an expanded HIN would be minimal and described why, while other commenters provided cost estimates to show that costs would be excessive. The Coast Guard found these comments helpful in showing a variety of opinions and possible data regarding the proposal to expand the HIN. These comments, however, also indicate that currently there are no definitive means to address this issue.

Although some commenters provided certain requested data, the request for comments did not garner any quantitative data or specific information regarding the benefits of an expanded HIN. Some commenters specifically agreed with the Coast Guard's discussion of possible benefits from an expanded HIN, such as enhanced assistance in the recovery of stolen vessels, reduced recreational vessel fraud, improved accuracy of accident data analysis, and increased remote identification of a "suspect" vessel. None of the commenters provided any

benefit-specific data or information to support the commenters' expressed views. Challenges to an expanded HIN proposal and its potential benefits were also general statements—opposing the proposal or disagreeing with the Coast Guard's discussion of the proposal—and did not contain sufficiently specific data or information.

In addition to seeking information from the public on an expanded HIN proposal, the Coast Guard also performed its own evaluation of the potential costs and benefits of such a proposal. The Coast Guard found a lack of available data regarding potential costs and benefits.

Conclusion

At this time, the Coast Guard has decided that it is in the best interest of the public and the boating safety community to focus its attention and devote its resources to other regulatory actions. If the Coast Guard decides in the future to reconsider an expanded HIN, we will provide notice in a new **Federal Register** publication.

Dated: February 2, 2011.

K.S. Cook,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Director of Prevention Policy.

[FR Doc. 2011-3037 Filed 2-10-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

36 CFR Part 242

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. FWS-R7-SM-2011-0004; 70101-1261-0000L6]

RIN 1018-AX52

Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—Subpart B, Federal Subsistence Board

AGENCIES: Forest Service, Agriculture; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would revise the regulations concerning the composition of the Federal Subsistence Board (Board). On October 23, 2009, the Secretary of the Interior announced the initiation of a Departmental review of the Federal Subsistence Management Program in Alaska. The review focused on how the program is meeting the

purposes and subsistence provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA), and how the program is serving rural subsistence users. The review proposed several administrative and regulatory changes to strengthen the program and make it more responsive to rural users. One proposed change called for adding two public members representing rural Alaskan subsistence users to the existing Board, which would afford additional regional representation and increase stakeholder input in the decisionmaking process.

DATES: *Public meetings:* The Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils will hold public meetings to receive comments and make proposals to change this proposed rule on several dates between February 15, 2011, and March 24, 2011, and to make recommendations on the proposed rule to the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board will discuss and evaluate proposed regulatory changes during a public meeting in Anchorage, AK, on May 3, 2011, and make recommendations on the proposed rule to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. *See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION* for specific information on dates and locations of the public meetings.

Public comments: Comments and proposals to change this proposed rule must be received or postmarked by April 12, 2011.

ADDRESSES: *Public meetings:* The Federal Subsistence Board and the Regional Advisory Councils' public meetings will be held at various locations in Alaska. *See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION* for specific information on dates and locations of the public meetings.

Public comments: You may submit comments by one of the following methods:

- *Electronically:* Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for FWS-R7-SM-2011-0004, which is the docket number for this rulemaking.

- *By hard copy:* U.S. mail or hand-delivery to: USFWS, Office of Subsistence Management, 1011 East Tudor Road, MS 121, Attn: Theo Matuskowitz, Anchorage, AK 99503-6199, or hand delivery to the Designated Federal Official attending any of the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council public meetings. *See SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION* for additional information on locations of the public meetings.

We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This

generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see the Public Review Process section below for more information).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, c/o U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention: Peter J. Probasco, Office of Subsistence Management; (907) 786-3888 or *subsistence@fws.gov*. For questions specific to National Forest System lands, contact Steve Kessler, Regional Subsistence Program Leader, USDA, Forest Service, Alaska Region; (907) 743-9461 or *skessler@fs.fed.us*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) jointly implement the Federal Subsistence Management Program (Program). This Program provides a preference for take of fish and wildlife resources for subsistence uses on Federal public lands and waters in Alaska. The Secretaries published temporary regulations to carry out this Program in the **Federal Register** on June 29, 1990 (55 FR 27114), and final regulations were published in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22940). The Program has subsequently amended these regulations a number of times. Because this Program is a joint effort between Interior and Agriculture, these regulations are located in two titles of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): Title 36, "Parks, Forests, and Public Property," and Title 50, "Wildlife and Fisheries," at 36 CFR 242.1-28 and 50 CFR 100.1-28, respectively. The regulations contain subparts as follows: Subpart A, General

Provisions; Subpart B, Program Structure; Subpart C, Board Determinations; and Subpart D, Subsistence Taking of Fish and Wildlife. Only the Secretaries can promulgate changes to the subpart A and B regulations.

