DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG–2015–0066]

Notice of Enforcement for Special Local Regulations; RiverFest; Port Neches, TX

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of enforcement of regulation.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard will enforce Special Local Regulations for the RiverFest Power Boat races on the Neches River in Port Neches, TX from 2 p.m. on May 1, 2015, through 6 p.m. on May 3, 2015. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, participating vessels, non-participating vessels and other users of the waterway. During the enforcement periods no person or vessel may enter the zone established by the Special Local Regulation without permission of the Captain of the Port (COTP) Port Arthur or his designated on-scene Patrol Commander.

DATES: The regulations in 33 CFR 100.801 will be enforced from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. on May 1, 2015; and from 8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. on May 2 and 3, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this notice of enforcement, call or email Mr. Scott Whalen, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur, TX; telephone 409–719–5086, email scott.k.whalen@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Coast Guard will enforce Special Local Regulation for the annual boat races in 33 CFR 100.801 on May 1, 2015, from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. and on May 2 and 3, 2015 from 8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. Under the provisions of 33 CFR 100.801, a vessel may not enter the regulated area, unless it receives permission from the Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene Patrol Commander. Spectator vessels may safely transit outside the regulated area but may not anchor, block, loiter, or impede participants or official patrol vessels. The Coast Guard may be assisted by other federal, state or local law enforcement agencies in enforcing this regulation.

This notice is issued under authority of 33 CFR 100.801 and 33 U.S.C. 1233. In addition to this notice in the Federal Register, the Coast Guard will provide the maritime community with notification of this enforcement period via Local Notice to Mariners, Safety Marine Information Broadcasts, and Marine Safety Information Bulletins. If the Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene Patrol Commander determines that the regulated area need not be enforced for the full duration stated in this notice, he or she may use a Broadcast Notice to Mariners to grant general permission to enter the regulated area.

Dated: March 12, 2015.

R. S. Ogrydziak,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Port Arthur.

[FR Doc. 2015–07319 Filed 3–30–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Parts 140 and 143

46 CFR Parts 110 and 111

[Docket No. USCG–2012–0850]

RIN 1625–AC00

Electrical Equipment in Hazardous Locations

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is issuing regulations applicable to newly constructed mobile offshore drilling units (MODUs), floating outer continental shelf (OCS) facilities, and vessels other than offshore supply vessels (OSVs) that engage in OCS activities. The regulations expand the list of acceptable national and international explosion protection standards and add the internationally accepted independent third-party certification system, the International Electrotechnical Commission System for Certification to Standards relating to Equipment for use in Explosive Atmospheres (IECEx), as an accepted method of testing and certifying electrical equipment intended for use in hazardous locations. The regulations also provide owners and operators of existing U.S. MODUs, floating OCS facilities, vessels other than OSVs, and U.S. tank vessels that carry flammable or combustible cargoes, the option of following this compliance regime as an alternative to the requirements contained in existing regulations.

DATES: This final rule is effective April 30, 2015.

The Director of the Federal Register has approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in this rule, effective April 30, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket USCG–2012–0850 and are available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket online by going to http://www.regulations.gov and following the instructions on that Web site.

Viewing material incorporated by reference: You may make arrangements to view this material by calling the Coast Guard’s Office of Regulations and Administrative Law at 202–372–3870 or by emailing HQS-SMB-CoastGuardRegulationsLaw@uscg.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Mr. Raymond Martin, Systems Engineering Division (CG–ENG–3), Coast Guard; telephone 202–372–1384, email Raymond.W.Martin@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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I. Abbreviations

ABS American Bureau of Shipping
ANSI American National Standards Institute
ASTM ASTM International
ATEX (Directive) Protective Systems
Intended for use in Potentially Explosive Atmospheres
comment on a notice of policy we published in the Federal Register (77 FR 71607) on December 3, 2012. The policy recommended that electrical equipment on foreign mobile offshore drilling units (MODUs) that had never operated on the outer continental shelf (OCS), but were intended to do so, meet Chapter 6 of the 2009 MODU Code of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and obtain equipment certification under the International Electrotechnical Commission Certification to Standards relating to Equipment for use in Explosive Atmospheres (IECEx) System. While NOSAC was reviewing the notice of policy, we published the Electrical Equipment in Hazardous Locations NPRM (78 FR 37760) in the Federal Register. The NPRM proposed regulations similar to the recommendations contained in the notice of policy. Unlike the notice of policy, however, the NPRM was not limited to foreign MODUs but applied to all vessels and facilities that had never operated on the outer continental shelf (OCS) but intended to. Further, the NPRM proposed requiring that certification under the IECEx System be conducted by Coast Guard accepted independent laboratories in order to facilitate Coast Guard oversight of those laboratories. NOSAC provided comments on the notice of policy and on the NPRM, and those comments were considered in developing this final rule.

III. Background

A key finding of the Coast Guard’s investigation of the MODU DEEPWATER HORIZON explosion, fire, and sinking emphasized the importance of proper electrical equipment installations in hazardous locations during oil drilling exploration on U.S. and foreign MODUs. The Coast Guard, therefore, reviewed the existing regulations for hazardous locations; specifically, the requirements for electrical equipment testing and certification and the standards applicable to U.S. and foreign MODUs, floating OCS facilities, and vessels that engage in OCS activities. Currently, electrical equipment on U.S. vessels and floating facilities that operate on the OCS must comply with 46 CFR subpart 111.105. This subpart adopts international and national standards and requires the equipment to be tested and certified by a Coast Guard-accepted independent third-party laboratory.

In contrast, foreign vessels and floating facilities that engage in OCS activities must meet the requirements of 33 CFR subchapter N. Currently, foreign floating OCS facilities must meet the same engineering standards as U.S. floating OCS facilities, while foreign vessels engaged in OCS activities on the U.S. OCS do not meet the same engineering standards as U.S. vessels. While the Coast Guard supports the development and adoption of international vessel safety standards, the existing safety requirements of the International Convention on the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 (SOLAS) do not completely account for the specifics of hydrocarbon production, processing, storage, and handling systems, and the 2009 IMO MODU Code, which provides a recommended SOLAS equivalency for MODUs, is not a legally binding instrument. For electrical equipment in hazardous locations, we believe this rule is necessary to ensure that all vessels engaged in OCS activities meet the same, OCS-specific safety standards.

