

meatpacking and poultry industries. Based on the available data from 300 Logs, even without an MSD column, UFCW was able to develop industry-specific and sufficiently detailed information to understand the nature of particular MSDs and develop prevention strategies relevant to those specific injuries (as opposed to all MSDs generally) (Document ID 0174, p. 2–5).

MSD injuries are somewhat unique because of the breadth of their conditions and causes, and thus aggregate data about these injuries will typically be harder to apply than with respect to other types of injuries and illnesses. Ultimately, to understand and address MSDs that are occurring in workplaces, employers and others must be able to link specific types of injuries to job characteristics or working conditions. This requires evaluation of each individual case to determine the part of the body affected, the nature of the job performed by the injured employee, and other relevant data. Such information is currently available in the case-description section of the 300 Log and in the 301 Incident Report. OSHA recognizes that such an evaluation requires time and effort, but the MSD column would not provide a substitute for a review of the detailed information on the 300 Log and the 301 Incident Report. OSHA acknowledges that many employers may find their time and effort better spent on examining the detailed information that they already produce than attempting to determine whether to place a check mark in a summary column that in the end would not prove a substitute for analysis of the underlying data.

For these reasons, OSHA is withdrawing the proposal to add an MSD column on the 300 Log. Withdrawal of the proposal does not change any employer's obligation to complete and retain injury and illness records under 29 CFR 1904. Withdrawal of the proposal also does not change the recording criteria or definitions used for these records.

IV. Legal Determinations

A. Paperwork Reduction Act

This final action withdraws OSHA's proposal to add an MSD column on the 300 Log. Therefore this rule continues OSHA's current practices unaltered, resulting in no changes in actual paperwork burden compared with current practice. As a result, it is not necessary to estimate changes in OSHA's paperwork burden because this rule leaves the paperwork burden unaffected.

B. Economic Analysis

In the 2010 proposal, OSHA estimated that 1,542,000 establishments were currently required to keep a recordkeeping log and thus would be affected by the proposed rule. OSHA also estimated that they would need, in any given year, to record 1,566,000 MSDs. Also in the 2010 proposal, OSHA estimated there would be two kinds of costs if the proposal was finalized: familiarization costs derived from the time required to learn what the rule required; and the costs of actually determining what injuries and illnesses would be MSDs and making the appropriate marking in the MSD column. Some commenters point to other possible kinds of costs such as expansion of the number of cases recorded (e.g., Document ID 0095; 0100; 0116; 0118) and cost for modifying software (e.g., Document ID 0037; 0063; 0067; 0082; 0094; 0100; 0115; 0121; 0122; 0154; 0161; 0176; 0181; 0185; 0190). All of these sources of costs disappear with the withdrawal of the proposed rule.

Based on an estimate that familiarization would require 5 minutes per establishment, OSHA at that time estimated that this would be a one-time cost incurred in the first year and would total annualized costs of \$735,000 per year. These familiarization cost estimates did not appear to account for the time necessary to download new forms. OSHA estimated that recording and checking the MSD column would require 1 minute per MSD plus 1 minute for additional injuries and illnesses, that, though not MSDs, would need to be examined. OSHA estimated that this would result in annualized costs of approximately \$1 million per year.

These unit cost estimates, and the resulting total cost estimates, received significant comment. Some agreed broadly with OSHA's estimates (e.g., Document ID 0157; 0159; 0160; 0165; 0166; 0171; 0173; 0174; 0177). However, others argued OSHA's costs were far too low (e.g., Document ID 0084; 0091; 0092; 0096; 0097; 0099; 0107; 0109; 0110; 0111; 0114; 0115; 0121; 0124; 0125; 0133; 0148; 0151; 0172). OSHA notes that since the proposed rule was issued, the estimated number of establishments required to keep a recordkeeping log has declined (84 FR 405 (January 25, 2019)), and the number of recordable injuries and illnesses has also declined (https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/osh_11082018.pdf). Since these cost estimates are made irrelevant by the withdrawal of the proposed rule, there is no need to resolve the issue of the

best cost estimate. OSHA notes only that the withdrawal of the proposed rule results in avoided costs that were estimated to be \$1,735,000 per year in 2010, at the time the proposal was issued, and is estimated to be \$2,424,100 in 2024 dollars.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Certification

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601), the Acting Assistant Secretary certifies that this final action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This final action withdraws a proposal that would have added requirements on small businesses. The removal of those requirement will impose no costs on small businesses.

