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DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2017–0098]

Notice of a Determination Regarding the Classical Swine Fever and Swine Vesicular Disease Status of Japan

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public of our determination that Japan is free of classical swine fever (CSF) and swine vesicular disease (SVD). Based on an evaluation of the CSF and SVD status of Japan, which we made available to the public for review and comment through a previous notice, the Administrator has determined that CSF and SVD are not present in Japan and that live swine, pork, and pork products may safely be imported into the United States from Japan subject to conditions in the regulations.

DATES: This change in Japan’s CSF and SVD status will be recognized on July 9, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Kelly Rhodes, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Regionalization Evaluation Services, National Import Export Services, VS, APHIS, USDA, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; email: Kelly.Rhodes@aphis.usda.gov; (301) 851–3315.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 animal diseases, including classical swine fever (CSF) and swine vesicular disease (SVD). These are dangerous and communicable diseases of swine.

Within part 94, § 94.9 contains requirements governing the importation of pork and pork products from regions where CSF exists. Section 94.10 contains importation requirements for swine from regions where CSF is considered to exist. Section 94.12 contains requirements governing the importation of pork or pork products from regions where SVD exists. Section 94.14 prohibits the importation of domestic swine which are moved from or transit any region in which SVD is known to exist.

In accordance with §§ 94.9(a)(1) and 94.10(a)(1), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) maintains a web-based list of regions which the Agency considers free of CSF. Sections 94.9(a)(2) and 94.10(a)(2) state that APHIS will add a region to this list after it conducts an evaluation of the region and finds that CSF is not present.

Similarly, in accordance with § 94.12(a)(1), APHIS maintains a web-based list of regions which the Agency considers free of SVD. Paragraph (a)(2) of this section states that APHIS will add a region to this list after it conducts an evaluation of the region and finds that SVD is not present.

The regulations in § 92.2 contain requirements for requesting the recognition of the animal health status of a region (as well as for the approval of the export of a particular type of animal or animal product to the United States from a foreign region). If, after review and evaluation of the information submitted in support of the request, APHIS believes the request can be safely granted, APHIS will make its evaluation available for public comment through a document published in the Federal Register. Following the close of the comment period, APHIS will review all comments received and will make a final determination regarding the request that will be detailed in another document published in the Federal Register.

In accordance with that process, Japan requested that APHIS evaluate the CSF and SVD disease status of the country. Based on our evaluation, we determined that Japan is free of both CSF and SVD and that the surveillance, prevention, and control measures implemented by Japan are sufficient to minimize the likelihood of introducing CSF and SVD into the United States via imports of species or products susceptible to these diseases.

On February 20, 2018, we published in the Federal Register (83 FR 7138, Docket No. APHIS–2017–0098) a notice in which we announced the availability for review and comment of our evaluation of the CSF and SVD status of Japan. We solicited comments on the notice for 30 days ending on March 22, 2018. We received no comments on our evaluation.

Therefore, based on the findings of our evaluation and the absence of comments that would lead us to reconsider those findings, we are announcing our determination to add Japan to the list of regions declared free of CSF and the list of regions declared free of SVD. These lists are available on the APHIS website at https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/animalhealth/animal-and-animal-product-import-information/ct_animal_disease_status.


Done in Washington, DC, this 1st day of June 2018.

Kevin Shea,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2018–12186 Filed 6–6–18; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2017–0073]

Bayer CropScience LP; Availability of a Preliminary Plant Pest Risk Assessment, Draft Environmental Assessment, Preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact, and Preliminary Determination of Nonregulated Status for Cotton Genetically Engineered For Resistance to HPPD-Inhibitor Herbicides (e.g., Isoxaflutole) and Glyphosate

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

1 To view the notice and the supporting documents, go to https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=APHIS20170698.
SUMMARY: We are advising the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has prepared a preliminary determination regarding a request from Bayer CropScience LP seeking a determination of nonregulated status for cotton designated as event GHB811, which has been genetically engineered for dual resistance to HPPD-inhibitor herbicides (e.g., isoxaflutole) and the herbicide glyphosate. We are also making available for public review and comment our preliminary plant pest risk assessment, draft environmental assessment, and preliminary finding of no significant impact for the preliminary determination of nonregulated status.

DATES: We will consider all comments that we receive on or before July 9, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=APHIS-2017-0073.
- **Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:** Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2017-0073, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238.