IV. Discussion of Comments and Changes

As noted above, we received 23 comment letters in response to the NPRM. Additionally, NOSAC submitted a report to the Coast Guard that included their comments on the NPRM. We considered all of these comments in the development of this final rule. The comments and our responses have been grouped into subject-matter categories below. In cases where the comment resulted in a change to the regulations previously proposed in the NPRM, the change is specifically identified and discussed.

Implementation Date

The NPRM’s proposed implementation date was 30 days after publication of the final rule. Fourteen comments stated that was unreasonable. These commenters explained that over 200 MODUs were either under contract, under construction or due to be constructed in the next 5 years and that the costs of changing the specifications for the electrical equipment located in hazardous locations would be much greater than that indicated in Section VI of the NPRM.

We agree. While the estimates provided correspond to the global MODU population currently under construction, a majority of which have
not historically sought to operate on the OCS, the associated burden on vessels under construction is real. Thus, we have delayed the implementation date of the requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108. The requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108 will apply to MODUs, floating OCS facilities, and vessels, other than offshore supply vessels regulated under 46 CFR subchapter L, that are constructed after April 2, 2018 and that engage in OCS activities.

Estimates of the affected foreign flagged vessel population reside in the regulatory analysis section of this final rule. The definition of “constructed” has been added to 33 CFR 140.10 and 46 CFR 110.15–1(b). It is consistent with the existing definition for “constructed” found in 46 CFR 170.055(f). Constructed means either the date a keel is laid or the date that construction identified with the vessel or facility has begun.

Existing U.S. MODUs, floating OCS facilities, and vessels, other than offshore supply vessels (OSVs), and U.S. tank vessels that carry flammable or combustible cargoes may immediately use the expanded list of explosion protection standards and IECEx certification regime identified in this final rule in lieu of the existing requirements in §§111.105–1 through 111.105–17.

2009 IMO MODU Code

The NPRM proposed the adoption of a selection of explosion protection standards and certification schemes. Thirteen comments suggested that the proposed regulations were unnecessary and that compliance with the 2009 IMO MODU Code should be sufficient for all vessels. Many of these comments further noted that the 2009 IMO MODU Code already requires certification by an independent testing laboratory. We agree in part. The Coast Guard supports the development and adoption of international vessel safety standards. The Coast Guard believes the 2009 IMO MODU Code provides helpful guidance for the design and engineering of MODUs, particularly in supplementing SOLAS with standards specific to hydrocarbon production, processing, storage, and handling systems, and should be given appropriate effect by flag administrations. However, the 2009 IMO MODU Code is not a legally binding instrument and by its terms does not apply to vessels that are not MODUs. Additionally, there are differing interpretations of the “independent testing laboratory” certification contained in the 2009 MODU Code. As the coastal state with jurisdiction, we find that it is a necessary and reasonable safety measure to require that newly constructed foreign vessels and floating facilities that engage in OCS activities have uniform safety standards for explosion protection in hazardous locations.

Cost of Compliance for Existing Foreign Vessels and Facilities

Ten comments addressed the cost of bringing into compliance with the proposed rule existing MODUs that are currently not operated on the OCS but the owners or operators intend them to do so. Those comments stated that the cost of bringing the existing vessels into compliance would likely exceed the cost published in the NPRM. In addition to required equipment recertification and replacement costs, there would be a loss of revenue during necessary downtime for replacement of equipment that could equal or exceed all other costs.

We recognize that the costs to retrofit an existing MODU could be prohibitive depending on the design, construction and type of operation of an individual MODU. Because of this, we decided to make the final rule applicable to vessels and facilities that are constructed after April 2, 2018 and that engage in OCS activities. Existing vessels and facilities will continue to be subject to the regulations and standards effective at the time of their construction.

Similarly, one comment recommended that the Coast Guard address electrical equipment in hazardous locations on MODUs currently on the OCS. The Coast Guard disagrees. As explained earlier, this rule does not require any existing vessel or facility to meet the requirements of subpart 111.108 because the costs to retrofit existing equipment could be prohibitive depending on the design, construction and type of operation of an individual vessel or facility.

One comment stated that the Coast Guard should address electrical equipment in hazardous locations on foreign oil and chemical tankers and gas carriers entering U.S. ports. These vessels are outside the scope of this rulemaking, confined to vessels and facilities engaged in OCS activities. Additionally, foreign oil and chemical tankers and gas carriers are already subject to international standards and to Coast Guard inspection for compliance with those standards.

Sister Vessels of Vessels Already Operating on the OCS

Four comments requested that the final rule not apply to sister vessels of vessels already operating on the OCS. They argued that these vessels are identical in design to those existing vessels that the Coast Guard is excluding from the requirements of this final rule.

Under the NPRM, vessels new to the OCS would have been subject to the new requirements, whereas vessels and facilities that had previously operated on the OCS would not. In this final rule, we have changed the applicability to include only those vessels and facilities that are constructed after April 2, 2018 and that engage in OCS activities. This final rule, therefore, does not place new requirements on any existing vessels or facilities nor any vessel or facility that is constructed on or before April 2, 2018. Existing vessels or facilities or those constructed on or before April 2, 2018 will remain subject to the regulations and standards effective at the time of their construction and will remain subject to Coast Guard inspection. Any vessel or facility constructed after the implementation date will be subject to the requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108 before operating on the OCS.

Coast Guard Independent Laboratory Requirement

Eleven comments addressed the proposed requirement in 46 CFR 111.108–3 requiring the testing and certification of electrical equipment in hazardous locations by an independent laboratory. The definition of independent laboratory in the Coast Guard’s Electrical Engineering regulations is contained in 46 CFR 110.15–1, and means a laboratory accepted by the Coast Guard using the independent laboratory criteria found in 46 CFR 159.010. Commenters stated that this requirement is burdensome and unnecessary, particularly for Ex Certification Bodies (ExCBs) and Ex Testing Laboratories operating under the IECEx System. Additionally, these commenters were concerned that there were not enough independent laboratories accepted by the Coast Guard, particularly within the IECEx System, to meet the demands for equipment certifications necessary to comply with this final rule. Further, the commenters stated that requiring Coast Guard-accepted independent laboratories undermines use of international standards, foreign flag administrations, and Recognized Organizations.