Authority and Signature

Amanda Laihow, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506 *et seq.*) and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 8–2020 (85 FR 58393).

Dated: June 20, 2025.

Amanda Laihow,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2025–11624 Filed 6–30–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

29 CFR Parts 1910, 1915, 1917, 1918, 1926

[Docket No. OSHA–2025–0015]

RIN 1218–AD69

Vinyl Chloride

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

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule removes language in OSHA's Vinyl Chloride standard that is duplicative with OSHA's Respiratory Protection standard.

DATES: Comments and other information, including requests for a hearing, must be received on or before September 2, 2025.

Informal public hearing: OSHA will schedule an informal public hearing on the rule if requested during the comment period. If a hearing is requested, the location and date of the

hearing, procedures for interested parties to notify the agency of their intention to participate, and procedures for participants to submit their testimony and documentary evidence will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES:

Written comments: You may submit comments and attachments, identified by Docket No. OSHA–2025–0015, electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for making electronic submissions.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency's name and the docket number for this rulemaking (Docket No. OSHA–2025–0015). When uploading multiple attachments to [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), please number all of your attachments because [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) will not automatically number the attachments. This will be very useful in identifying all attachments. For example, Attachment 1—title of your document, Attachment 2—title of your document, Attachment 3—title of your document. For assistance with commenting and uploading documents, please see the Frequently Asked Questions on <https://www.regulations.gov>.

All comments, including any personal information you provide, are placed in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Therefore, OSHA cautions commenters about submitting information they do not want made available to the public or submitting materials that contain personal information (either about themselves or others), such as Social Security Numbers and birthdates.

Docket: The docket for this rulemaking (Docket No. OSHA–2025–0015) is available at <https://www.regulations.gov>, the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Most exhibits are available at <https://www.regulations.gov>; some exhibits (e.g., copyrighted material) are not available to download from that web page. However, all materials in the dockets are available for inspection at the OSHA Docket Office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For press inquiries: Contact Frank Meilinger, Director, OSHA Office of Communications, Occupational Safety and Health Administration; telephone: (202) 693–1999; email: meilinger.francis2@dol.gov.

General information and technical inquiries: Contact Andrew Levinson, Director, OSHA Directorate of Standards

and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration; telephone: (202) 693–1950; email: osha.dsg@dol.gov.

Copies of this Federal Register notice: Electronic copies are available at <https://www.regulations.gov>. This **Federal Register** notice, as well as news releases and other relevant information, also are available at OSHA's web page at <https://www.osha.gov>. A "100-word summary" is also available at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Legal Authority and Preliminary Findings
- III. Events Leading to the Proposed Rule
- IV. Summary and Explanation of the Proposed Requirements
- V. Economic Analysis
- VI. Additional Requirements
- VII. Authority and Signature
- VIII. Regulatory Text

I. Executive Summary

This proposed rule is intended to remove language in the Vinyl Chloride standard, 29 CFR 1910.1017, which is redundant with language in the Respiratory Protection standard. This would result in improved comprehensibility of the standard and avoid employer confusion and redundant efforts to comply with both standards. This proposal is also consistent with OSHA's intent, when it published the revised Respiratory Protection standard, to use it as a foundation for substance-specific standards.

II. Legal Authority and Preliminary Findings

The purpose of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*) ("the Act" or "the OSH Act") is "to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources" (29 U.S.C. 651(b)). To achieve this goal, Congress authorized the Secretary of Labor ("the Secretary") to promulgate standards to protect workers, including the authority "to set mandatory occupational safety and health standards applicable to businesses affecting interstate commerce" (29 U.S.C. 651(b)(3)); *see also* 29 U.S.C. 654(a)(2) (requiring employers to comply with OSHA standards), 29 U.S.C. 655(a) (authorizing summary adoption of existing consensus and established federal standards within two years of the Act's enactment), 29 U.S.C. 655(b) (authorizing promulgation, modification or revocation of standards pursuant to notice and comment), and

29 U.S.C. 655(b)(7) (authorizing OSHA to include among a standard's requirements labeling, monitoring, medical testing, and other information-transmittal provisions)). An occupational safety and health standard is ". . . a standard which requires conditions, or the adoption or use of one or more practices, means, methods, operations, or processes, reasonably necessary or appropriate to provide safe or healthful employment and places of employment" (29 U.S.C. 652(8)). The Secretary may also issue regulations requiring employers to keep records regarding their activities relating to the Act, as well as records of work-related deaths, injuries, and illnesses (29 U.S.C. 657(c)(1)–(2)).

