change and may be made available online at *www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through *www.regulations.gov* or email. *www.regulations.gov* is an ''anonymous access'' system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send email directly to EPA, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic files should avoid the use of special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at *www.regulations.gov* and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901. While all documents in the docket are listed at *www.regulations.gov,* some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., 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: Nancy Levin, EPA Region IX, (415) 942–3848, *levin.nancy@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal addresses the *Final Update of the Limited Maintenance Plan for the Payson PM* $_{10}$ *Maintenance Area* (December 2011) (''Second Ten-Year Limited Maintenance Plan'') submitted as a revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan (SIP) on January 23, 2012 by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register,** we are approving the Second Ten-Year Limited Maintenance Plan for the Payson area in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe this SIP revision is not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: March 5, 2014.

Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2014–05667 Filed 3–18–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

45 CFR Part 170

RIN 0991–AB92

Voluntary 2015 Edition Electronic Health Record (EHR) Certification Criteria; Interoperability Updates and Regulatory Improvements; Correction

AGENCY: Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC), Department of Health and Human Services.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This notice makes the following corrections to the proposed rule that appeared in the February 26, 2014 **Federal Register** entitled ''Voluntary 2015 Edition Electronic Health Record (EHR) Certification Criteria; Interoperability Updates and Regulatory Improvements'': Corrects the preamble text and gap certification table for four certification criteria that were omitted from the list of certification criteria eligible for gap certification for the 2015 Edition EHR certification criteria; and provides information on inactive web links that appear in the proposed rule.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rule published February 26, 2014, at 79 FR 10880, continue to be accepted until no later than 5 p.m. on April 28, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Posnack, Director, Federal Policy Division, Office of Policy and Planning, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, 202–690–7151.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In FR Doc. 2014–03959, the proposed rule entitled ''Voluntary 2015 Edition Electronic Health Record (EHR) Certification Criteria; Interoperability Updates and Regulatory Improvements'' (79 FR 10880) (hereinafter referred to as the 2015 Edition proposed rule), four 2015 Edition EHR certification criteria were omitted from the list of certification criteria eligible for gap certification. There are also inactive web links included in the preamble. These errors are identified and corrected in this correction notice.

II. Summary of Errors

We define ''gap certification'' at 45 CFR 170.502 as ''the certification of a previously certified Complete EHR or EHR Module(s) to: (1) [a]ll applicable new and/or revised certification criteria adopted by the Secretary at subpart C of [part 170] based on the test results of a NVLAP-accredited testing laboratory; and (2) [a]ll other applicable certification criteria adopted by the Secretary at subpart C of [part 170] based on the test results used to previously certify the Complete EHR or EHR Module(s)'' (for further explanation, see 76 FR 1307–1308). Our gap certification policy focuses on the differences between certification criteria that are adopted through rulemaking at different points in time. This allows EHR technology to be certified to only the differences between certification criteria editions rather than requiring EHR technology to be fully retested and recertified to certification criteria that remain ''unchanged'' from one edition to the next and for which previously acquired test results are sufficient. Under our gap certification policy, ''unchanged'' certification criteria (see 77 FR 54248 for further explanation) are eligible for gap certification, and each ONC-Authorized Certification Body (ONC–ACB) has discretion over whether it will provide the option of gap certification.

In the 2015 Edition proposed rule, we noted whether a proposed 2015 Edition EHR certification criterion was ''eligible'' or ''ineligible'' for gap certification at the beginning of each section of the preamble that discussed each certification criterion. We also provided a table that cross-walked ''unchanged'' 2015 Edition EHR certification criteria to the corresponding 2014 Edition EHR certification criteria (79 FR 10916, Table 4). In the preamble section for each certification criterion and in the gap certification table (Table 4), we omitted four certification criteria that are eligible

for gap certification because they are ''unchanged'' based on our description of what constitutes an ''unchanged'' criterion. These criteria are:

- For the inpatient setting only § 170.315(a)(2) Computerized provider order entry—laboratory (79 FR 10887);
- § 170.315(h)(1) Transmit—Applicability Statement for Secure Health Transport (79 FR 10914);
- § 170.315(h)(2) Transmit—Applicability Statement for Secure Health Transport and XDR/XDM for Direct Messaging (79 FR 10914);
- § 170.315(h)(3) Transmit—SOAP Transport and Security Specification and XDR/XDM for Direct Messaging (79 FR 10914).

In addition, some of the web links in the preamble have become inactive since the proposed rule was published.

