

Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight. The Joint Audit Committee must obtain a written report from the examinations expert in accordance with paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(G)(3) of this section.

(3) At the conclusion of the examinations expert's engagement pursuant to paragraph (d)(2)(ii)(G)(1) or (2) of this section, the Joint Audit Committee must obtain from the examinations expert a written report on findings and recommendations issued under the consulting services standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The Joint Audit Committee must provide the Director of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight with a copy of the examinations expert's written report, and the Joint Audit Committee's written responses to any of the examinations expert's findings and recommendations, within thirty days of the receipt thereof. Upon resolution of any questions or comments raised by the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, and upon written notice from the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight that it has no further comments or questions on the examinations standards as amended (by reason of the examinations expert's proposals, consideration of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight's questions or comments, or otherwise), the Joint Audit Committee shall commence applying such examinations standards for examining its registered futures commission merchant members for all examinations conducted with an "as of" date later than the date of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary's written notification.

(H) The Joint Audit Program must require the Joint Audit Committee members to report to their respective risk and/or audit committee of their respective board of directors, or a functional equivalent committee, with timely reports of the activities and findings of the Joint Audit Program to assist the risk and/or audit committee of the board of directors, or a functional equivalent committee, to fulfill its responsibility of overseeing the examination function.

(I) The examinations expert's written report, the Joint Audit Committee's response, if any, as well as any information concerning the supervisory program is confidential.

(iii) *Meetings of the Joint Audit Committee.* (A) The Joint Audit Committee members must meet at least once each year. During such meetings, the Joint Audit Committee members shall consider revisions to the Joint

Audit Program as a result of regulatory changes, revisions to the examination standards resulting from new or amended auditing standards issued by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, or the results of an examinations expert's review.

(B) In addition to the items considered in paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(A) of this section, the Joint Audit Committee members must consider the following items during the meetings:

(1) Coordinating and sharing information between the Joint Audit Committee members, including issues and industry concerns in connection with examinations of futures commission merchants;

(2) Identifying industry regulatory reporting issues and financial and operational internal control issues and modifying the Joint Audit Program accordingly;

(3) Issuing risk alerts for futures commission merchants and/or designated self-regulatory organization examiners on an as-needed basis;

(4) Responding to industry issues; and

(5) Providing industry feedback to Commission proposals.

(C) Minutes must be taken of all meetings and distributed to all members on a timely basis.

(D) The Director of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight must receive timely prior notice of each meeting, have the right to attend and participate in each meeting and receive written copies of the minutes required pursuant to paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(C) of this section, respectively.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 28, 2018, by the Commission.

Christopher Kirkpatrick,
Secretary of the Commission.

Note: The following appendix will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Appendix to Financial Surveillance Examination Program Requirements for Self-Regulatory Organizations—Commission Voting Summary

On this matter, Chairman Giancarlo and Commissioners Quintenz and Behnam voted in the affirmative. No Commissioner voted in the negative.

[FR Doc. 2018-14272 Filed 7-2-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

29 CFR Part 1910

[Docket No. OSHA-2018-0003]

RIN 1218-AB76

Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: With this document, OSHA is withdrawing the proposed rule that accompanied its direct final rule (DFR) amending the beryllium standard for general industry to address the application of the standard to materials containing trace amounts of beryllium.

DATES: As of July 3, 2018, the proposed rule published May 7, 2018 (83 FR 19989) is withdrawn.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Press inquiries: Mr. Frank Meilinger, OSHA Office of Communications, Room N-3647, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693-1999; email: meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.

General information and technical inquiries: William Perry or Maureen Ruskin, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Room N-3718, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693-1950; fax: (202) 693-1678.

*Copies of this **Federal Register** document and news releases:* Electronic copies of these documents are available at OSHA's web page at <http://www.osha.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 7, 2018, OSHA published a DFR amending the application of the beryllium standard to materials containing trace amounts of beryllium (83 FR 19936). OSHA also published a companion proposed rule proposing the same changes to the beryllium standard (83 FR 19989). In the DFR, OSHA stated that it would withdraw the companion proposed rule and confirm the effective date of the DFR if no significant adverse comments were submitted on the DFR by June 6, 2018. OSHA received seven comments in the record from Materion Brush, Inc., Mead Metals Inc., National Association of Manufacturers, Airborn, Inc., Edison Electric Institute, and two private citizens (Document ID OSHA-2018-0003-0004 thru OSHA-2018-0003-0010). The seven submissions

contained comments that were either supportive of the DFR or were considered not to be significant adverse comments (Document IDs OSHA–2018–0003–0004 thru OSHA–2018–0003–0010). Three of these submissions also contained comments that were outside the scope of the DFR and OSHA is not considering portions of those submissions that are outside the scope (OSHA–2018–0003–0004 thru OSHA–2018–0003–0006). Accordingly, OSHA is not proceeding with the proposed rule and is withdrawing it from the rulemaking process.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 1910

Beryllium, General industry, Health, Occupational safety and health.