Before OSHA may promulgate a health or safety standard, it must find that a standard is reasonably necessary or appropriate within the meaning of section 652(8) of the OSH Act, which OSHA did here in 1974 when it published the Vinyl Chloride standard (39 FR 35890). The Supreme Court, in its decision on OSHA's benzene standard, interpreted OSHA's obligation under section 652(8) as requiring it to evaluate "whether significant risks are present and can be eliminated or lessened by a change in practices" (*Indus. Union Dep't, AFL-CIO v. Am. Petroleum Inst.*, 448 U.S. 607, 642 (1980) (plurality opinion)). OSHA originally published this standard as an emergency temporary standard (ETS) and found that vinyl chloride posed a grave danger, which is a higher threshold than significant risk (39 FR 12342). When, as here, OSHA has previously determined that its standard substantially reduces a significant risk, it is unnecessary for the agency to make additional findings on risk for every provision of that standard (*see, e.g., Pub. Citizen Health Research Grp. v. Tyson*, 796 F.2d 1479, 1502 n.16 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (rejecting the argument that OSHA must "find that each and every aspect of its standard eliminates a significant risk")). Rather, once OSHA makes a general significant risk finding in support of a standard, the next question is whether a particular requirement is reasonably related to the purpose of the standard as a whole (*see Asbestos Info. Ass'n/N. Am. v. Reich*, 117 F.3d 891, 894 (5th Cir. 1997); *Forging Indus. Ass'n v. Sec'y of Labor*, 773 F.2d 1436, 1447 (4th Cir. 1985); *United Steelworkers of Am., AFL-CIO-CLC v. Marshall*, 647 F.2d 1189, 1237–38 (D.C. Cir. 1980) ("*Lead I*"). Therefore, while OSHA is not making a preliminary finding of significant risk for this proposed rule, the agency has

made a preliminary determination that the proposed changes are reasonably related to the purpose of the Vinyl Chloride standard as a whole.

A standard is technologically feasible if the protective measures it requires already exist, can be brought into existence with available technology, or can be created with technology that is reasonably expected to be developed (*see Am. Iron and Steel Inst. v. OSHA*, 939 F.2d 975, 980 (D.C. Cir. 1991)). Courts have also interpreted technological feasibility to mean that a typical firm in each affected industry or application group will reasonably be able to implement the requirements of the standard in most operations most of the time (*see, e.g., Public Citizen v. OSHA*, 557 F.3d 165, 170–71 (3d Cir. 2009) (citing *Lead I* at 1272)).

This proposed rule would not modify existing requirements for respiratory protection in workplaces; nor would it create new requirements. All employers in compliance with the existing standard would also be in compliance with the revised standard. Therefore, OSHA has made a preliminary determination that the proposed rule would be technologically feasible.

In evaluating economic feasibility, OSHA must consider the average cost of compliance in an industry rather than costs for individual employers. In its economic analyses, OSHA “must construct a reasonable estimate of compliance costs and demonstrate a reasonable likelihood that these costs will not threaten the existence or competitive structure of an industry, even if it does portend disaster for some marginal firms” (*Am. Iron and Steel Inst.*, 939 F.2d at 980, quoting *Lead I* at 1272). OSHA has made a preliminary finding that this proposal is economically feasible because it is deregulatory and is not expected to increase costs for employers. OSHA’s economic analysis is presented in Section V.

The Administrative Procedures Act directs agencies to include in each rule adopted “a concise general statement of [the rule’s] basis and purpose” (5 U.S.C. 553(c)); *cf.* 29 U.S.C. 655(e) (requiring the Secretary to publish a “statement of reasons” for any standard promulgated)). This notice satisfies this concise statement requirement.

III. Events Leading to the Proposed Rule

OSHA adopted a Vinyl Chloride standard in 1974 (39 FR 35890). OSHA also has a general Respiratory Protection standard, 29 CFR 1910.134, which it first promulgated in 1971 (39 FR 9835). OSHA published a revised Respiratory

Protection standard on January 8, 1998 (63 FR 1152). The Respiratory Protection standard contains worksite-specific requirements for program administration, as well as procedures for respirator selection, employee training, fit testing, medical evaluation, and respirator use, among other provisions. OSHA noted that the revised standard was to “serve as a ‘building block’ standard with respect to future standards that may contain respiratory protection requirements” (63 FR 1265). In 2006, OSHA revised the Respiratory Protection standard again to incorporate assigned protection factors (APFs) in the respirator selection process (71 FR 50122–01).

