

HI was five at the 95th percentile. See 79 FR 78328–32. The Commission’s justification for the proposed rule was based on available data showing that a statistically stable, non-zero percentage of the women studied had an HI greater than one and that an HI less than or equal to one is necessary “to ensure a reasonable certainty of no harm to children, pregnant women, or other susceptible individuals with an adequate margin of safety.” See 79 FR 78334–35.

After publication of the proposed rule, the Commission examined new data using the CHAP’s original methodology. Based on the new data, the Commission determined that phthalate exposures had changed over time and that there were too few samples in the study with an HI above one to make a statistically reliable estimate for the population of the number or percentage of women of reproductive age with an HI greater than one. No new data on infants were available, so risk estimates for this population did not change in the updated analysis. Based on the new data for women of reproductive age, the Commission found that the risk of antiandrogenic effects had decreased, and that the HI at the 95th percentile had decreased from five to less than one. 82 FR 49958. Based on the new data, the Commission could not determine exactly what percentage of the women studied had an HI greater than one but did state that “between two and nine real women from the sample of 538 [women of reproductive age] had an HI greater than one.” *Id.* The Commission’s justification for the final rule was based on the facts that between two and nine individual samples had HI levels greater than one and not the 10 percent of women who had exposures described in the proposed rule, and that no new data on infants were available. For details regarding the respective justifications, potential commenters are directed to the preamble of the respective **Federal Register** notices for the proposed and final rule.

The court of appeals held that the Commission did not provide adequate notice and comment when it changed the justification for the prohibitions in the proposed rule to the final rule. Accordingly, the Commission is publishing this notice to request public comment regarding the justification for the final rule.

B. Request for Comment on Cost-Benefit Analysis of Continuing Interim DINP Prohibition

The Fifth Circuit held that the final phthalates rule was deficient because it

did not consider the costs and benefits of continuing the interim prohibition on DINP. Specifically, the court found that the Commission was required at least to consider the cost, as well as the effect on utility and availability of products containing DINP, to determine whether to continue the interim prohibition.

The staff of the Directorate for Economic Analysis has conducted a cost-benefit analysis regarding continuing the interim prohibition on DINP in the final rule. The staff memorandum “Cost-Benefit Analysis of Continuing the Interim DINP Prohibition in the Final Rule: 16 CFR part 1307 ‘Prohibition of Children’s Toys and Child Care Articles Containing Specified Phthalates’” can be found here: https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/CostBenefitAnalysisDINPinPhthalatesFinalRule.pdf?VersionId=4dQErAhY2cQdvQpf1I8rAqTNCjinie_h. The Commission requests public comment regarding the cost-benefit analysis of continuing the interim prohibition on DINP in the final rule.

III. Submission of Comments

We request comments on two issues: The rationale for the final rule in section II.A; and the cost-benefit analysis of continuing the DINP interim prohibition discussed in section II.B of this document. Only comments submitted regarding the rationale for the final rule and/or the cost-benefit analysis of continuing the DINP interim prohibition will be considered. Comments submitted on any other issues are out of scope and will not be considered. Finally, untimely submitted comments will not be considered.

Information regarding the court decision is available on the CPSC website or <http://www.regulations.gov>, under Docket No. CPSC–2014–0033, Supporting and Related Materials. Alternatively, interested parties may obtain a copy of the court decision by writing or calling the Division of the Secretariat, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–6833.

Alberta E. Mills,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2022–06223 Filed 3–23–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

22 CFR Part 22

[Public Notice: 11649]

RIN 1400–AF48

Schedule of Fees for Consular Services—Elimination of the “Return Check Processing Fee”

AGENCY: Department of State.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of State (the Department) is adjusting the Schedule of Fees for Consular Services (Schedule) by removing Item Number 74, a \$25 return check processing fee. Domestically, the Bureau of Consular Affairs, Office of Passport Services (CA/PPT), has charged customers this fee when the instruments they have used to submit payment for a passport application could not be processed due to insufficient funds, closed accounts, stop payments, and altered/fictitious checks or money orders. A recent review of the Department’s Cost of Service Model (CoSM) established that the costs associated with attempts to recover on non-viable instruments are now captured within the passport application fee. The Department therefore stopped charging this fee on December 13, 2021, and will remove this fee from the Schedule.

DATES: This rule is effective March 24, 2022.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Johanna Cruz, Management Analyst, Office of the Comptroller, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; phone: 202–485–8915, email: fees@state.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This rule makes changes to the Schedule of Fees in 22 CFR 22.1 by removing Item Number 74, the \$25 return check processing fee, from the Schedule of Fees. This fee was added to the Schedule in 1991 to recoup the cost of time spent by passport office personnel attempting to recover on bad checks applicants had submitted to the Department. According to the Passport Directorate’s research, in FY 1989 there were approximately 8,800 bad checks and money orders, which required an estimated 5,400 staff hours to process. This fee has only been charged domestically; overseas posts do not accept personal checks and have not charged the fee. A recent review of the Department’s CoSM established that the costs associated with the return check processing fee are now captured within

TABLE 1—CHANGES TO THE SCHEDULE OF FEES—Continued

Item No.	Proposed fee	Current fee	Change in fee	Percentage increase	Projected annual number of applications ¹	Estimated change in annual fees collected ²	Change in state retained fees	Change in remittance to Treasury
74. Return Check Processing Fee	\$0	\$25	(\$25)	(100%)	8,293	(\$207,325)	\$0	(\$207,325)

¹ Based on estimated FY 2021 workload calculated with 8/1/2021 actual demand.

² Using FY 2021 workload to generate collections. This will be a reduction in total annual remittance to Treasury.

Executive Orders 12372 and 13132

This regulation will not 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. Therefore, in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13132, it is determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to require consultations or warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on federal programs and activities do not apply to this regulation.

Executive Order 13175

The Department has determined that this rulemaking will not have tribal implications, will not impose substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments, and will not preempt tribal law. Accordingly, the requirements of Executive Order 13175 do not apply to this rulemaking.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not impose any new reporting or record-keeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

List of Subjects in 22 CFR Part 22

Consular services, Fees.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the preamble, 22 CFR part 22 is amended as follows:

PART 22—SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR CONSULAR SERVICES—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN SERVICE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 22 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 8 U.S.C. 1101 note, 1153 note, 1157 note, 1183a note, 1184(c)(12), 1201(c), 1351, 1351 note, 1713, 1714, 1714 note; 10 U.S.C. 2602(c); 22 U.S.C. 214, 214 note, 1475e, 2504(h), 2651a, 4206, 4215, 4219, 6551; 31 U.S.C. 9701; Exec. Order 10718, 22 FR 4632 (1957); Exec. Order 11295, 31 FR 10603 (1966).

■ 2. Amend § 22.1 by

- a. Revising the introductory text; and
- b. In the table, removing and reserving entry 74.

The revision reads as follows:

§ 22.1 Schedule of Fees

The following table sets forth the fees for the following categories listed on the U.S. Department of State’s Schedule of Fees for Consular Services:

* * * * *

Rena Bitter,

*Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs,
Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2022–06131 Filed 3–23–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2021–0750]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Craighill Channel, MD

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is extending the duration of a temporary safety zone on certain navigable waters of the Chesapeake Bay. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of persons and the marine environment from the potential safety hazards associated with the damage assessment and salvage of the grounded freight ship EVER FORWARD, through 9 p.m. on April 13, 2022. This rule prohibits persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Maryland-National Capital Region or a designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective without actual notice from March 24, 2022 until 9 p.m. on April 13, 2022. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from 9 p.m. on March 20, 2022, until March 24, 2022.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2021–0750 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Next, in the Document Type column, select “Supporting & Related Material.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Mr. Ron Houck, Sector Maryland-NCR, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard: telephone 410–576–2674, email Ronald.L.Houck@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

- CFR Code of Federal Regulations
- COTP Captain of the Port
- DHS Department of Homeland Security
- FR Federal Register
- NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
- § Section
- U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background Information and Regulatory History

On March 14, 2022, the Coast Guard issued a final rule establishing a temporary safety zone on certain navigable waters of the Chesapeake Bay to protect persons and vessels during damage assessment and salvage operations at the grounded 1,102-foot Hong Kong-flagged motor vessel EVER FORWARD. The original rule runs through 9 p.m. on March 20, 2022. However, additional time is needed to conduct the damage assessment and salvage operations and, as a result, the Coast Guard needs to extend the safety zone through 9 p.m. on April 13, 2022. The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this extension because it