

connection with such incentive or bonus and monitors compliance with such policies and controls at least annually; and

(D) Receipt of compensation from a person outside a federal credit union by a volunteer official or non-senior-management employee of the credit union, or an immediate family member of a volunteer official or employee of the credit union, for a service or activity performed outside the credit union, provided that no referral has been made by the credit union or the official, employee, or family member.

In the past, credit unions have been confused about how to interpret the term “overall financial performance” in § 701.21(c)(8)(iii)(B). As noted, § 701.21(c)(8) generally prohibits most credit union employees and officials from receiving compensation made “in connection with any loan” a credit union makes, but provides exceptions, including one that permits incentive compensation to employees based on the credit union’s overall financial performance. Credit unions have expressed uncertainty about whether the NCUA permits loan metrics such as aggregate loan growth to be a factor in assessing overall financial performance. They also have asserted that the regulation is subject to varying interpretations and levels of enforcement across the NCUA’s regions.

Given the degree of confusion and uncertainty this regulation has caused, the Board seeks comment as to how the NCUA should modernize its regulations generally governing the compensation of credit union officials and employees in connection with loans made by credit unions and specifically with respect to defining “overall financial performance.” In addition, the Board specifically requests feedback addressing the following:

- Is there a single industry standard or methodology for developing executive compensation plans? Are there multiple standards or methodologies for credit unions of different asset sizes?

- Are the terms and conditions of executive compensation plans developed by credit unions themselves or are the plans crafted by third-party vendors?

- What do these plans look like? Are there specific formulas employed to determine terms and conditions? If so, what are the formulas?

- Is the current structure of § 701.21(c)(8), namely a broad prohibition with specific exceptions, the best format for regulating this area?

- Do commenters prefer a bright line test for permissible compensation to

regulations that make a more holistic evaluation of individual compensation plans and the incentives they provide? Is a bright line test even possible in this highly fact determinative area? If so, where is that line?

- Are current credit union compensation plans similar to, and competitive with, those provided at other financial institutions? If not, how do they differ and what, if anything, in the NCUA’s regulations contributes to those differences?

- What limitations, if any, are necessary to prevent individuals from being incentivized to take inappropriate risks that endanger their credit unions? What authorities do credit unions need to enable them to compete for talented executives?

- To what extent should the NCUA permit loan metrics, such as loan volume, to be a part of compensation plans? How would those metrics be incorporated into the overall plan?

- Should the NCUA provide additional requirements for compensation related to a line of business that is new for the credit union or one in which the credit union lacks substantial experience or expertise?

III. Legal Authority

The Board has issued this ANPR pursuant to its authority under the Federal Credit Union Act (FCU Act). Under the FCU Act, the NCUA is the chartering and supervisory authority for federal credit unions and the federal supervisory authority for federally insured credit unions (FICUs).⁶ The FCU Act grants NCUA a broad mandate to issue regulations governing both federal credit unions and all FICUs. Section 120 of the FCU Act is a general grant of regulatory authority and authorizes the Board to prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of the FCU Act.⁷ Section 207 of the FCU Act is a specific grant of authority over share insurance coverage, conservatorships, and liquidations.⁸ Section 209 of the FCU Act is a plenary grant of regulatory authority to issue rules and regulations necessary or appropriate to carry out its role as share insurer for all FICUs.⁹ Accordingly, the FCU Act grants the Board broad rulemaking authority to ensure that the credit union industry and the NCUSIF remain safe and sound.

⁶ 12 U.S.C. 1752–1775.

⁷ 12 U.S.C. 1766(a).

⁸ 12 U.S.C. 1787.

⁹ 12 U.S.C. 1789.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on April 18, 2019.

Gerard Poliquin,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2019–08166 Filed 4–22–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 1610

[Docket No. CPSC–2019–0008]

Request for Information About Possible Exemptions From Testing and Other Changes to the Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles

AGENCY: U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Request for information.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) requests information about possible changes to the Commission’s Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles to expand the list of fabrics that are exempt from testing under the standard. CPSC is particularly interested in receiving information about the possibility of adding spandex to the list of fabrics that are exempt from the testing requirements. CPSC also would like information about the equipment and procedures specified in the standard and possible ways to update those provisions to reduce the burdens associated with the testing requirements.

DATES: CPSC will accept written comments through June 24, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit written comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2019–20008, using the methods described below. CPSC encourages you to submit comments electronically, rather than in hard copy.

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments provided on the website. To ensure timely processing of comments, please submit all electronic comments through www.regulations.gov, rather than by email to CPSC.