Several OSHA standards regulating exposure to toxic substances and harmful physical agents, including the Vinyl Chloride standard, require compliance with many provisions of 29 CFR 1910.134. However, when revising the respirator rule, the Agency decided to retain several special respirator selection provisions in the existing substance-specific standards. In this regard, OSHA noted that the respirator selection requirements retained in the substance-specific standards were developed in rulemakings to provide protection against a hazardous characteristic or condition unique to the regulated substance. Consequently, OSHA felt that preserving these provisions in the individual substance-specific standards would maintain the level of respiratory protection afforded to employees.

In this proposal, OSHA has identified a training provision in the Vinyl Chloride standard which can be eliminated in order to reduce redundancy with 29 CFR 1910.134 without compromising employee safety. The purpose of deleting this provision is to avoid an unintended result of employers duplicating their efforts to comply with the training provisions of both the Vinyl Chloride standard and the Respiratory Protection standard, as well as to reduce the burden associated with reviewing unnecessary provisions in standards.

OSHA expects that the rule would ultimately reduce the compliance burden on the regulated community. Therefore, OSHA believes this proposed rule is consistent with Executive Order (E.O.) 14219, “Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President’s ‘Department of Government Efficiency’ Deregulatory Initiative,” E.O. 14192, “Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation.”

IV. Summary and Explanation of the Proposed Requirements

OSHA is proposing to revise paragraph (j) of its general industry Vinyl Chloride standard (29 CFR 1910.1017) to remove redundant language and improve the comprehensibility of the requirements for respiratory protection programs. This revision would simplify compliance for employers by removing language in 1910.1017 that is duplicative with the requirements in 1910.134. This change would avoid the possibility of employers duplicating their efforts to comply with the training provisions of both the Vinyl Chloride standard and the Respiratory Protection standard, as well as reduce the burden associated with reviewing unnecessary provisions in standards. The Agency preliminarily concludes, therefore, that updating this rule is consistent with the goal of reducing undue burden.

OSHA has preliminarily determined that paragraph (j)(1)(iii) of the Vinyl Chloride standard, which requires training on “The purpose for, proper use, and limitations of respiratory protection devices,” unnecessarily duplicates the general provisions covered by the Respiratory Protection standard, at 1910.134(k), and is proposing to remove and reserve that paragraph.

OSHA recognizes that adopting this revision will also result in the revision of the respiratory protection requirements in OSHA’s shipyard employment, marine terminals, longshoring, and construction industry standards for vinyl chloride (*see* 29 CFR 1926.1117, 29 CFR 1917.1, 29 CFR 1918.1, and 29 CFR 1915.1017, which apply the requirements in 29 CFR 1910.1017 to construction, marine terminals, longshoring, and shipyards). OSHA requests comment regarding whether there are any considerations that are unique to the use of respirators for protection against vinyl chloride in shipyards, marine terminals, longshoring, or construction that OSHA should consider when finalizing this proposal. OSHA is in the process of appointing members to the Advisory Committee on Construction Safety and Health (ACCSH). The agency intends to present this proposed rule to ACCSH once that process is complete. The agency will put the Committee’s recommendations on the OSHA website and in the docket for this proposed rule prior to the close of the comment period to allow the public to provide comments on those recommendations.

OSHA requests comments on the following questions:

1. Are there any concerns that making the change described in this proposal will decrease worker safety?

2. Is there an alternative approach OSHA should consider?

V. Economic Analysis

This proposed rule would remove redundant training requirements in the Vinyl Chloride standard, 29 CFR 1910.1017, and therefore OSHA has preliminarily concluded that there will be no additional costs imposed by this proposed revision. OSHA also anticipates that there may be some cost savings associated with this rule, including a reduction of the burden associated with complying with and reviewing unnecessarily duplicative regulations. Because this rule would impose no new costs, OSHA has made a preliminary determination that the rule would be economically feasible.

The changes to the requirements for vinyl chloride may reduce the time necessary for employee training on respirators. OSHA estimates that 4,407 employees work at establishments affected by the vinyl chloride rule. Assuming a hiring rate of 30.6 percent annually,¹ a loaded wage of \$54.26 an hour, and that the changes to the standard may result in a decrease of 15 minutes per employee, this proposal could result in cost savings of \$18,292 (or \$136,117 over 10 years at a 3 percent discount rate).²

OSHA is seeking comments and data on this preliminary analysis, including on the following questions:

1. How many employers were likely to have been impacted by the redundant provisions and were providing duplicative training? How many employees were being provided duplicative training?