Authority and Signature

Loren Sweatt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this document under the following authorities: Sections 4, 6, and 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657), Secretary of Labor's Order 5–2007 (72 FR 31159), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC, on June 27, 2018.

Loren Sweatt,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2018–14275 Filed 7–2–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0222; FRL–9980–21–Region 9]

Approval of Arizona Air Plan; Hayden Lead Nonattainment Area Plan for the 2008 Lead Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a state implementation plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Arizona to meet Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”) requirements applicable to the Hayden lead (Pb) nonattainment area (“Hayden Lead NAA”). The EPA is proposing to approve the base year emissions inventory, the attainment demonstration, the control strategy, including reasonably available control technology and reasonably available control measures demonstrations, the reasonable further progress

demonstration, the contingency measure, and the new source review (NSR) provisions of the submittal as meeting the requirements of the CAA and the EPA’s implementing regulations for the 2008 lead national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS).

DATES: Any comments on this proposal must arrive by August 2, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2018–0222, at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. For either manner of submission, the EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket.

Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the EPA’s full public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ginger Vagenas, EPA Region IX, 415–972–3964, vagenas.ginger@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, the terms “we,” “us,” and “our” mean the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. Background
 - A. The Lead NAAQS
 - B. Designation of the Hayden Lead NAA
 - C. CAA Requirements for Lead Nonattainment Areas
 - D. Sources of Lead in the Hayden Lead NAA
- II. Arizona’s SIP Submittal To Address the Hayden Lead NAA
 - A. Arizona’s SIP Submittal
 - B. CAA Procedural and Administrative Requirements for SIP Submittals
- III. CAA and Regulatory Requirements for Lead Attainment SIPs
 - A. CAA and EPA Guidance

- B. Infrastructure SIPs for Lead
- IV. Review of the 2017 Hayden Lead Plan
 - A. Summary of the EPA’s Proposed Actions
 - B. Emissions Inventories
 - C. Reasonably Available Control Measure/Reasonably Available Control Technology Demonstration and Adopted Control Strategy
 - D. Attainment Demonstration
 - E. Reasonable Further Progress Demonstration
 - F. Contingency Measures
 - G. New Source Review
- V. The EPA’s Proposed Action and Request for Public Comments
 - A. The EPA’s Proposed Approvals
 - B. Request for Public Comments
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

A. The Lead NAAQS

Under the CAA, the EPA must establish NAAQS for six pollutants, including lead. Lead is generally emitted in the form of particles that are deposited in water, soil, and dust. People may be exposed to lead by inhaling it or by ingesting lead-contaminated food, water, soil, or dust. Once in the body, lead is quickly absorbed into the bloodstream and can result in a broad range of adverse health effects including damage to the central nervous system, cardiovascular function, kidneys, immune system, and red blood cells. Children are particularly vulnerable to lead exposure, in part because they are more likely to ingest lead and in part because their still-developing bodies are more sensitive to the effects of lead. The harmful effects to children’s developing nervous systems (including their brains) arising from lead exposure may include IQ¹ loss, poor academic achievement, long-term learning disabilities, and an increased risk of delinquent behavior.

The EPA first established a lead standard in 1978 at 1.5 micrograms per meter cubed (µg/m³) as a quarterly average.² Based on new health and scientific data, the EPA revised the federal lead standard to 0.15 µg/m³ and revised the averaging time for the standard on October 15, 2008.³ A violation of the standard occurs when ambient lead concentrations exceed 0.15

¹ IQ (intelligence quotient) is a score created by dividing a person’s mental age score, obtained by administering an intelligence test, by the person’s chronological age, both expressed in terms of years and months. “Glossary of Important Assessment and Measurement Terms,” Philadelphia, PA: National Council on Measurement in Education. 2016.

² See 43 FR 46246 (October 5, 1978).

³ See 73 FR 66964 (November 12, 2008) (“lead NAAQS rule”).