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Safety Zone; 2011 Hylebos Bridge Restoration, Hylebos Waterway, Tacoma, WA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary safety zone extending 50 yards to the north and south of the Hylebos Bridge, Tacoma, WA in both directions along the entire length of the Hylebos Bridge to ensure the safety of the boating public during the Hylebos Bridge restoration project. This safety zone is necessary to protect vessels transiting in the vicinity of the Hylebos Bridge from falling debris resulting from concrete removal performed as part of the bridge restoration.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before May 17, 2011. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before April 18, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2011–0114 using any one of the following methods:


(2) Fax: 202–493–2251.


(4) Hand delivery: Same as mail address above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail Ensign Anthony P. LaBoy, USCG Sector Puget Sound Waterways Management Division, Coast Guard; telephone 206–217–6323, e-mail SectorPugetSoundWWM@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov and will include any personal information you have provided.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2011–0114), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (via http://www.regulations.gov) or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via http://www.regulations.gov, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an e-mail address, or a telephone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to http://www.regulations.gov, click on the “submit a comment” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Document Type” field, drop down menu select “Proposed Rule” and insert “USCG–2011–0114” in the “Keyword” box. Click “Search” then click on the balloon shape in the “Actions” column. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit comments by mail and would like to know that they reached the facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to http://www.regulations.gov, click on the “read comments” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Keyword” box insert “USCG–2011–0114” and click “Search.” Click the “Open Docket Folder” in the “Actions” column. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation to use the Docket Management Facility.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the Federal Register (73 FR 3316).

Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one using one of the four methods specified under ADDRESSES. Please explain why you believe a public meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the Federal Register.

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities or to request special assistance at the public meeting, contact Ensign Anthony P. LaBoy at the telephone number or e-mail address indicated under the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this notice.

Basis and Purpose

The Hylebos Bridge restoration involves removal of deteriorated
The term "small entities" refers to the zone from the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or Designated Representative. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against any person or vessel from entering or remaining in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or Designated Representative.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The City of Tacoma Public Works has requested a closure of the waterway to prevent property damage and/or personal injury to the maritime public during concrete removal portions of the Hylebos Bridge restoration. The Coast Guard is proposing this safety zone to ensure the safety of the maritime public during concrete removal and will do so by prohibiting any person or vessel from entering or remaining in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or Designated Representative.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order.

The Coast Guard bases this finding on the fact that the safety zone is small in size, short in duration, and maritime traffic will be able to transit this area during times when the zone is not enforced. Maritime traffic may also request permission to transit through the zone from the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or Designated Representative.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of the Hylebos Waterway from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m. from August 20, 2011 through August 22, 2011. This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, because the safety zone is short in duration, is minimal in size, and maritime traffic will be allowed to transit through the safety zone with the permission of the Captain of the Port, Puget Sound or Designated Representative.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see ADDRESSES) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Ensign Anthony P. LaBoy at the telephone number or e-mail address indicated under the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this notice.

The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of $100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This proposed rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have
determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed and adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M1647.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination will be made available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. This proposed rule involves the establishment of a safety zone. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR Part 165, as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

1. The authority citation for Part 165 continues to read as follows:


2. Add § 165.T13–177 to read as follows:


(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: All waters extending 50 yards to the north and south, along the entire length of the Hylebos Bridge in Tacoma, WA.

(b) Regulations. In accordance with the general regulations in 33 CFR Part 165, Subpart C, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the safety zone without permission of the Captain of the Port or Designated Representative. See 33 CFR Part 165, Subpart C, for additional requirements. Vessel operators wishing to enter the zone during the enforcement period must request permission for entry by contacting Vessel Traffic Service Puget Sound on VHF channel 14, or the Sector Puget Sound Joint Harbor Operations Center at (206) 217–6001.

(c) Authorization. All vessel operators who desire to transit through or remain in the safety zone must obtain permission from the Captain of the Port or Designated Representative. The Captain of the Port may be assisted by federal, state, or local agencies as needed.

(d) Enforcement Period. This rule is enforced daily from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m. from August 20, 2011 through August 22, 2011 unless canceled sooner by the Captain of the Port.

Dated: March 1, 2011.

S.J. Ferguson,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Puget Sound.

[FR Doc. 2011–6337 Filed 3–17–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Kansas; Proposed Disapproval of Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan Revision for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to our authority under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), EPA is proposing to disapprove the portion of the Kansas CAA “Infrastructure” State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal addressing significant contribution to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in another State with respect to the 2006 24-hour fine particle (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standards NAAQS). On April 12, 2010, Kansas submitted a State Implementation Plan (SIP) intended to address the infrastructure SIP requirements for “infrastructure.” The submittal also included language to address the interstate transport requirements under the CAA. In this action, EPA is proposing to disapprove the portion of the Kansas SIP revision intended to address requirements prohibiting a State’s emissions from significantly contributing to nonattainment or interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in any other State. The rationale for the proposed action is described in this proposal.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 18, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2011–0279 by one of the following methods:


2. E-mail: kramer.elizabeth@epa.gov.


4. Hand Delivery or Courier: Deliver your comments to: Ms. Elizabeth Kramer, Air Planning & Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office’s normal hours of operation.