2. Are there any other savings for employers that would result from the proposed change?

2. Are there any benefits for worker protection that can be anticipated from this proposed change?

3. Are there any costs for employers that would result from this change that OSHA has not considered?

A. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires preparation of an initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) and a final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA) for any rule that by law must be proposed for public comment, unless the agency certifies

that the rule, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

OSHA reviewed this proposed rule under the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. This rule would eliminate burdensome regulations. Therefore, OSHA initially concludes that the impacts of the revisions would not have a “significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities,” and that the preparation of an IRFA is not warranted. OSHA will transmit this certification and supporting statement of factual basis to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration for review under 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

B. Review Under Executive Order 12866

E.O. 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review” (58 FR 51735 (Oct. 4, 1993)), requires agencies, to the extent permitted by law, to (1) propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that its benefits justify its costs (recognizing that some benefits and costs are difficult to quantify); (2) tailor regulations to impose the least burden on society, consistent with obtaining regulatory objectives, taking into account, among other things, and to the extent practicable, the costs of cumulative regulations; (3) select, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those approaches that maximize net benefits; (4) to the extent feasible, specify performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance that regulated entities must adopt; and (5) identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior, such as user fees or marketable permits, or providing information upon which choices can be made by the public.

Section 6(a) of E.O. 12866 also requires agencies to submit “significant regulatory actions” to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) for review. OIRA has determined that this proposed rule would not constitute a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of E.O. 12866. Accordingly, this proposal was not submitted to OIRA for review under E.O. 12866.

VI. Additional Requirements

A. Requirements for States With OSHA-Approved State Plans

Under section 18 of the OSH Act (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*), Congress expressly provides that States may adopt, with Federal approval, a plan for the development and enforcement of

occupational safety and health standards that are “at least as effective” as the Federal standards in providing safe and healthful employment and places of employment (29 U.S.C. 667). OSHA refers to these OSHA-approved, State-administered occupational safety and health programs as “State Plans.”³

When Federal OSHA promulgates a new standard or a more stringent amendment to an existing standard, State Plans must either amend their standards to be identical to, or “at least as effective as,” the new Federal standard or amendment, or show that an existing State Plan standard covering this issue is “at least as effective” as the new Federal standard or amendment (29 CFR 1953.5(a)). However, when OSHA promulgates a new standard or amendment that does not impose additional or more stringent requirements than an existing standard, State Plans do not have to amend their standards, although they may opt to do so. OSHA has preliminarily determined this proposed rule does not impose additional or more stringent requirements than the existing standard, and therefore State Plans are not required to amend their standards. OSHA seeks comment on this assessment of its proposal.

B. OMB Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) defines “collection of information” to mean “the obtaining, causing to be obtained, soliciting, or requiring the disclosure to third parties or the public, of facts or opinions by or for an agency, regardless of form or format” (44 U.S.C. 3502(3)(A)). Under the PRA, a Federal agency cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it is approved by OMB under the PRA and the agency displays a currently valid OMB control number (44 U.S.C. 3507). Also, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if the collection of information does not display a currently valid OMB control number (44 U.S.C. 3512(a)(1)). The process for OMB approval is found in 5 CFR part 1320.

³ Of the 29 States and U.S. territories with OSHA-approved State Plans, 22 cover public and private-sector employees: Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. The remaining six States and one U.S. territory cover only State and local government employees: Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and the Virgin Islands.

¹ Based on BLS JOLTs data.

² See Document ID OSHA-2011-0196-0015 for details on employment and wage estimates.

This proposed rule would impose no new information collection requirements. Because the revisions are deregulatory and affect only minor changes to the existing information collections in the Vinyl Chloride standards (OMB Control Number 1218–0010), OMB has waived the requirements of 5 CFR part 1320 and approved the modified Information Collection Request (ICR) under existing OMB Control Number 1218–0010 (*see* 5 CFR 1320.18(d)).

C. Environmental Impacts/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

OSHA has reviewed this proposed rule according to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), as amended by the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (Pub. L. 118–5, 321, 137 Stat. 10), and the Department of Labor’s NEPA procedures (29 CFR part 11). OSHA has determined that this proposal would have no impact on the quality of the human environment.

