I. Authority and Background

Title III, Part C of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (EPCA or the Act), Public Law 94–163 (42 U.S.C. 6311–6317, as codified), established the Energy Conservation Program for Certain Industrial Equipment, a program covering certain industrial equipment, which includes the focus of this notice: Automatic commercial ice makers.

EPCA prescribes energy conservation standards for cube type automatic commercial ice makers with harvest rates between 50 and 2,500 pounds of ice per 24 hours. (42 U.S.C. 6313(d)(1)) These standards are set out for specific equipment types: Self-contained ice makers using air or water for cooling, ice-making heads using air or water for cooling, and remote condensing ice makers with or without a remote compressor. Id. In a final rule published on October 18, 2005, DOE adopted the energy conservation standards and water conservation standards pursuant to this section and placed them under 10 CFR part 431, subpart H, Automatic Commercial Ice Makers. 70 FR 60407, 60415–16.

EPCA requires DOE to review these standards and determine, by January 1, 2015, whether amending the applicable standards is technologically feasible and economically justified. (42 U.S.C. 6313(d)(3)(A)) If amended standards are technologically feasible and economically justified, DOE must issue a final rule by the same date. (42 U.S.C. 6313(d)(3)(B)) EPA also grants DOE authority to conduct rulemakings to establish new standards for automatic commercial ice makers not covered by 42 U.S.C. 6313(d)(1). (42 U.S.C. 6313(d)(2)(A)) Pursuant to this authority, DOE identified additional automatic commercial ice maker types as candidates for standards to be established in this rulemaking. These include flake and nugget ice makers (collectively “continuous” ice makers), as well as batch type ice makers that are not included in the EPA standards set for cube type ice makers, such as machines with harvest rates greater than 2,500 pounds ice per 24 hours.

DOE initiated the current rulemaking on November 4, 2010 by publishing on its Web site the “Rulemaking Framework for Automatic Commercial Ice Makers.” (The Framework document is available at: www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/)


A link to the docket Web page can be found at: http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=EERE-2010-BT-STD-0037. The regulations.gov Web page contains instructions on how to access all documents in the docket, including public comments.

For further information on how to review the docket, contact Ms. Brenda Edwards at (202) 586–2945 or by email: Brenda.Edwards@ee.doe.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:


The preliminary TSD provided an overview of DOE’s review of the standards for automatic commercial ice makers, discussed the comments DOE received in response to the Framework document, and addressed issues including the scope of coverage of the rulemaking. The document also described the analytical framework used in this rulemaking to consider amended standard levels for automatic commercial ice makers, including a description of the methodology, the analytical tools, and the relationships between the various analyses that are part of this rulemaking. In addition, the preliminary TSD presented in detail each analysis that DOE performed for this equipment, including descriptions of inputs, sources, methodologies, and results. These analyses, which are described in greater detail in the preliminary TSD, included: (1) a market and technology assessment, (2) a screening analysis, (3) an engineering analysis, (4) an energy and water use analysis, (5) a markups analysis, (6) a life-cycle cost (LCC) analysis, (7) a payback period (PBP) analysis, (8) a shipments analysis, (9) a national impact analysis (NIA), and (10) a preliminary manufacturer impact analysis (MIA).

DOE presented the methodologies and results of the analyses set forth in the preliminary TSD at a public meeting held on February 16, 2012 (February 2012 public meeting). Interested parties provided comments on the following issues: (1) Equipment classes; (2) technology options; (3) energy modeling and validation of engineering models; (4) cost modeling; (5) market information, including distribution channels and distribution mark-ups; (6) efficiency levels; (7) life-cycle costs to customers, including installation, repair and maintenance costs, and water and wastewater prices; and (8) historical shipments.

Following the February 2012 public meeting, DOE updated and revised inputs and performed analyses to establish proposed energy conservation standards for automatic commercial ice makers, which were presented in the notice of proposed rulemaking (NOPR) published on March 17, 2014. 79 FR 14845. The NOPR outlined the proposed standard levels, discussed the comments received in response to the preliminary analysis document, and presented the results of the NOPR analysis. The NOPR also included employment, utility, emissions, social cost of carbon, manufacturer impact, and regulatory impact analyses. DOE also invited written comments and announced the availability of a NOPR analysis technical support document (NOPR TSD). Id. (The NOPR TSD is available at: http://www.regulations.gov/#/documentDetail;D=EERE-2010-BT-STD-0037-0026.) Finally, DOE sought comments concerning other relevant issues that could affect amended energy conservation standards for automatic commercial ice makers, or that DOE should address in this rulemaking. Id.

