

the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### 8. Taking of Private Property

This rule will 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 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

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

#### 11. Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 action is not a "significant energy action" under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

#### 13. Technical Standards

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

#### 14. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule involves the creation of a safety zone. The safety zone is implemented to protect persons and property due to removal of two 16 inch pipelines at mile 45 Upper Mississippi River. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination will be made available as indicated under the ADDRESSES section. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this 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 amends 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:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. A new temporary § 165.T08–0878 is added to read as follows:

#### § 165.T08–0878 Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River MM 44 to 46, Thebes, IL.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: all waters of the Upper Mississippi River from mile 44 to 46, Thebes, IL., extending the entire width of the Upper Mississippi River.

(b) *Effective dates.* This rule is effective from November 1, 2014 to January 31, 2015 or until pipeline removal is completed, whichever occurs first. Enforcement times and specific restrictions will be announced via Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM).

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone during the enforcement period is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) Ohio Valley or a designated representative.

(2) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the COTP and designated on-scene patrol personnel. On-scene patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the U.S. Coast Guard.

(3) Persons or vessels may request deviation from the safety zone restriction prescribed under paragraph (c)(1) of this section from the COTP Ohio Valley or a designated representative who may be a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard. The COTP Ohio Valley may be contacted by telephone at 1–800–253–7465 or on VHF–FM channel 16.

(d) *Informational Broadcasts.* The Captain of the Port Ohio Valley or a designated representative will inform the public through broadcast notices to mariners of the enforcement period for the safety zone as well as any changes in the dates and times of enforcement.

Dated: October 2, 2014.

**R.V. Timme,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Ohio Valley.*

[FR Doc. 2014–28270 Filed 11–28–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2014–0698]

RIN 1625–AA87

#### Security Zone; USCGC Hamilton Commissioning Ceremony, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary Final Rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary security zone in the navigable waters of the Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC within Coast Guard Sector Charleston's Captain of the Port Zone. The security zone is necessary to prevent damage or injury to vessels and to safeguard Charleston Harbor during the USCGC HAMILTON commissioning ceremony. Persons and vessels will be prohibited from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on December 5 and 6, 2014 and will be enforced from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on December 6, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket USCG-2014-0698. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email Chief Warrant Officer Christopher Ruleman, Sector Charleston Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone (843) 740-3184, email [christopher.l.ruleman@uscg.mil](mailto:christopher.l.ruleman@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Cheryl Collins, 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. Regulatory Information**

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Under 5 U.S.C.

553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because the Coast Guard did not have sufficient time to publish an NPRM and to receive public comments prior to the event. Any delay in the effective date of this rule would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest. The event will occur before a notice-and-comment rulemaking could be completed, thereby jeopardizing the safety and security of the commissioning ceremony.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. For the same reasons discussed in the preceding paragraph, delaying the effective date of this rule would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

**B. Basis and Purpose**

The legal basis for the rule is the Coast Guard's authority to establish regulated security zones and other limited access areas: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

The security zone is necessary to safeguard the Port of Charleston during the USCGC HAMILTON commissioning ceremony.

**C. Regulatory Analyses**

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

**1. Regulatory Planning and Review**

This 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. The economic impact of this rule is not significant for the following reasons: (1) the security zone will only be enforced for a total of eight hours; (2) although persons and vessels may not enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the security zone without authorization from the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative, they may operate in the

surrounding area during the enforcement period; and (3) the Coast Guard will provide advance notification of the security zone to the local maritime community by Local Notice to Mariners and Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

**2. Impact on Small Entities**

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601-612), as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term "small entities" comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule would affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels intending to transit in a portion of the Charleston Harbor in Charleston, South Carolina from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. on December 6, 2014.

For the reasons discussed in the Regulatory Planning and Review section above, this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

**3. Assistance for Small Entities**

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this 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.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

#### 4. Collection of Information

This 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 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 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 rule will not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### 8. Taking of Private Property

This rule will 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 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

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

#### 11. Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 action is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

#### 13. Technical Standards

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

#### 14. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined 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 rule involves a security zone on waters of the Charleston Harbor, South Carolina during the USCGC HAMILTON commissioning ceremony on Saturday, December 6, 2014. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph (34)(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this 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 amends 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:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add a temporary § 165.T07–0698 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T07–0698 Security Zone; USCGC HAMILTON commissioning ceremony, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC.

(a) *Regulated Area.* The rule establishes a security zone on certain waters of the Charleston Harbor, South Carolina. The security zone will create a regulated area that encompasses a portion of the waterway; all waters of the Charleston Harbor within 500 yards of the South Carolina Ports Authority Union Street Pier.

(b) *Definition.* The term “designated representative” means Coast Guard Patrol Commanders, including Coast Guard coxswains, petty officers, and other officers operating Coast Guard vessels, and Federal, state, and local officers designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Charleston in the enforcement of the regulated area.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) All persons and vessels are prohibited from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the regulated area unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative.

