

Young / Sommer LLC

ENVIRONMENTAL BREAKFAST CLUB REGULATORY SUMMARY

September 8, 2017

Prepared by:
Elizabeth Morss
Young/Sommer LLC
5 Palisades Drive
Albany, NY 12205
(518) 438-9907, ext. 232
emorss@youngsommer.com
www.youngsommer.com

Final Statutes, Regulations, Guidance and Cases

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
CHEMICAL			
<p>FEDERAL TSCA Reform Implementation Regulations 40 CFR Parts 702 and 710 82 Fed. Reg. 37520 (Aug. 11, 2017) (inventory notification active/inactive status); 82 Fed. Reg. 33753 (July 20, 2017) (procedures for prioritizing chemicals for risk evaluation)</p>	<p>EPA issued a pair of regulations implementing key requirements of the 2016 Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) reform statute relating to the identification and prioritization of chemicals for review. While the original TSCA statute focused on assessing chemicals before they entered the marketplace, the 2016 reforms require EPA to systematically prioritize and assess existing chemicals. In conjunction with that process, EPA issued a rule for identifying chemicals that have not been manufactured recently and can therefore be dropped from the TSCA inventory. Within 180 days of publication of the final rule, manufacturers must notify EPA of each chemical substance on the TSCA inventory that was manufactured for non-exempt commercial purposes during the 10-year period preceding enactment of the TSCA reform statute. If EPA receives a notice, the chemical is considered active and may potentially be subject to further TSCA review. Otherwise, the chemical is assumed to be inactive and cannot be produced without first notifying EPA.</p> <p>The second rule implements a process for prioritizing chemicals for purposes of deciding whether to conduct a risk evaluation. The process, which is intended to take between 9 and 12 months once a chemical is selected, consists of four steps: (1) Pre-prioritization. During this phase, EPA must review existing information to identify candidates for high-priority designations using a risk-based process. In the wake of extensive public comment, EPA dropped its initial pre-prioritization process and announced plans to reach out to stakeholders for further input. (2) Initiation. Once a chemical has been selected, EPA will initiate the formal prioritization process by publishing a Federal Register notice and commencing a 90-day public comment period for gathering additional information. (3) Proposed priority designation. After the close of the comment period, EPA will review the information and propose whether to designate the chemical as high or low priority. If there is insufficient information, the chemical will be designated high priority. The proposed designation will be made available for a second 90-day public notice and comment period. (4) Final priority designation. After the close of the second public comment period, EPA will designate the chemical high or low priority, marking the beginning of the formal risk evaluation for high priority chemicals.</p> <p>The rules can be found in the July 20, 2017 and August 11, 2017 Federal Registers at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The rules are potentially of interest to companies that manufacture, import, process, distribute, use or dispose of chemicals. Under the amended TSCA statute, EPA has approximately one year to decide whether to conduct a risk evaluation and three years to complete the evaluation and decide whether the chemicals present an unreasonable risk to humans and/or the environment. If EPA determines that a particular substance poses an unreasonable risk, EPA must mitigate that risk within two years. The active/inactive rule establishes procedures for identifying chemicals that are no longer being manufactured and so do not necessitate prioritization. The prioritization rule establishes the criteria and timeframes for identifying high priority chemicals that require a risk evaluation. The risk evaluation rule (see below) establishes procedures for completing the actual risk evaluation process.</p>	<p>The final rule for identifying chemicals as active or inactive took effect August 11, 2017. Manufacturers/importers have 180 days from that date to inform EPA of the chemicals that remain active. The procedures for prioritizing chemicals for review take effect September 18, 2017.</p> <p>The active/inactive rule also contains procedures for informing EPA if manufacturing or processing of an inactive chemical is expected to resume, necessitating redesignation of the chemical to active.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
CHEMICAL			
<p>FEDERAL TSCA Reform Implementation Regulations 40 CFR Part 702 82 Fed. Reg. 33726 (July 20, 2017) (procedure for chemical risk evaluation)</p>	<p>As a companion to the rule for prioritizing chemicals for review, EPA adopted a rule establishing the process for conducting risk evaluations to determine whether a chemical substance presents an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment and must therefore be mitigated. TSCA requires EPA to evaluate the risks associated with: (1) the 10 chemicals identified from the 2014 TSCA work plan update for immediate review; (2) chemicals identified as “high priority” via the prioritization process; and (3) chemicals identified by manufacturers for review.