III. Correction of Errors

In FR Doc. 2014–03959 of February 26, 2014 (79 FR 10880), make the following corrections:

1. On page 10887, first column, line 15, ''Ineligible.'' is corrected to read ''Eligible for the inpatient setting. Ineligible for the ambulatory setting.''

2. On page 10914, second column, line 24, ''Ineligible'' is corrected to read ''Eligible.''

3. On page 10914, second column, line 50, ''Ineligible'' is corrected to read ''Eligible.''

4. On page 10914, third column, line 12, ''Ineligible'' is corrected to read ''Eligible.''

5. On page 10916, Table 4—Gap Certification Eligibility for 2015 Edition EHR Certification Criteria is revised to read as follows:

TABLE 4—GAP CERTIFICATION ELIGIBILITY FOR 2015 EDITION EHR CERTIFICATION CRITERIA

2015 Edition		2014 Edition	
Regulation section	Title of regulation paragraph	Regulation section	Title of regulation paragraph
§ 170.315(a)(1)	Computerized physician order entry—medications.	§ 170.314(a)(1)	Computerized Provider Order Entry.
§ 170.315(a)(2) Inpatient setting only.	Computerized physician order entry—laboratory.		
§ 170.315(a)(3)	Computerized physician order entry—radiology/imaging.		
§ 170.315(a)(4)	Drug-drug, drug-allergy interaction checks.	§ 170.314(a)(2)	Drug-drug, drug-allergy interaction checks.
§ 170.315(a)(6)	Vital signs, BMI, & growth charts	§ 170.314(a)(4)	Vital signs, BMI, & growth charts.
§ 170.315(a)(7)	Problem list	§ 170.314(a)(5)	Problem list.
§ 170.315(a)(8)	Medication list	§ 170.314(a)(6)	Medication list.
§ 170.315(a)(9)	Medication allergy list	§ 170.314(a)(7)	Medication allergy list.
§ 170.315(a)(12)	Drug-formulary checks	§ 170.314(a)(10)	Drug-formulary checks.
§ 170.315(a)(13)	Smoking status	§ 170.314(a)(11)	Smoking status.
§ 170.315(a)(14)	Image results	§ 170.314(a)(12)	Image results.
§ 170.315(a)(16)	Patient list creation	§ 170.314(a)(14)	Patient list creation.
§ 170.315(a)(18)	Electronic medication administration record.	§ 170.314(a)(16)	Electronic medication administration record.
§ 170.315(a)(19)	Advance directives	§ 170.314(a)(17)	Advance directives.
§ 170.315(b)(3)	Electronic prescribing	§ 170.314(b)(3)	Electronic prescribing.
§ 170.315(c)(1)–(3)	Clinical quality measures	§ 170.314(c)(1)–(3)	Clinical quality measures.
§ 170.315(d)(1)	Authentication, access control, & authorization.	§ 170.314(d)(1)	Authentication, access control, & authorization.
§ 170.315(d)(3)	Audit report(s)	§ 170.314(d)(3)	Audit report(s).
§ 170.315(d)(4)	Amendments	§ 170.314(d)(4)	Amendments.
§ 170.315(d)(5)	Automatic log-off	§ 170.314(d)(5)	Automatic log-off.
§ 170.315(d)(6)	Emergency access	§ 170.314(d)(6)	Emergency access.
§ 170.315(d)(7)	End-user device encryption	§ 170.314(d)(7)	End-user device encryption.
§ 170.315(d)(8)	Integrity	§ 170.314(d)(8)	Integrity.
§ 170.315(d)(9)	Accounting of disclosures	§ 170.314(d)(9)	Accounting of disclosures.
§ 170.315(e)(3)	Secure messaging	§ 170.314(e)(3)	Secure messaging.
§ 170.315(f)(1)	Immunization information	§ 170.314(f)(1)	Immunization information.
§ 170.315(f)(3) #	Transmission to public health agencies—syndromic surveillance.	§ 170.314(f)(3) #	Transmission to public health agencies—syndromic surveillance
§ 170.315(f)(5)	Cancer case information	§ 170.314(f)(5)	Cancer case information.
§ 170.315(g)(4)	Quality management system	§ 170.314(g)(4)	Quality management system.
§ 170.315(h)(1)	Transmit—Applicability Statement for Secure Health Transport.	§ 170.314(b)(2)(ii)(A)	Transitions of care—create and transmit transition of care/referral summaries.
§ 170.315(h)(2)	Transmit—Applicability Statement for Secure Health Transport and XDR/XDM for Direct Messaging	§ 170.314(b)(2)(ii)(B)	Transitions of care—create and transmit transition of care/referral summaries.
§ 170.315(h)(3)	Transmit—SOAP Transport and Security Specification and XDR/XDM for Direct Messaging	§ 170.314(b)(2)(ii)(C)	Transitions of care—create and transmit transition of care/referral summaries.

