

ADDRESSES: In compliance with 28 U.S.C. 2112(a), OSHA designates the Associate Solicitor of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health as the recipient of petitions for review of the final standard. Contact Joseph M. Woodward, Associate Solicitor, at the Office of the Solicitor, Room S-4004, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693-5445; email: woodward.joseph@dol.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *General information and press inquiries:* Contact Frank Meilinger, Director, OSHA Office of Communications, Room N-3647, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693-1999; email: meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.

Technical information: Contact Todd Owen, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Room N-3609, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693-2260; fax: (202) 693-1663; email: owen.todd@dol.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Copies of this Federal Register notice:* Electronic copies of this **Federal Register** notice are available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. This Federal Register notice, as well as news releases and other relevant information, also are available at OSHA's Web page at <http://www.osha.gov>.

Confirmation of the effective date: On November 20, 2014, OSHA published a direct final rule (DFR) in the **Federal Register** revising paragraphs (e)(1)(i) and (e)(1)(ii) of OSHA's Mechanical Power Presses Standard at 29 CFR 1910.217. The DFR revised paragraph (e)(1)(i) of OSHA's Mechanical Power Presses Standard at 29 CFR 1910.217 to require that employers perform and complete necessary maintenance and repair on their mechanical power presses, and to develop and maintain certification records of these tasks. The DFR also removed requirements from paragraph (e)(1)(ii) of this standard to develop and maintain certification records for weekly inspections and tests performed on mechanical power presses. The revisions made in this final rule maintain the safety previously afforded to employees by these provisions, while substantially reducing paperwork burden hours and cost to employers.

In the DFR, OSHA stated that it would confirm the effective date of the DFR as a final rule if it received no significant adverse comments on the direct final rule or the proposal. OSHA received two comments, neither of which was a significant adverse comment (see ID:

OSHA-2013-0010-0003 and OSHA-2013-0010-004 in the docket for this rulemaking). Accordingly, OSHA is confirming the effective date of the final rule.

The first commenter, Ms. Teresa Brown of University of Memphis, expressed concern that the proposed revisions would prevent employers from ascertaining whether employees who operate mechanical power presses received adequate training for these operations. In addition, Ms. Brown believed that the proposed revisions would require employers to use only computers to develop and maintain training records (ID: OSHA-2013-0010-0003). OSHA notes that the final rule does not revise the training requirements or the recordkeeping requirements for training specified in the Mechanical Power Presses Standard. In addition, the final rule does not revise the means that employers can use to meet the information-collection requirements specified by this standard. For recordkeeping purposes, the recordkeeping requirements specified by the final rule are still written in performance-oriented language, i.e., in terms of what information to collect rather than how to collect the information.

Mr. Tim Hutchison submitted the second comment. Mr. Hutchison asked how would OSHA "know if [a] repair was not performed when noted" and "[h]ow will [OSHA] determine a 'willful' violation" (ID: OSHA-2013-0010-0004). In response to these questions, OSHA notes that paragraph (e)(1)(i) previously required employers to inspect all parts, auxiliary equipment, and safeguards of mechanical power presses on a periodic and regular basis, and to maintain certification records showing that they conducted the inspections; this provision did not require employers to perform any maintenance or repair tasks found necessary during the inspections, much less document such tasks. This final rule revises paragraph (e)(1)(i) to require that employers conduct periodic and regular inspections of each press and, before operating the press, perform and complete any maintenance or repair task found necessary during the inspections. In addition, employers must maintain certification records of inspections conducted and any maintenance and repairs performed during the inspections. These maintenance and repair records, supplemented by employee interviews, will permit OSHA to determine if an employer performed necessary maintenance and repairs on a press before operating it. The Agency will determine whether a violation of

these requirements is willful based on OSHA's *Field Operations Manual* (FOM).¹

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Parts 1910

Mechanical power presses, Occupational safety and health, Safety.

Authority and Signature

David Michaels, Ph.D., MPH, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210, authorized the preparation of this final rule. OSHA is issuing this final rule pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 653, 655, and 657, 5 U.S.C. 553, Secretary of Labor's Order 1-2012 (77 FR 3912), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC, on April 14, 2014.

David Michaels,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2014-08864 Filed 4-17-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0683; FRL-9909-66-Region 9]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is finalizing approval of revisions to the El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (EDAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action was proposed in the **Federal Register** on October 25, 2013 and concerns negative declarations for volatile organic compound (VOC) source categories for EDAQMD. We are approving these negative declarations under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: This rule will be effective on May 19, 2014.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0683 for this action. Generally, documents in the

¹ See the FOM, CPL 02-00-150, Ch. 4, § V, pp. 4-28 to 4-29 (Apr. 22, 2011), available on OSHA's Web page.

docket for this action are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105-3901. While all documents in the docket are listed at <http://www.regulations.gov>, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps, multi-volume reports), and some may not be available in either location (e.g.,

confidential business information (CBI)). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stanley Tong, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4122, tong.stanley@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. Proposed Action
- II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
- III. EPA Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Proposed Action

On October 25, 2013 (78 FR 63934), EPA proposed to approve the following document into the California SIP.

