

**STATUS OF REGULATORY ACTIONS BY EPA
AND OSHA**

**P.J. Wakelyn and P.K. Adair
National Cotton Council
Washington, DC**

Abstract

Both EPA and OSHA continue to be very active with regulations and guidance. Some of the more significant EPA and OSHA regulations that could impact cotton gins are discussed. For EPA these include air quality activities (the new NAAQS for PM and ozone, proposals for regional haze and non-road diesel engines, MACT standard for process heaters, and accidental release prevention for propane) and TSCA activities (review of respirable cotton fibers). For OSHA these include the Cooperative Compliance Program (CCP), the safety and health program standard, ergonomics, crystalline silica and others.

Introduction

Both the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) continue to be very active in the regulatory arena. Even though in 1997 there was no significant new legislation and none is really expected in 1998, both OSHA and EPA are very active in developing regulations under existing laws. Some of the more important EPA and OSHA regulations that could impact cotton gins are discussed.

EPA -- Environmental Regulatory Actions

Environmental issues are becoming more complex and regulations more difficult to comply with. EPA is also more aggressive in enforcement of regulations. In FY 97 the Agency referred the largest number of civil and criminal enforcement cases in its' history to the US Dept. of Justice and assessed the largest total amount of civil and criminal penalties in any one-year period in its history (see Table 1). During FY 97 EPA also significantly expanded the use of a new policy which encourages industry to disclose and correct environmental violations (EPA Audit Policy).

Table 1. EPA FY 97 Enforcement*

	Cases	Fines
Criminal Cases	278	\$169.3 million
Civil Cases	426	\$ 95.1 million

*Defendants spent \$1.98 billion to correct violations.

Some of the more significant EPA regulations are discussed below.

EPA Air Quality

In 1990, Congress amended the Clean Air Act (CAA). The amended Act, among other things, set new requirements for federal operating permits (Title V), for attainment of particulate matter (PM) and ozone requirements (criteria pollutants), and for hazardous air pollutants (HAP). These requirements have caused confusion and problems for industry as they are being developed and implemented.

Various states are finalizing and revising their state implementation plans (SIP) and federal EPA is finalizing the requirements for various emissions sources. Cotton production, ginning, and cottonseed crushing operations are all affected in some way. All of the Cotton Belt states/air districts now have interim final or final approval of their federal operating permit program (Title V). NCC and NCGA continue to work with Federal EPA and state environmental agencies to develop acceptable permitting requirements for gins; are working with Federal EPA on the development of a guidance for determining potential-to-emit and Title V permitting of gins. Tim Smith of EPA indicates that a draft proposal on potential-to-emit and major source limits will be available in early 1998. NCC and NCGA also worked with EPA on revised emission factors (AP-42) for gins (issued on July 9, 1996; see Table 2).

Table 2. AP-42 Emission Factors for Gins

US EPA 1996
With high-efficiency cyclones on all exhausts: TSP: 1.09 kg/bale (2.4 lb./bale) PM10: 0.37 kg/bale (0.82 lb./bale)
With screens on the lint cleaner and battery condenser drums and high-efficiency cyclones on all other exhausts: TSP: 1.41 kg/bale (3.1 lb./bale) PM10: 0.54 kg/bale (1.2 lb./bale)

New Standards for Particulate Matter and Ozone

EPA's review of the PM and ozone standards has lead to significantly tighter new standards for both pollutants, which have the potential to affect cotton industry segments significantly. PM and ozone are national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS), which EPA considers the minimum Federal standards for ambient air quality needed to protect public health and welfare. These standards are to be reviewed and revised, if necessary, every 5 years. The standards are health based standards (economics are not considered) intended to provide an ample margin of safety. In the implementation of these standards EPA has to consider costs and benefits but not in setting the standards. The new standards were published on July 18, 1997 (PM: 62 FR 38652-38760; PM, reference and equivalent method: 62 FR 38764-38854; Ozone: 62 FR 38856-38896). EPA added a PM 2.5 standard to the existing PM 10 standard (see Table 3) and replaced the 1-hour ozone standard with an 8-hour standard at a level of 80 parts per billion (ppb). As a result, many more areas of the US will be nonattainment and there will be large economic effects on many industries, including production agriculture and agricultural processing. About 24 counties in nine states

where cotton is grown and ginned will be nonattainment for PM 2.5 and about 66 counties in 14 states will be nonattainment for ozone. Presently for cotton, only areas in California and Arizona are nonattainment for PM and in California, Arizona and Tennessee for ozone. Table 4 contains the EPA tentative timetable for implementation of the PM 2.5 standard.