The draft environmental assessment, preliminary regulatory determination, preliminary finding of no significant impact, preliminary plant pest risk assessment, and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=APHIS-2017-0073 or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799–7039 before coming.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. John Turner, Director, Environmental Risk Analysis Programs, Biotechnology Regulatory Services, APHIS, 4700 River Road, Unit 147, Riverdale, MD 20737–1236; (301) 851–3954, email: john.t.turner@aphis.usda.gov. To obtain copies of the petition, contact Ms. Cindy Eck at (301) 851–3892, email: cynthia.a.eck@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Under the authority of the plant pest provisions of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the regulations in 7 CFR part 340, “Introduction of Organisms and Products Altered or Produced Through Genetic Engineering Which Are Plant Pests or Which There Is Reason to Believe Are Plant Pests,” regulate, among other things, the introduction (importation, interstate movement, or release into the environment) of organisms and products altered or produced through genetic engineering that are plant pests or that there is reason to believe are plant pests. Such genetically engineered (GE) organisms and products are considered “regulated articles.”

The regulations in § 340.6(a) provide that any person may submit a petition to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) seeking a determination that an article should not be regulated under 7 CFR part 340. APHIS received a petition (APHIS Petition Number 17–138–01p) from Bayer CropScience LP (Bayer) of Research Triangle Park, NC, seeking a determination of nonregulated status of cotton (Gossypium spp.) designated as event GHB811, which has been genetically engineered for dual resistance to HPPD-inhibitor herbicides (e.g., isoxaflutole) and the herbicide glyphosate. The Bayer petition states that information collected during field trials and laboratory analyses indicates that GHB811 cotton is not likely to be a plant pest and therefore should not be a regulated article under APHIS’ regulations in 7 CFR part 340.

According to our process 5 for soliciting public comment when considering petitions for determinations of nonregulated status of GE organisms, APHIS accepts written comments regarding a petition once APHIS deems it complete. In a notice 2 published in the Federal Register on October 27, 2017 (82 FR 49782–49783, Docket No. APHIS–2017–0073), APHIS announced the availability of the Bayer petition for public comment. APHIS solicited comments on the petition for 60 days ending on December 26, 2017, in order to help identify potential environmental and interrelated economic issues and impacts that APHIS may determine should be considered in our evaluation of the petition. APHIS received eight comments on the petition. One submission was in favor of the GHB811 cotton determination. Seven of the comments expressed a general disapproval of the planting and use of GE crops. Of the seven comments in opposition, two submissions contained attached comments by organizations. APHIS has evaluated the issues raised during the comment period and, where appropriate, has provided a discussion of these issues in our draft environmental assessment (EA).

After public comments are received on a completed petition, APHIS evaluates those comments and then provides a second opportunity for public involvement in our decisionmaking process. According to our public review process (see footnote 1), the second opportunity for public involvement follows one of two approaches, as described below.

If APHIS decides, based on its review of the petition and its evaluation and analysis of comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the petition, that the petition involves a GE organism that raises no substantive new issues, APHIS will follow Approach 1 for public involvement. Under Approach 1, APHIS announces in the Federal Register the availability of APHIS’ preliminary regulatory determination along with its draft EA, preliminary finding of no significant impact (FONSI), and its preliminary plant pest risk assessment (PPRA) for a 30-day public review period. APHIS will evaluate any information received related to the petition and its supporting documents during the 30-day public review period. For this petition, we are using Approach 1.

Had APHIS decided, based on its review of the petition and its evaluation and analysis of comments received during the 60-day public comment period on the petition, that the petition involves a GE organism that raises substantive new issues, APHIS would follow Approach 2. Under Approach 2, APHIS first solicits written comments from the public on a draft EA and preliminary PPRA for a 30-day comment period through the publication of a Federal Register notice. Then, after reviewing and evaluating the comments on the draft EA and preliminary PPRA and other information, APHIS would revise the preliminary PPRA as necessary and prepare a final EA and, based on the final EA, a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document (either FONSI or a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement).
As part of our decisionmaking process regarding a GE organism's regulatory status, APHIS prepares a PPRA to assess the plant pest risk of the article. APHIS also prepares the appropriate environmental documentation—either an EA or an environmental impact statement—in accordance with NEPA, to provide the Agency and the public with a review and analysis of any potential environmental impacts that may result if the petition request is approved.

APHIS has prepared a preliminary PPRA and has concluded that cotton designated as event GHB811, which has been genetically engineered for dual herbicides resistance, is unlikely to pose a plant pest risk. In section 403 of the Plant Protection Act, “plant pest” is defined as any living stage of any of the following that can directly or indirectly injure, cause damage to, or cause disease in any plant or plant product: A protozoan, a nonhuman animal, a parasitic plant, a bacterium, a fungus, a nonhuman animal, a protozoan, a parasitic plant, a bacterium, a fungus, or allied with any of the foregoing.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.

The draft EA was prepared in accordance with (1) 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). Based on our analysis of data submitted by Bayer, a review of other scientific data, and additional data, APHIS has determined that cotton designated as event GHB811, or (2) make a determination of nonregulated status of cotton designated as event GHB811.