We disagree. First, there are differing interpretations of the “independent testing laboratory” certification contained in the 2009 MODU Code. U.S. MODUs, vessels and floating facilities, have been subject to independent third-party testing for over 30 years because we believe it is a critically important
element in preventing accidental explosions in hazardous locations. As the coastal state with jurisdiction, we find that it is a necessary and reasonable safety measure to require that newly constructed foreign vessels and floating facilities that engage in OCS activities have uniform safety standards for explosion protection in hazardous locations. This final rule, therefore, requires compliance with uniform explosion protection standards and certification regimes. The requirement to use Coast Guard-accepted independent laboratories allows the Coast Guard reasonable oversight of laboratories located worldwide and is consistent with our existing regulations for U.S. vessels and facilities engaged in OCS activities. Currently, the majority of ExCBs are Coast Guard-accepted independent laboratories. We have contacted all ExCBs to suggest that they apply for acceptance. We expect that if the demand is present, additional ExCBs will apply for acceptance. Because this final rule applies to new vessels and facilities constructed after April 2, 2018, we expect system designers, equipment manufacturers, and independent laboratories will be able to smoothly transition from existing international standards to the requirements of this final rule. Finally, the existing SOLAS standards do not completely account for the particularities of vessels designed and constructed for OCS activities, and the 2009 IMO MODU Code is neither mandatory nor applicable to all vessels. Therefore, implementation of a domestic standard for electrical equipment in hazardous locations is necessary to ensure that all vessels engaged in U.S. OCS activities meet uniform safety standards particular to OCS activities and does not undermine international standards or organizations.

In a separate rulemaking, the Coast Guard published an interim rule on August 16, 2014 (79 FR 48894) for U.S. offshore supply vessels greater than 6,000 GT ITC. That interim rule also recognized the IECEx System for certification of electrical equipment in hazardous locations. Unlike section 111.108–3(b)(3) of this final rule, 46 CFR 111.106–3(b)(3)(iii) of the interim rule does not require certification of electrical equipment in hazardous locations to be done by a Coast Guard accepted independent laboratory. The Coast Guard recognizes the inconsistency between 46 CFR 111.106–3(b)(3)(iii) of the interim rule and 46 CFR 111.108–3(b)(3) of this final rule and intends to align 46 CFR 111.108–3(b)(3)(iii) with this final rule in a future rulemaking.

ATEX Equipment Certified by a Third-Party Independent Laboratory

Eight comments suggested the Coast Guard accept electrical equipment with certification issued under the European Commission Directive (94/9/EC) on equipment and Protective Systems Intended for use in Potentially Explosive Atmospheres (ATEX Directive or ATEX).

We disagree. ATEX certification does not require independent third party testing for all types of equipment. It also does not ensure that electrical equipment installed in hazardous locations is fully tested to relevant standards. When foreign MODUs and vessels have electrical equipment installed in hazardous locations that is not independently tested, there is not the same level of safety for explosion protection in hazardous areas as required of U.S. vessels and floating facilities that operate on the OCS and that are required to meet 46 CFR subpart 111.105. The ATEX Directive is a European conformity assessment scheme designed to facilitate trade within Europe and is based on “Essential Health and Safety Requirements.” Additionally, the ATEX Directive is currently not applicable to seagoing vessels or MODUs and it is our experience with ATEX certification that it can be difficult to determine the extent of testing performed by the “notified body.”

It is also important to recognize that some ATEX certified electrical equipment may be acceptable under subpart 111.108 if it can be demonstrated that the electrical equipment has been fully tested and certified to the applicable standards contained in 46 CFR subchapter J by an independent laboratory as defined in 46 CFR 110.15–1. Frequently, equipment with ATEX certification also has certifications acceptable under 46 CFR 111.108–3 of this final rule.

Two comments requested that the Coast Guard clarify a statement in CG-ENG Policy Letter No. 01–13, Alternate Design and Equipment Standard for Floating Offshore Installations (FOI) and Floating Production, Storage, and Offloading (FPSO) Units on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf, of June 26, 2013. For hazardous locations, the policy letter states that electrical equipment certified under the ATEX scheme will not be accepted by the Coast Guard. As explained above, if the equipment is also certified in accordance with one of the acceptable methods listed in 46 CFR 111.108–3, in addition to its ATEX certification, then the equipment is acceptable under 46 CFR 111.108–3 of this final rule.

Class I, Special Division 1 Hazardous Locations

Three comments said the proposed use of Class I, Special Division 1 in 46 CFR 111.108–3(e) may cause confusion as it is not a term recognized by the National Fire Protection Association’s (NFPA) standard, NFPA 70, National Electrical Code (NEC). We disagree and have not revised this section. Class I, Special Division 1 is intended to be equivalent to Class I, Zone 0, and is consistent with Informational Note No. 2 of Article 500.5(B)(3) of NFPA 70.

Coast Guard regulations have long recognized that certain spaces such as cargo pump rooms and cargo tanks are more hazardous than other Class I, Division 1 locations. For these hazardous locations, we limit the types of permitted electrical installations. Use of the term “Class I, Special Division 1” simplifies the designation of these locations.

Electrical Equipment Inspection and Maintenance Requirements

Five comments recommended that the Coast Guard establish standards for the design, installation, inspection, and maintenance of electrical equipment in hazardous locations. Two comments suggested requiring an onboard electrical equipment register that contains information regarding electrical equipment and its inspection, maintenance, and operational history. The commenters also suggest this information could be reviewed by visiting Coast Guard marine inspectors or third-party inspection personnel and could become part of a company’s quality system. We agree that competency and accurate recordkeeping are critical to safety, but this recommendation is outside the scope of this rulemaking.

“Operated on the OCS”

Under the NPRM, vessels and facilities new to the OCS would be subject to the NPRM, whereas vessels and facilities that had previously operated on the OCS, would not. Two comments requested that the Coast Guard more clearly define what constitutes having “operated on the OCS.” Because this final rule now applies only to vessels and facilities constructed after April 2, 2018, that engage in OCS activities, we believe no
further elaboration is needed, because the phrase “operated on the OCS” is no longer used.