Table 3. New EPA PM standards

New*
PM 2.5 - 65 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
PM 10 - 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
PM 2.5 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
PM 10 - 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$

* 62 FR 38652; July 18, 1998

Table 4. US EPA Implementation Timeline for PM 2.5 Standard

● 1997	EPA issues final PM 2.5 NAAQS (7/18/97; 62 FR 38652)
● 1999	EPA designates areas as “unclassifiable”
● 1998 - 2000	Monitors put in place nationwide
● 1998 - 2003	Collect monitoring data
● 2002	EPA completes 5 year scientific review of standards
● 2002 - 2005	EPA designates nonattainment areas
● 2005 - 2008	States submit implementation plans for meeting the standard
● 2012 - 2017	States have up to 10 years to meet standards plus two possible 1-year extensions

A USDA Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality Research, which was required by the 1996 Fair Act, has been appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to advise USDA and EPA. Calvin Parnell, Dennis Tristao and Phil Wakelyn from the cotton industry are members. Efforts of the Task Force have lead to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between USDA and EPA to help insure that the best available science is used by EPA in all air regulations that affect agriculture. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to try to get changes or delayed implementation. However, nothing is expected to pass.

Regional Haze

On July 31, 1997 (62 FR 41138) EPA proposed a regulation to address “regional haze.” The purpose of the regulation is to improve visibility in 156 national parks and wilderness areas (referred to as “Class 1 areas” in the Clean Air Act) throughout the US. It is not a health-based regulation; it is part of how EPA is addressing public welfare concerns from PM. On July 18, 1997 EPA published revisions to the NAAQS for PM (as discussed earlier), which are health based standards. In the final action EPA recognized that visibility impairment is an important effect of PM on public welfare and established secondary standards for PM identical to the primary standards (to protect human health) in conjunction with this revised visibility protection program in mandatory Class 1 areas. Section 169A of the Clean Air Act sets forth a national goal for visibility which is the “prevention of any future, and the remedying of any existing, impairment of visibility in mandatory Class 1

Federal areas which impairment results from man-made pollution.

Regional haze impairs visibility and is caused by natural sources and manmade air pollution. Long range transport of fine particles contributes to regional haze. The ultimate goal of the proposed regulation is to return visibility conditions to natural levels in Class 1 areas; that is, visibility that is not affected by manmade air pollution.

The proposed regulation establishes a target -- one “deciview” improvement per decade -- to be achieved until natural background visibility levels are reached. On deciview equates to approximately a 10% decrease in airborne particulate concentrations. Several decades of emission reductions will be required to reach background levels in Class 1 areas. The proposed regulation requires control of fine particles, like the new ambient air quality standard for PM2.5, but would be on a faster schedule (2 years earlier) in some areas, affect more areas (all 50 states) and ultimately require greater emission reductions. To address regional haze, distant sources (perhaps hundreds of miles from Class 1 areas) will be subject to emission controls. Presently, it is uncertain how many miles away sources will be regulated. The exact distance will be based on analyses by the states and EPA. Besides the additional controls on agriculture, business, industry and others, states will be burdened with developing new plans to implement the regional haze program at the same time many are faced with developing plans to implement the new standards for ozone and PM2.5.

Comments were due on Dec. 5, 1997. A new rule is expected to be finalized in 1998; SIPs submitted in 1999; and SIPs finalized by July 2003.

