

number of small entities. See 5 U.S.C. 605(b). As explained above, this rule is ministerial in nature and does not impose any additional regulatory burdens.

H. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This proposed rule is not a major rule as defined by Section 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This proposed rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of the United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

I. Executive Order 13175 (Indian Tribal Governments)

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175 that would require a tribal summary impact statement. The proposed rule would not have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes.

J. Executive Order 12630 (Government Actions and Interference With Constitutionally Protected Property Rights)

This NPRM is not subject to Executive Order 12630 because it does not involve implementation of a policy that has takings implications or that could impose limitations on private property use.

K. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform)

The NPRM was drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12988 and will not unduly burden the Federal court system. The NPRM was: (1) Reviewed to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguities; (2) written to minimize litigation; and (3) written to provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct and to promote burden reduction.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 34

Implementation of the Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Requirements of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982, as Amended (JTPA).

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Department proposes to

rescind 29 CFR part 34 in its entirety as follows:

PART 34—[REMOVED AND RESERVED]

- 1. Remove and reserve part 34, consisting of §§ 34.1 through 34.53.

Signed at Washington, DC, on September 13, 2018.

Bryan Slater,

Assistant Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 2018–20409 Filed 9–25–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

29 CFR Part 2200

Revisions to Procedural Rules Governing Practice Before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On September 7, 2018, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission solicited recommendations for amendments to the Commission's rules of procedure. The comment period, which was set to expire on October 9, 2018, has been extended to November 16, 2018.

DATES: The comment period for the advance notice of proposed rulemaking (83 FR 45366) is extended. Submit comments on or before November 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Email:* rbailey@oshrc.gov. Include "Advance notice of proposed rulemaking, 29 CFR part 2200" in the subject line of the message.
- *Fax:* 202–606–5417.
- *Mail:* One Lafayette Centre, 1120 20th Street NW, Ninth Floor, Washington, DC 20036–3457.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* same as mailing address.

Instructions: All submissions must include your name, return address, and email address, if applicable. Please clearly label submissions as "Advance notice of proposed rulemaking, 29 CFR part 2200."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ron Bailey, via telephone at 202–606–5410, or via email at rbailey@oshrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A request was received by the Commission asking that the comment period for the advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) be extended to allow "extra time . . . to coordinate a response to the [notice] among various labor unions and employee advocacy groups." To make the ANPRM comment process as inclusive as possible, the Commission has extended the comment period for the ANPRM (83 FR 45366) to November 16, 2018.

Dated: September 18, 2018.

Heather L. MacDougall,
Chairman.

[FR Doc. 2018–20859 Filed 9–25–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7600–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 85 and 86

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 523, 531, 533, 536, and 537

[NHTSA–2018–0067; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283; FRL–9984–62–OAR; NHTSA–2017–0069]

RIN 2127–AL76; RIN 2060–AU09

The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document extends the comment period for a proposed rule published in the August 24, 2018 issue of the **Federal Register** entitled The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks and also extends the comment period for NHTSA's Draft Environmental Impact Statement that accompanies it. This extension is shorter than that requested by several parties, and those requests are accordingly denied.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published August 24, 2018, at 83 FR 42986, is extended. The comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement accompanying that proposed rule and

published on NHTSA’s website is also extended. Comments on both documents should be received on or before October 26, 2018.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283 and/or NHTSA–2018–0067, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for sending comments.

- *Fax:* EPA: (202) 566–9744; NHTSA: (202) 493–2251.

- *Mail:*

- EPA: Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), Air and Radiation Docket, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460, Attention Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283. In addition, please mail a copy of your comments on the information collection provisions for the EPA proposal to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attn: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th St. NW, Washington, DC 20503.

- NHTSA: Docket Management Facility, M–30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Rm. W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery:*

- EPA: Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC, Attention Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Docket’s normal hours of

operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

- NHTSA: West Building, Ground Floor, Rm. W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Public Participation” heading of the proposed rule (83 FR at 43470).

Docket: For access to the dockets to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, and/or:

- *For EPA:* EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744.

- *For NHTSA:* Docket Management Facility, M–30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Rm. W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Management Facility is open

between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

EPA: Christopher Lieske, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Assessment and Standards Division, Environmental Protection Agency, 2000 Traverwood Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105; telephone number: (734) 214–4584; fax number: (734) 214–4816; email address: lieske.christopher@epa.gov, or contact the Assessment and Standards Division, email address: otaqpublicweb@epa.gov. NHTSA: James Tamm, Office of Rulemaking, Fuel Economy Division, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; telephone number: (202) 493–0515.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 24, 2018, NHTSA and EPA published in the **Federal Register** a document titled “The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks.” 83 FR 42986. The public comment period for the proposed rule was scheduled to end on October 23, 2018. Additionally, the public comment period for NHTSA’s DEIS was scheduled to end on September 24, 2018.

