

LIHPRHA (see, in particular, section 222(a)(2)(G)(i), 12 U.S.C. 4112 (a)(2)(G) and HUD's regulations at 24 CFR 248.145(a)(9)) requires that future rent adjustments for LIHPRHA projects be made by applying an annual factor, to be determined by HUD to the portion of project rent attributable to operating expenses for the project and, where the owner is a priority purchaser, to the portion of project rent attributable to project oversight costs.

**III. Findings and Certifications**

*Environmental Impact*

This issuance sets forth rate determinations and related external administrative requirements and procedures that do not constitute a development decision affecting the physical condition of specific project areas or building sites. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(6), this notice is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

*Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number*

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for this program is 14.187.

*Paperwork Reduction Act*

This notice reduces information collection requirements already submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520). In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Dated: September 26, 2014.

**Carol J. Galante,**

*Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.*

**Appendix**

**OPERATING COST ADJUSTMENT FACTORS FOR 2015**

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Alabama .....              | 1.9 |
| Alaska .....               | 2.2 |
| Arizona .....              | 2.0 |
| Arkansas .....             | 1.9 |
| California .....           | 2.6 |
| Colorado .....             | 2.0 |
| Connecticut .....          | 1.7 |
| Delaware .....             | 1.5 |
| District of Columbia ..... | 2.3 |
| Florida .....              | 2.2 |
| Georgia .....              | 2.0 |
| Hawaii .....               | 1.5 |
| Idaho .....                | 2.5 |

**OPERATING COST ADJUSTMENT FACTORS FOR 2015—Continued**

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Illinois .....        | 1.7 |
| Indiana .....         | 2.1 |
| Iowa .....            | 2.1 |
| Kansas .....          | 2.2 |
| Kentucky .....        | 2.1 |
| Louisiana .....       | 2.7 |
| Maine .....           | 1.8 |
| Maryland .....        | 2.1 |
| Massachusetts .....   | 2.4 |
| Michigan .....        | 1.4 |
| Minnesota .....       | 2.4 |
| Mississippi .....     | 2.4 |
| Missouri .....        | 2.0 |
| Montana .....         | 2.2 |
| Nebraska .....        | 2.1 |
| Nevada .....          | 2.0 |
| New Hampshire .....   | 2.2 |
| New Jersey .....      | 2.0 |
| New Mexico .....      | 2.4 |
| New York .....        | 2.2 |
| North Carolina .....  | 2.0 |
| North Dakota .....    | 2.0 |
| Ohio .....            | 2.0 |
| Oklahoma .....        | 1.8 |
| Oregon .....          | 2.2 |
| Pacific Islands ..... | 1.5 |
| Pennsylvania .....    | 2.0 |
| Puerto Rico .....     | 2.0 |
| Rhode Island .....    | 2.7 |
| South Carolina .....  | 2.2 |
| South Dakota .....    | 2.0 |
| Tennessee .....       | 2.0 |
| Texas .....           | 2.4 |
| Utah .....            | 2.2 |
| Vermont .....         | 2.0 |
| Virgin Islands .....  | 2.4 |
| Virginia .....        | 1.8 |
| Washington .....      | 2.2 |
| West Virginia .....   | 1.6 |
| Wisconsin .....       | 2.1 |
| Wyoming .....         | 2.1 |
| US Average .....      | 2.1 |

[FR Doc. 2014–23475 Filed 10–1–14; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Investigation No. 701–TA–457 (Review)]

**Certain Tow-Behind Lawn Groomers and Parts Thereof From China**

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of termination of five-year review.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission instituted the subject five-year review in July 2014 to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty order on certain tow-behind lawn groomers and parts thereof from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury (79 FR 37349). On September 23, 2014, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the order effective September

23, 2014, “{b}ecause the domestic interested parties did not participate in this sunset review . . .” (79 FR 56769). Accordingly, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)), the subject review is terminated.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* September 24, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Angela M.W. Newell (202–708–5409), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

**Authority:** This review is being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission’s rules (19 CFR 207.69).

Issued: September 29, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–23460 Filed 10–1–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

[Docket No. 14–01]

**The Medicine Shoppe; Decision and Order**

On March 24, 2014, Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall issued the attached Recommended Decision. Respondent filed Exceptions to the Recommended Decision.

Having reviewed the entire record including Respondent’s Exceptions, I have decided to adopt the ALJ’s findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended order. A discussion of Respondent’s Exceptions follows.

**Respondent’s Exceptions**

Respondent raises twelve different exceptions to the ALJ’s decision in no logical order. His contentions can be summarized as follows:

(1) That the ALJ failed to consider less punitive sanctions than revocation;