Local agency	Document	Adopted	Submitted
EDAQMD	EDAQMD Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) State Implementation Plan (SIP) Update Analysis Staff Report (“2006 RACT SIP”).	02/06/07	07/11/07

On March 13, 2014 (79 FR 14176), we finalized approval of EDAQMD’s 2006 RACT SIP. Included in EDAQMD’s submittal were a number of negative declarations. Ozone nonattainment areas classified at moderate and above are required to adopt VOC regulations for the published Control Technique

Guidelines (CTG) categories and for major non-CTG sources of VOC or NO_x. If an ozone nonattainment area does not have stationary sources covered by an EPA published CTG, then the area is required to submit a negative declaration. We proposed approval of EDAQMD’s negative declarations listed

in Table 1 below because we determined that they complied with the relevant CAA requirements. This action finalizes our approval of EDAQMD’s negative declarations into the SIP. Our proposed action contains more information on the submitted document and our evaluation.

TABLE 1—EDAQMD NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

CTG Source category	CTG Document title
Aerospace	EPA-453/R-97-004—Control of VOC Emissions from Coating Operations at Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework.
Automobile Coating; Metal Coil Container, & Closure; Paper & Fabric.	EPA-450/2-77-008—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources—Volume II Surface Coating of Cans, Coils, Paper, Fabrics, Automobiles, and Light-Duty Trucks.
Large Appliances	EPA-450/2-77-034—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume V: Surface Coating of Large Appliances.
Magnet Wire	EPA-450/2-77-033—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume IV: Surface Coating of Insulation of Magnet Wire.
Metal Furniture	EPA-450/2-77-032—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume III: Surface Coating of Metal Furniture.
Ships	61 FR 44050 Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Operations (Surface Coating).
Wood Coating: Factory Surface Coating of Flat Wood Paneling.	EPA-450/2-78-032—Control of Volatile Organic emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume VII: Factory Surface Coating of Flat Wood Paneling.
Wood Furniture	EPA-453/R-96-007—Control of VOC Emissions from Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations.
Natural Gas/Gasoline	EPA-450/2-83-007—Control of VOC Equipment Leaks from Natural Gas/Gasoline Processing Plants.
Refineries	EPA-450/2-77-025—Control of Refinery Vacuum Producing Systems, Wastewater Separators, and Process Unit Turnarounds.
Synthetic Organic Chemical	EPA-450/2-78-036—Control of VOC Leaks from Petroleum Refinery Equipment. EPA-450/3-84-015—Control of VOC Emissions from Air Oxidation Processes in Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry.
Tanks	EPA-450/4-91-031—Control of VOC Emissions from Reactor Processes and Distillation Operations in SOCM.
	EPA-450/2-77-036—Control of VOC Emissions from Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed Roof Tanks.
	EPA-450/2-78-047—Control of VOC Emissions from Petroleum Liquid Storage in External Floating Roof Tanks.
Dry Cleaning	EPA-450/3-82-009—Control of VOC Emissions from Large Petroleum Dry Cleaners.
Pharmaceutical Products	EPA-450/2-78-029—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Synthesized Pharmaceutical Products.
Polyester Resin	EPA-450/3-83-008—Control of VOC Emissions from Manufacture of High-Density Polyethylene, Polypropylene, and Polystyrene Resins.
	EPA-450/3-83-006—Control of VOC Fugitive Emissions from Synthetic Organic Chemical Polymer and Resin Manufacturing Equipment.
Rubber Tires	EPA-450/2-78-030—Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Pneumatic Rubber Tires.

II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

EPA's proposed action provided a 30-day public comment period. During this period, we received no comments on the proposed approval of El Dorado County's negative declarations.

III. EPA Action

No comments were submitted. Therefore, as authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the Act, EPA is fully approving these negative declarations into the California SIP.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve State choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this action merely approves State law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.);
- is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);
- does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and

- does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address disproportionate human health or environmental effects with practical, appropriate, and legally permissible methods under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, this rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the State, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 et seq., as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by June 17, 2014. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see section 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 21, 2014.

Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52 [AMENDED]

- 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

- 2. Section 52.222 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(7)(iii) to read as follows:

§ 52.222 Negative declarations.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(7) * * *

(iii) Control of VOC Emissions from Coating Operations at Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework; Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources—Volume II: Surface Coating of Cans, Coils, Paper, Fabrics, Automobiles, and Light-Duty Trucks; Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume V: Surface Coating of Large Appliances; Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume IV: Surface Coating of Insulation of Magnet Wire; Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume III: Surface Coating of Metal Furniture; 61 FR 44050 Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Operations (Surface Coating); Control of Volatile Organic emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume VII: Factory Surface Coating of Flat Wood Paneling; Control of VOC Emissions from Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations; Control of VOC Equipment Leaks from Natural Gas/Gasoline Processing Plants; Control of Refinery Vacuum Producing Systems, Wastewater Separators, and Process Unit Turnarounds; Control of VOC Leaks from Petroleum Refinery Equipment; Control of VOC Emissions from Air Oxidation Processes in Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry; Control of VOC Emissions from Reactor Processes and Distillation Operations in SOCM; Control of VOC Emissions from Storage of Petroleum Liquids in Fixed Roof Tanks; Control of VOC Emissions from Petroleum Liquid Storage in External Floating Roof Tanks; Control of VOC Emissions from Large Petroleum Dry Cleaners; Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Synthesized Pharmaceutical Products; Control of VOC Emissions from Manufacture of High-Density Polyethylene, Polypropylene, and Polystyrene Resins; Control of VOC Fugitive Emissions from Synthetic Organic Chemical Polymer and Resin Manufacturing Equipment; and Control

of Volatile Organic Emissions from Manufacture of Pneumatic Rubber Tires were submitted on July 11, 2007 and adopted on February 6, 2007.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2014-08742 Filed 4-17-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0049; FRL-9909-08-Region 8]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is partially approving and partially disapproving revisions to the South Dakota State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) to EPA on June 20, 2011. The SIP revisions address the permitting of sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs). Specifically, we are approving revisions to the State's Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program to incorporate the provisions of the federal PSD and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule (Tailoring Rule). The SIP revisions incorporate by reference the federal Tailoring Rule's emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modifications to existing stationary sources become subject to South Dakota's PSD permitting requirements for their GHG emissions. EPA is finalizing disapproval of a related provision that would rescind the State's Tailoring Rule revision in certain circumstances. EPA will take separate action on an amendment to the chapter Construction Permits for New Sources or Modifications in the June 20, 2011 submittal, regarding permits for minor sources. EPA is finalizing this action under section 110 and part C of the Clean Air Act (the Act or CAA).

DATES: This final rule is effective May 19, 2014.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0049. All documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov index. Although listed in the index,

some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Air Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop St., Denver, Colorado 80202-1129. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to view the hard copy of the docket. You may view the hard copy of the docket Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jody Ostendorf, Air Program, Mailcode 8P-AR, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, 1595 Wynkoop St., Denver, Colorado 80202-1129, (303) 312-7814, ostendorf.jody@epa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Definitions

For the purpose of this document, the following definitions apply:

- (i) The words or initials *Act* or *CAA* mean or refer to the federal Clean Air Act, unless the context indicates otherwise.
- (ii) The initials *DENR* mean or refer to the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources.
- (iii) The words *EPA*, *we*, *us* or *our* mean or refer to the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
- (iv) The initials *GHG* mean or refer to Greenhouse Gas.
- (v) The initials *PSD* mean or refer to Prevention of Significant Deterioration.
- (vi) The initials *SIP* mean or refer to State Implementation Plan.
- (vii) The words *State* or *SD* mean the State of South Dakota, unless the context indicates otherwise.

Table of Contents

- I. Background for Our Final Action
- II. Response to Comments
- III. What final action is EPA taking?
- IV. Statutory and Executive Orders Review

I. Background for Our Final Action

The June 20, 2011 submittal incorporates by reference the provisions of the federal PSD and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule (Tailoring Rule), that establish (1) that GHG is a regulated pollutant under South Dakota's PSD program, and (2) emission thresholds for determining which new stationary sources and modification projects become subject to South Dakota's PSD permitting

requirements for their GHG emissions. The background for today's final rule, our rationale for disapproving the submitted rescission clause language, and EPA's national actions pertaining to GHGs is discussed in detail in our proposal (see 79 FR 8130, February 11, 2014). The comment period was open for 30 days and we received two adverse comment letters.

II. Response to Comments

We received adverse comments on our proposed action, specifically on our proposed disapproval of the rescission clause, from the South Dakota DENR. We received similar comments from Otter Tail Power Company. After considering the comments, EPA has decided to finalize our action as proposed. The comments and our responses follow.

Comment: DENR states that EPA's first proposed basis for disapproval was that the rescission clause would allow for revision of the SIP without the approval of the Administrator. EPA cited 40 CFR 51.105, which states that revisions of a plan, or portions thereof, will not be considered part of an applicable plan until such revisions have been approved by the Administrator in accordance with part 51.

DENR characterizes EPA as stating that the rescission clause will be a revision of the plan down the road that the Administrator has not had a chance to approve. DENR disagrees, stating that EPA has the chance to approve the rescission clause now. Otter Tail Power Company makes a similar argument, stating that 40 CFR 51.105 will not be violated in the event of a triggering action because the Administrator will have already approved the fact that the rules can be revised.

Response: EPA disagrees with this comment. We did not say the rescission clause as submitted is not before EPA for approval. Instead, we said that we were considering whether any *future* change to the SIP that occurs as a result of the automatic rescission clause would be consistent with EPA's interpretation of the effect of the triggering EPA or federal court action. In this case, even if EPA were to approve South Dakota's rescission clause now, the SIP would be modified without any EPA interpretation of the triggering federal court action. This violates 40 CFR 51.105.

Comment: DENR states that EPA approval of the rescission clause would not violate any public notice requirements. DENR notes that the public had notice and opportunity to comment on both the State's rulemaking