Consistent with subpart B of these regulations, the Secretaries established a Federal Subsistence Board to administer the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The Board is made up of:

- A Chair appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. National Park Service;
- The Alaska State Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management;
- The Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs; and
- The Alaska Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service.

Through the Board, these agencies participate in the development of regulations for subparts C and D, which, among other things, set forth program eligibility and specific harvest seasons and limits. As the Secretaries are responsible for promulgating changes to subparts A and B; the Board is assisting the Secretaries in this effort.

In administering the program, the Secretaries divided Alaska into 10 subsistence resource regions, each of which is represented by a Regional Council. The Regional Councils provide a forum for rural residents with personal knowledge of local conditions and resource requirements to have a meaningful role in the subsistence management of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands in Alaska. The Regional Council members represent varied geographical, cultural, and user interests within each region.

Proposed Regulatory Changes

On October 23, 2009, Secretary of the Interior Salazar announced the initiation of a Departmental review of the Federal Subsistence Management Program in Alaska. The review focused on how the Program is meeting the purposes and subsistence provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA), and how the Program is serving rural subsistence users as envisioned when the program was begun in the early 1990s.

On August 31, 2010, the Secretaries announced the findings of the review. The Program review proposed several administrative and regulatory changes to strengthen the Program and make it more responsive to the concerns of those who rely on it for their subsistence needs. One proposal called for adding two public members representing rural Alaskan subsistence users to the Federal Subsistence Board, which would allow additional regional representation and increased stakeholder input in the decisionmaking process. Conforming regulatory changes are also proposed to clarify the designation of alternates for Federal Board members and to increase the size of a quorum.

Public Review Process—Comments, Proposals, and Public Meetings

The Regional Councils have a substantial role in reviewing this proposed rule and making recommendations for the final rule. The Federal Subsistence Board, through the Regional Councils, will hold meetings on this proposed rule at the following locations in Alaska, on the following dates:

Region 1—Southeast Regional Council	Sitka	March 22, 2011.
Region 2—Southcentral Regional Council	Anchorage	March 16, 2011.
Region 3—Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Council	Kodiak	February 16, 2011.
Region 4—Bristol Bay Regional Council	Naknek	March 9, 2011.
Region 5—Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council	Mtn. Village	February 23, 2011.
Region 6—Western Interior Regional Council	Galena	March 1, 2011.
Region 7—Seward Peninsula Regional Council	Nome	February 15, 2011.
Region 8—Northwest Arctic Regional Council	Kotzebue	March 18, 2011.
Region 9—Eastern Interior Regional Council	Fairbanks	March 3, 2011.
Region 10—North Slope Regional Council	Barrow	March 7, 2011.

A notice will be published of specific dates, times, and meeting locations in local and statewide newspapers prior to this series of meetings. Locations and dates may change based on weather or local circumstances. The amount of work on each Regional Council's agenda

determines the length of each Regional Council meeting.

The Board will discuss and evaluate proposed changes to the subsistence management regulations during a public meeting scheduled to be held in Anchorage, AK, on May 3, 2011. The Council Chairs, or their designated

representatives, will present their respective Councils' recommendations at the Board meeting. Additional oral testimony may be provided to the Board at that time. At that public meeting, the Board will deliberate and make final recommendations to the Secretaries on this proposed rule.

Tribal Consultation and Comment

As expressed in Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments," the Federal officials that have been delegated authority by the Secretaries are committed to honoring the unique government-to-government political relationship that exists between the Federal Government and Federally Recognized Indian Tribes (Tribes) as listed in 75 FR 60810 (October 1, 2010) and the relationship required by statute for consultation and coordination with Alaska Native corporations. Consultation with Alaska Native corporations is based on Public Law 108-199, div. H, Sec. 161, Jan. 23, 2004, 118 Stat. 452, as amended by Public Law 108-447, div. H, title V, Sec. 518, Dec. 8, 2004, 118 Stat. 3267, which provides that: "The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and all Federal agencies shall hereafter consult with Alaska Native corporations on the same basis as Indian Tribes under Executive Order No. 13175."