Non-Road Diesel Engines

Farm equipment and vehicles would be included in EPA’s proposed rule (Sep. 24, 1997; 62 FR 50152) to control emissions of air pollution from non-road diesel engines. If the standards are implemented as proposed, EPA indicates that standards for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM) would be reduced by up to two-thirds from current standards. According to a study by the Equipment Manufacturers Institute, this will cost agriculture at least \$1 billion per year for the next 10 years. The action will affect the implementation of the new PM standards. Comments were due Dec. 22, 1997 and a new standard is expected in 1998.

Emission Standard for Process Heaters (MACT Standard)

In 1997 EPA convened the Industrial Combustion Coordinated Rulemaking (ICCR) to identify and develop technology based standards for combustion sources for potential hazardous air pollution (HAP). This is done under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), which requires

EPA to establish emission standard for major and area sources of HAPs.

As part of the ICCR process there is a Process Heater Workgroup to identify and develop emission standards (Maximum Available Control Technology [MACT] standards) for process heaters.

Two types of process heaters are identified:

1. Indirect-fired process heater
2. Direct-fired process heater (dryers used in cotton gins are considered direct-fired units).

Direct-fired process heaters are process heaters in which the combustion gases come in direct contact with the process material. The Process Heater Working Group has described (2/98) and EPA agrees that direct-fired process heaters will not be considered at this time. This action assures that no direct-fired process heater MACT standards will be proposed within the ICCR process, and that direct-fired process heaters be addressed through the various source specific MACT rulemaking proceedings the EPA is undertaking. (There are no such rulemakings for most agriculture industries including cotton gins.) This will allow a coalition of groups including NCC to meet with EPA to develop a standard, if necessary. Hopefully if any standard is developed the MACT floor requirement would be existing controls or "Good Combustion Practices" (as was developed for indirect-fired process heaters). This MACT standard, if necessary, is due by Nov. 15, 2000.

For direct-fired process heaters the products of combustion (from gas, liquid, or solid fuels and/or waste) mix with the process emissions and exit from the same stack. The emissions are source and industry specific. The only way to properly identify air pollutants emitted from these source specific direct-fired process heaters is to have specific knowledge of the process and the raw materials used in the process. For cotton gins the emissions (NO_x, CO) are very small if natural gas is used.

Accidental Release Prevention, Risk Management Program (RMP)

The 1990 amended Clean Air Act (CAA) included provisions for Accidental Release Prevention (Sec. 112(r)). The objective of this EPA regulation, similar to that of the OSHA Process Safety Management (29 CFR 1910.119) regulation, was to prevent toxic releases, fires and explosions from processes handling toxic and/or flammable materials. OSHA's objectives is to protect employees. EPA's objective is to protect the public and the environment. The final result was the Risk Management Program (RMP) rule. On June 20, 1996 the Final Rule was published (61 FR 31730) by EPA. Sites covered under this rule have three years to comply with the elements of RMP. By June 20, 1999, each site must submit their completed

RMP to the EPA. Sites must comply with the RMP if one or more listed substances are on site and these substances are at or over the listed thresholds for the substances. The list of chemicals specifically covered (40 CFR 68.130) include:

- A list of 77 toxic substances and 63 flammable substances are in Appendix A of the RMP Rule; and
- Explosive substances with a mass explosion hazard (Division 1.1, 49 CFR 172.01) as listed by the US Dept. of Transportation (DOT).

Some light hydrocarbon fuels are listed flammable substances (Butane, Ethane, Methane, and Propane). Each of these substances has a threshold of 10,000 pounds (this is equivalent to 2431 gal. of propane). OSHA has exempted these fuels, such as propane, under their PSM regulation 29 CFR 1910.119 (a)(ii).

In the RMP Rule, the EPA defined three Programs for compliance:

- Program 1 is for the sites that do not impact any public receptor with a worst case release and have had no incidents in the past five years.
- Program 2 is for the sites not covered by Program 3 and do not qualify for the Program.
- Program 3 is for the sites covered by OSHA's PSM regulation or those that fall in one of the SIC codes listed in the RMP rule.

Cotton gins, having an inventory of 10,000 pounds or more of propane or any other light fuel, will fall either into Program 1 or Program 2. Most likely, the sites will not be able to meet the requirements of Program 1 and will fall into Program 2. The Propane Distributor Association is developing a generic RMP. If this is not sufficient, NCC and NCGA will most likely develop a compliance guidance document.