</p> <p>The regulation outlines the steps for submitting a manufacturer request for a risk evaluation, including the method/content of the submission, public notice (including a minimum 45-day public comment period); and EPA determination on whether to grant the request. If EPA concludes that it has sufficient information after the review, it will begin the risk evaluation. If additional information is necessary, the applicant must provide it or the request to initiate a risk evaluation will be deemed withdrawn. Each risk evaluation, whether manufacturer or EPA-initiated, must include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope. Identification of the conditions of use of the chemical, hazards, exposures, and potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulations that EPA expects to consider. Notice of the scope must be published in the Federal Register within 6 months of initiation of the risk evaluation and is subject to a 45-day public notice and comment period. • Hazard assessment. Identification of the types of adverse health or environmental effects that can be caused by the chemical and the quality and weight of evidence supporting the identification. • Exposure assessment. Identification of the likely duration, intensity, frequency, and number of exposures under the conditions of use. • Risk characterization. Integration of information on hazards and exposures to convey the nature and presence or absence of risks, along with information about how the risk was assessed, where assumptions and uncertainties still exist, and considerations of data quality. • Risk evaluation/determination. EPA’s draft risk evaluation will be published in the Federal Register and subject to a 60-day public comment period. EPA must publish the final risk evaluation no later than three years after the start of the evaluation process with a possible six-month extension. <p>The rule can be found in the July 20, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>See discussion of prioritization process above.</p>	<p>The final rule will take effect September 18, 2017.</p> <p>In conjunction with the final rule, EPA issued <i>Guidance to Assist Interested Persons in Developing and Submitting Draft Risk Evaluations Under the Toxic Substances Control Act</i>. The guidance addresses the science standards, the data quality considerations, and the steps of the risk evaluation process that external parties should follow when developing draft risk evaluations for consideration by EPA.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
REMEDATION			
<p>FEDERAL EPA Superfund Task Force Recommendations (July 2017)</p>	<p>A task force of EPA staff convened by the EPA Administrator provided recommendations on ways to restructure the Superfund cleanup process to expedite remediation, reduce the burden on cooperating parties, incentivize remediation, encourage private investment in cleanups, and promote redevelopment. The EPA Superfund Task Force Report identified five overarching goals, followed by strategies, recommendations and specific actions for achieving each goal. The five goals and their related strategies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expediting cleanup and remediation. Accelerate national priorities list (NPL) sites to completion; promote the application of adaptive management at complex sites and expedite cleanup through use of early/interim records of decision and removal actions; clarify policies/guidance to expedite remediation; and, use best management practices, systematic planning remedy optimization, and access to expert technical resources. • Re-Invigorating responsible party cleanup and reuse. Encourage and facilitate responsible parties' expeditious and thorough clean-up of sites to effect re-use more quickly; create oversight efficiencies for potentially responsible party (PRP) lead cleanups; and promote redevelopment/reuse of sites by encouraging PRPs to invest in reuse outcomes. • Encouraging private investment. Use alternative/non-traditional approaches to finance cleanups; streamline the process for comfort letters and settlement agreements with third parties; optimize tools and realign incentives to encourage third-party investment; address local government liability concerns. • Promoting redevelopment and community revitalization. Facilitate site redevelopment and support ongoing information sharing; utilize reuse planning to lay the foundation and set expectations for site redevelopment. • Engaging partners and stakeholder. <p>The report contains 42 recommendations, many of which are to be implemented immediately. These include prioritizing and taking actions at sites where the risk of human exposure is not fully controlled; utilizing early or interim response actions more frequently to address immediate risk; prioritizing development of remedial investigation/feasibility studies for sites that require immediate action; compiling existing information on cleanup state and reuse potential of NPL sites; tracking real time remedy implementation and completion; and focusing resources on current NPL sites with the most reuse potential.</p> <p>The recommendations can be found on EPA's website at: www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-task-force-recommendations.</p>	<p>The task force report is potentially of interest to anyone engaged in a site cleanup under the federal Superfund program. While the program has been successful in cleaning up contaminated sites, it has been widely criticized for taking too long and costing too much. The task force's recommendations are intended to accelerate cleanup, especially for sites that have been on the NPL for years. The focus of the recommendations is on setting aggressive deadlines for site cleanups and identifying sites where land can be re-used to promote third party investment. EPA also is recommending use of the superfund alternative approach, which involves the same site investigation/remediation process but avoids adding the site to the NPL, thus avoiding the stigma of listing.</p>	<p>Of the 42 recommendations in the task force report, EPA identified 11 that could be implemented immediately, consistent with existing authority and guidance. All of the recommendations are expected to be implemented by the end of 2018. EPA plans to issue more detailed directives and guidance to help implement various aspects of the task force's recommendations.</p>