BSEE–USCG MOA, OCS–8, Regarding MODUs

Two comments requested clarification on the responsibilities of the Coast Guard and of the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) for electrical equipment in hazardous locations on MODUs under the USCG/BSEE Memorandum of Agreement, OCS–8, signed June 4, 2013. While the subject is outside the scope of this rulemaking because neither agency’s responsibilities with regard to regulating electrical equipment located in hazardous locations are affected by this final rule, it is relevant to understanding the regulatory requirements for electrical equipment located in hazardous locations.

BSEE and Coast Guard have a shared responsibility for safety on the OCS. In general, the Coast Guard is responsible for the vessel or facility and all of its supporting systems while BSEE is responsible for systems related to the drilling and production of resources. Classification of hazardous locations and design of electrical systems is a vessel-wide or facility-wide task and the Coast Guard maintains a holistic view of the vessel or facility. The Coast Guard, in this rule, provides an expanded list of standards that are applicable to systems under the Coast Guard’s jurisdiction as explained in BSEE–USCG MOA OCS–8. The electrical safety standards contained in BSEE’s OCS regulations, 30 CFR part 250, are acceptable to the Coast Guard. Frequent drilling and production components will be installed on vessels or facilities on a temporary or semi-temporary basis. In general, BSEE oversees these systems and if they find them acceptable, their installation is acceptable to the Coast Guard.

Class I, Division 2 and Class I, Zone 2

Two comments suggested that electrical equipment in Division 2 or Zone 2 locations be accepted without independent third-party certification or be accepted with ATEX certification. The Coast Guard agrees to the extent applicable provisions of NFPA 70 and the 2009 IMO MODU Code permit. 46 CFR 111.108–3(b)(1) and (b)(2) incorporate by reference Articles 500–504 and Article 505 of the NFPA 70. Articles 501.125(B) and 505.20(C) of the NFPA 70 allow the installation of certain electrical equipment in these locations without independent identification or listing if the equipment meets specific requirements that reduce the risk of explosion. This final rule is not intended to modify these standards.

Acceptance of IECEx Certified Equipment

One comment asked if equipment tested to the IECEx System but not yet marked as such would be acceptable. The commenter explained that equipment is sometimes delivered before the IECEx Certificate of Compliance is issued. Another comment noted that equipment can be certified under both the ATEX Directive and the IECEx System but only have ATEX labeling. Finally, a comment requested acceptance of equipment consisting of assemblies of IECEx certified components rather than requiring a certificate for the entire assembly.

Ultra Low Sulfur (ULS) Diesel Fuels

One comment requested that the Coast Guard consider lowering the minimum flashpoint that defines hazardous locations, because Ultra Low Sulfur (ULS) diesel fuels are being produced against a minimum flashpoint of 52°C, rather than the 60°C minimum that has served as the basis for both Coast Guard and IMO requirements to date. We are unable to make this change in the final rule because it was not proposed in the NPRM. The minimum flashpoint of 60°C exists in numerous standards and regulations including 46 CFR 111.105–29, 46 CFR 111.105–31, 46 CFR 58.01–10, numerous locations within SOLAS, and IEC 6002–502–1999. We may consider proposing a change to the minimum flashpoint in a future rulemaking. This will provide the public the opportunity to comment on the proposal. Until that occurs, the MSC can accept arrangements that provide an equivalent level of safety in accordance with 46 CFR 110.20–1.

IECEx Certified Equipment in Class I, Division 1 and Class I, Division 2 Locations

One commenter requested that drill floor equipment that is IECEx certified for Class I, Zone 1 or Class I, Zone 2 be
permits on drill floors classified to Class I, Division 1 or Class I, Division 2. Equipment certified using the zone classification system, regardless of whether certification was by a Coast Guard-accepted independent laboratory or IECEx ExCB, is permitted in locations that are classified using the division classification system in accordance with Article 501.5 of NFPA 70, NEC. The same commenter requested that drill floors be allowed to be classified under both systems so that both zone and division certified equipment could be used. We do not favor one classification system over the other and we are not opposed to dual classification, but we caution that great care must be taken. While both systems offer comparable levels of safety the two systems are not identical or interchangeable. Indiscriminate “mixing and matching” of systems could result in errors that result in lower levels of safety. This limits the benefit of dual classification. Article 505.7 of NFPA 70 provides details on dual classification. Any mixing of classification systems should be done in accordance with NFPA 70 to ensure that the requirements of 46 CFR part 111.108 are met.

V. Incorporation by Reference
The Director of the Federal Register has approved the material in §110.10–1 for incorporation by reference under 5 U.S.C. 552 and 1 CFR part 51. Copies of the material are available from the sources listed in that section.

VI. Regulatory Analyses
We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders (E.O.s) related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes or E.O.s.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review
Executive Orders 12866 (“Regulatory Planning and Review”) and 13563 (“Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”) direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility.

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not reviewed it under that Order. Nonetheless, we developed an analysis of the costs and benefits of the rule to ascertain its probable impacts on industry.

A summary of the changes between the NPRM and the final rule follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1—CHANGES BETWEEN NPRM AND FINAL RULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Final rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected Population</td>
<td>U.S. and foreign vessels and floating OCS facilities that are new to the OCS or newly built.</td>
<td>Under the final rule, only vessels and facilities constructed after April 2, 2018 will be subject to the rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Date</td>
<td>Affected population required to comply by the effective date, which is 30 days after final rule is published.</td>
<td>Changed to 3 years after effective date of the rule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Applicable Regulatory Assessment Comments and Changes
The Coast Guard received several comments on the published NPRM. These comments have been grouped by topic, as several comments addressed similar concerns, and are discussed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2—NPRM COMMENT TOPICS AND RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Implementation Date | Several commenters voiced their concern that the 30 day period between publication of the final rule and the effective date of the requirements was too brief and did not allow sufficient time for vessel and facility owners to come into compliance. Changing the implementation date from 30 days to 3 years after publication of the rule addresses this concern and provides owners and operators of the affected population the amount of time deemed sufficient by both the Coast Guard and commenters alike, to meet the requirements of this rule. |
| Compliance costs for vessels currently under contract or construction. | Several comments addressed the concern that vessels currently under contract or construction could face recertification costs before the vessel has been completed. For example, one such comment stated, “Proposed regulations will block entry onto the OCS of over 200 MODUs, built to the 2009 MODU Code, that are currently under contracting or construction.” The Coast Guard acknowledges the potential cost associated with vessels currently under design or construction. Estimates suggest that delays and contracts are sometimes set as much as 3 years in advance. It is for this reason that we have changed the implementation date to 3 years after the publication of the rule. A 3 year delayed implementation date allows vessels currently under contract or construction to remain subject to the regulations in effect at the time that their construction began. Changing the implementation date to 3 years after the publication of the rule allows owners and operators of vessels currently under contract or construction to avert any costs associated with the requirements of this rule. |
Costs: U.S. Vessels