Eighteen requests to extend the comment period have been received by the agencies’ dockets as of the time of this writing, as follows:

Requester	Date submitted	Docket ID No.	Length of extension requested
Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM).	August 24, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–2158; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0790.	120 days for comment period as a whole.
Attorneys General of the States of California, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and the District of Columbia, and the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.	August 27, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–2567; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0792.	120 days for comment period as a whole.
National Coalition for Advanced Transportation (NCAT).	August 29, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–2872; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0794.	120 days for comment period as a whole.
Environmental Law and Policy Center ..	August 30, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–2728; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0892.	120 days for comment period as a whole.
Center for Biological Diversity (CBD), Conservation Law Foundation, Earthjustice, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Public Citizen, Sierra Club, and Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS).	August 30, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–3278; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0797.	120 days for comment period as a whole.
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and Minnesota Department of Transportation.	August 30, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–3580; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0798.	180 days for comment period as a whole.
Consumer Federation of America	September 5, 2018	NHTSA–2018–0067–3400; EPA–HQ–OAR–2018–0283–0872.	120 days for comment period as a whole.

Requester	Date submitted	Docket ID No.	Length of extension requested
National Governors Association (NGA), Environmental Council of the States (ECOS), National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA), Association of Air Pollution Control Agencies (AAPCA), National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO). Georgetown Climate Center	September 5, 2018	EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0871	120 days for comment period as a whole.
Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers (Alliance). City of Los Angeles	September 6, 2018 September 6, 2018 September 7, 2018	NHTSA-2018-0067-3610; EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0873. NHTSA-2018-0067-3619; EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0876. NHTSA-2018-0067-4159; EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0893. NHTSA-2018-0067-3615; EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0875.	At least 120 day comment period. Not less than 120 day comment period. 120 days for comment period as a whole.
American Lung Association	September 9, 2018	Received by mail	At least 120 day comment period.
32 U.S. Senators ¹	September 10, 2018.	Received by mail	120 days for a comment period as a whole.
New York Department of Environmental Conservation. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Edison Electric Institute (EEl), National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA), National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), Electric Drive Transportation Association (EDTA), and American Public Power Association (APPA). New York University School of Law Institute for Policy Integrity. Alliance to Save Energy	September 10, 2018. September 12, 2018. September 18, 2018. September 18, 2018. September 19, 2018.	EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0885	120 days for a comment period as a whole. Not less than 120 day comment period. 120 days for comment period as a whole. At least 120 days as a whole. At least 120 day comment period.

¹ Kamala D. Harris (D, CA); Dianne Feinstein (D, CA); Charles E. Schumer (D, NY); Edward J. Markey (D, MA); Sheldon Whitehouse (D, RI); Jeffrey A. Merkley (D, OR); Richard Blumenthal (D, CT); Patrick Leahy (D, VT); Chris Van Hollen (D, MD); Ron Wyden (D, OR); Catherine Cortez Masto (D, NV); Tina Smith (D, MN); Richard J. Durbin (D, IL); Mazie Hirono (D, HI); Benjamin L. Cardin (D, MD); Michael F. Bennet (D, CO); Jeanne Shaheen (D, NH); Margaret Wood Hassan (D, NH); Maria Cantwell (D, WA); Tammy Duckworth (D, IL); Cory A. Booker (D, NJ); Tammy Baldwin (D, WI); Jack Reed (D, RI); Patty Murray (D, WA); Kirsten Gillibrand (D, NY); Bernard Sanders (D, VT); Elizabeth Warren (D, MA); Thomas R. Carper (D, DE); Robert Menendez (D, NJ); Christopher A. Coons (D, DE); Bill Nelson (D, FL); Amy Klobuchar (D, MN).

Many of these requesters also asked that the agencies hold additional public hearings to allow more opportunities for oral presentation of public comments, in additional locations. Specifically:

- NESCAUM requested a public hearing be held in a central location in a Northeast state that has adopted California’s greenhouse gas (GHG) standards and zero emissions vehicle (ZEV) program for light-duty vehicles and ZEV, such as Hartford, CT or Boston, MA;
- The Attorneys General requested that EPA (alone or with NHTSA) hold an additional hearing in Sacramento specifically on the California waiver withdrawal proposal, as well as holding additional hearings on the proposal in Los Angeles, Washington, DC, either Portland, OR or Seattle, WA, somewhere in New York State, and Baltimore, MD;
- Georgetown Climate Center also requested that a public hearing be held in Sacramento specifically on the California waiver withdrawal proposal, as well as holding hearings in Los Angeles and Washington, DC, and in other states that have adopted California’s vehicle standards;

- The City of Los Angeles requested that a public hearing be held in Los Angeles, and supported the requests from other parties to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the country;
- The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and Minnesota Department of Transportation requested that the agencies provide workshops like EPA did during development of the Clean Power Plan rule to help states and other stakeholders understand and comment on the content of the proposal and the agencies’ modeling and analyses; and
- SCAQMD supported the requests from other parties to hold additional hearings.

