

provide comments *specifically on the ACs* posted in the docket (FAA–2013–0933), the FAA is opening a 30-day comment period to allow for comments on the referenced ACs only. The FAA will not accept or address comments on the NPRM because the comment period for the NPRM closed on May 28, 2014.

Additional Information

A. Comments Invited

The FAA invites interested persons to participate in this request for comment by submitting written comments, data, or views. The most helpful comments should reference a specific portion of the AC, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. To ensure the docket does not contain duplicate comments, commenters should send only one copy of written comments, or if comments are filed electronically, commenters should submit them only one time. All comments received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the FAA before we issue the final ACs.

Proprietary or Confidential Business Information: Do not file proprietary or confidential business information in the docket. Such information must be sent or delivered directly to the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document, and marked as proprietary or confidential. If submitting information on a disk or CD-ROM, mark the outside of the disk or CD-ROM, and identify electronically within the disk or CD-ROM the specific information that is proprietary or confidential.

Under 14 CFR 11.35(b), if the FAA is aware of proprietary information filed with a comment, the agency does not place it in the docket. It is held in a separate file to which the public does not have access, and the FAA places a note in the docket that it has received it. If the FAA receives a request to examine or copy this information, it treats it as any other request under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). The FAA processes such a request under the DOT procedures found in 49 CFR part 7.

B. Availability of Rulemaking Documents

An electronic copy of rulemaking documents may be obtained from the Internet by—

1. Searching the Federal eRulemaking Portal (<http://www.regulations.gov>);
2. Visiting the FAA's Regulations and Policies Web page at http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies or

3. Accessing the Government Printing Office's Web page at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>.

Copies may also be obtained by sending a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–1, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–9680. Commenters must identify the docket or notice number when submitting a request.

Issued under authority provided by 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 44701(a), and 44703 in Washington, DC, on December 12, 2015.

Frank P. Paskiewicz,

Deputy Director, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2014–29799 Filed 12–19–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2014–0213]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Coquille River, Coos Bay, OR

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the operating schedule that governs the U.S. 101 highway drawbridge also known as Bullard's Drawbridge, near Coos Bay, Oregon. The proposed change would allow the drawbridge to permanently remain in the closed position, no longer opening for vessel traffic. While there is vessel traffic on this waterway, no one has requested a drawbridge opening since 1998. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) owns the bridge and requested to update the operating schedule accordingly.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 20, 2015. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before January 21, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2014–0213 using any one of the following methods:

- (1) Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>.
- (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 instructions on submitting comments. To avoid duplication, please use only one of these methods.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Mr. Steven Fischer, Bridge Administrator, Thirteenth Coast Guard District; telephone 206–220–7282, email d13-pf-d13bridges@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Acronyms

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
§ Section Symbol
U.S.C. United States Code

A. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this proposed 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 proposed rulemaking (USCG–2014–0213), 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 (<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 email address, or a phone 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–2014–0213] 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 them 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–2014–0213) 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 now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one by January 21, 2015 using one of the methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why one 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 Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) owns the U.S. 101 Highway Bridge also known as

Bullard’s Drawbridge, Coquille River, mile 3.5, Coos Bay, OR, and has requested that the drawbridge regulation be amended to allow the bridge to remain in the permanently closed position. ODOT provided the Coast Guard with bridge logs which indicated no request for bridge openings have been received since 1998. The U.S. 101 Highway Bridge also known as Bullard’s Drawbridge, Coquille River, in the closed position, provides 28.1 feet of vertical clearance at mean high water and 35 feet at low water. In the open position the span provides 74.3 feet of vertical clearance at mean high water. Coquille River is transited by commercial fishing and recreational vessel traffic.

The Coast Guard believes this proposed rule is reasonable, and if implemented, should continue to meet the present and future needs of navigation. Based on the records provided by ODOT to the Coast Guard, it is expected that the proposed change will have no known impact to navigation or other waterway users.

C. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR 117.875 which requires the U.S. 101 highway bridge also known as Bullard’s Drawbridge to open on signal if at least two hours notice is given to the drawtender at the Coos Bay South Slough bridge. The amendment allows the bridge to remain closed to the passage of vessels. However, pursuant to 117.39, the draws must be able to operate within six months of being required to do so by the District Commander. The Coast Guard believes this proposed rule change will meet the current and future reasonable needs of navigation since the drawbridge has not received a request to open for marine traffic since 1998.

D. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 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 Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management

and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. The Coast Guard basis of this finding is on the fact that the bridge has received no requests for openings and has remained in the closed position for the last 16 years without any impacts to waterway users.

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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Vessels that can safely transit under the bridge may do so at any time. Furthermore, no known waterway users have requested a bridge opening within the last 16 years.

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.

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 would call for no 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 have determined that it 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 will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed 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

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.

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.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. 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 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

- 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. Revise § 117.875 to read as follows:

§ 117.875 Coquille River.

The draws of the US 101 highway bridge, mile 3.5 at Bandon, Oregon, need not be opened for the passage of vessels; however, the draws shall be restored to operable condition within 6 months after notification by the District Commander to do so.

Dated: December 5, 2014.

R.T. Gromlich,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Thirteenth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2014–29851 Filed 12–19–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA–R03–OAR–2014–0147; FRL–9920–70–Region 3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Reading, Pennsylvania Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard, and 2007 Base Year Inventory

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Commonwealth or Pennsylvania) request to redesignate to attainment the Reading, Pennsylvania nonattainment area (Reading Area or the Area) for the 1997 annual fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). In addition, EPA is proposing to approve, as a revision to the Pennsylvania State Implementation Plan (SIP), the Reading Area maintenance plan to show maintenance of the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS through 2025 for the Area. The maintenance plan includes the 2017 and 2025 PM_{2.5} and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) mobile vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) for the Reading Area for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS, which EPA is proposing to approve for transportation conformity purposes. EPA is also proposing to find adequate the MVEBs for Berks County. Finally, EPA is proposing to approve, as a revision to the Pennsylvania SIP, the 2007 base year emissions inventory for the Area for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS.