

**PART 172—FOOD ADDITIVES  
PERMITTED FOR DIRECT ADDITION  
TO FOOD FOR HUMAN  
CONSUMPTION**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 172 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 321, 341, 342, 348, 371, 379e.

■ 2. Add § 172.382 to subpart D to read as follows:

**§ 172.382 Vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder.**

Vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder may be used safely in foods as a source of vitamin D<sub>2</sub> in accordance with the following prescribed conditions:

(a) Vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder is the substance produced by exposing an aqueous homogenate of edible cultivars of *Agaricus bisporus* mushrooms to ultraviolet (UV) light, resulting in the photochemical conversion of

endogenous ergosterol in the mushrooms to vitamin D<sub>2</sub> (also known as ergocalciferol or [9,10-Seco(5Z,7E,22E)-5,7,10(19),22-ergostatetraen-3-ol]).

(b) The total dose of UV light applied to the mushroom homogenate shall not exceed 12 Joules/square centimeter (J/cm<sup>2</sup>).

(c) Vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder meets the following specifications:

(1) Moisture, not more than 10 percent.

(2) Negative for *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Listeria monocytogenes*, and any other recognized microbial pathogen or any harmful microbial toxin.

(3) Standard plate count, not more than 5,000 colony forming units per gram (CFU/g).

(4) Yeasts and molds, not more than 100 CFU/g.

(5) Lead, not more than 0.5 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg).

(6) Arsenic, not more than 0.3 mg/kg.

(d) To assure safe use of the additive, the label or labeling of the food additive container shall bear, in addition to the other information required by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, adequate directions for use to provide a final product that complies with the limitations prescribed in paragraph (f) of this section.

(e) Labels of manufactured food products containing the additive shall bear, in the ingredient statement, the name of the additive “vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder,” in the proper order of decreasing predominance in the finished food.

(f) Vitamin D<sub>2</sub> mushroom powder may be used as a source of vitamin D<sub>2</sub> in food as follows:

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (f)

Category of food	Maximum level of vitamin D <sub>2</sub>
Breakfast cereals .....	350 IU/100 g.
Edible plant-based beverages marketed as milk alternatives .....	84 IU/100 g.
Edible plant-based products marketed as yogurt alternatives .....	89 IU/100 g.
Extruded vegetable snacks .....	80 IU/28 g.
Fruit smoothies .....	100 IU/240 mL.
100% fruit juices that are fortified with greater than or equal to 330 mg of calcium per 240 mL, excluding fruit juices that are specially formulated or processed for infants.	100 IU/240 mL.
Fruit juice drinks that are fortified with greater than or equal to 100 mg of calcium per 240 mL, excluding fruit juice drinks that are specially formulated or processed for infants.	100 IU/240 mL.
Grain products and pastas .....	90 IU/100 g.
Meal replacement bars or other-type bars that are represented for special dietary use in reducing or maintaining body weight.	100 IU/40 g.
Meal replacement beverages that are not intended for special dietary use in reducing or maintaining body weight and that are represented for use such that the total amount of Vitamin D provided by the product does not exceed 1,000 IU per day.	500 IU/240 mL.
Plant protein products .....	80 IU/85 g.
Soups and soup mixes, except for soup and soup mixes containing meat or poultry that are subject to regulation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the Federal Meat Inspection Act or the Poultry Products Inspection Act.	100 IU/245 mL.
Soy-based spreads marketed as butter alternatives .....	330 IU/100 g.
Soy-based products marketed as cheese and cheese-product alternatives .....	270 IU/100 g.
Soy beverage products .....	89 IU/100 g.
Soy-protein based meal replacement beverages (powder or liquid) that are represented for special dietary use in reducing or maintaining body weight.	140 IU/240 mL.
Vegetable juices .....	100 IU/240 mL.
Yeast-leavened baked goods and baking mixes and yeast-leavened baked snack foods .....	400 IU/100 g.

Dated: June 22, 2020.

Lowell J. Schiller,

Principal Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2020-13822 Filed 7-10-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164-01-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0150; FRL-10011-22-Region 1]

**Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire;  
Negative Declaration for the Oil and  
Gas Industry**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of New Hampshire. The revision provides the State's determination, via a negative declaration, that there are no facilities within its borders subject to EPA's 2016 Control Technique Guideline (CTG) for the oil and gas industry. The intended effect of this action is to approve this item into the New Hampshire SIP. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on August 12, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0150. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Region 1 Regional Office, Air and Radiation Division, 5 Post Office Square—Suite 100, Boston, MA. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding legal holidays and facility closures due to COVID-19.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bob McConnell, Environmental Engineer, Air and Radiation Division (Mail Code 05-2), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3912; (617) 918-1046.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA.