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act does not provide rights to Tribes for the subsistence taking of wildlife, fish, and shellfish. However, because Tribal members are affected by subsistence fishing, hunting, and trapping regulations, the Secretaries, through the Board, will provide Federally recognized Tribes and Alaska Native corporations an opportunity to consult on this rule.

The Board will engage in outreach efforts for this rule, including a notification letter, to ensure that Tribes and Alaska Native corporations are advised of the mechanisms by which they can participate. The Board provides a variety of opportunities for consultation: Commenting on proposed changes to the existing rule; engaging in dialogue at the Regional Council meetings; engaging in dialogue at the Board's meetings; and providing input in person, by mail, e-mail, or phone at any time during the rulemaking process. The Board will commit to efficiently and adequately providing an opportunity to Tribes and Alaska Native corporations for consultation with regard to subsistence rulemaking.

The Board will consider Tribes' and Alaska Native corporations' information, input, and recommendations, and address their concerns as much as practicable. The Board will inform the Tribes and Alaska Native corporations how their recommendations were considered.

Compliance With Statutory and Regulatory Authorities*National Environmental Policy Act*

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement that described four alternatives for developing a Federal Subsistence Management Program was distributed for public comment on October 7, 1991. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was published on February 28, 1992. The Record of Decision (ROD) on Subsistence Management for Federal Public Lands in Alaska was signed April 6, 1992. The selected alternative in the FEIS (Alternative IV) defined the administrative framework of an annual regulatory cycle for subsistence regulations.

Several alternatives were considered for the composition of the Board including all Federal agency heads and all public members representing subsistence users. This proposed regulation adding two additional public members to the Board falls within the scope of alternatives. For this reason, the impacts described in the FEIS and ROD are deemed sufficient for this proposed regulation and require no further analysis.

Even in the absence of the consideration of alternatives in the existing programmatic FEIS and ROD, no further NEPA analysis would be required in this instance. There are two reasons for this. The first is that this action is merely administrative in nature and has no environmental impact. The second is that activities of this nature are categorically excluded from the requirements of NEPA under both Department of the Interior (DOI) regulations and Department of Agriculture (DOA) regulations. Specifically, DOI regulations at 43 CFR 46.210 set forth categorical exclusions for both internal organizational changes and the adoption of regulations that are of an administrative nature. Similarly, DOA regulations at 7 CFR 1b.3(a) provide a categorical exclusion for routine activities such as personnel and organizational changes, and similar administrative functions.

A 1997 environmental assessment dealt with the expansion of Federal jurisdiction over fisheries and is available at the office listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The Secretary of the Interior, with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, determined that expansion of Federal jurisdiction does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the human environment and, therefore, signed a Finding of No Significant Impact.

Section 810 of ANILCA

An ANILCA section 810 analysis was completed as part of the FEIS process on the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The intent of all Federal subsistence regulations is to accord subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on public lands a priority over the taking of fish and wildlife on such lands for other purposes, unless restriction is necessary to conserve healthy fish and wildlife populations. The final section 810 analysis determination appeared in the April 6, 1992, ROD and concluded that the Federal Subsistence Management Program, under Alternative IV with an annual process for setting subsistence regulations, may have some local impacts on subsistence uses, but will not likely restrict subsistence uses significantly. This analysis describes impacts of the alternative Board compositions. This proposed action falls within that analysis and no further analysis is warranted.

During the subsequent environmental assessment process for extending fisheries jurisdiction, an evaluation of the effects of this rule was conducted in accordance with § 810. That evaluation concluded that, because this is merely an administrative action, the rule will not reach the "may significantly restrict" threshold that would require notice and hearings under ANILCA § 810(a).

Paperwork Reduction Act

An agency may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. This proposed rule does not contain any new collections of information that require OMB approval. OMB has reviewed and approved the following collections of information associated with the subsistence regulations at 36 CFR 242 and 50 CFR 100: Subsistence hunting and fishing applications, permits, and reports, Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Membership Application/Nomination and Interview Forms (OMB Control No. 1018-0075 expires January 31, 2013).

Regulatory Planning and Review (Executive Order 12866)

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that this proposed rule is not significant and has not reviewed this rule under Executive Order 12866. OMB bases its determination upon the following four criteria:

(a) Whether the rule will have an annual effect of \$100 million or more on

the economy or adversely affect an economic sector, productivity, jobs, the environment, or other units of the government.

(b) Whether the rule will create inconsistencies with other agencies' actions.

(c) Whether the rule will materially affect entitlements, grants, user fees, loan programs, or the rights and obligations of their recipients.

