
(a) Name. The name of the viticultural area described in this section is “Elkton Oregon”. “Elkton OR” may also be used as the name of the viticultural area described in this section. For purposes of part 4 of this chapter, “Elkton Oregon” and “Elkton OR” are terms of viticultural significance.

(b) Approved maps. The five United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:24,000 scale topographic maps used to determine the boundary of the Elkton Oregon viticultural area are titled:

(2) Old Blue Quadrangle, Oregon-Douglas Co., Provisional Edition 1990;
(4) Elkton Quadrangle, Oregon-Douglas Co., Provisional Edition 1990; and

(c) Boundary. The Elkton Oregon viticultural area is located in Douglas County, Oregon. The boundary of the Elkton Oregon viticultural area is described below:

(1) The beginning point is on the Kellogg map at the intersection of the T23S/T24S and R7W/R6W common lines. From the beginning point, proceed northwest in a straight line, crossing onto the Old Blue map, to the eastern-most intersection of the T22S/T23S and R8W/R9W common lines; then

(2) Proceed north along the R8W/R9W common line onto the Devils Graveyard map, across the Umpqua River, to the intersection of the R8W/R9W common line with the 1,000-foot elevation line along the western boundary section 30, T23S/R8W; then

(3) Proceed generally east along the meandering 1,000-foot elevation line that crosses over Patterson Creek, Weatherly Creek headwaters, Cedar Creek, and House Creek; continue following the 1,000-foot elevation line onto the Elkton map, back to the Devils Graveyard map, returning to the Elkton map, and then continuing generally east and southeast across Paradise Creek and Little Tom Folley Creek, to the intersection of the 1,000-foot elevation line with an unnamed, improved road in the southeast quadrant of section 4, T22S/R7W; then

(4) Proceed south-southwest along the unnamed, improved road to the intersection of that road with an unimproved logging road, approximately 1.65 miles due north of the Mile 5 marker on Elk Creek, section 9, T22S/R7W; then

(5) Proceed southeast in a straight line, passing through the southeast corner of section 9, T22S/R7W, to Elk Creek, section 15, T22S/R7W; then

(6) Proceed generally southeast (downstream) along Elk Creek to the State Route 38 bridge at BM 172, section 15, T22S/R7W; then

(7) Proceed south in a straight line to the intersection of the 1,000-foot elevation line and the section 22 south boundary line, T22S/R7W; then

(8) Proceed generally south, west, and then north along the meandering 1,000-foot elevation line crossing back and forth between the Kellogg map and the Yellow Butte map, returning to the Yellow Butte map to the intersection of the 1,000-foot elevation line with the R7W/R6W common line on Bell Ridge, along the section 1 east boundary line, T23S/R7W; then

(9) Proceed southeast in a straight line to the intersection of the line with the 1,000-foot elevation line and an unnamed, unimproved road, section 7, T23S/R6W; then

(10) Proceed south and west along the meandering 1,000-foot elevation, crossing back and forth between the Kellogg and Yellow Butte maps, and finally returning to the Kellogg map, to the intersection of the 1,000-foot elevation line with the T23S/T24S common line along the section 3 north boundary line, T24S/R7W; and then

(11) Proceed west along the T23S/T24S common line to the beginning point.

Signed: June 11, 2012.

John J. Manfreda,
Administrator.
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AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the Colorado River in Bullhead City, Arizona for the Bullhead City Regatta on August 11, 2012. This temporary safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, participating vessels, and other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels would be prohibited from entering into, transiting through or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before July 19, 2012.

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


(2) Fax: 202–493–2251.

(3) Mail or Delivery: Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Deliveries accepted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Petty Officer Deborah Metzger, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego; telephone (619) 278–7656, email d11marineeventssd@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:

Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

A. 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.
1. Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, 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 at 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, 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 email 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, type the docket number USCG–2012–0441 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on “Submit a Comment” on the line associated with this rulemaking.

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.

2. 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, type the docket number USCG–2012–0441 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. 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.

3. 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, business, 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).

4. Public Meeting

We do not plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one using one of the 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.