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
SOLID WASTE			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Final Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FSGEIS) for Proposed Revisions to the Solid Waste Regulations 6 NYCRR Part 360 et seq.</p>	<p>In anticipation of finalizing its major overhaul of New York’s solid waste regulations, DEC published a notice announcing that it has accepted a FSGEIS on the proposed 6 NYCRR Part 360 rulemaking. After providing an overview of the rulemaking, the FSGEIS includes the following information for each major change to the regulations: a brief description of the proposed change; a discussion of the history and purpose of the change; a review of the alternatives considered; and a summary of the environmental impact of the proposed change. Although the FSGEIS addresses all aspects of the proposed rulemaking, it includes extensive information on the more controversial aspects of the proposal, including provisions addressing fill material (including the reuse of excavated soil on and off-site), construction and demolition debris, and mulch processing.</p> <p>The FSGEIS can be found on DEC’s website at: www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/81768.html.</p>	<p>The proposed regulations will affect all types of solid waste management activities/facilities in New York.</p>	<p>DEC plans to issue the final revisions to the solid waste management regulations shortly.</p>
WATER			
<p>NEW YORK STATE Lead Testing of School Drinking Water 10 NYCRR subpart 67-4</p>	<p>The New York State Department of Health (DOH) adopted a fourth emergency rule imposing lead testing requirements for school drinking water to extend the program while it finalizes a permanent rule. The rule requires all school districts, including those already classified as public water systems, to test potable water outlets for lead and develop and implement a lead remediation plan, where necessary. For buildings serving elementary school age children (prekindergarten through fifth grade), the first samples were required to be collected by September 30, 2016, with an October 31, 2016 deadline for all other schools. If the results exceed 15 parts per billion, the school must: prohibit use of the outlet until the problem is remediated; supply the building with adequate potable water; immediately report the test results to the local health department; and notify staff and parents in writing and via the school’s website. Schools also must post a list of buildings found to be lead-free and report the sample results to DOH and others through DOH’s electronic reporting system. Additional samples must be taken in 2020 and at least every five years thereafter.</p> <p>The emergency rule can be found at: https://regs.health.ny.gov/regulations/proposed-rule-making.</p>	<p>The regulation implements A.10740, which was signed by Governor Cuomo on September 6, 2016. The emergency rule is primarily of interest to school districts and board of cooperative education service facilities (collectively public schools) and to the students, teachers and staffs in those schools. The rule does not apply to private schools.</p>	<p>DOH proposed a permanent regulation to replace the emergency rule and accepted comment through June 26, 2017. The current emergency rule expires September 28, 2017.</p>