(2) Persons and vessels desiring to enter, transit through, or remain within the regulated area may contact the Captain of the Port Charleston by telephone at 843–740–7050, or a designated representative via VHF radio on channel 16, to request authorization. If authorization to enter, transit through, or remain within the regulated area is granted by the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative, all persons and vessels receiving such authorization must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port Charleston or a designated representative.

(3) The Coast Guard will provide notice of the regulated area by Local Notice to Mariners, Broadcast Notice to Mariners, and on-scene designated representatives.

(d) *Effective and enforcement period.* This rule is effective on December 5 through 6, 2014 and will be enforced from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. on December 6, 2014.

Dated: November 4, 2014.

**R. R. Rodriguez,**  
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the  
Port Charleston.

[FR Doc. 2014-28271 Filed 11-28-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0550; FRL-9919-87-  
Region 7]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; 2014 Iowa State Implementation Plan

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection  
Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve a revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the State of Iowa. This final action will approve a revision to Iowa's SIP for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The proposed action was published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 2014. As stated in the proposal, the SIP revision submitted by the state satisfies the applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and will keep the Muscatine County, Iowa area in attainment of the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on December 31, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0550. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. 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 either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 4:30 excluding Federal holidays. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the office at least 24 hours in advance.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amy Algoe-Eakin, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219 at (913) 551-7942, or by email at [algoe-eakin.amy@epa.gov](mailto:algoe-eakin.amy@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document "we," "us," or "our" refer to EPA. This section provides additional information by addressing the following:

- I. What is being addressed in this document?
- II. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?
- III. EPA's Response to Comments
- IV. What action is EPA taking?
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. What is being addressed in this document?

EPA is granting final approval to the Iowa SIP submitted in response to a July 14, 2011, SIP Call related to the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. 76 FR 41424. EPA proposed approval of this SIP revision on August 11, 2014. 79 FR 46742. A complete background of this rulemaking can be found in the docket for the proposal.

#### II. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?

The state submission has met the public notice requirements for SIP submissions in accordance with 40 CFR 51.102. The submission also satisfied the completeness criteria of 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. In addition, as explained above and in more detail in the technical support document which is part of this document, the revision meets the substantive SIP requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

#### III. EPA's Response to Comments

The public comment period on EPA's proposed rule opened August 11, 2014, the date of its publication in the **Federal Register**, and closed on September 10, 2014. During this period, EPA received three comment letters from the Iowa Chapter of the Sierra Club, Iowa Environmental Council, and Clean Air Muscatine, Inc.

*Comment 1:* Two commenters commented on the negative effects of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions the citizens of Muscatine. One commenter stated that excessive PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions "deprive health people of their ability to live their lives as actively as they might wish." One commenter stated that PM<sub>2.5</sub> causes and exacerbates respiratory illness. A commenter also stated that excessive PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions impede a community's ability to enjoy economic progress.

*Response 1:* EPA agrees that PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions can have negative health and economic effects on a community. EPA issued a SIP Call to Iowa to address the violations of the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in the Muscatine County, area. 76 FR 41424. The July 30, 2014, Technical Support Document (TSD) for this proposed action<sup>1</sup> shows that the monitored values are currently below the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. In this SIP being finalized today the State of Iowa has identified permanent and enforceable strategies to provide for continued attainment.

*Comment 2:* Two commenters commented on the emissions from Grain Processing Corporation (GPC). Both commenters note that GPC has a history of pollution and violating the CAA. Both commenters noted the enforcement action taken by the Iowa Attorney General's office regarding violations at GPC. Both commenters also expressed concerns about GPC complying with the terms of the SIP.

*Response 2:* The final action today incorporates Iowa's SIP into the Federally-approved SIP. As a result, EPA will have the authority to enforce any violations of the SIP pursuant to section 113 of the CAA. EPA intends to monitor compliance with the obligations set forth in Iowa's SIP for the Muscatine County area to ensure the area continues to attain the NAAQS. Further, the SIP contingency measures provide, that if, after the implementation of controls, the area violates the standard, the contingency measures will go into effect to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in the Muscatine County area. These protections ensure that emission sources will comply with the terms of the SIP.

*Comment 3:* Two commenters stated that the 2017 attainment date was later than what was proposed in the SIP Call. One commenter stated that the technology to "clean the air" has been around for years and the corrective measures proposed are to be completed by 2017.

*Response 3:* The July 30, 2014, TSD for the proposed action<sup>2</sup> shows that the monitored values for PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Muscatine area are currently below the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and the State of Iowa has identified permanent and enforceable strategies to provide for continued attainment. Further, the TSD discusses the complexity of the projects GPC is implementing. The number of pollutant-reducing projects as well as the necessity of a phased construction

<sup>1</sup> 79 FR 43742 (August 11, 2014); EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0550; FRL 9915-02-Region 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*