## Table of Contents

- I. Background and Purpose
- II. Response to Comment
- III. Final Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

### I. Background and Purpose

On April 6, 2020, EPA published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM; see 85 FR 19116) with an associated Direct Final Rule (DFR; see 85 FR 19087) for the State of New Hampshire. The DFR approved a negative declaration for New Hampshire for EPA's 2016 Control Technique Guideline (CTG) for the oil and gas industry. We received one, relevant adverse comment on the NPRM, and so withdrew the DFR via a Withdrawal Notice published on June 5, 2020. See 85 FR 34524. Other specific requirements of the State's submittal and the rationale for EPA's proposed action are explained in the NPRM and will not be restated here. Our response to the adverse comment on the NPRM

is summarized and responded to in section II below.

### II. Response to Comment

We received one, relevant adverse comment on the NPRM. A summary of the comment, and our response, follows.

*Comment: Did EPA even do any independent review to see if sources exist within New Hampshire? EPA seems to make a categorical conclusion about New Hampshire's SIP based simply on where EPA “believes” sources are located. EPA should withdraw this illogical conclusion and affirmatively determine whether the state has sources subject to the CTG based on a review of the State's SIP and an independent review of EPA's databases.*

*Response:* First, we note that the commenter does not provide any information to contradict New Hampshire's finding that no sources subject to EPA's 2016 CTG for the oil and gas industry exist within the State. EPA is not aware of any information indicating that a facility subject to the 2016 oil and gas CTG exists within the State of New Hampshire. Additionally, we note that EPA has historically allowed states to submit a negative declaration for a particular CTG category if the state finds that no sources exist in the state which would be subject to that CTG. EPA has addressed the idea of negative declarations numerous times and for various NAAQS including in the General Preamble to the 1990 Amendments,<sup>1</sup> the 2006 RACT Q&A Memo,<sup>2</sup> and the 2008 Ozone Implementation Rule.<sup>3</sup> In each of these documents, EPA asserted that if no sources exist in the nonattainment area for a particular CTG category, the state would be allowed to submit a negative declaration SIP revision. This principle also applies to states in the ozone transport region.

Second, we note that New Hampshire's finding is consistent with information contained within EPA data resources of industrial activity within the United States, such as the National Emissions Inventory (NEI) database of sources of air pollution, which is available at: [https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/national-](https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories/national-emissions-inventory-nei)

[emissions-inventory-nei](https://www.epa.gov/air-emissions-inventories-nai). And last, we note that EPA Region 1 worked with New Hampshire, and EPA headquarters' technical experts on the CTG, to review the applicability criteria of EPA's 2016 oil and gas CTG to assist the State with its determination.

### III. Final Action

We are approving a negative declaration for EPA's 2016 CTG entitled “Control Techniques Guidelines for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry” into the New Hampshire SIP.

### IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 regulatory action because this action is not significant under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National

<sup>1</sup> “State Implementation Plans; General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990,” (57 FR 13498 at 13512 (April 16, 1992)).

<sup>2</sup> “RACT Q's and A's—Reasonably Available Control Technology RACT: Questions and Answers” Memorandum from William T. Harnett, May 18, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> “Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements,” (80 FR 12263 at 12278 (March 6, 2015)).

Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and

- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Section 804,

however, exempts from section 801 the following types of rules: Rules of particular applicability; rules relating to agency management or personnel; and rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Because this is a rule of particular applicability, EPA is not required to submit a rule report regarding this action under section 801.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by September 11, 2020. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE NONREGULATORY

reference, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 18, 2020.

**Dennis Deziel,**

*Regional Administrator, EPA Region 1.*

For the reasons stated in the preamble, EPA amends Part 52 of chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

#### PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

#### Subpart EE—New Hampshire

■ 2. In § 52.1520, amend paragraph (e) by adding an entry in the table for “Negative declaration for the 2016 Control Techniques Guideline for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry” at the end of the table, to read as follows:

#### § 52.1520 Identification of plan.

*	*	*	*	*
(e)	*	*	*	*

Name of nonregulatory SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/ effective date	EPA approved date <sup>3</sup>	Explanations
Negative declaration for the 2016 Control Techniques Guidelines for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry.	Statewide .....	12/20/2019	7/13/2020 [Insert <b>Federal Register</b> citation].	Negative declaration.

<sup>3</sup> In order to determine the EPA effective date for a specific provision listed in this table, consult the **Federal Register** notice cited in this column for the particular provision.

[FR Doc. 2020–13635 Filed 7–10–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0291; FRL–10010–73–Region 9]

#### Air Plan Approval; California; Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to

approve a revision to the Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District (MCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns reporting of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) in nonattainment areas. We are approving a local rule to require submittal of emissions statements under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This rule will be effective on August 12, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0291. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index,

some information is not publicly available, *e.g.*, Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available through <https://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nancy Levin, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 972–3848 or by email at [levin.nancy@epa.gov](mailto:levin.nancy@epa.gov).