We do not anticipate any costs to be borne by the U.S.-flagged vessels that will be affected by this rule. The rule requires that all U.S. vessels, excluding OSVs that are regulated under 46 CFR subchapter L, that are constructed after April 2, 2018 and engage in OCS activity, comply with the newly created subpart 111.108. U.S. flagged vessels which fall within this scope are provided with an expanded list of standards and certification options.

Subpart 111.108 will not impose any burden on U.S. vessels due to the nature of current industry practice. Because North American certification of electrical equipment is generally to the most current edition of the published reference standards, we do not anticipate new equipment will be tested and certified to the standards referenced in subpart 111.105 when more current, updated editions of the standards are available.

While the logic applied to U.S. vessels, excluding OSVs as discussed above, applies to U.S. MODUs and floating OCS facilities as well. We do not anticipate any cost burden associated with this rule to be imposed on this vessel class. We believe this because the affected population are those U.S. MODUs and floating OCS facilities that are constructed after April 2, 2018. These vessels will be subject to subpart 111.108, a subpart that contains the updated standards to which new equipment will be certified. As with the vessels discussed earlier, in the absence of subpart 111.108, new equipment would be built to the most current standards as a matter of industry practice. Under this final rule, this scenario will not require any costs to the vessel owner as there is no change in the regulatory environment for U.S. MODUs and floating OCS facilities.

Under this final rule, all U.S. MODUs, floating OCS facilities, vessels other than OSVs, and U.S. tank vessels may comply with this new subpart in lieu of §§111.105–1 through 111.105–15. We do not foresee any additional costs to the owners of these vessels and facilities by providing this option but if there are additional costs, there is expected to be equal or greater benefit to the owner driving the selection of this option. Currently, the regulations for electrical installations in hazardous locations are contained in subpart 111.105. This regulation will expand the available subparts to include subpart 111.108, while still allowing owners and operators the option to remain subject to existing subpart 111.105.

Costs: Foreign Vessels

While the modification of the affected population aids us in estimating the effects of the proposed rulemaking, it does not further refine the costs which are applied to the population. As some commenters on the NPRM document have reinforced, the estimated costs associated with the rule could vary widely. Industry costs were constructed from a variety of elements, for example the cost of certifying equipment or the opportunity cost of recertification of said equipment. With the modification of the affected population we are able to drop the opportunity cost from our analysis, which allows us to further streamline our discussion of the costs for the rulemaking. What remains is the cost associated with third party certification of equipment.

Currently, foreign vessels are not required to utilize third party certified equipment in hazardous areas unless explicitly required by their flag state. Implementation of the final rule will require certification by a Coast Guard approved, independent laboratory which, in effect, changes the baseline for newly constructed foreign vessels. Foreign flagged vessels constructed 3 years after the implementation date seeking entrance to the OCS in pursuit of OCS activities will be required to utilize third party certified equipment where previously this was not explicitly required. Our analysis of this baseline change is clouded by the aggregate nature of the cost of certification. When an entity purchases equipment for use in a hazardous location on a vessel, the marginal cost of the certification element of the purchase price is not itemized for the purchaser. The certification cost is present in the purchase price as a value added component of the total price of the equipment. As such, we are not able to explicitly determine the marginal cost difference between equipment certified by a third party and those without third party certification. Additionally, the list of equipment present in these locations, and required to be third party certified, is diverse. For example, one equipment list obtained by the Coast Guard contained equipment which ranged in complexity from a fluorescent light to elements of the tank temperature monitoring system.

While the cost estimation is obtuse, it is not insurmountable. We have several elements which should allow us to construct a range for the final rule’s associated costs. On the high end of the

---

2 Confirmed by Principal Engineer—Global Hazardous Locations Product Safety, UL LLC, 12/26/2012.
range, we have the cost to replace all of the electrical installations in a representative vessel. While not specifically applicable to a newly built vessel, it is an appropriate estimate of the costs associated with replacement of electrical installations in hazardous areas. This estimate contains the costs associated with replacement of both the equipment and the certification on a U.S. flagged vessel, which are already subject to the certification requirements in this final rule. The $500,000 cost quote for replacement of the equipment appropriate for a hazardous location on a vessel is useful as a cost ceiling. The replacement cost for this equipment, contains that which is associated with the third party certification, in addition to the price of the equipment itself. This function well as a price ceiling as we can be sure that the marginal cost of third party certification will fall below this point estimate, as it is not likely to be above the full cost of the equipment with its associated certification.

The cost floor is a function of costs potentially accured to a hypothetical vessel to be built in the future. In some cases these vessels would be built to the certification specifications contained in this final rule anyway, in which case they would accrue no additional costs from this rule. However, due to the probable greater cost of third-party-certified equipment, we can assume that, without this rulemaking, some equipment would be installed without third party certification. Table 3 presents the range.

**Table 3—Cost Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-cost floor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High-cost ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affected Population**

The Coast Guard-maintained MISLE database, contains records of all applicable vessels operating on the OCS in pursuit of OCS activities. Historic data extracted from this database is presented below in Table 4.

**Table 4—MISLE Historic Data—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded.

Over the past 10 years, 17 foreign vessels have been built which would fall under this rule's application. The database was filtered to include foreign vessels, those vessel classes which would potentially be on the OCS in pursuit of OCS activities, and have build years within the past decade. Evaluation of this data found that on average, 2 foreign vessels are built per year which could seek entrance to the US OCS in pursuit of OCS activities.

