In this action the United States, acting on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and joined by the State of Alabama, the Alabama Department of Environmental Management, and the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality acting for the State of Oklahoma, filed a complaint under the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq., against El Dorado Chemical Company, Cherokee Nitrogen Company, and Pryor Chemical Company, the owners and operators of three nitric acid manufacturing facilities located respectively in El Dorado, Arkansas, Cherokee, Alabama, and Pryor, Oklahoma, seeking civil penalties and injunctive relief. The Complaint alleges that the Defendants constructed or made modifications to a total of six nitric acid plants, located across the three nitric acid manufacturing facilities, without first obtaining preconstruction permits and installing required pollution control equipment, in violation of: The CAA Nonattainment New Source Review, Prevention of Significant Deterioration, and Title V permitting requirement provisions, 42 U.S.C. 7470–7492, 7501–7511f, 7661– 7661f; the CAA State Implementation Plans in Alabama, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, 42 U.S.C. 7410; and Subparts A and G of the CAA's New Source Performance Standards, 40 CFR 60.2, 60.70, 60.72, 60.73, and 60.82. The Complaint also alleges violations based on Oklahoma law at the Pryor, Oklahoma facility.

The Consent Decree resolves the claims in the Complaint and requires the Settling Defendants, who consist of the named Defendants, LSB Industries, Inc. (the named Defendant's parent company), and El Dorado Nitrogen, L.P. (an LSB Industries subsidiary), to pay a \$725,000 civil penalty, of which \$362,500 will go to the United States, \$156,250 will go to the State of Alabama, and \$206,250 will go to the State of Oklahoma. Additionally, under the Consent Decree the Settling Defendants will install or upgrade controls to reduce emissions of NOx and install or upgrade continuous emissions monitoring systems for all operating nitric acid plants at the Arkansas, Alabama, and Oklahoma facilities as well as at an additional facility in Baytown, Texas, operated by El Dorado Nitrogen, L.P. Finally, under the Consent Decree, the Settling Defendants will undertake an environmental mitigation project to remediate acidified soils and reforest land in Union County, Arkansas.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States, et al. v. El Dorado Chemical Company, et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–10311. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By e-mail By mail	pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov. Assistant Attorney General, Re: Comments D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–10311, U.S. DOJ–ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$25.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy of the Consent Decree without the attachments, which may be alternatively requested, the cost is \$20.50.

Thomas P. Carroll,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2014–06597 Filed 3–25–14; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Town of Ramapo, New York*, Civil Action No. 7:14–cv–01888–NSR, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on March 18, 2014.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against Defendant Town of Ramapo, New York, pursuant to Sections 301(a) and 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311(a), 1344(s), to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendant for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States and by failing to adhere to the conditions of a permit issued under 33 U.S.C. 1344(s). The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendant to perform mitigation and to pay a civil penalty.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Assistant United States Attorney Andrew E. Krause, United States Attorney's Office, Southern District of New York, 86 Chambers Street, 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10007, and refer to United States v. Town of Ramapo, New York, USAO No. 2013V00629.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, The Hon. Charles L. Brieant Jr. Federal Building and Courthouse, 300 Quarropas Street, White Plains, NY 10601–4150. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.

Cherie L. Rogers,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2014–06613 Filed 3–25–14; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Logging Operations Standard

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, "Logging Operations Standard," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for continued use, without change, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

DATES: Submit comments on or before April 25, 2014.

ADDRESSES: A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely

respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained free of charge from the RegInfo.gov Web site at http:// www.reginfo.gov/public/do/ PRAViewICR?ref nbr=201402-1218-007 (this link will only become active on the day following publication of this notice) or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129, TTY 202-693-8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at DOL PRA PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Submit comments about this request by mail or courier to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL-OSHA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503; by Fax: 202-395-6881 (this is not a toll-free number); or by email: OIRA submission@omb.eop.gov. Commenters are encouraged, but not required, to send a courtesy copy of any comments by mail or courier to the U.S. Department of Labor-OASAM, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attn: Departmental Information Compliance Management Program, Room N1301, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210; or by email: DOL PRA PUBLIC@dol.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129, TTY 202-693-8064, (these are not toll-free numbers) or by email at *DOL* PRA PUBLIC@dol.gov.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D). SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This ICR seeks to extend PRA authorization for the information collection requirements specified in the Logging Operations Standard and codified at 29 CFR 1910.266(f), (g), and (i). The Standard requires a covered employer to assure operating and maintenance instructions are available on a machine or in the area where the machine is operated. For vehicles, an employer must assure that operating and maintenance instructions are available for each vehicle. The standard also requires an employer to provide training to workers and to certify that the training has been provided. The Occupational Safety and Health Act authorizes this information collection. See 29 U.S.C. 657.

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of

law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. The DOL obtains OMB approval for this information collection under Control Number 1218-0198.

OMB authorization for an ICR cannot be for more than three (3) years without renewal, and the current approval for this collection is scheduled to expire on March 31, 2014. The DOL seeks to extend PRA authorization for this information collection for three (3) more years, without any change to existing requirements. The DOL notes that existing information collection requirements submitted to the OMB receive a month-to-month extension while they undergo review. For additional substantive information about this ICR, see the related notice published in the Federal Register on December 5, 2013 (78 FR 73208).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the address shown in the ADDRESSES section within 30 days of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. In order to help ensure appropriate consideration, comments should mention OMB Control Number 1218-0198. The OMB is particularly interested in comments that:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected: and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Àgency: DOL–OSHA. Title of Collection: Logging Operations Standard. OMB Control Number: 1218-0198.

Affected Public: Private Sectorbusinesses or other for-profits.

Total Estimated Number of Respondents: 8,286. Total Estimated Number of

Responses: 50,904.

Total Estimated Annual Other Costs

Total Estimated Annual Time Burden:

Burden: \$0.

Dated: March 19, 2014.

Michel Smyth,

Departmental Clearance Officer. [FR Doc. 2014-06589 Filed 3-25-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

TA-W-82.9981

Innovative Dental, Inc., Reno, Nevada; **Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for** Reconsideration

By application dated September 27, 2013, a separated worker requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm (issued September 12, 2013). The Department's Notice of determination was published in the Federal Register on October 3, 2013 (78 FR 61394).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

- (1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous:
- (2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or
- (3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The negative determination of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) petition filed on behalf of workers at Innovative Dental, Inc., Reno, Nevada was based on the Department's findings that a significant number or proportion of workers at the subject firm has not been totally or partially separated, or threatened with such separation. In a worker group of fewer than fifty workers, a significant number or proportion of workers is three workers. 29 CFR 90.2

The request for reconsideration stated that "over 60% of the dental laboratory restorations in this country are manufactured overseas . . . or across our Southern border" and did not provide any information regarding the