The NOPR TSD described in detail DOE’s analysis of potential standard levels for automatic commercial ice makers. The document also described the analytical framework used in considering standard levels, including a description of the methodology, the analytical tools, and the relationships between the various analyses. Additionally, it presented each analysis that DOE performed to evaluate automatic commercial ice makers, including descriptions of inputs, sources, methodologies, and results. DOE included the same analyses that were conducted at the preliminary analysis stage, with revisions based on comments received and additional research.

At the public meeting held on April 14, 2014, DOE presented the methodologies and results of the analyses set forth in the NOPR TSD. Interested parties provided comments on a variety of different areas. Some key issues raised by stakeholders included: (1) Whether the energy model accurately predicts efficiency improvements associated with design options; (2) the size restrictions and applications of 22-inch wide ice makers; (3) the efficiency distributions assumed for shipments of ice makers; and (4) the impact on manufacturers relating to redesign of ice maker models, in light of the proposed compliance date of 3 years after publication of the final rule.

In response to comments regarding the energy model used in the analysis, DOE held a public meeting on June 19, 2014 in order to facilitate an additional review of the model, gather additional feedback and data on the energy model, and to allow for a more thorough explanation of DOE’s use of the model in the engineering analysis. 79 FR 33877 (June 13, 2014). At that meeting, DOE presented the energy model, demonstrated its operation, and described how it was used in the rulemaking’s engineering analysis. DOE indicated in this meeting that it is considering modifications to its NOPR analyses based on the NOPR comments and additional research and information gathered for the June 2014 public meeting is available at http://www.regulations.gov/
III. Summary of Updated Rulemaking Analyses

DOE conducted analyses of automatic commercial ice makers in the following areas: (1) Engineering; (2) life-cycle cost and payback period; and (3) national impacts. The revised rulemaking analyses and their respective results (engineering, life-cycle cost, and national impacts spreadsheets) are available at: http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/rulemaking.aspx/ruleid/29. Each spreadsheet includes an introduction describing the various inputs and outputs to the analysis, as well as operation instructions. Also available on the DOE Web site is a document outlining the LCC/PBP and NIA results, a document defining the trial standard levels (TSLs) levels that DOE considered in the NODA analyses, and a spreadsheet with charts showing the TSLs’ energy use as functions of harvest capacity.

Summary of Changes to the Engineering Analysis:
- Based on new test data, DOE made changes to the ‘Percent Energy Use Reduction’ values associated with individual design options. These new values are included in the Engineering Results spreadsheet (column D of the ‘Design Option Curves’ tab). The ‘Updated Analysis’ tab details which design options were changed as a result of new test data obtained through (1) Non-Disclosure Agreements with DOE’s engineering contractor and (2) comments made during the NOPR comment period.
- Based on new cost data, DOE made changes to the ‘Individual cost’ values associated with individual design options. These new values are included in the Engineering Results spreadsheet (column D of the ‘Design Option Curves’ tab). The ‘Updated Analysis’ tab details which design options were changed as a result of new data obtained through (1) Non-Disclosure Agreements with DOE’s engineering contractor and (2) comments made during the NOPR comment period.
- Based on comments made during the NOPR period, DOE added additional cost-efficiency curves for 22-inch width units in the IMH–A-Small-B, IMH–A-Large-B, and IMH–W-Small-B equipment classes, and an additional cost-efficiency curve for the RCU-Small-C equipment class. The new cost-efficiency curves are described in Engineering Results spreadsheet (‘Design Option Curves’ tab).
- Summary of Changes to the Life-Cycle Cost and Payback Period: As described above, the engineering analysis examined design options and efficiency level improvements for 22-inch units for three equipment classes under a scenario where no increase in equipment size was considered, resulting in two separate cost-efficiency curves (space constrained and non-space constrained). For the LCC/PBP analysis and the NIA, a major source of change was the integration of these two curves for these equipment classes.
- Other changes include the inclusion of additional installation costs for certain other efficiency improvements (drain water heat exchangers and larger condensers in remote condenser units), changes in the calculation of repair costs to explicitly identify labor and material components, changes to the efficiency distribution of equipment in the baseline market, and changes to the utilization factor used to determine electricity and water usage. The changes to the LCC and NIA are described in the document entitled ACIM NODA tabulated LCC–NIA results.

IV. Public Participation

DOE is interested in receiving comments on all aspects of the data and analysis presented in the NODA and supporting documentation that can be found at: http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/rulemaking.aspx/ruleid/29. DOE is particularly interested in receiving comments on the changes that were made to the engineering and LCC–NIA as described in Section III.