Therefore, the range of costs associated with this rulemaking will fall between $0 (2 Vessels * $0) and $1,000,000 (2 vessels * $500,000) per year with an average per year cost of $500,000 (2 vessels * $250,000).

**Cost estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-cost floor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High-cost ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NPRM vs Final Rule**

Burden estimates in the NPRM were $800,000 per year. With the changes that the final rule makes to the affected population, the yearly costs have been reduced, by an estimation that is upwards of 37%.

\[
\frac{500,000 - 800,000}{800,000} = -0.375
\]

**Benefits**

We are unable to monetize benefits. We can find no casualties that would have been prevented by these regulations. However, third-party testing and certification for critical equipment, such as electrical equipment intended for use in hazardous locations, addresses a potentially catastrophic hazard consisting of an explosive gas or vapor combined with an electrical ignition source, and is generally understood by industry as an appropriate measure that enhances safety and protects life, the environment, and property.

**Alternatives**

We considered five alternatives when evaluating the effects of this final rule. The first, abstaining from action, was rejected because it allows a regulatory imbalance and a potential safety gap to exist between foreign vessels and U.S. vessels operating on the OCS.

The second alternative we considered was to require both U.S. and foreign vessels and facilities to adhere to the existing international standards. This alternative was deemed insufficient because compliance with international standards, such as the 2009 IMO Code, is subject to the interpretation of the applicable flag administration. An example of an undesired consequence of this alternative would be the acceptance of ATEX certified equipment. The Coast Guard, however, will not accept ATEX certifications because evidence of full testing to the applicable harmonized 60079 series of standards by an independent third-party laboratory is not guaranteed. Consistent with preexisting Coast Guard practices, third-party testing and certification for critical equipment is generally required.

The third alternative we considered was to require foreign vessels and floating facilities to meet current U.S. standards. This alternative was not selected because we believe that requiring compliance with U.S. standards is unnecessary when there are comparable international standards acceptable to the Coast Guard. Because these latest editions of internationally recognized standards for explosion protection offer owners and operators greater flexibility, while also avoiding the costs of coastal state-specific requirements, we are expanding the list of international explosion protection standards deemed acceptable.

The fourth alternative, implementing the regulations in this final rule, puts in place a regulatory regime that will allow for both the U.S., as the coastal state, and industry to be confident in the certification and assessment of electrical equipment intended for use in hazardous locations. This will be achieved through the use of the most current, internationally recognized standards for explosion protection and independent third-party certification. The regulations in this final rule expand the list of national and international explosion protection standards deemed acceptable for U.S. operators.

A fifth and final alternative is that which was presented to the public in the NPRM. This alternative included the application of the NPRM regulation to existing vessels before those vessels engaged in OCS activities for the first time.
time. This alternative would have included foreign vessels currently under contract or construction. We determined that this alternative would force an undue burden on the industry due primarily to the cost effects. Industry’s comments to the docket suggest that the compliance cost per vessel could be cost prohibitive. With current estimates of 219 foreign MODUs in some stage of construction, the cost of this alternative could have potentially outpaced its benefits.

B. Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, we have considered whether this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. We do not anticipate any effect on small entities. As noted in the previous discussion, there is no anticipated cost burden placed on U.S. entities by this rule and, as such, we do not anticipate any effect on small entities that would be addressed by this section. Therefore, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

C. Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, Public Law 104–121, we offered to assist small entities in understanding this rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247).

D. Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.

E. Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132. Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132. Our analysis is explained below.

It is well settled that States may not regulate in categories reserved for exclusive regulation by the Coast Guard. It is also well settled that all of the categories for inspected vessels covered in 46 U.S.C. 3306, 3703, 7101, and 8101 (design, construction, alteration, repair, maintenance, operation, equipping, personnel qualification, and manning of vessels), as well as the reporting of casualties and any other category in which Congress intended the Coast Guard to be the sole source of a vessel’s obligations, are within fields foreclosed from regulation by the States. (See the decision of the Supreme Court in the consolidated cases of United States v. Locke and Intertanko v. Locke, 529 U.S. 89, 120 S.Ct. 1135 (March 6, 2000).) This final rule regulates electrical equipment standards on inspected vessels. As such, States may not regulate within this category. Therefore, the rule is consistent with the principles of federalism and preemption requirements in Executive Order 13132.

F. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

G. Taking of Private Property

This rule will not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under E.O. 12630 (“Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights”).

H. Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of E.O. 12988, (“Civil Justice Reform”), to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

I. Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under E.O. 13045 (“Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks”). This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

J. Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under E.O. 13175 (“Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments”), because it would not have a substantial direct effect 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.

K. Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under E.O. 12211 (“Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use”). We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under E.O. 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy.

L. Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, codified as a note to 15 U.S.C. 272, directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through OMB, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed and adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This rule uses the following voluntary consensus standards:

- ANSI/ISA–12.12.01–2012—Nonincendive Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I and II, Division 2 and Class III, Divisions 1 and 2
- Hazardous (Classified) Locations,


• UL 823—Electric Heaters for Use in Hazardous (Classified) Locations, Ninth Edition including revisions through November 15, 2007 (dated October 20, 2006) (“ANSI/UL 823"


• CSA C22.2 No. 213–M1987—Non-incendive Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I, Division 2 Hazardous Locations, Reaffirmed 2008 (“CSA C22.2 No. 213–M1987"

• CAN/CSA–C22.2 No. 0–M91—General Requirements—Canadian Electrical Code, Part II, Reaffirmed 2006 (“CSA C22.2 No. 0–M91"

• CAN/CSA–C22.2 No. 157–92—Intrinsically Safe and Non-incendive Equipment for Use in Hazardous Locations, Reaffirmed 2006 (“CSA C22.2 No. 157–92"

• FM Approvals Class Number 3600—Approval Standard for Electric Equipment for use in Hazardous (Classified) Locations General Requirements, November 1998 (“FM Approvals Class Number 3600"

• FM Approvals Class Number 3610—Approval Standard for Intrinsically Safe Apparatus and Associated Apparatus for Use in Class I, II, and III, Division 1, Hazardous (Classified) Locations, January 2010 (“FM Approvals Class Number 3610"

• FM Approvals Class Number 3611—Approval Standard for Nonincendive Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I and II, Division 2, and Class III, Divisions 1 and 2, Hazardous (Classified) Locations, December 2004 (“FM Approvals Class Number 3611"

• FM Approvals Class Number 3615—Approval Standard for Explosionproof Electrical Equipment General Requirements, August 2006 (“FM Approvals Class Number 3615"

• FM Approvals Class Number 3620—Approval Standard for Purged and Pressurized Electrical Equipment for Hazardous (Classified) Locations, August 2000 (“FM Approvals Class Number 3620"


• NFPA 70—National Electrical Code, 2011 Edition (“NFPA 70"


The sections that reference these standards and the locations where these standards are available are listed in 46 CFR 110.10–1.