EPA - TSCA

The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) is evaluating, with the help of a contractor Syracuse Research Corp., whether inhalation of inorganic and organic fibers (natural and synthetic/manufactured), including cotton can cause health problems similar to those caused by asbestos. This could lead to expensive testing requirements under section 4 of TSCA and an additional regulatory burden. The deposition of inhaled fibers is a function of fiber diameter and density as well as length and aspect ratio. The definition of a fiber as used for counting purposes according to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is that of a particle of length > 5 μm, and diameter < 3 μm and with an aspect ratio (length to diameter) of > 3:1 as measured by phase contrast optical

microscopy (PCOM) using the membrane filter method (M. Meldrum).

All textile fibers like cotton have the potential to produce respirable fiber fragments because of mechanical abrasion of the fiber during processing. Unlike synthetic/manufactured fiber workers, cotton workers have been studied for years and there is much good medical information that is being put together. Also USDA at my request is characterizing the fibrous component of cotton related dust in airborne samples in cotton textile processing. These data should lead to getting cotton removed from this potential EPA action.

OSHA -- Safety and Health Regulatory Actions

In 1995 the Clinton Administration released its initiative to “reinvent” OSHA, focusing mainly on eliminating or simplifying unnecessary or burdensome regulations. During ‘96 and ‘97 OSHA has sought to make administrative changes, moving away from the traditional “command and control” regulatory agency to one of partnership with employers toward a common goal of safer workplaces.

The OSHA Strategic Plan, which was required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), was issued Sep. 30, 1997. OSHA’s plan to measure their performance is to reduce the three most common workplace injuries and illnesses by 15%. The agency will also specifically target five high-hazard industries. OSHA did not list the three most common workplace injuries and illnesses or the five targeted industries. OSHA also listed three goals:

- Goal 1. Improve workplace safety and health for all workers, as evidenced by fewer hazards, reduced exposures, and fewer injuries, illnesses and fatalities (OSHA estimates that fatal injuries are 6000/year and illnesses 50,000/year)
- Goal 2. Change workplace culture to increase employer and worker awareness of, commitment to, and involvement in safety and health.
- Goal 3. Secure public confidence through excellence in the development and delivery of OSHA’s programs and services

Charles Jeffress, former head of NC OSHA, became the new OSHA head in Nov. ‘97. Jeffress indicates that he favors targeted inspections of worksites, with high worker compensation claims as the basis, to use the limited resources of OSHA better. He believes in inspections as a valuable tool to get employers’ attention and feels that safety and health management programs are the key to a good OSHA program.

OSHA has a very active regulatory agenda that could impact all sectors of the cotton industry. The current OSHA regulatory activities include (see Table 5 which summarizes OSHA activities):

Cooperative Compliance Program (CCP)

On Nov. 25, 1997 OSHA unveiled a nationwide Cooperative Compliance Program (CCP), an enforcement program that aims at focusing OSHA’s efforts on worksites with lost workplace injury and illness rates (LWDII) that are greater than 7.0, which is twice the general industry average. More than 12,000 worksites located in 29 states that fall under federal OSHA received letters in December inviting them to join the program or undergo a wall-to-wall inspection. The cotton belt states affected by this action are listed in Table 6. Employers had until Feb. 17, 1998 to make the decision on whether or not to participate in the CCP. Inspections for worksites that elect not to participate will begin no sooner than May 4, 1998. Worksites that choose to participate most likely will be required to have a written safety and health program and have an ergonomics program as well as comply with many requirements for which OSHA has yet to promulgate standards.

OSHA considers CCP a target enforcement activity. However, most industry sectors consider this a new rule that has not gone through rulemaking and constitutes “coercive compliance programs” because of the perceived threat of wall-to-wall inspections if employers did not sign on to the program. Several industry groups in Jan. 1998 filed suit in the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to prevent this activity by OSHA until it goes through “notice and comment” rulemaking. In Feb. the Court enjoined the agency from implementing the program while the court reviewed its legality (Chamber of Commerce of the US vs. US Dept. of Labor, CA DC, No. 98-1036, petition for stay granted 2/17/98). The program is now on hold indefinitely.