Submission of Comments

DOE will accept comments, data, and information regarding this notice no later than the date provided in the DATES section at the beginning of this notice. Interested parties may submit comments, data, and other information using any of the methods described in the ADDRESSES section at the beginning of this notice.

Submitting comments via

www.regulations.gov. The www.regulations.gov Web page will require you to provide your name and contact information. Your contact
information will be viewable to DOE Building Technologies staff only. Your contact information will not be publicly viewable except for your first and last names, organization name (if any), and submitter representative name (if any). If your comment is not processed properly because of technical difficulties, DOE will use this information to contact you. If DOE cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, DOE may not be able to consider your comment.

However, your contact information will be publicly viewable if you include it in the comment itself or in any documents attached to your comment. Any information that you do not want to be publicly viewable should not be included in your comment, nor in any document attached to your comment. Otherwise, persons viewing comments will see only first and last names, organization names, correspondence containing comments, and any documents submitted with the comments.

Do not submit to www.regulations.gov information for which disclosure is restricted by statute, such as trade secrets and commercial or financial information (hereinafter referred to as Confidential Business Information (CBI)). Comments submitted through www.regulations.gov cannot be claimed as CBI. Comments received through the Web site will waive any CBI claims for the information submitted. For information on submitting CBI, see the Confidential Business Information section below.

DOE processes submissions made through www.regulations.gov before posting. Normally, comments will be posted within a few days of being submitted. However, if large volumes of comments are being processed simultaneously, your comment may not be viewable for up to several weeks. Please keep the comment tracking number that www.regulations.gov provides after you have successfully uploaded your comment.

Submitting comments via email, hand delivery/courier, or mail. Comments and documents submitted via email, hand delivery, or mail also will be posted to www.regulations.gov. If you do not want your personal contact information to be publicly viewable, do not include it in your comment or any accompanying documents. Instead, provide your contact information in a cover letter. Include your first and last names, email address, telephone number, and optional mailing address. The cover letter will not be publicly viewable as long as it does not include any comments. Include contact information each time you submit comments, data, documents, and other information to DOE. If you submit via mail or hand delivery/courier, please provide all items on a CD, if feasible, in which case it is not necessary to submit printed copies. No facsimiles (faxes) will be accepted.

Comments, data, and other information submitted to DOE electronically should be provided in PDF (preferred), Microsoft Word or Excel, WordPerfect, or text (ASCII) file format. Provide documents that are not secured, that are written in English, and that are free of any defects or viruses. Documents should not contain special characters or any form of encryption and, if possible, they should carry the electronic signature of the author.

Campaign form letters. Please submit campaign form letters by the originating organization in batches of between 50 to 500 form letters per PDF or as one form letter with a list of supporters’ names compiled into one or more PDFs. This reduces comment processing and posting time.

Confidential Business Information. Pursuant to 10 CFR 1004.11, any person submitting information that he or she believes to be confidential and exempt by law from public disclosure should submit two well-marked copies: one copy of the document marked “confidential” including all the information believed to be confidential, and one copy of the document marked “non-confidential” with the information believed to be confidential deleted. DOE will make its own determination about the confidential status of the information and treat it according to its determination.

Factors of interest to DOE when evaluating requests to treat submitted information as confidential include: (1) A description of the items; (2) whether and why such items are customarily treated as confidential within the industry; (3) whether the information is generally known by or available from other sources; (4) whether the information has previously been made available to others without obligation concerning its confidentiality; (5) an explanation of the competitive injury to the submitting person which would result from public disclosure; (6) when such information might lose its confidential character due to the passage of time; and (7) why disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest.

It is DOE policy that all comments may be included in the public docket, without change and as received, including any personal information provided in the comments (except information deemed to be exempt from public disclosure).

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 5, 2014.

Kathleen B. Hogan,
Deputy Assistance Secretary for Energy Efficiency, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 2014–21668 Filed 9–10–14; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines]

RIN 2120-AA64

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to adopt a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain serial number Lycoming Engines reciprocating engines. This proposed AD was prompted by events of propeller governor shaft set screws coming loose due to improper installation, which could result in engine oil loss, damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane. This proposed AD would require application of Loctite 290, or equivalent, to the threads of the propeller governor shaft set screw at each installation of the set screw in addition to the peening of crankcase hole threads. We are proposing this AD to prevent the propeller governor shaft set screw from coming loose, causing damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by November 10, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
• Fax: 202–493–2251.