

separately to each change would be substantial. Therefore, we periodically have announced uniform compliance dates for new food labeling requirements (see, e.g., the **Federal Register** of October 19, 1984 (49 FR 41019); December 24, 1996 (61 FR 67710); December 27, 1996 (61 FR 68145); December 23, 1998 (63 FR 71015); November 20, 2000 (65 FR 69666); December 31, 2002 (67 FR 79851); December 21, 2006 (71 FR 76599); December 8, 2008 (73 FR 74349); December 15, 2010 (75 FR 78155); and November 28, 2012 (77 FR 70885)). Use of a uniform compliance date provides for an orderly and economical industry adjustment to new labeling requirements by allowing sufficient lead time to plan for the use of existing label inventories and the development of new labeling materials.

We have determined under 21 CFR 25.30(k) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

This final rule contains no collections of information. Therefore, clearance by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 is not required.

We have examined the impacts of the final rule under Executive Order 12866, Executive Order 13563, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4). Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct Agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity). We believe that this final rule is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

The establishment of a uniform compliance date does not in itself lead to costs or benefits. We will assess the costs and benefits of the uniform compliance date in the regulatory impact analyses of the labeling rules that take effect at that date.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires Agencies to analyze regulatory options that would minimize any significant economic impact of a rule on small entities. Because the final rule does not impose compliance costs on small entities, we certify that the final rule will not have a significant

economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Section 202(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires that Agencies prepare a written statement, which includes an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits, before proposing “any rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year.” The current threshold after adjustment for inflation is \$141 million, using the most current (2013) Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product. We do not expect this final rule to result in any 1-year expenditure that would meet or exceed this amount.

We have analyzed this final rule in accordance with the principles set forth in Executive Order 13132. We have determined that the rule does not contain policies that 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. Accordingly, we have concluded that the rule does not contain policies that have federalism implications as defined in the Executive Order and, consequently, a federalism summary impact statement is not required.

This action is not intended to change existing requirements for compliance dates contained in final rules published before January 1, 2015. Therefore, all final rules published by FDA in the **Federal Register** before January 1, 2015, will still go into effect on the date stated in the respective final rule. We generally encourage industry to comply with new labeling regulations as quickly as feasible, however. Thus, when industry members voluntarily change their labels, it is appropriate that they incorporate any new requirements that have been published as final regulations up to that time.

In rulemaking that began with publication of a proposed rule on April 15, 1996 (61 FR 16422), and ended with a final rule on December 24, 1996, we provided notice and an opportunity for comment on the practice of establishing uniform compliance dates by issuance of a final rule announcing the date. Receiving no comments objecting to this practice, FDA finds any further advance notice and opportunity for comment or delayed effective date unnecessary for establishment of the uniform compliance date. We have previously invited comment on the practice of

establishing uniform compliance dates by issuing a final rule, and interested parties will have an opportunity to comment on the compliance date for each individual food labeling regulation as part of the rulemaking process for that regulation. Nonetheless, under 21 CFR 10.40(e)(1), we are providing an opportunity for comment on whether the uniform compliance date established by this final rule should be modified or revoked.

The new uniform compliance date will apply only to final FDA food labeling regulations that require changes in the labeling of food products and that publish after January 1, 2015, and before December 31, 2016. Those regulations will specifically identify January 1, 2018, as their compliance date. All food products subject to the January 1, 2018, compliance date must comply with the appropriate regulations when initially introduced into interstate commerce on or after January 1, 2018. If any food labeling regulation involves special circumstances that justify a compliance date other than January 1, 2018, we will determine for that regulation an appropriate compliance date, which will be specified when the final regulation is published.

II. Comments

Interested persons may submit either electronic comments regarding this document to <http://www.regulations.gov> or written comments to the Division of Dockets Management (see **ADDRESSES**). It is only necessary to send one set of comments. Identify comments with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Received comments may be seen in the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, and will be posted to the docket at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Dated: December 4, 2014.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014–28829 Filed 12–9–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2014–0123; FRL–9920–13–Region 5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: Due to the receipt of an adverse comment, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is withdrawing the October 17, 2014, direct final rule approving a revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan (SIP) to phase out the requirements of the Stage II Vapor Recovery program.

DATES: The direct final rule published at 79 FR 62352 on October 17, 2014, is withdrawn effective December 10, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Francisco J. Acevedo, Mobile Source Program Manager, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6061, acevedo.francisco@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency submitted this revision as a modification to the SIP for gasoline vapor recovery requirements. In the direct final rule, EPA stated that if adverse comments were submitted by November 17, 2014, the rule would be withdrawn and not take effect. On October 20, 2014, EPA received an adverse comment and, therefore, is withdrawing the direct final rule. EPA will address the comment in a subsequent final action based upon the proposed action also published on October 17, 2014. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Oxides of nitrogen, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: November 24, 2014.

Susan Hedman,

Regional Administrator, Region 5.

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Accordingly, the amendment to 40 CFR 52.720 published in the **Federal Register** on October 17, 2014 (79 FR 62352) on page 62356 is withdrawn effective December 10, 2014.

[FR Doc. 2014-28803 Filed 12-9-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0480; FRL-9919-76-Region 9]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking direct final action to approve revisions to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern particulate matter (PM) emissions from fugitive dust and abrasive blasting. We are approving local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule is effective on February 9, 2015 without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by January 9, 2015. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this direct final rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0480, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions.
2. *Email:* steckel.andrew@epa.gov.
3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Instructions: All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through www.regulations.gov or email.

www.regulations.gov is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at www.regulations.gov and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105-3901. While all documents in the docket are listed at www.regulations.gov, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Vineyard, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4125, vineyard.christine@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State’s Submittal
 - A. What rules did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. EPA Recommendations to Further Improve the Rules
 - D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State’s Submittal

A. What rules did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rules we are approving with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agencies and submitted by the California Air Resource Board.