This rule also uses technical standards other than voluntary consensus standards.


The section that references this standard and the locations where this standard is available are listed in 46 CFR 110.10–1.

M. Environment

We have analyzed this final rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This final rule is categorically excluded under section 2.B.2, figure 2–1, paragraphs (34)(a), (d) and (e) of the Instruction and under section 6(a) of the “Appendix to National Environmental Policy Act: Coast Guard Procedures for Categorical Exclusions, Notice of Final Agency Policy” (67 FR 48244, July 23, 2002)."

This final rule involves regulations which are editorial and concern inspection and equipping of vessels and regulations concerning vessel operation safety standards. An environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are available in
the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects

33 CFR Part 140
Continental shelf, Investigations, Marine safety, Occupational safety and health, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

33 CFR Part 143
Continental shelf, Marine safety, Occupational safety and health, Vessels.

46 CFR Part 110
Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Vessels, Incorporation by reference.

46 CFR Part 111
Vessels.
For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR parts 140 and 143 and 46 CFR parts 110 and 111 as follows:

Title 33—Navigation and Navigable Waters
CHAPTER I—COAST GUARD,
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SUBCHAPTER N—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ACTIVITIES
PART 140—GENERAL

1. The authority citation for part 140 continues to read as follows:


2. Amend § 140.10 by adding a definition for “Constructed” in alphabetical order to read as follows:

§ 140.10 Definitions.
* * * * *
Constructed means the date—(1) The vessel’s keel was laid; or (2) Construction identifiable with the vessel or facility began and assembly of that vessel or facility commenced comprising of 50 metric tons or at least 1 percent of the estimated mass of all structural material, whichever is less. * * * * *

PART 143—DESIGN AND EQUIPMENT

3. The authority citation for part 143 continues to read as follows:


4. Amend § 143.120 by adding paragraphs (d) to read as follows:

§ 143.120 Floating OCS facilities.
* * * * *
(d) Each floating OCS facility that is constructed after April 2, 2018 must comply with the requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108 prior to engaging in OCS activities.

5. Add § 143.208 to read as follows:

§ 143.208 Hazardous location requirements on foreign MODUs.
Each mobile offshore drilling unit that is documented under the laws of a foreign nation and is constructed after April 2, 2018 must comply with the requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108 prior to engaging in OCS activities.

6. Add § 143.302 to read as follows:

§ 143.302 Hazardous location requirements on foreign vessels engaged in OCS activities.
Each vessel that is documented under the laws of a foreign nation and is constructed after April 2, 2018 must comply with the requirements of 46 CFR subpart 111.108 prior to engaging in OCS activities.

PART 146—SHIPPING
CHAPTER I—COAST GUARD,
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SUBCHAPTER J—ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING
PART 110—GENERAL PROVISIONS

7. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:


8. Revise § 110.10–1 to read as follows:

§ 110.10–1 Incorporation by reference.
(a) Certain material is incorporated by reference into this subchapter with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. To enforce any edition other than that specified in this section, the Coast Guard must publish notice of change in the Federal Register and the material must be available to the public. The word “should,” when used in material incorporated by reference, is to be construed the same as the words “must” or “shall” for the purposes of this subchapter. All approved material is available for inspection at the U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Design and Engineering Standards (CG–ENG), 2703 Martin Luther King Jr Ave. SE., Stop 7418, Washington, DC 20593–7418, and is available from the sources listed below. It is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030 or go to http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal_regulations/ibr_locations.html.


(1) Rules for Building and Classing Steel Vessels, Part 4 Vessel Systems and Machinery, 2003 (“ABS Steel Vessel Rules”), IBR approved for §§ 110.15–1, 111.01–9, 111.12–1, 111.12–3, 111.12–5, 111.12–7, 111.33–11, 111.35–1, 111.70–1, 111.105–31, 111.105–39, 111.105–40, and 113.05–7 of this chapter.

(2) Rules for Building and Classing Mobile Offshore Drilling Units, Part 4 Machinery and Systems, 2001 (“ABS MODU Rules”), IBR approved for §§ 111.12–1–3, 111.12–5, 111.12–7, 111.33–11, 111.35–1, and 111.70–1 of this chapter.


(3) ANSI/ISA 12.12.01–2008—Nonincendive Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I and II, Division 2 and Class II, Divisions 1 and 2 Hazardous (Classified) Locations, approved 9 July 2012 (“ANSI/ISA 12.12.01”), IBR approved for § 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(4) ANSI/ISA–60079–18—Electrical Apparatus for Use in Class I, Zone 1 Hazardous (Classified) Locations: Type of Protection—Encapsulation “m”, approved July 31, 2009 (“ANSI/ISA 60079–18”), IBR approved for § 111.106–3(d) of this chapter.


(6) American Petroleum Institute (API), Order Desk, 1220 L Street NW.,
Intrinsically Safe and Non-incendive Equipment for Use in Hazardous Locations, Reaffirmed 2006 ("CSA C22.2 No. 157–92"). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.


(1) Class Number 3600—Approval Standard for Electric Equipment for use in Hazardous (Classified) Locations, Reaffirmed 2007 ("CSA C22.2 No. 30–M1896."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(2) CSA C22.2 No. 213–M1987—Non-incendive Electrical Equipment for Use in Class I, Division 2 Hazardous Locations, Reaffirmed 2008 ("CSA C22.2 No. 213–M1987."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(3) CAN/CSA–C22.2 No. 0–M91—General Requirements—Canadian Electrical Code, Part II, Reaffirmed 2006 ("CSA C22.2 No. 0–M91."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(4) CAN/CSA–C22.2 No. 157–92—Intrinsically Safe and Non-incendive Equipment for Use in Cable Tray in Industrial and Division 2, and Class III, Divisions 1 and 2, Hazardous (Classified) Locations, December 2004 ("FM Approvals Class Number 3611."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(4) Class Number 3615—Approval Standard for Explosionproof Electrical Equipment General Requirements, August 2006 ("FM Approvals Class Number 3615."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.