Written Submissions: Submit written comments by mail, hand delivery, or courier to: Division of the Secretariat, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket

number for this notice. CPSC may post all comments, without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If furnished at all, such information should be submitted by mail, hand delivery, or courier.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments, go to: www.regulations.gov, and insert the docket number, CPSC–2019–20008, into the “Search” box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Allyson Tenney, Director, Division of Engineering, Directorate for Laboratory Sciences, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 5 Research Place, Rockville, MD 20850; telephone: (301) 987–2769; email: ATenney@cpsc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On June 16, 2017, the Commission requested input from interested parties about ways to reduce the burdens and costs associated with existing regulations, while still protecting consumers from risks of death or injuries associated with consumer products. 82 FR 27636. The Commission followed up on this burden reduction goal in its Fiscal Year 2019 Operating Plan, directing CPSC staff to review possibilities for reducing burdens, including “expanding exemptions from flammability testing.” U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Fiscal Year 2019 Operating Plan, p. 18 (Oct. 10, 2018), available at: <https://www.cpsc.gov/content/fiscal-year-2019-operating-plan>. Accordingly, this notice requests information about expanding the exemptions from flammability testing and other ways to reduce the burdens associated with the Commission’s Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles.

The Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U.S.C. 1191–1204) authorizes the Commission to issue flammability standards, under certain circumstances, when “needed to protect the public against unreasonable risk of the occurrence of fire leading to death or personal injury, or significant property damage.” 15 U.S.C. 1193(a). Under this authority, the Commission adopted a Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles in 16 CFR part 1610. The standard applies to clothing and textiles intended to be used for clothing. The regulations provide testing

requirements, establish three classes of flammability, set out the criteria for classifying textiles, and prohibit the use of textiles that exhibit rapid and intense burning. The purpose of these regulations is to reduce the risk of injury or death by prohibiting the use of dangerously flammable clothing textiles. 16 CFR 1610.1(a).

The regulations exempt certain fabrics from the testing requirements because “experience gained from years of testing in accordance with the Standard demonstrates that certain fabrics consistently yield acceptable results when tested in accordance with the Standard.” 16 CFR 1610.1(d). Currently, the following fabrics are exempt from the testing requirements:

- (1) Plain surface fabrics, regardless of fiber content, weighing 2.6 ounces per square yard or more, and
 - (2) All fabrics, both plain surface and raised-fiber surface textiles, regardless of weight, made entirely from any of the following fibers or entirely from combination of the following fibers: Acrylic, modacrylic, nylon, olefin, polyester, wool.
- Id.*

II. Request for Information

CPSC is considering changes to the Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles to reduce the costs and burdens associated with these requirements. One specific possibility that industry members have suggested is to add spandex to the list of fabrics in 16 CFR 1610.1(d)(2) that are exempt from the testing requirements in the standard. In addition, possible updates to the equipment and procedures specified in the standard may reduce the burdens associated with the testing requirements. CPSC requests comments on the following specific topics:

A. Possible Exemption of Spandex From Testing Requirements:

1. Data Regarding Spandex Test Results

CPSC staff is aware of stakeholder interest in adding spandex fibers to the Specific Exemptions in 16 CFR 1610.1(d). Please provide relevant information and data about spandex fibers that would help CPSC determine whether spandex “consistently yield[s] acceptable results when tested in accordance with the Standard.” CPSC is particularly interested in test data from testing a range of fabric constructions, fabric weights, and fiber blends. For example, it would be helpful to receive information about:

- (1) Plain surface fabrics with spandex blended with one or a combination of the exempted fibers listed in 16 CFR

1610.1(d)(2) weighing less than 2.6 ounces per square yard, and

(2) raised surface fabrics, regardless of weight, that contain spandex with one or a combination of the exempted fibers listed in 16 CFR 1610.1(d)(2).

2. Burden and Cost Associated With Testing Spandex

Please provide information about the general test burden and costs associated with testing fabric containing spandex fibers. The following specific information would be helpful:

- How much testing is required for fabrics containing spandex subject to 16 CFR part 1610?
- What are the costs associated with the required testing?
- What types of fabrics and garments require testing?

