

abrogate the responsibilities or obligations of the United States to implement fully the provisions of the Montreal Protocol. In the case of conflict between any provision of this subchapter and any provision of the Montreal Protocol, the more stringent provision shall govern. Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to affect the authority or responsibility of the Administrator to implement Article 4 of the Montreal Protocol with other appropriate agencies.

(c) Technology export and overseas investment

Upon November 15, 1990, the President shall—

(1) prohibit the export of technologies used to produce a class I substance;

(2) prohibit direct or indirect investments by any person in facilities designed to produce a class I or class II substance in nations that are not parties to the Montreal Protocol; and

(3) direct that no agency of the government provide bilateral or multilateral subsidies, aids, credits, guarantees, or insurance programs, for the purpose of producing any class I substance.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title VI, § 614, as added Pub. L. 101-549, title VI, § 602(a), Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2668.)

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, referred to in subsec. (b), probably means Pub. L. 101-549, Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2399. For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see Short Title of 1990 Amendment note set out under section 7401 of this title and Tables.

§ 7671n. Authority of Administrator

If, in the Administrator's judgment, any substance, practice, process, or activity may reasonably be anticipated to affect the stratosphere, especially ozone in the stratosphere, and such effect may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare, the Administrator shall promptly promulgate regulations respecting the control of such substance, practice, process, or activity, and shall submit notice of the proposal and promulgation of such regulation to the Congress.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title VI, § 615, as added Pub. L. 101-549, title VI, § 602(a), Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2669.)

§ 7671o. Transfers among Parties to Montreal Protocol

(a) In general

Consistent with the Montreal Protocol, the United States may engage in transfers with other Parties to the Protocol under the following conditions:

(1) The United States may transfer production allowances to another Party if, at the time of such transfer, the Administrator establishes revised production limits for the United States such that the aggregate national United States production permitted under the revised production limits equals the lesser of (A) the maximum production level permitted for the substance or substances concerned in the transfer year under the Protocol minus the production allowances transferred,

(B) the maximum production level permitted for the substance or substances concerned in the transfer year under applicable domestic law minus the production allowances transferred, or (C) the average of the actual national production level of the substance or substances concerned for the 3 years prior to the transfer minus the production allowances transferred.

(2) The United States may acquire production allowances from another Party if, at the time of such transfer, the Administrator finds that the other Party has revised its domestic production limits in the same manner as provided with respect to transfers by the United States in this subsection.

(b) Effect of transfers on production limits

The Administrator is authorized to reduce the production limits established under this chapter as required as a prerequisite to transfers under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section or to increase production limits established under this chapter to reflect production allowances acquired under a transfer under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Regulations

The Administrator shall promulgate, within 2 years after November 15, 1990, regulations to implement this section.

(d) "Applicable domestic law" defined

In the case of the United States, the term "applicable domestic law" means this chapter.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title VI, § 616, as added Pub. L. 101-549, title VI, § 602(a), Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2669.)

§ 7671p. International cooperation

(a) In general

The President shall undertake to enter into international agreements to foster cooperative research which complements studies and research authorized by this subchapter, and to develop standards and regulations which protect the stratosphere consistent with regulations applicable within the United States. For these purposes the President through the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, shall negotiate multilateral treaties, conventions, resolutions, or other agreements, and formulate, present, or support proposals at the United Nations and other appropriate international forums and shall report to the Congress periodically on efforts to arrive at such agreements.

(b) Assistance to developing countries

The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall support global participation in the Montreal Protocol by providing technical and financial assistance to developing countries that are Parties to the Montreal Protocol and operating under article 5 of the Protocol. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$30,000,000 to carry out this section in fiscal years 1991, 1992 and 1993 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal years 1994 and 1995. If China and India become Parties to the Montreal

Protocol, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than an additional \$30,000,000 to carry out this section in fiscal years 1991, 1992, and 1993.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title VI, § 617, as added Pub. L. 101-549, title VI, § 602(a), Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2669.)

AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF STATE

Except as otherwise provided, Secretary of State to have and exercise any authority vested by law in any official or office of Department of State and references to such officials or offices deemed to refer to Secretary of State or Department of State, as appropriate, see section 2651a of Title 22, Foreign Relations and Intercourse, and section 161(d) of Pub. L. 103-236, set out as a note under section 2651a of Title 22.

§ 7671q. Miscellaneous provisions

For purposes of section 7416 of this title, requirements concerning the areas addressed by this subchapter for the protection of the stratosphere against ozone layer depletion shall be treated as requirements for the control and abatement of air pollution. For purposes of section 7418 of this title, the requirements of this subchapter and corresponding State, interstate, and local requirements, administrative authority, and process, and sanctions respecting the protection of the stratospheric ozone layer shall be treated as requirements for the control and abatement of air pollution within the meaning of section 7418 of this title.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title VI, § 618, as added Pub. L. 101-549, title VI, § 602(a), Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2670.)

CHAPTER 86—EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION

Sec.	
7701.	Congressional findings.
7702.	Congressional statement of purpose.
7703.	Definitions.
7704.	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.
7704a.	Report on seismic safety property standards.
7705, 7705a.	Repealed.
7705b.	Seismic standards.
7705c.	Acceptance of gifts.
7705d.	Repealed.
7705e.	Post-earthquake investigations program.
7706.	Authorization of appropriations.
7707.	Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System.
7708.	Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation.
7709.	Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee.

§ 7701. Congressional findings

The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) All 50 States are vulnerable to the hazards of earthquakes, and at least 39 of them are subject to major or moderate seismic risk, including Alaska, California, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, Utah, and Washington. A large portion of the population of the United States lives in areas vulnerable to earthquake hazards.

(2) Earthquakes have caused, and can cause in the future, enormous loss of life, injury, de-

struction of property, and economic and social disruption. With respect to future earthquakes, such loss, destruction, and disruption can be substantially reduced through the development and implementation of earthquake hazards reduction measures, including (A) improved design and construction methods and practices, (B) land-use controls and redevelopment, (C) prediction techniques and early-warning systems, (D) coordinated emergency preparedness plans, and (E) public education and involvement programs.

(3) An expertly staffed and adequately financed earthquake hazards reduction program, based on Federal, State, local, and private research, planning, decisionmaking, and contributions would reduce the risk of such loss, destruction, and disruption in seismic areas by an amount far greater than the cost of such program.

(4) A well-funded seismological research program in earthquake prediction could provide data adequate for the design, of an operational system that could predict accurately the time, place, magnitude, and physical effects of earthquakes in selected areas of the United States.

(5) The geological study of active faults and features can reveal how recently and how frequently major earthquakes have occurred on those faults and how much risk they pose. Such long-term seismic risk assessments are needed in virtually every aspect of earthquake hazards management, whether emergency planning, public regulation, detailed building design, insurance rating, or investment decision.

(6) The vulnerability of buildings, lifelines, public works, and industrial and emergency facilities can be reduced through proper earthquake resistant design and construction practices. The economy and efficacy of such procedures can be substantially increased through research and development.

(7) Programs and practices of departments and agencies of the United States are important to the communities they serve; some functions, such as emergency communications and national defense, and lifelines, such as dams, bridges, and public works, must remain in service during and after an earthquake. Federally owned, operated, and influenced structures and lifelines should serve as models for how to reduce and minimize hazards to the community.

(8) The implementation of earthquake hazards reduction measures would, as an added benefit, also reduce the risk of loss, destruction, and disruption from other natural hazards and manmade hazards, including hurricanes, tornadoes, accidents, explosions, landslides, building and structural cave-ins, and fires.

(9) Reduction of loss, destruction, and disruption from earthquakes will depend on the actions of individuals, and organizations in the private sector and governmental units at Federal, State, and local levels. The current capability to transfer knowledge and information to these sectors is insufficient. Improved mechanisms are needed to translate existing