(d) Whether the rule raises novel legal or policy issues.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires preparation of flexibility analyses for rules that will have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities, which include small businesses, organizations, or governmental jurisdictions. In general, the resources to be harvested under this rule are already being harvested and consumed by the local harvester and do not result in an additional dollar benefit to the economy. However, we estimate that two million pounds of meat are harvested by subsistence users annually and, if given an estimated dollar value of \$3.00 per pound, this amount would equate to about \$6 million in food value statewide. Based upon the amounts and values cited above, the Departments certify that this rulemaking will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

Under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), this rule is not a major rule. It does not have an effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, and does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

Executive Order 12630

Title VIII of ANILCA requires the Secretaries to administer a subsistence priority on public lands. The scope of this program is limited by definition to certain public lands. Likewise, these regulations have no potential takings of private property implications as defined by Executive Order 12630.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Secretaries have determined and certify pursuant to the Unfunded

Mandates Reform Act, 2 U.S.C. 1502 *et seq.*, that this rulemaking will not impose a cost of \$100 million or more in any given year on local or State governments or private entities. The implementation of this rule is by Federal agencies and there is no cost imposed on any State or local entities or Tribal governments.

Executive Order 12988

The Secretaries have determined that these regulations meet the applicable standards provided in §§ 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, regarding civil justice reform.

Executive Order 13132

In accordance with Executive Order 13132, the proposed rule does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. Title VIII of ANILCA precludes the State from exercising subsistence management authority over fish and wildlife resources on Federal lands unless it meets certain requirements.

Executive Order 13175

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act does not provide rights to Tribes for the subsistence taking of wildlife, fish, and shellfish. However, the Board will provide Federally recognized Tribes and Alaska Native corporations an opportunity to consult on this rule. Consultation with Alaska Native corporations is based on Public Law 108–199, div. H, Sec. 161, Jan. 23, 2004, 118 Stat. 452, as amended by Public Law 108–447, div. H, title V, Sec. 518, Dec. 8, 2004, 118 Stat. 3267, which provides that: “The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and all Federal agencies shall hereafter consult with Alaska Native corporations on the same basis as Indian Tribes under Executive Order No. 13175.”

The Secretaries, through the Board, will provide a variety of opportunities for consultation: Commenting on proposed changes to the existing rule; engaging in dialogue at the Regional Council meetings; engaging in dialogue at the Board's meetings; and providing input in person, by mail, e-mail, or phone at any time during the rulemaking process.

Executive Order 13211

This Executive Order requires agencies to prepare Statements of Energy Effects when undertaking certain actions. However, this proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under E.O. 13211, affecting energy supply, distribution, or use, and no Statement of Energy Effects is required.

Drafting Information

Theo Matuskowitz drafted these regulations under the guidance of Pat Pourchot, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior for Alaska Affairs, Department of the Interior, Anchorage, Alaska. Additional assistance was provided by:

- Peter J. Probasco, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and
- Steve Kessler, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Forest Service.

List of Subjects

36 CFR Part 242

Administrative practice and procedure, Alaska, Fish, National forests, Public lands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wildlife.

50 CFR Part 100

Administrative practice and procedure, Alaska, Fish, National forests, Public lands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Wildlife.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Secretaries propose to amend 36 CFR 242 and 50 CFR 100, as set forth below.

PART —SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS FOR PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

1. The authority citation for both 36 CFR Part 242 and 50 CFR Part 100 would continue to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 3, 472, 551, 668dd, 3101–3126; 18 U.S.C. 3551–3586; 43 U.S.C. 1733.

2. Amend § .10 by revising paragraphs (b)(1) and (d)(2) to read as follows:

§ .10 Federal Subsistence Board.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) The voting members of the Board are: A Chair to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture; two public members representing rural Alaskan subsistence users to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture; the Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Alaska Regional Director, National Park Service; Alaska Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service; the Alaska State Director, Bureau of Land Management; and the Alaska Regional Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Each Federal agency member of the Board may appoint a designee.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(2) A quorum consists of five members.

* * * * *

Dated: February 2, 2011.

Thomas L. Strickland,

Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior.

Dated: January 18, 2011.

Beth G. Pendleton,

Regional Forester, USDA—Forest Service.

[FR Doc. 2011–2959 Filed 2–10–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–P; 4310–55–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 141

[EPA–HQ–OW–2008–0692, EPA–HQ–OW–2009–0297; FRL–9262–8]

RIN 2040–AF08

Drinking Water: Regulatory Determination on Perchlorate

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Regulatory determination.