D. Other Statutory and Executive Order Considerations

OSHA has considered its obligations under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*) and the Executive Orders on Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments (E.O. 13175, 65 FR 67249 (Nov. 6, 2000)), Federalism (E.O. 13132, 64 FR 43255 (Aug. 10, 1999)), and Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (E.O. 13045, 62 FR 19885 (Apr. 23, 1997)). Given that this is a proposed deregulatory action that involves the removal of duplicative requirements, that OSHA does not foresee economic impacts of \$100 million or more, and that the action does not constitute a policy that has federalism or tribal implications, OSHA has determined that no further agency action or analysis is required to comply with these statutes and executive orders. Furthermore, OSHA has determined that this proposal is consistent with the policies and directives outlined in E.O. 14192, “Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation” and is an Executive Order 14192 deregulatory action.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 1910

Airborne contaminants, Health, Occupational safety and health, Respirators, Respirator selection

VII. Authority and Signature

This document was prepared under the direction of Amanda Laihow, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health. It is

issued under the authority of sections 4, 6, and 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, and 657), 5 U.S.C. 553, Secretary of Labor’s Order No. 8–2020 (85 FR 58393), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Dated: June 20, 2025.

Amanda Laihow,

Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

VIII. Regulatory Text

Proposed Amendments

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, OSHA is proposing to amend 29 CFR part 1910 as follows:

PART 1910—OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

Subpart Z—Toxic and Hazardous Substances

■ 1. The authority citation for subpart Z of part 1910 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 941; 29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657; Secretary of Labor’s Order No. 12–71 (36 FR 8754), 8–76 (41 FR 25059), 9–83 (48 FR 35736), 1–90 (55 FR 9033), 6–96 (62 FR 111), 3–2000 (65 FR 50017), 5–2002 (67 FR 65008), 5–2007 (72 FR 31160), 4–2010 (75 FR 55355), 1–2012 (77 FR 3912), or 8–2020 (85 FR 58393); 29 CFR part 1911; and 5 U.S.C. 553, as applicable.

All of subpart Z issued under 29 U.S.C. 655(b), except those substances that have exposure limits listed in Tables Z–1, Z–2, and Z–3 of § 1910.1000. The latter were issued under 29 U.S.C. 655(a).

Section 1910.1000, Tables Z–1, Z–2, and Z–3 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553, but not under 29 CFR part 1911, except for the arsenic (organic compounds), benzene, cotton dust, and chromium (VI) listings.

Section 1910.1001 also issued under 40 U.S.C. 3704 and 5 U.S.C. 553.

Section 1910.1002 also issued under 5 U.S.C. 553, but not under 29 U.S.C. 655 or 29 CFR part 1911.

Sections 1910.1018, 1910.1029, and 1910.1200 also issued under 29 U.S.C. 653.

Section 1910.1030 also issued under Public Law 106–430, 114 Stat. 1901.

Section 1910.1201 also issued under 49 U.S.C. 1801–1819 and 5 U.S.C. 553.

§ 1910.1017(j)(1)(iii) [Reserved]

■ 2. Remove and reserve § 1910.1017(j)(1)(iii).

[FR Doc. 2025–11644 Filed 6–30–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

29 CFR Parts 1910, 1915, 1917, 1918, 1926

[Docket No. OSHA–2025–0016]

RIN 1218–AD65

Inorganic Arsenic

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

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule revises some substance-specific respirator requirements to allow different types of respirators to be used under OSHA’s Inorganic Arsenic standard and better aligns this standard with OSHA’s Respiratory Protection standard.

DATES: Comments and other information, including requests for a hearing, must be received on or before September 2, 2025.

Informal public hearing: OSHA will schedule an informal public hearing on the rule if requested during the comment period. If a hearing is requested, the location and date of the hearing, procedures for interested parties to notify the agency of their intention to participate, and procedures for participants to submit their testimony and documentary evidence will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES:

Written comments: You may submit comments and attachments, identified by Docket No. OSHA–2025–0016, electronically at <https://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for making electronic submissions.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency’s name and the docket number for this rulemaking (Docket No. OSHA–2025–0016). When uploading multiple attachments to <https://www.regulations.gov>, please number all of your attachments because [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) will not automatically number the attachments. This will be very useful in identifying all attachments. For example, Attachment 1—title of your document, Attachment 2—title of your document, Attachment 3—title of your document. For assistance with commenting and uploading documents, please see the Frequently Asked Questions on <https://www.regulations.gov>.