B. Additional Possible Changes to the Standard:

1. Availability and Specifications of Stop Thread

Section 1610.5 specifies the test apparatus and materials that must be used for flammability testing. The flammability test apparatus must include, among other things, a particular stop thread that is stretched from the spool through stop guides. The stop thread must be “a spool of No. 50, white, mercerized, 100% cotton sewing thread.” 16 CFR 1610.5(a)(2)(ii). CPSC staff is aware that this stop thread may have limited availability or that the numbering specified in the standard may be outdated. Please provide comments about the specifications of the stop thread and thread availability. What procedures are used to confirm the thread meets the specifications?

2. Refurbishing (Dry-Cleaning and Laundering)

Section 1610.6(b)(1)(i) specifies a dry cleaning procedure as part of the process of refurbishing plain and raised textile fabrics. As part of the dry cleaning procedure, the solvent perchloroethylene is required in 16 CFR 1610.6(b)(1)(i). Staff is aware of the limited availability of, and legal restrictions on the use of, perchloroethylene solvent. Please provide any comments on the testing burden or cost of performing the dry cleaning procedure with perchloroethylene solvent. Please provide details, and potential alternatives, when possible.

Section 1610.6(b)(1)(ii) requires samples to be washed and dried in accordance with American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists (AATCC) Test Method 124–2006,

Appearance of Fabrics After Repeated Home Laundering. AATCC 124–2006 requires the use of an automatic washer (Table III) and tumble dryer (Table IV) that meet certain conditions. Staff is aware of the limited availability of automatic washing machines, and possibly dryers, capable of meeting the conditions in AATCC 124–2006. Please provide any comments on the testing burden or cost of performing the laundering procedure with the automatic washing machine and tumble dryer specified in the standard. Please provide details, and potential alternatives, when possible.

3. Test Result Codes

The standard lists reporting codes in 16 CFR 1610.8(b)(2) to describe the burning behavior of raised surface fabrics. The reporting codes, which are based on test results, indicate the proper classification for the textile. CPSC staff has received input that these codes may be confusing. Please provide any comments on the use or needed clarification of these codes.

4. Additional Burdens Associated With 16 CFR Part 1610

Please provide other input and recommendations about opportunities to reduce the cost of testing requirements or other costs and burdens associated with 16 CFR part 1610. Also please identify test procedures that may need clarifications, and provide recommendations or alternatives that may reduce the burdens associated with these regulations, as well as details about the costs of those alternatives.

Alberta E. Mills,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2019–08140 Filed 4–22–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

26 CFR Part 1

[REG–121694–16]

RIN 1545–BN80

Updating Section 301 Regulations To Reflect Statutory Changes; Correction

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Correction to a notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document contains a correction to a notice of proposed rulemaking (REG–121694–16) that was

published in the **Federal Register** on March 26, 2019. The proposed regulations updated existing regulations under section 301 to reflect statutory changes made by the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988.

DATES: Written or electronic comments and requests for a public hearing are still being accepted and must be received by June 24, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Concerning the proposed regulations, Grid R. Glycer, (202) 317–6847; concerning submission of comments, Regina Johnson, (202) 317–6901 (not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The proposed regulations that are the subject of this correction are under sections 301, 356, 368, and 902 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Need for Correction

As published, the notice of proposed regulations (REG–121694–16) contains errors which may prove to be misleading and need to be clarified.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking (REG–121694–16) that was the subject of FR Doc. 2019–05649, published at 84 FR 11263 (March 26, 2019), is corrected to read as follows:

§ 1.301–1 [Corrected]

■ On page 11266, first column, the sixth and seventh lines of paragraph (f)(3)(ii), the language “similar to, the transaction in Notice 99–59” is corrected to read “similar to the transaction in, Notice 99–59”.

Martin V. Franks,

Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Legal Processing Division, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration).

[FR Doc. 2019–08113 Filed 4–22–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0665; FRL–9992–52–Region 4]

Air Plan Approval; SC; 2010 1-Hour SO₂ NAAQS Transport Infrastructure

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve

South Carolina’s June 25, 2018, State Implementation Plan (SIP) submission pertaining to the “good neighbor” provision of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) for the 2010 1-hour sulfur dioxide (SO₂) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). The good neighbor provision requires each state’s implementation plan to address the interstate transport of air pollution in amounts that contribute significantly to nonattainment, or interfere with maintenance, of a NAAQS in any other state. In this action, EPA is proposing to determine that South Carolina’s SIP contains adequate provisions to prohibit emissions within the State from contributing significantly to nonattainment or interfering with maintenance of the 2010 1-hour SO₂ NAAQS in any other state.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before May 23, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0665 at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michele Notarianni, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Ms. Notarianni can be reached via phone number (404) 562–9031 or via electronic mail at notarianni.michele@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: