Feature Story

OMB Seeks Comment on Supporting Documents for Updated Social Cost of Carbon

The Office of Management and Budget will be seeking comment on the Technical Support Document (TSD) for the updated social cost of carbon (SCC), entitled *Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866*. This action is in response to a request for comments initiated in August by the Department of Energy on whether it was appropriate for DOE to rely on a new SCC value in a final rulemaking without first undergoing public comment. The SCC, which is used by agencies “to estimate the value to society of marginal reductions in carbon emissions,” was updated earlier this year through the release of a TSD which did not receive public input; the significantly increased SCC values were then incorporated into DOE’s final rule after it had gone through the public comment process. In November, OMB published an updated TSD, on which it is now seeking comment. Specifically, OMB is seeking comment on “selection of the three [integrated assessment models] for use in the analysis and the synthesis of the resulting SCC estimates, as outlined in the 2010 TSD the model inputs used to develop the SCC estimates, including economic growth, emissions trajectories, climate sensitivity and intergenerational discounting; how the distribution of SCC estimates should be represented in regulatory impact analyses; and the strengths and limitations of the overall approach.” Comments are due on January 27th, 2014; Read our analysis [here](#).
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FDA Seeks Nominations for Drugs for Difficult-to-Compound List

The Food and Drug Administration published a proposed rule announcing that the agency is planning “to develop a list of drug products that present demonstrable difficulties for compounding (difficult-to-compound list). To identify candidates for this list, FDA is encouraging interested groups and individuals to nominate specific drug products or categories of drug products and is describing the information that should be provided to the Agency in support of each nomination.” In a concurrent proposed rule, FDA is also accepting nominations for bulk drug substances for use in pharmacy compounding. After it receives nominations, FDA will consult with the Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee and issue its difficult-to-compound list and its bulk drug substances list as proposed rules under traditional notice-and-comment procedures. Comments are due on March 4th, 2014.
Department of the Treasury

OCC, Fed Board, FDIC Propose Liquidity Requirements Consistent with Basel Liquidity Ratio

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation published a proposed rule “that would implement a quantitative liquidity requirement consistent with the liquidity coverage ratio standard established by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. The requirement is designed to promote the short-term resilience of the liquidity risk profile of internationally active banking organizations, thereby improving the banking sector’s ability to absorb shocks arising from financial and economic stress, as well as improvements in the measurement and management of liquidity risk. The proposed rule would apply to all internationally active banking organizations, generally, bank holding companies, certain savings and loan holding companies, and depository institutions with more than $250 billion in total assets or more than $10 billion in on-balance sheet foreign exposure, and to their consolidated subsidiaries that are depository institutions with $10 billion or more in total consolidated assets. The proposed rule would also apply to companies designated for supervision by the Board by the Financial Stability Oversight Council under section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that do not have significant insurance operations and to their consolidated subsidiaries that are depository institutions with $10 billion or more in total consolidated assets. The Board also is proposing on its own a modified liquidity coverage ratio standard that is based on a 21-calendar day stress scenario rather than a 30 calendar-day stress scenario for bank holding companies and savings and loan holding companies without significant insurance or commercial operations that, in each case, have $50 billion or more in total consolidated assets.” Comments are due on January 31st, 2014.

Internal Revenue Service

IRS Proposes to Limit Political Activities by Tax-Exempt 501(c)(4) Organizations

The Internal Revenue Service published a proposed rule redefining allowable activity undertaken by non-profit 501(c)(4) organizations, which are defined in the tax code as “[c]ivic leagues or organizations not organized for profit but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare.” Current regulations, established in 1959, define “promotion of social welfare” as “operated primarily for the purpose of bringing about civic betterments and social improvements.” The rules further elaborate that “promotion of social welfare does not include direct or indirect participation or intervention in political campaigns on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office.” Currently, IRS determines whether social welfare organizations are meeting their tax-exempt status requirements on a case-by-case basis. “The Treasury Department and the IRS recognize that more definitive rules with respect to political activities related to candidates—rather than the existing, fact-intensive analysis—would be helpful in applying the rules regarding qualification for tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(4). Although more definitive rules might fail to capture (or might sweep in) activities that would (or would not) be captured under the IRS’ traditional facts and circumstances approach, adopting rules with sharper distinctions in this area would provide greater certainty and reduce the need for detailed factual analysis in determining whether an organization is described in section 501(c)(4). Accordingly, the Treasury Department and the IRS propose to amend Treas. Reg. § 1.501(c)(4)-1(a)(2) to identify specific political activities that would be considered candidate-related political activities that do not promote social welfare.” Comments are due on February 27th, 2014.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

FDIC Adopts Annual Stress Test Scenario Guidance in Final Rule

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation published a final rule adopting its November 20th interim guidance establishing the processes and factors to be used by FDIC in developing and distributing the stress test scenarios. “A key component of the annual stress test is the development of the stress test scenarios that are provided to covered banks on or before November 15th of each year by the FDIC. Scenarios are those sets of conditions that affect the U.S. economy or the financial condition of a covered bank that the FDIC annually determines are appropriate for use in the stress tests, including, but not limited to, baseline, adverse, and severely adverse scenarios. Each scenario includes the values of the variables specified for each quarter over the stress test horizon. The variables specified for each scenario generally address economic activity, asset prices, and other measures of financial market conditions for the United States and key foreign countries.”
Federal Reserve System  
Fed Board Adopts Final Policy Statement Establishing its Approach to Designing Stress Test Scenarios  
The Federal Reserve Board published a [final policy statement](#) explaining the approach the Board will adopt for designing scenarios for the annual stress tests pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act. “In order to enhance the transparency of the scenario design process, on November 23, 2012, the Board published for public comment a proposed policy statement (proposed policy statement) that would be used to develop scenarios for annual supervisory and company-run stress tests under the stress testing rules issued under the Dodd-Frank Act and the capital plan rule. The proposed policy statement outlined the characteristics of the supervisory stress test scenarios and explained the considerations and procedures that underlie the formulation of these scenarios… The proposed policy statement provided a broad description of the baseline, adverse, and severely adverse scenarios and described the types of variables that the Board would expect to include in the macroeconomic scenarios and in the market shock component of the stress test scenarios applicable to companies with significant trading activity. The proposed policy statement also described the Board’s approach to developing the macroeconomic scenarios and market shocks, as well as the relationship between the macroeconomic scenario and the market shock components. The Board noted that it may determine that material modifications to the proposed policy statement are appropriate if the supervisory stress test framework expands materially to include additional components or other scenarios that are currently not captured.”

Department of Transportation  
NHTSA Finalizes Rule Requiring Seat Belts in New Over-the-Road Buses  
The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued a [final rule](#) that amends the Federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) on occupant crash protection to require lap/shoulder seat belts for each passenger seating position in all new over-the-road buses, and in other new buses with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 26,000 pounds. **The notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) preceding this final rule… proposed to call buses with a GVWR greater than 11,793 kg (26,000 lb) “motorcoaches,” and proposed to apply seat belt requirements to those vehicles. This final rule fulfills a statutory mandate on motorcoach safety set forth in the “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act”. The final rule rule亦 furthers the first priority of NHTSA's goal in the 2007 plan by enhancing the safety of all heavy buses used in intercity bus transportation, while attending to the Motorcoach Enhanced Safety Act's focus on over-the-road buses. NHTSA’s 2007 plan, “NHTSA's Approach to Motorcoach Safety,” sought to research improvements to bus safety. The final rule is based on scientific data from an extensive test program completed in 2009 at NHTSA's Vehicle Research and Test Center. The annualized benefits using a 3% and 7% discount rate range from $28.5 - $158.6 million and the costs range from $21.8 - $121.1. This rule was considered final on November 25, 2013, and is intended to significantly reduce the risk of fatality and serious injury in frontal crashes and the risk of occupant ejection in rollovers, thus considerably enhancing the safety of these vehicles.**

**Agencies**

**Transportation Security Administration**  
TSA Institutes $85 Application Fee for TSA Pre Check Program for Trusted Travelers  
The Transportation Security Administration published a [notice](#) announcing an $85 application fee for TSA’s new Pre-Check program for trusted travelers. “Members of the public may apply to this TSA program by voluntarily providing biometric and biographic information and paying a fee. TSA will use these fees from applicants to fund selected activities of the TSA Pre✓™ Application Program, including the cost of conducting the security threat assessment and adjudicating the application. Successful applicants will be eligible to receive expedited screening at participating U.S. airport security checkpoints, including use of a dedicated screening lane and more limited physical screening.”

**Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation**  
FDIC & OCC Publish Joint Guidance for Consumer Protection Related to Deposit Advance Products  
The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in conjunction with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, [issued](#) a final supervisory guidance addressing sound banking practices and consumer protection related to deposit advance products. “The Guidance is intended to ensure that banks are aware of the significant risks associated with deposit advance products and supplements the FDIC's existing guidance on payday loans and subprime lending.
Although the FDIC encourages banks to respond to customers’ small-dollar credit needs in a responsible manner and with reasonable terms and conditions, deposit advance products pose a variety of credit, reputation, operational, and compliance risks to banks… Typically, the bank does not analyze the customer's ability to repay the loan based on recurring debits or other indications of a need for residual income to pay other bills. The decision to advance credit to customers, based solely on the amount and frequency of their deposits, stands in contrast to banks' traditional underwriting standards for other products, which typically include an assessment of the ability to repay the loan based on an analysis of the customer's finances.”
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