Table 6. Cotton Belt States OSHA Enforcement

<u>OSHA State Plan States</u>	<u>State Under Federal OSHA Jurisdiction</u>	<u>CCP Implementation[†] Date</u>
AZ	AL	6/96
CA*	AR	1998
NC	FL	1998
NM	GA	9/96
SC	KA	1998
TN	LA	1998
VA	MO	1998
	MS	3/96
	OK	1998
	TX	1998

*CA has a regulation: 1989 Injury and Illness Prevention Program Standard (Safety and Health Program Standard; requires every employer to have a written safety and health program)

[†]Cooperative Compliance Programs; OSHA announced that it would begin implementing the remaining programs in 1998; one aspect of CCP is a safety and health program.

Safety and Health Program Standard

This regulation, to promote a safe and healthful workplace and identify and control/eliminate hazards in the workplace, could also include medical surveillance and monitoring requirements. It is a top priority for OSHA and would be the centerpiece of OSHA programs. Companies with existing programs may be grandfathered, so NCC is developing draft guidelines that could be used by cotton industry segments. NCGA's voluntary safety and health management program is being developed. A draft OSHA proposal was released in May '96; OSHA held meetings to get input from small business on the slightly revised proposal in Summer '97; and a proposal is expected in 1998. NCC participates in OSHA stakeholder meetings of this issue, which could have far reaching effects on industry.

Ergonomics

Development of an ergonomic standard is a priority for OSHA and a top regulatory issue for the AFL-CIO. There was an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in '92. The Dept. of Labor appropriations bill included language that would bar OSHA from proposing an ergonomics rule later this year. The Agency is working on an ergonomics proposal to be issued in late 1998 (a draft regulatory text is to be available in May according to OSHA). OSHA is considering regulating individual work activities in manufacturing and other general industry facilities that cause musculoskeletal disorders (MSD) by repetition, overexertion, and awkward posture. They will cover those jobs with the greatest numbers of MSDs and where solutions exist. Agriculture is not scheduled to be covered by the first regulations. An ergonomics regulation would be very costly to agriculture. NCC has participated in OSHA stakeholder meetings on ergonomics for agriculture and general industry. The California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board adopted an ergonomics regulation April 17 which became law July 3. The measure would apply to all CA businesses with 10 or more employees and would be triggered when two workers performing identical tasks have been diagnosed with repetitive motion injuries (RMI) in a 12 month period. This controversial standard is the subject of lawsuits by groups on both sides of the issue.

Crystalline Silica

Crystalline silica, which may represent as much as 20% of soil dust, was designated by the International Agency on Cancer Research (IARC) as a known human carcinogen (for lung cancer) in Feb. 1997. It can also cause acute and chronic non-malignant respiratory disease [silicosis (restrictive lung disease) and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)] and possibly other health risks. Crystalline silica was added to the OSHA regulatory agenda in Oct. '97 for rulemaking for a "full and comprehensive standard" (a proposal is expected in about 2 years). OSHA plans to reexamine the permissible exposure limit (PEL) which is now about 0.1 mg/m³ and could lower it, in

addition to adding monitoring, medical surveillance, training, etc. the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is expected to propose a comprehensive rule in '98 which OSHA may follow; OSHA also has a special emphasis program (SEP) on silica for silicosis (started in 1996). The OSHA project leader, Loretta Schuman, strongly believes that the lifetime risk of silicosis from exposure to crystalline silica at the current PEL is 35% to 47%.