Proposed Laws, Regulations and Guidance

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
AIR			
FEDERAL Retention of National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide 40 CFR Part 50 82 Fed. Reg. 34792 (July 26, 2017)	EPA is proposing to retain the existing national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) without revisions after finding that the current standards provide the requisite protection to public health with an adequate margin of safety. EPA established a new hourly NO ₂ standard of 100 ppb in 2010 to supplement the long-standing annual standard of 53 ppb. Under the current short-term standard, an area violates the NAAQS if NO ₂ in the ambient air exceeds 100 ppb based on the 3-year average of the 98 th percentile of the annual distribution of daily maximum 1-hour concentrations. After reviewing recent data on the health and environmental effects of NO ₂ in the ambient air, EPA concluded that the available studies do not call into question the adequacy of the public health protection provided by the current standards. EPA is collectively reviewing the ecological welfare effects of oxides of nitrogen and sulfur and particulate matter as part of a single comprehensive review of the secondary NAAQS for these pollutants. The final rule can be found in the July 26, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys .	The announcement is primarily of interest to state regulators, who will not be required to revise their state implementation plans to address reductions in the NAAQS.	EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rule until September 25, 2017 .

Citation	Summary	Implications	Schedule/Notes
WATER			
<p>FEDERAL Rescission of EPA and Army Corps Rule Defining “Waters of the United States” 33 CFR Part 328; 40 CFR Parts 110, 112 et al. 82 Fed. Reg. 34899 (July 27, 2017)</p>	<p>EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) proposed to rescind the 2015 joint rule redefining the term “waters of the United States” and thus the scope of protection afforded under the Clean Water Act (CWA). The CWA prohibits the discharge of pollutants into “navigable waters” except in compliance with specific CWA requirements. Navigable waters, in turn, is defined as “waters of the United States.” Over the years, many questions have arisen about the scope of CWA jurisdiction in light of this definition. These developments culminated in a controversial 2015 rulemaking defining the term “waters of the United States” to include specific categories of jurisdictional waters and allowing other waters to be included on a case-by-case basis. The controversial rule was stayed by a federal appellate court shortly after it was enacted. With the current rulemaking, EPA and the ACOE have proposed to formally rescind the 2015 rule and recodify the pre-2015 rule, which is currently in effect because of the stay. Per the notice, the agencies will “apply the definition of ‘waters of the United States’ as it is currently being implemented . . . informed by applicable agency guidance documents and consistent with Supreme Court decisions and long-standing practice.” In a second step, the agencies plan to reevaluate the definition and potentially propose changes.</p> <p>The proposed rule can be found in the July 27, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.</p>	<p>The definition of “waters of the United States” implicates virtually all CWA programs, including ACOE § 404 permits, National/State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System wastewater discharge permits, and CWA § 401 water quality certifications. Although the 2015 rule was intended to clarify the scope of the CWA, representatives of a variety of industries, including agriculture, oil and gas, and residential development, strongly objected to the change, arguing that it significantly expanded the agencies’ jurisdiction. In February 2017, President Trump issued an executive order directing the agencies to review the 2015 rule for consistency with certain policies and propose rescission, if appropriate.</p>	<p>EPA is accepting comments on the proposed rescission until September 27, 2017 (extended from August 28, 2017).</p>

Other Recent Developments (Final)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA **withdrew its proposal to extend the deadline for states to designate nonattainment areas under the 2015 ozone NAAQS** one year until October 1, 2018. In 2015, EPA lowered the primary 8-hour ozone NAAQS from 0.075 to 0.070 part per million after concluding that the lower standard was necessary to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety; EPA also adopted an identical secondary (welfare-based) standard. Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), EPA must designate nonattainment areas under a new NAAQS within two years of the effective date of the standard. However EPA can extend the date for one year if the agency concludes that it lacks sufficient information to promulgate the designations. In June 2017, EPA invoked its authority under this provision to extend the deadline for issuing designations under the 2015 ozone standard until October 1, 2018. However, in response to public comments, EPA declared that the “information gaps that formed the basis of the extension may not be as expansive as [EPA] previously believed” and that an extension is not currently necessary. The withdrawal notice can be found in the August 10, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: EPA must promulgate its initial designations under the 2015 ozone NAAQS by October 1, 2017.