A separate request to hold a public hearing in Oregon was submitted by the Democratic members of the U.S. Congressional Delegation from Oregon.² This request did not include a request for an extension of the comment period.³

² Specifically, U.S. Senators Jeffrey A. Merkley and Ron Wyden, and U.S. Representatives Earl Blumenauer, Suzanne Bonamici, Peter DeFazio, and Kurt Schrader.
³ Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283-0894.

In addition to requesting extension to the comment period on the proposal, the Attorneys General, the 32 U.S. Senators, the Alliance, ELPC, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Consumer Federation of America, NCAT, CBD *et al.*, SCAQMD, and New York University School of Law’s Institute for Policy Integrity also requested extensions of the comment period for NHTSA’s DEIS, to align the end of that comment period with the (extended) comment period for the proposal.

In support of their requests for longer comment periods and additional public hearings (for those who requested them), all requesters cited the breadth and depth of the record to review, the changes from prior analyses conducted on the same topic, and the importance of the proposal in terms of its potential effects on the U.S. economy, safety, health, and the environment. Several requesters also stated that EPA had provided a 120-day comment period for its Clean Power Plan rule.

The requests for extension of the comment period for the proposal to 120 days (or 180 days, in the case of the

Minnesota requesters) and for additional public hearing locations are denied. Automakers will need maximum lead time to respond to the final rule, and extending the comment period and holding additional public hearings (which would also cause the comment period to be extended) are inconsistent with provision of maximum lead time. We recognize, however, that the original schedule for the proposed rule public comment period did not reflect the Clean Air Act requirement that the record of proceedings allowing oral presentation of data, views, and arguments on a proposed rule be kept open for thirty days after completion of the proceeding to provide an opportunity for submission of rebuttal and supplementary information. 42 U.S.C. 7607(d)(5). Because the final “proceeding allowing oral presentation of data, views, and arguments,” is expected to be the September 26, 2018 public hearing in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the comment period for the proposed rule is being extended by 3 days to Friday, October 26, 2018. To provide additional flexibility to commenters, NHTSA is also extending the public comment period for the DEIS by 32 days to Friday, October 26, 2018. The agencies believe that this amount of time should be adequate for commenters to comment meaningfully on the proposal and on NHTSA’s DEIS.

Issued on September 21, 2018 in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.5

Heidi R. King,

Deputy Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Dated: September 21, 2018.

William L. Wehrum,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 2018–20962 Filed 9–21–18; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

48 CFR Parts 1503 and 1552

[EPA–HQ–OARM–2015–0657; FRL–9936–63–OARM]

Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation (EPAAR); Scientific Integrity

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing a proposed rule to address scientific integrity

requirements in the creation of a contract clause for inclusion in solicitations and contracts when the contractor may be required to perform, communicate, or supervise scientific activities or use scientific information to perform advisory and assistance services. This clause will complement the EPA scientific integrity policy to ensure all scientific work developed and used by the Government is accomplished with scientific integrity.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 26, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OARM–2015–0657; FRL–9936–63–OARM, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit: <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Holly Hubbell, Policy, Training, and Oversight Division, Acquisition Policy and Training Service Center (3802R), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 202–564–1091; email address: hubbell.holly@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

1. *Submitting Classified Business Information.* Do not submit CBI to EPA website <https://www.regulations.gov> or email. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD–ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM as CBI, and then identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In

addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for Preparing Your Comments.* When submitting comments, remember to:

- Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, **Federal Register** date and page number).
- Follow directions—The Agency may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part or section number.
- Explain why you agree or disagree, suggest alternatives, and substitute language for your requested changes.
- Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.
- If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.
- Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.
- Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.
- Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

II. Background

The Agency’s policy on scientific integrity was based on a Presidential Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, Subject Line: Scientific Integrity, Dated: March 9, 2009. The memo directs the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to work with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and agencies to develop policies to ensure all scientific work developed and used by the Government is done so with scientific integrity. This proposed rule requires the Contractor to ensure that all personnel within its organization, subcontractors and consultants, that perform, communicate, or supervise scientific activities or use scientific information to perform advisory and assistance services under the specified contract, have read and understand their compliance responsibilities regarding the EPA’s Scientific Integrity Policy.