

### 6. *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.

### 7. *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.

### 8. *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.

### 9. *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 might disproportionately affect children.

### 10. *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.

### 11. *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.

### 12. *Technical Standards*

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

### 13. *Environment*

We have analyzed this 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 concluded 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 removing drawbridge operating regulations. 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.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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.

#### § 117.639 [Removed]

■ 2. Remove § 117.639.

Dated: March 19, 2015.

**F. M. Midgette,**

*Rear Admiral, U. S. Coast Guard,  
Commander, Ninth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2015–07318 Filed 3–31–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Parts 161 and 164

[Docket No. USCG–2005–21869]

RIN 1625–AA99

#### Vessel Requirements for Notices of Arrival and Departure, and Automatic Identification System

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Correcting amendments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard published a final rule in the **Federal Register** on January 30, 2015, to expand the applicability of notice of arrival and automatic identification system (AIS) requirements and make related

amendments regarding AIS. In that rule there is an error in the definition of Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) User and one in the AIS applicability regulation. This rule corrects those errors.

**DATES:** This rule is effective April 1, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email call or email Mr. Jorge Arroyo, Office of Navigation Systems (CG–NAV–2), Coast Guard; telephone 202–372–1563, email [Jorge.Arroyo@uscg.mil](mailto:Jorge.Arroyo@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Ms. Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Viewing Documents Associated With This Rule

To view the final rule published on January 30, 2015 (80 FR 5282), or other documents in the docket for this rulemaking, go to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), type the docket number, USCG–2005–21869, in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on “Open Docket Folder” in the first item listed. Use the following link to go directly to the docket: [www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=USCG-2005-21869](http://www.regulations.gov/#/docketDetail;D=USCG-2005-21869).

#### Background

On January 30, 2015, the Coast Guard published a final rule to expand the applicability of notice of arrival and automatic identification system (AIS) requirements and make related amendments regarding AIS. 80 FR 5282. We have identified two errors in this correction document.

In the final rule, we revised the definition of “VTS User” (Vessel Traffic Service User) in 33 CFR 161.2. 80 FR 5334. Paragraph (3) of that definition should only have included vessels required to install and use a Coast Guard type-approved AIS, instead the definition included all vessels equipped with a Coast Guard type-approved AIS whether it is required or not. The definition published in the final rule is inconsistent with the discussion in the preambles of both the NPRM and final rule which encourage all vessel owners to use AIS. 73 FR 76295, 76301, December 16, 2008; and 80 FR 5311, Jan. 30, 2015. The definition of “VTS User” in the final rule is also inconsistent with our authority to impose VTS User requirements.

Also in the final rule at paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of 33 CFR 164.46, we omitted the word “self-propelled” when describing vessels certificated to carry more than 150 passengers that are

required to have on board a properly installed, operational Coast Guard type-approved AIS Class A device. 80 FR 5335. As indicated in the final rule preamble (80 FR 5307, January 30, 2015) and the NPRM proposed rule (73 FR 76317, December 16, 2008), we intended to limit the applicability of § 164.46(b)(1)(iii) to self-propelled vessels.

### Need for Corrections

As discussed above, the published definition of “VTS User” in 33 CFR 161.2 and AIS applicability paragraph (b)(1)(iii) in § 164.46 each contain an error which is misleading and needs to be corrected.

### List of Subjects

#### 33 CFR Part 161

Harbors, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Vessels, Waterways.

#### 33 CFR Part 164

Incorporation by reference, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

Accordingly, 33 CFR parts 161 and 164 are corrected by making the following correcting amendments:

### PART 161—VESSEL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

- 1. The authority citation for part 161 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1223, 1231; 46 U.S.C. 70114, 70119; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. In § 161.2, add the word “required” before the words “Coast Guard” in paragraph (3) of the definition of “VTS User.”

### PART 164—NAVIGATION SAFETY REGULATIONS

- 3. The authority citation for part 164 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1222(5), 1223, 1231; 46 U.S.C. 2103, 3703; E.O. 12234, 45 FR 58801, 3 CFR, 1980 Comp., p. 277; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1. Sec. 164.13 also issued under 46 U.S.C. 8502. Sec. 164.46 also issued under 46 U.S.C. 70114 and Sec. 102 of Pub. L. 107–295. Sec. 164.61 also issued under 46 U.S.C. 6101.

- 4. In § 164.46(b)(1)(iii), add the word “self-propelled” before the word “vessel”.

Dated: March 25, 2015.

**K. Kroutil,**

*Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard.*

[FR Doc. 2015–07228 Filed 3–31–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2014–0586; FRL–9924–64–Region 9]

### Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze Progress Report

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a revision to the California Regional Haze (RH) State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) documenting that the State’s existing plan is making adequate progress to achieve visibility goals by 2018. The revision consists of the California Regional Haze Plan 2014 Progress Report that addresses the Regional Haze Rule (RHR) requirements under the Clean Air Act (CAA) to describe progress in achieving visibility goals in Federally designated Class I areas in California and nearby states. EPA is taking final action to approve California’s determination that the existing RH SIP is adequate to meet these visibility goals and requires no substantive revision at this time.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* This rule is effective May 1, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2014–0586 for this action. Generally, documents in the docket are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. Please note that while many of the documents in the docket are listed at <http://www.regulations.gov>, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps, multi-volume reports, or otherwise voluminous materials), and some may not be available at either location (e.g., confidential business information). To inspect the hard copy materials that are publicly available, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed directly below.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas Webb, U.S. EPA, Region 9, Planning Office, Air Division, AIR–2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. Thomas Webb may be reached at telephone number (415) 947–4139 and via electronic mail at [webb.thomas@epa.gov](mailto:webb.thomas@epa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Overview of Proposed Action
- II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
- III. Summary of Final Action
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

#### I. Overview of Proposed Action

EPA proposed on September 29, 2014, to approve the California Regional Haze Plan 2014 Progress Report (“Progress Report” or “Report”) as a revision to the California RH SIP.<sup>1</sup> CARB submitted the Progress Report to EPA on June 16, 2014, to address the RHR requirements at 40 CFR 51.308(g), (h), and (i). As described in our proposal, CARB demonstrated that the emission control measures in the existing California RH SIP are sufficient to enable California, as well as other states with Class I areas affected by emissions from sources in California, to meet all established visibility goals (known as reasonable progress goals or RPGs) for 2018. Based on our evaluation of the Report, we proposed to approve CARB’s determination that the California RH SIP requires no substantive revision at this time. We also proposed to find that CARB fulfilled the requirements in 51.308(i)(2), (3), and (4) to provide Federal Land Managers (FLMs) with an opportunity to consult on the RH SIP revision, describe how CARB addressed the FLMs’ comments, and provide procedures for continuing the consultation. Please refer to our proposed rule for background information on the RHR, the California RH SIP, and the specific requirements for Progress Reports.

#### II. Public Comments and EPA Responses

EPA’s proposed action provided for a public comment period that, upon request, was extended to 60 days ending on November 28, 2014.<sup>2</sup> We received one set of comments from the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA).<sup>3</sup> NPCA’s comments and our responses are summarized below.

<sup>1</sup> 79 FR 58302–58309.

<sup>2</sup> 79 FR 64160.

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Nathan Miller (NPCA) to Thomas Webb (EPA) dated November 29, 2014.