SUMMARY: This action presents EPA's (or the Agency's) regulatory determination for perchlorate in accordance with the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). Specifically, EPA has determined that perchlorate meets SDWA's criteria for regulating a contaminant—that is, perchlorate may have an adverse effect on the health of persons; perchlorate is known to occur or there is a substantial likelihood that perchlorate will occur in public water systems with a frequency and at levels of public health concern; and in the sole judgment of the Administrator, regulation of perchlorate in drinking water systems presents a meaningful opportunity for health risk reduction for persons served by public water systems. Therefore, EPA will initiate the process of proposing a national primary drinking water regulation (NPDWR) for perchlorate.

DATES: For purposes of judicial review, the regulatory determination is issued as of February 11, 2011, as provided in 40 CFR 23.7.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established dockets for this action under Docket ID numbers EPA–HQ–OW–2008–0692 and EPA–HQ–OW–2009–0297. All documents in these dockets are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material,

is not placed on the Internet, but will be publicly available in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Water Docket, EPA/DC, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC. 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 EPA Docket Center is (202) 566–2426.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Burneson, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Standards and Risk Management Division, at (202) 564–5250 or e-mail burneson.eric@epa.gov. For general information contact the EPA Safe Drinking Water Hotline at (800) 426–4791 or e-mail: hotline-sdwa@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. General Information
 - Does this action impose any requirements on my public water system?
- II. Background
 - A. What is the purpose of this action?
 - B. Background on Perchlorate Regulatory Determinations
 - C. What is EPA's final regulatory determination on perchlorate and what happens next?
- III. Final Regulatory Determination for Perchlorate
 - A. May perchlorate have an adverse effect on the health of persons?
 - B. Is perchlorate known to occur or is there a substantial likelihood that perchlorate will occur in public water systems with a frequency and at levels of public health concern?
 - C. Is there a meaningful opportunity for the reduction of health risks from perchlorate for persons served by public water systems?
 - D. Regulatory Determination
 - E. Key Commenter Issues
 - 1. Health Implications of Perchlorate Exposure above the RfD
 - 2. Other Thyroid Inhibiting Chemicals
 - 3. Perchlorate in Food
 - 4. Iodide Nutritional Status
 - 5. Physiologically-Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling
 - F. Next Steps
- IV. References

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CBI—confidential business information
 CCL—Contaminant Candidate List
 EPA—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 FR—Federal Register
 HRL—health reference level
 kg—kilogram
 L—liter
 MCL—maximum contaminant level
 MRL—Minimum Reporting Limit

NOEL—no observed effect level
 NPDWR—National Primary Drinking Water Regulation
 NRC—National Research Council
 PBPK—Physiologically-Based Pharmacokinetic
 PWS—public water system
 RfD—reference dose
 SDWA—Safe Drinking Water Act
 UCMR—Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule
 µg—microgram (one-millionth of a gram)
 U.S.—United States

I. General Information

Does this action impose any requirements on my public water system?

Today's action notifies interested parties of EPA's determination to regulate perchlorate, but imposes no requirements on public water systems (PWSs). However, this action also initiates the process to develop a national primary drinking water regulation (NPDWR) for perchlorate. At such time as the Agency establishes an NPDWR, certain PWSs will be required to take action to comply with the regulation in accordance with the schedule specified in the regulation.

II. Background

A. What is the purpose of this action?

The purpose of today's action is to present EPA's final determination to regulate perchlorate in drinking water, the rationale EPA used to make this regulatory determination, and EPA's response to certain key issues raised by commenters on previous **Federal Register** (FR) notices on the drinking water regulatory determination for perchlorate. (All comments are addressed in a Response to Comments document that is available in EPA's docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2009–0297 for this regulatory determination.)

B. Background on Perchlorate Regulatory Determinations

The statutory and regulatory background for this action is described in detail in the October 10, 2008, FR notice discussing EPA's preliminary regulatory determination for perchlorate (73 FR 60262; USEPA 2008a). Briefly, SDWA section 1412(b)(1)(A), as amended in 1996, requires EPA to make a determination whether to regulate at least five contaminants from its Contaminant Candidate List (CCL) every five years. To regulate a contaminant in drinking water, EPA must determine that it meets three criteria: (1) The contaminant may have an adverse effect on the health of persons; (2) the contaminant is known to occur or there is a substantial likelihood that the