(5) Class Number 3620—Approval Standard for Purged and Pressurized Electrical Equipment for Hazardous (Classified) Locations, August 2000 ("FM Approvals Class Number 3620."). IBR approved for §§ 111.106–3(b) and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.


(2) IEEE Std C37.010–1999—IEEE Application Guide for AC High-Voltage Circuit Breakers Rated on a Symmetrical Current Basis, 1999 ("IEEE C37.010."). IBR approved for § 111.54–1 of this chapter.


(6) IEEE Std 45–2002—IEEE Recommended Practice for Electrical Installations On Shipboard, October 11, 2002 ("IEEE 45–2002."). IBR approved for §§ 111.05–7, 111.15–2, 111.30–1, 111.30–5, 111.33–3, 111.33–5, 111.40–1, 111.60–1, 111.60–3, 111.60–5, 111.60–11, 111.60–13, 111.60–19, 111.60–21, 111.60–23, 111.75–5, and 113.65–5 of this chapter.


(35) IEC 60092–502—Electrical installations in ships—Part 502: Tankers—Special features, Fifth edition, 1999–02 ("IEC 60092–502"), IBR approved for §§ 111.81–1, 111.105–31, 111.106–3(b), 111.106–5(c), 111.106–15(a), and 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.


(42) IEC 60533—Electrical and Electronic Installations in Ships—Electromagnetic Compatibility, Second Edition, 1999 ("IEC 60533"), IBR approved for § 113.05–7 of this chapter.


(46) IEC 62271–100—High-voltage switchgear and controlgear—part 100: High-voltage alternating current circuitbreakers, Edition 1.1, 2003 ("IEC 62271–100"), IBR approved for § 111.54–1 of this chapter.

(1) International Maritime Organization (IMO Publications Section), A Albert Embankment, London SE1 7SR, United Kingdom, +44 (0) 20 7735 7611, http://www.imo.org.


(2) Resolution A.1023(26)—Code for the Construction and Equipment of Mobile Offshore Drilling Units, 2009, 18 January 2010 ("2009 IMO MODU Code"), IBR approved for § 111.108–3(b) of this chapter.


(2) [Reserved]
Subpart 111.108—Hazardous Locations Requirements on U.S. and Foreign MODUs, Floating OCS Facilities, Vessels Conducting OCS Activities, and U.S. Vessels That Carry Flammable and Combustible Cargo

Sec. 111.108–1 Applicability.
111.108–2 [Reserved]
111.108–3 General requirements.

§ 110.15–1 Definitions.
* * * * *
(b) * * * *
Constructed means the date—
(1) The vessel’s keel was laid; or
(2) Construction identifiable with the vessel or facility commenced and assembly of that vessel or facility commenced comprising of 50 metric tons or at least 1 percent of the estimated mass of all structural material, whichever is less.
* * * * *
OCS activity has the same meaning as it does in 33 CFR 140.10.
Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) has the same meaning as it does in 33 CFR 140.10.
* * * * *

§ 110.25–1 Plans and information required for new construction.
* * * * *
(q) For vessels with hazardous locations to which subpart 111.108 of this chapter applies, plans showing the extent and classification of all hazardous locations, including information on—
(1) Equipment identification by manufacturer’s name and model number;
(2) Equipment use within the system;
(3) Parameters of intrinsically safe systems, including cables;
(4) Equipment locations;
(5) Installation details and/or approved control drawings; and
(6) A certificate of testing, and listing or certification, by an independent laboratory or an IECEx Certificate of Conformity under the IECEx System, where required by the respective standard in § 111.108–3(b)(1), (2), or (3) of this chapter.

PART 111—ELECTRIC SYSTEMS GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

§ 111. Authority citation for part 111 continues to read as follows:

§ 112. Add subpart 111.108 to read as follows:
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs

41 CFR Parts 60–1, 60–2, 60–4, and 60–50

Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors; Agency Information Collection Activities; Announcement of OMB Approval


ACTION: Announcement of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of collection of information requirements.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) is announcing that the collection of information requirements contained in the final rule titled “Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors” (41 CFR part 60) have been approved by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The OMB approval control number is 1250–0009.

DATES: The final rule published December 9, 2014 (79 FR 72985), including the information collection requirements, will take effect on April 8, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Debra A. Carr, Director, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave. NW., Room C–3325, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 693–0104. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: OFCCP published a final rule entitled “Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors” on December 9, 2014. This final rule amends the regulations implementing Executive Order 11246 by replacing the words “sex, or national origin” with the words “sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin” as directed by Executive Order 13672, titled “Further Amendments to Executive Order 11478, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government and Executive Order 11246, Equal Employment Opportunity.” This final rule becomes effective on April 8, 2015.

OFCCP submitted the information collection request on December 8, 2014 to OMB for approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. On March 17, 2015 OMB approved the collections of information contained in the final rule and assigned this collection OMB Control Number 1250–0009 title “Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors.” The approval for the collection expires on September 30, 2015. The approved collections of information are:

- Amending the Equal Opportunity Clause: Sections 60–1.4(a) and (b) and 60–4.3(a);
- Amending the Tag Line in Job Advertisements and Solicitations: Sections 60–1.4(a)(2), and 1.4(b)(2); and
- Reporting Denied Visas to Department of State and OFCCP: Section 60–1.10.

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Federal Register Notice for the final rule stated that compliance with the collection of information requirements was not required until these requirements are approved by OMB, and the Department of Labor publishes a notice in the Federal Register announcing that OMB approved and assigned a control number to the requirements. As provided in 5 CFR 1320.5(b) and 1320.6(a), an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs members of the public who must respond to the collection of information that they are not required to respond to the collection of information unless the agency displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Dated: March 25, 2015.

Debra A. Carr, Director, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

BILLING CODE 4510–CM–P