WATER

FEDERAL: EPA issued a rule **modifying and updating its testing procedures approved for analysis and sampling under the CWA**. The CWA requires facilities with NPDES//SPDES permits to sample and analyze their wastewater discharge in accordance with procedures approved by EPA. With the recent rulemaking, EPA revised the list of approved methods set forth in 40 CFR Part 136 to: add newly approved methods; approve new versions of previously approved EPA methods; and update the list of methods and alternative test procedures (ATPs) developed by voluntary consensus standards bodies such as ASTM and incorporated by reference into Part 136. EPA also revised Part 136 to fix typographical errors and make other corrections, including eliminating language that unintentionally authorized states to approve ATPs and revising the procedure for determining the method detection limit. The regulation, which takes effect September 27, 2017, can be found in the August 28, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The rule is of general interest to any facility subject to a NPDES/SPDES permit or otherwise required to monitor wastewater discharges in accordance with 40 CFR Part 136.

Recent Developments (Proposed)

AIR

FEDERAL: EPA is proposing changes to a pair of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) to address issues arising from mandatory residual risk/periodic technology reviews. In response to a petition for reconsideration, EPA is proposing to revise the **NESHAP for manufacture of amino/phenolic resins** set forth at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart OOO to: revise the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standards for back-end continuous process vents (CPVs) at existing sources; accept comment on the need to revise the standards for front-end CPVs at existing sources; extend the compliance date for the proposed revisions; and propose requirements for storage vessels at new and existing sources during planned routine maintenance of fixed-roof tanks. In a separate rulemaking, EPA is proposing amendments to the **MACT standards for the wool fiberglass manufacturing source category** at 40 CFR Part 63, subpart NNN, to address issues that were deferred during the 2015 residual risk/periodic technology review. With the recent rulemaking, EPA undertook a complete technology review of rotary spin (RS) lines under 42 USC § 7412(d)(6) and proposed various amendments to the subpart NNN NESHAP as applied to RS lines, including readopting formaldehyde limits, setting methanol limits, and establishing work standards for phenol, among numerous other changes. EPA is accepting comment on the changes to the amino/phenolic resins standard until **October 23, 2017**; the deadline for submitting comments on the changes to the wool fiberglass manufacturing standard closes **October 13, 2017**. The proposals can be found in the August 24, 2017 and August 29, 2017 Federal Registers, respectively, at www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The proposals are of interest to facilities subject to the amino/phenolic resins manufacturing and wool fiberglass manufacturing source categories.

CLIMATE CHANGE

FEDERAL: EPA is accepting comment on whether to **reconsider the results of its mid-term evaluation (MTE) of its light-duty vehicle greenhouse gas (GHG) emission standards**. In 2012, EPA adopted GHG and corporate average fuel economy (CAFÉ) standards applicable to model year 2017-2025 light-duty vehicles. The rule requires EPA to review the standards for model year 2022-2025 to confirm that the standards are still appropriate and achievable. With a few days left in the Obama administration, EPA announced the results of its MTE, declaring that the GHG standards in the 2012 rule for 2022-2025 model year vehicles were feasible at reasonable cost using existing and emerging technologies. Shortly after President Trump took office, EPA announced plans to review the MTE after noting that the evaluation was not due until April 1, 2018 and that the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration had not yet issued its MTE findings with respect to the CAFÉ standards. With the recent notice, EPA announced that it is accepting comments on the final MTE determination as well as on whether the GHG emission standards for model year 2021 light-duty vehicles are appropriate. The deadline for submitting comments on the proposed reconsideration is **October 5, 2017**; it can be found in the August 21, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The reconsideration is primarily of interest to the automotive industry, which had expressed concerns about the cost and feasibility of achieving the second phase of the light-duty vehicle GHG emission standards.

FEDERAL: EPA proposed **renewable fuel standards (RFS) for gasoline and diesel transportation fuel produced or imported for 2018**. Under the RFS program, gasoline and diesel producers and importers must use an increasing percentage of four types of renewable fuel: cellulosic biofuel, biomass-based diesel, advanced biofuel, and renewable fuel. To implement the RFS, EPA established a credit program under which every gallon of renewable fuel is assigned a unique number that is transferred along with the fuel. Refiners, blenders and importers subject to the RFS program must have sufficient RFS credits to meet their obligations under the program. With the current rulemaking, EPA proposed to establish the volume standards for the four types of fuel subject to the RFS program for the year 2018 (2019 for biomass-based diesel) at levels below those mandated by the CAA. According to EPA, constraints in the fuel market make it impossible to accommodate the increasing volumes of renewable fuel mandated by the Act. These constraints include lower than expected cellulosic biofuel production, a significant reduction in gasoline sales as well as a reluctance by distributors to sell E15 gasoline (i.e., gasoline containing up to 15% ethanol). EPA therefore exercised its waiver authority to set standards below those specified in the CAA. The deadline for submitting comments on the proposed rule has closed; it can be found in the July 21, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The RFS rule is primarily of interest to motor vehicle fuel producers, blenders, importers and distributors.

REMEDICATION

FEDERAL: EPA is taking comment on possible **voluntary criteria for assessing the competence of organizations that credential radon service providers**. In the late 1980s, EPA established a program comprised primarily of voluntary measures to reduce exposure to indoor radon that included a Radon Proficiency Program to identify qualified radon service providers, i.e., companies supplying radon testing and remediation services. When the federal program was discontinued, two organizations remained qualified as responsible parties for credentialing radon service providers in addition to various state-run certification programs—the National Radon Proficiency Program and the American Association of Radon Scientists and Technologists. With the recent notice, EPA announced its intent to establish a voluntary standard of competence for organizations that credential radon service providers. If finalized, the proposal would expand the number of organizations potentially authorized to issue credentials. The notice seeks comment on various aspects of such a program, including the overall approach to establishing criteria for radon credentialing, the possible application of the voluntary criteria to existing state programs, and the requirements for accreditation organizations, including the demonstration of compliance with certain existing international standards, and the scope of the program (including whether it should address labs and devices in addition to radon testing and remediation services). EPA is accepting comments on the credentialing criteria until **October 23, 2017**; the notice can be found in the August 23, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The notice is primarily of interest to companies that provide radon sampling, mitigation and related services.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

FEDERAL: The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) **proposed to extend the deadline for crane operator certification an additional year** to November 10, 2018. The rule, which is set forth at 29 CFR Part 1926, subpart CC, requires employers in the construction industry to ensure that crane operators are certified in one of four ways, the most common of which is by an accredited independent testing organization. After the rule was issued, OSHA received complaints that the rule did not adequately ensure that crane operators could operate their equipment safely, prompting OSHA to delay implementation for four years and impose a provision requiring employers to ensure that operators of equipment covered by the standard are competent to operate safely and to provide training and evaluation as appropriate. OSHA extended the deadline an additional three years in 2014 while it considered permanent changes to the rule. With the recent rulemaking, OSHA proposed an additional one-year extension until November 18, 2018 to provide time to propose and finalize a rulemaking to address stakeholder concerns. OSHA is accepting comments on the proposed extension until **September 29, 2017**; it can be found in the August 30, 2017 Federal Register at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys.

Implications: The rule is primarily of interest to employers that utilize cranes and derricks in construction.

Upcoming Deadlines

NOTE: This calendar contains items of general interest.

September 25, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposal to retain the existing primary NO₂ NAAQS. See the July 26, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

September 27, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed rescission of the 2015 rule defining "waters of the United States" under the CWA (extended from August 28, 2017). See the July 27, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

September 29, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on OSHA's proposal to extend the deadline for certification of construction crane and derrick operators an additional year. See the August 30, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

September 29, 2017: Deadline for submitting data to assist DEC in identifying impaired waters that do not meet water quality standards. See DEC's website at www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/31290.html for details.

October 5, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's reconsideration of its earlier determination to retain GHG emission standards for model year 2022-2025 light-duty vehicles. See the August 21, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

October 13, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the NESHAP for wool fiberglass manufacturing. See the August 29, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

October 23, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's proposed revisions to the NESHAP for amino/phenolic resins manufacturing. See the August 24, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.

October 23, 2017: Deadline for submitting comments on EPA's notice of intent to establish voluntary criteria for radon credentialing organizations. See the August 23, 2017 Federal Register at www.gpo.gov/fdsys for details.