If certified to the revised 2014 Edition version of this criterion after the effective date of the 2015 Edition Final Rule. For further information on this distinction, please see the gap certification discussion under the ''Transmission to Public Health Agencies—Syndromic Surveillance'' in section III.A of this preamble.

Inactive Web Links

Inactive web links included in the 2015 Edition proposed rule are identified on ONC's Standards and Certification Regulations page with an explanation and/or corrected link (*http://www.healthit.gov/policy-researchers-implementers/standards-and-certification-regulations).*

Dated: March 13, 2014.

Jennifer M. Cannistra,

Executive Secretary to the Department.

[FR Doc. 2014–06041 Filed 3–17–14; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–45–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 131206999–4206–01]

RIN 0648–BD83

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Amendment 20A

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes regulations to implement Amendment 20A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources (CMP) in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region (FMP) (Amendment 20A), as prepared and submitted by the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils (Councils). If implemented, this rule would restrict sales of king and Spanish mackerel caught under the bag limit (those fish harvested by vessels that do not have a valid commercial vessel permit for king or Spanish mackerel and are subject to the bag limits specified in 50 CFR 622.382) and remove the income qualification requirements for king and Spanish mackerel commercial vessel permits. The purpose of this rule is to obtain more accurate landings data while ensuring the CMP fishery resources are utilized efficiently.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before May 5, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the proposed rule, identified by ''NOAA–NMFS–2013–0168'' by any of the following methods:

• *Electronic Submission:* Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to *www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2013-0168,* click the ''Comment Now!'' icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

• *Mail:* Submit written comments to Susan Gerhart, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701.

Instructions: Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on *www.regulations.gov* without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.,* name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter ''N/A'' in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous). Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

Electronic copies of the documents supporting this proposed rule, which include an environmental assessment, a Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis, and a regulatory impact review, may be obtained from the Southeast Regional Office Web site at *http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable_fisheries/gulf_sa/cmp/index.html.*

Comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in the proposed rule may be submitted in writing to Anik Clemens, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701; and OMB, by email at *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov,* or by fax to 202–395–7285.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Gerhart, telephone: 727–824–5305, or email: *Susan.Gerhart@noaa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The coastal migratory pelagic (CMP) fishery in the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) and the Atlantic is managed under the FMP. The FMP was prepared by the Councils and implemented through regulations at 50 CFR part 622 under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

Management Measures Contained in the Proposed Rule

Currently, no Federal permits are required to sell CMP species, although commercial vessel permits are required to exceed the bag limit for king and Spanish mackerel. All fish harvested in Federal waters that are sold are considered commercial harvest and count towards a species' commercial quota, whether or not the fisherman has a Federal commercial permit. The Councils and NMFS are concerned that landings from recreational trips that are sold may contribute to the commercial quota and lead to early closures in the commercial sector. Reducing the sale of fish caught under the bag limit should improve the accuracy of data by reducing ''double counting,'' *i.e.,* harvest from a single trip that is counted towards both the commercial quota and recreational allocation. This practice occurs when the same catches are reported through recreational surveys and commercial trip tickets and logbooks.

For the Gulf region, this rule proposes to prohibit the sale of bag-limit-caught king and Spanish mackerel, except in two limited circumstances. First, bag-limit-caught king and Spanish mackerel could be sold when harvested during a for-hire trip on a vessel with both a Gulf Charter Vessel/Headboat Coastal Migratory Pelagic Fish Permit and either a King Mackerel Commercial Permit or a Spanish Mackerel Commercial Permit, as appropriate to the species harvested or possessed. The purpose of this exception is to preserve a historic practice that is important to Gulf charter and headboat businesses. Second, king and Spanish mackerel harvested during state-permitted tournaments may be donated to a dealer who has a state or Federal permit and then sold by that dealer, if the proceeds are donated to charity. Dealers receiving such fish must report them as tournament-caught fish. In the Gulf, sales from dually-permitted vessels or tournaments would only occur in Florida, because all other Gulf states prohibit the sale of any bag-limit-caught fish.

Currently, there is no Federal dealer permit for king or Spanish mackerel. However, a proposed rule published on January 2, 2014 (79 FR 81) for the Generic Dealer Amendment includes an action to implement a Gulf and South Atlantic dealer permit, which would be required for king and Spanish mackerel dealers. Therefore, if the Generic Dealer Amendment is approved and a final rule is implemented, there would be a Federal dealer permit for king and Spanish mackerel. In addition, the