B. Basis and Purpose

The City of Bullhead is sponsoring the Bullhead City Regatta, which is held on the navigable waters of the Colorado River in Bullhead City, AZ. The proposed temporary safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, sponsor vessels, and other vessels and users of the waterway. This event involves people floating down the river on inflatable rafts, inner tubes and floating platforms. The size of vessels used would vary in length from 3 feet to 100 feet. Approximately 30,000 to 40,000 people would be participating in this event. The sponsor would provide 50 patrol and rescue boats to help facilitate the event and ensure public safety.

D. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard is proposing a temporary safety zone that would be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on August 11, 2012. This safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the crews, spectators, participants, and other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels would be prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative. The proposed temporary safety zone would include the waters of the Colorado River between Davis Camp and Rotary Park in Bullhead City, AZ. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

E. Regulatory Analyses

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

1. 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, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. This determination is based on the size and location of the safety zone. Although the safety zone would apply to the entire width of the river, traffic would be allowed to pass through the zone with the permission of the Captain of the Port. Additionally, before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

2. Impact on Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered the impact of this proposed rule on small entities. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule will 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 waters of the Colorado River between Davis Camp to Rotary Park in Bullhead City, AZ from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on August 11, 2012.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Although the safety zone would apply to the entire width of the river, traffic would be allowed to pass through the zone with the permission of the Coast Guard patrol commander. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

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 to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

3. 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. 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 the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT, above. 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.

4. Collection of Information

This proposed rule will not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

5. Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism.

6. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the “For Further Information Contact” section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

7. 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 an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This 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.

11. 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.

12. Energy Effects

This proposed rule is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use 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.

13. Technical Standards

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

14. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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. This proposed rule involves establishing a temporary safety zone. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

F. 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

§ 165.101–496 Safety zone; Bullhead City Regatta; Bullhead City, AZ.

(a) Location. This temporary safety zone includes the waters of the Colorado River between Davis Camp and Rotary Park in Bullhead City, AZ.

(b) Enforcement Period. This section will be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on August 11, 2012. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM). If the event concludes prior to the scheduled termination time, the Captain of the Port will cease enforcement of this safety zone and will announce that fact via Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

(c) Definitions. The following definition applies to this section: designated representative, means any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, and local, state, and federal law enforcement vessels who have been authorized to act on the behalf of the Captain of the Port.

(d) Regulations. (1) Entry into, transit through or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port of San Diego or his designated representative.
Mariners can request permission to transit through the safety zone from the Patrol Commander. The Patrol Commander can be contacted on VHF-FM channels 16 and 23.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

(4) Upon being hailed by U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

(5) The Coast Guard may be assisted by other federal, state, or local agencies.


S.M. Mahoney,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port San Diego.

[FR Doc. 2012–14845 Filed 6–18–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
40 CFR Part 52
Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; PSD Regulations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) construction permit program of State of Michigan’s State Implementation Plan (SIP) to meet the Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements for PSD in Class I Areas attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 19, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2011–0826, by one of the following methods:

1. www.regulations.gov: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. Email: damico.genevieve@epa.gov.

3. Fax: (312) 385–5501.


Docket: All documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov index. To make sure that you can access the information, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. We recommend that you telephone Constantine Blathras, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 886–0671 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Constantine Blathras, Environmental Engineer, Air Permits Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–0671, Blathras.Constantine@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Throughout this document, whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

I. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?

When submitting comments, remember to:

1. Identify the rulemaking by docket number and other identifying information (subject heading, Federal Register date and page number).

2. Follow directions—EPA may ask you to respond to specific questions or organize comments by referencing a Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part or section number.

3. Explain why you agree or disagree; suggest alternatives and substitute language for your requested changes.

4. Describe any assumptions and provide any technical information and/or data that you used.

5. If you estimate potential costs or burdens, explain how you arrived at your estimate in sufficient detail to allow for it to be reproduced.

6. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns, and suggest alternatives.

7. Explain your views as clearly as possible, avoiding the use of profanity or personal threats.

8. Make sure to submit your comments by the comment period deadline identified.

II. What revisions are included in the proposed approval?

On September 2, 2011, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) submitted to EPA for approval a revision to the Michigan SIP consisting of amendments to Michigan Air Pollution Control Rules, Part 18, PSD, and Part 19, PSD for major sources. Specifically, Michigan submitted a revision to modify Michigan Air Pollution Control Rule R. 336.2816 to...