

same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(6) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.

(7) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(7) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(7) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

(8) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(8) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(8) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

* * * * *

(15) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(15) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(15) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

(16) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(16) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(16) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

(17) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(16) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(17) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

* * * * *

(22) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(22) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(22) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

(23) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(g)(23) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(g)(23) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

* * * * *

(h) * * *
(3) * * *

Example 12. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 12* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 12* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 13. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 13* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 13* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 14. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 14* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 14* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 15. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 15* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 15* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 16. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 16* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 16* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 17. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 17* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3),

Example 17 published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 18. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 18* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 18* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Example 19. [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(h)(3), *Example 19* is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(h)(3), *Example 19* published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

* * * * *

(k) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.385–3(k) is the same as the text of § 1.385–3T(k) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

■ **Par. 3.** Section 1.385–4 is added to read as follows:

§ 1.385–4 Treatment of consolidated groups.

[The text of proposed § 1.385–4 is the same as the text of § 1.385–4T published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

■ **Par. 4.** Section 1.752–2 is amended by:

- 1. Revising paragraph (c)(3).
- 2. Revising paragraph (l)(4).

The addition and revision read as follows

§ 1.752–2 Partner's share of recourse liabilities.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.752–2(c)(3) is the same as the text of § 1.752–2T(c)(3) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

* * * * *

(l) * * *

(4) [The text of the proposed amendment to § 1.752–2(l)(4) is the same as the text of § 1.752–2T(l)(4) published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

John Dalrymple,

Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2016–25104 Filed 10–13–16; 5:00 pm]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2016–0929]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Willamette River, Portland, OR

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone for certain waters of the Willamette River. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on these navigable waters during a fireworks display on November 13, 2016. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Columbia River or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before November 4, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2016–0929 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email Mr. Kenneth Lawrenson, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 503–240–9319, email msupdxwwm@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR—Code of Federal Regulations
DHS—Department of Homeland Security
FR—**Federal Register**
NPRM—Notice of proposed rulemaking
§—Section
U.S.C.—United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On September 22, 2016, Western Display Fireworks, Ltd., notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting a fireworks display from 7 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. on November 13, 2016, for a celebration of life of recently deceased Donald W. Gardner. The fireworks are to be launched from a barge in the Willamette River between the Burnside and Steel Bridges. Hazards from firework displays include accidental discharge of fireworks, dangerous projectiles, and falling hot embers or other debris. The Captain of the Port Sector Columbia River (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the fireworks to be used in this display would be a safety concern for anyone within a 450-yard radius of the barge.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels and the navigable waters within a 450-yard radius of the fireworks barge before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a safety zone from 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. on November 13, 2016. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters within 450 yards of the barge being used to launch the fireworks display in the Willamette River located between the Burnside and Steel Bridges in Portland, OR. The safety zone would be in effect for the duration of the event, which is scheduled to take place from 7 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., and one hour prior to and one hour after the event concludes, in order to ensure the safety of vessels and these navigable waters. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or his designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

IV. 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 and Executive orders and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This NPRM has not been designated a "significant regulatory action," under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the Willamette River for two and a half hours during the evening when vessel traffic is normally low. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF-FM marine

channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zone.

B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 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.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the safety zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

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.

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** section. 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.

C. Collection of Information

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

D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments

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 is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, 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. If you believe this proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

E. 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.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed 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 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), 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 a safety zone lasting two and one half hours that would prohibit entry within 450 yards of a fireworks barge. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist and 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.

G. 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.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. 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. If we issue a final rule in this rulemaking, because of the closeness of the event, we would make it effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, and we would explain our good cause for doing so in the final rule, as required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the **Federal Register** (70 FR 15086).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that Web site's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

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:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.T13–0929 to read as follows:

§ 165.T13–0929 Safety Zone; Willamette River, Portland, OR.

(a) *Safety zone.* The following area is designated a safety zone: Waters of the Willamette River, within a 450-yard radius of the fireworks barge located between the Burnside and Steel Bridges in Portland, OR.

(b) *Regulations.* In accordance with § 165.23, no person may enter or remain in this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Columbia River or his designated representative. Also in accordance with § 165.23, no person may bring into, or allow to remain in this safety zone any vehicle, vessel, or object unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Columbia River or his designated representative.

(c) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. on November 13, 2016.

Dated: October 17, 2016.

D. F. Berliner,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Alternate Captain of the Port, Sector Columbia River.

[FR Doc. 2016–25511 Filed 10–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2016–0526; FRL–9954–34–Region 4]

Air Plan Approval; KY; RACM Determination for the KY Portion of the Louisville Area 1997 Annual PM_{2.5}

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, through the Kentucky Division for Air Quality (KDAQ) on August 9, 2016, that addresses reasonably available control

measures (RACM) for the Kentucky portion of the Louisville, KY–IN, nonattainment area for the 1997 Annual fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (hereinafter referred to as the “bi-state Louisville Area” or “Area”).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 21, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2016–0526 at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madolyn Sanchez, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Ms. Sanchez can be reached by telephone at (404) 562–9644 or via electronic mail at sanchez.madolyn@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In 1997, EPA promulgated the first air quality standards for PM_{2.5}. EPA promulgated an annual standard at a level of 15 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) (based on a 3-year average of annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations) and a 24-hour standard of 65 µg/m³ (based on a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentrations). See 62 FR 38652 (July 18, 1997). On January 5, 2005 (70 FR 944), and supplemented on April 14, 2005 (70 FR 19844), EPA designated the bi-state Louisville Area as nonattainment for the 1997 Annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS. In that