Other (see Table 5)

OSHA in February '96 proposed revisions to the Occupational Injury and Illness Recording and Reporting Rules to improve injury and illness statistics and simplify recordkeeping. Comments were submitted in 5/96 and a final standard is expected in '98. OSHA proposed a revised respiratory standard in '94, a final standard was issued Jan. 8, 1998. A proposal for a limited update of the permissible exposure limits (PELs) for air contaminants is expected by Spring '98, which could include a lower level for hexane (used for oilseed extraction); it will also contain OSHA guide for risk assessment. There was a proposal on occupational exposure to tuberculosis in Nov. '97 which covers mainly health care workers. Recommendations to improve the hazard communication standard were submitted to OSHA by their general industry advisory committee; it is expected that OSHA will try to simplify and harmonize MSDSs but there is no timetable for action. According to the Nov. '96 regulatory calendar, OSHA has withdrawn generic standards for exposure monitoring, medical surveillance, and motor vehicle safety. There was a proposal for indoor air, which is a top priority at OSHA, in '94 that would regulate smoking in the workplace and implement indoor air compliance plans; OSHA is under pressure from the DC Court of Appeals to issue a rule because of an earlier law suit by an anti-smoking group. At this time OSHA is reviewing comments and deciding what actions to take; timing for final action is uncertain.

In Dec. '95 OSHA released its Priorities List for protection of worker health and safety. They gave special priority to five issues, which will be added to the Regulatory Agenda as current rulemakings are completed, including an extensive update of the PELs, a noise/hearing conservation standard for non-covered industries (i.e., agriculture), metal working fluids, and crystalline silica. The additional priority issues, including workplace violence, motor vehicle safety, diesel exhaust (MSHA proposal soon), occupational asthma and reproductive hazards, will be addressed through voluntary guidelines and voluntary industry standards. OSHA has said it will work with industry and labor groups on these issues to encourage worker protection without developing new rules at this time.

Summary

It can be seen from the list of potential new regulations discussed there is much activity and the cotton industry will

be very busy with regulatory agency activities. Fortunately, there are very many outstanding engineers and safety and health professionals in the ginning industry to assist in these efforts.

Reference

M. Meldrum, HSE (1996). Review of Fibre Toxicology, EH 65/30, UK, p.1.

Table 5. OSHA RULEMAKING

- On Oct. 29, 1997 OSHA published its Regulatory Agenda. Section 1 shows the Regulatory Agenda issues important to the cotton industry and the current status of each.
- On December 13, 1995 OSHA released its Priorities List for protection of worker health and safety. They gave special priority to five issues; those are seen in section 2 of the table. These issues will be added to the Regulatory Agenda as current rulemakings are completed.
- Additional priority issues (from the priorities list), seen in section 3, will be addressed through voluntary guidelines and voluntary industry standards. OSHA has said it will work with industry and labor groups to encourage worker protection without developing new rules on these issues at this time.
- As a result of the Clinton Administration plans to “reinvent government”, OSHA is undergoing an agency wide cultural shift from the traditional “command and control” approach to one that provides employees with a choice between partnership with OSHA and the traditional enforcement relationship. This has meant a change in OSHA’s regulatory approach. OSHA now seeks to establish clear and sensible priorities, emphasize consensus-based rulemakings, focus on developing a safety and health program rule, and eliminate out-of-date, confusing, or duplicative rules from the books.

ISSUE	STATUS
1. CURRENT REGULATORY AGENDA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and Health Program Standard (for general industry) 	draft proposal 11/96; NPRM due 6/98 (safety standard); “Centerpiece of OSHA’s 1998 plan” [CA standard 1989 - Injury and Illness Prevention]
⇒ medical surveillance (ANPR 9/88; withdrawn 3/95)	could be part of S&H Program Standard
⇒ monitoring (ANPR 9/88; withdrawn 3/95)	could be part of S&H Program Standard

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ergonomics 	ANPR 8/03/92; Proposed rule due in 1998 (long term); CA Standard final -- effective 7/97; ANSI draft out for ballot; FY 98 appropriations rider preventing proposed standard in FY 98; Stakeholder meetings 2/98; draft of regulatory text 5/98 and proposal 1998.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuberculosis 	SBREFA panel 9/10/96; Proposed rule 10/17/97; comments 2/98
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respirators (29 CFR 1910.134) (Proper Use of Modern Respirators) 	ANPR 1982; proposal 11/94; final standard (1/8/98; 63 FR 1152)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indoor Air 	proposal 4/94; hearings; OSHA reviewing comments; 11/96 court declined to compel regulation of tobacco smoke; final action long term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazard Communication (29 CFR 1910.1200) (Internal OSHA Task Force) 	NACOSH held 4 hearings in 1996 to discuss issues relating to simplifying MSDSs, recordkeeping, training effectiveness, nuisance dust, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cotton Dust (Section 610 Review) (29 CFR 1910.1043) 	Review under section 610 of Reg. Flex. Act, EO 12866; Review need for standard and other aspects of rule including industry changes in technology, economic conditions, etc.; begin review 10/97, end 09/98
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of Hazardous Energy Sources (lockout/tagout) (Section 610 review) 	Began review on effectiveness of standard, need for update, etc. 10/01/96, end 10/97
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplified Recordkeeping (occupational injury/illness reporting requirements) 	Proposal 2/2/96; final action due 6/98

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abatement verification 	proposal 4/19/94; final rule 03/31/97; effective 5/30/97
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PELs for Air Contaminants Update (10-12 new PELs) 	(n-hexane in 1996 notice, not on current list) public meeting 2/22/96; proposal due 03/98 (will also contain OSHA template for risk assessment)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Powered Industrial Truck Operator Training 	covers forklift truck; final action 1998
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confined Space (revisions to clarify rescue and emergency services, flexibility in retrieval line attachment, employee rights to observe evaluations and results) 	proposed 11/94; final action Spring '98 (rewriting existing standard into "plain English" pursuant to reinvention initiative)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grain Handling Facilities (29 CFR 1910.272) 	Changing definition of a storage facility as related to confined space. (Proposal 12/95). Final action 3/8/96; Section 610 review begins 10/97, end 9/98
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process Safety Management of Highly Hazardous Chemicals 	adding new chemicals and raising issue of reactives - NPRM due Spring '98
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire Brigades (29 CFR 1910.156) revise and update 	Notice of intent to form negotiated rulemaking due 10/97; appointment of members 6/98
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flammable and Combustible liquids storage (29 CFR 1910.106) revise and update 	NPRM early 1998 to get comment to make less complex and remove unnecessary parts
2. TOP NEW PRIORITIES (10/96 published 6/97): To be added to OSHA's regulatory calendar as others are completed	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Silica (crystalline) 	IARC has classified as human carcinogen (10/96, published 6/97); OSHA rulemaking underway (long term, about 2 years); OSHA Special Emphasis Program (SEP) for Silicosis 10/31/96; ACGIH to add to list suspect carcinogen 1998 list of intended changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PELs Update (more extensive/on regular basis) 	Agriculture proposal 6/92 (still active) included cotton dust
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise/Hearing Conservation 	for construction and other non-covered industries (e.g., agriculture)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metal Working Fluids (oil mist) 	could affect respiratory disease/endotoxins; Standards Advisory Committee (SAC) named 7/97
3. ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES: These will be addressed through guidelines, voluntary industry initiatives, informational campaigns, and other means, without developing new rules at this time.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workplace Violence 	3/96 non-mandatory guidelines for health-care and social service workers. 10/27/97 Guide to Federal Agencies; OSHA holding add'l stakeholder meetings; proposed guidelines late-night retail workplace
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motor Vehicle Safety 	proposal 7/90; withdrawn 3/95
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diesel Exhaust 	MSHA proposal soon (OSHA will follow MSHA)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupational Asthma (including latex allergy) 	could affect all organic dusts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solvents 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reproductive Hazards 	
NIOSH Research Activities:	
Children in Agricultural Settings	Started national research program April 1996

National Agriculture Research Centers (established 1990)	8 centers get \$800,000/year for research on agriculture related illness and safety; centers at U. CA Agriculture Health and Safety Center Davis; Southwest Center for Agriculture Health, Injury and Education, U. TX Health Center at Tyler and Southeast Center for Agriculture Health and Injury Prevention U. KY, Lexington cover cotton states
NIOSH National Agriculture Coordinator	Named Dr. Stephen Olenchock Assistant to NIOSH Administrator (11/12/97)
DOL targeting child labor in agriculture	vegetable crops