

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to Boeing Model 787 series airplanes. Should Boeing apply at a later date for a change to the type certificate to include another model incorporating the same novel or unusual design feature, these special conditions would apply to that model as well.

Conclusion

This action affects only one novel or unusual design feature on one model series of airplanes. It is not a rule of general applicability.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 25

Aircraft, Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority Citation

The authority citation for these special conditions is as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g), 40113, 44701, 44702, 44704.

The Proposed Special Conditions

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposes the following special conditions as part of the type certification basis for Boeing Model 787 series airplanes.

In addition to the requirements of § 25.562, passenger seats incorporating inertia locking device (ILD)s must meet the following:

1. Level of Protection Provided by ILD—It must be demonstrated by test that the seats and attachments, when subject to the emergency-landing dynamic conditions specified in § 25.562, and with one ILD not deployed, do not experience structural failure that could result in:

a. Separation of the seat from the airplane floor.

b. Separation of any part of the seat that could form a hazard to the seat occupant or any other airplane occupant.

c. Failure of the occupant restraint or any other condition that could result in the occupant separating from the seat.

2. Protection Provided Below and Above the ILD Actuation Condition—If step-change effects on occupant protection exist for impacts below and above that at which the ILD deploys, tests must be performed to demonstrate that the occupant is shown to be protected at any condition at which the ILD does or does not deploy, up to the maximum severity pulse specified by § 25.562. Test conditions must take into account any necessary tolerances for deployment.

3. Protection Over a Range of Crash Pulse Vectors—The ILD must be shown

to function as intended for all test vectors specified in § 25.562.

4. Protection During Secondary Impacts—The ILD activation setting must be demonstrated to maximize the probability of the protection being available when needed, considering a secondary impact that is above the severity at which the device is intended to deploy up to the impact loading required by § 25.562.

5. Protection of Occupants other than 50th Percentile—Protection of occupants for a range of stature from a two-year-old child to a ninety-five percentile male must be shown.

6. Inadvertent Operation—It must be shown that any inadvertent operation of the ILD does not affect the performance of the device during a subsequent emergency landing.

7. Installation Protection—It must be shown that the ILD installation is protected from contamination and interference from foreign objects.

8. Reliability—The performance of the ILD must not be altered by the effects of wear, manufacturing tolerances, aging/drying of lubricants, and corrosion.

9. Maintenance and Functional Checks—The design, installation and operation of the ILD must be such that it is possible to functionally check the device in place. Additionally, a functional check method and a maintenance check interval must be included in the seat installer's instructions for continued airworthiness (ICA) document.

10. Release Function—If a means exists to release an inadvertently activated ILD, the release means must not introduce additional hidden failures that would prevent the ILD from functioning properly.

Issued in Des Moines, Washington, on April 10, 2019.

Paul Siegmund,

Acting Manager, Transport Standards Branch, Policy and Innovation Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2019-08613 Filed 4-26-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2019-0178]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Fox River, Green Bay, WI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to authorize the Main Street Bridge, mile 1.58, the Walnut Street Bridge, mile 1.81, and the Tilleman Memorial Bridge, mile 2.27, all over the Fox River at Green Bay, WI to operate remotely. The request was made by WISDOT to operate all three bridges from the Walnut Street Bridge. This proposed rule will test the remote operations with tenders onsite, and will not change the operating schedule of the bridges.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 28, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2019-0178 using Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Mr. Lee D. Soule, Bridge Management Specialist, Ninth Coast Guard District; telephone 216-902-6085, email Lee.D.Soule@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
FR	Federal Register
HDCCTV	High Definition Closed Circuit Television
IGLD85	International Great Lakes Datum of 1985
IRCCTV	Infrared Closed Circuit Television
LWD	Low Water Datum based on IGLD 85
NPRM	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Advance, Supplemental)
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PLC	Programmable Logic Control
§	Section
U.S.C.	United States Code
WI-FI	Wireless Fidelity
WISDOT	Wisconsin Department of Transportation

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

Green Bay, Wisconsin, is located in the eastern portion of the state at the head or southwest end of Green Bay. The Bay is oriented northeast-southwest and is separated from Lake Michigan to the southeast by the Door Peninsula. Green Bay Harbor, at the mouth of Fox River at the south end of Green Bay, serves the cities of Green Bay, WI, and De Pere, WI. The major commodities handled at the port are coal, limestone, wood pulp, cement, aggregates and agricultural products. The dredged

entrance channel leads generally southwest through the shallow water in the south end of Green Bay for about 11.5 miles to the mouth of Fox River and thence upstream for about 7.2 miles to a turning basin at De Pere. There are three bascule bridges operated by WISDOT and the City of Green Bay: Main Street Bridge, mile 1.58, provides 120 feet horizontal and 12 feet vertical clearance in the closed position; the Walnut Street Bridge, mile 1.81, provides 124 feet horizontal and 11 feet vertical clearance in the closed position; and the Tilleman Memorial Bridge, mile 2.27, provides 124 feet horizontal and 32 feet vertical clearance in the closed position.

The Coast Guard is issuing this NPRM under authority 33 U.S.C. 499.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

Bridge owners are required to provide necessary drawtenders for the safe and prompt opening of a bridge and to respond to visual, sound, or radiotelephone communications for openings; unless, authorized by the U.S. Coast Guard District Commander to operate remotely.

This proposed rule will allow WISDOT and the City of Green Bay to operate all three bridges from the Walnut Street Bridge while keeping tenders at the Main Street and Tilleman Memorial Bridge while the public observes and comments on the remote operations throughout the summer.

WISDOT stated that their updated PLC, HDCCT system and updated communications systems have improved the safety of bridge operations. These systems use a redundant closed band WI-FI network to communicate between the bridges. The tenders operating the three bridges will be City of Green Bay employees with WISDOT technical assistance. Three distinct consoles will be used to control the three bridges from the Walnut Street Bridge. WISDOT stated WI-FI security protocols are in place to prevent unauthorized bridge operations and there are no physical wires connecting the control panels to any of the bridges.

Additional IFCCTV systems are installed on the bridges to see vessels during limited visibility and WISDOT intends to have extra drawtenders available during heavy weather and high traffic events. WISDOT installed a public address system that allows 2-way voice communication between vessels and the remote tender and a remotely operated VHF-FM Marine Radiotelephone that monitors Channel 16.

This proposed rule will require a tender to be physically at the bridges to evaluate the remote operations and to intervene if there is a failure in the remote abilities. If remote operations are approved and there is a discrepancy with the remote equipment the tender from Walnut Street can open all three bridges manually within 30-minutes.

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 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 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. 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 (OMB) and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels can still transit the bridge and the bridge will continue to open as required in the current regulation.

B. 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. While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge 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 because the bridge will continue to open on signal.

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**, 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.

C. 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.).

D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Government

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 above.

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 will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed 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 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. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration and a Memorandum for the Record are not required for this proposed rule. 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.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using [http://](http://www.regulations.gov)

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, visit <http://www.regulations.gov/privacynotice>.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in this docket and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website'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 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. Amend § 117.1087 by adding paragraph (a)(4) to read as follows:

(a) * * *
(4) The Main Street Bridge, mile 1.58, the Walnut Street Bridge, mile 1.81, and the Tilleman Memorial Bridge, mile 2.27, are operated remotely.

* * * * *

Dated: April 23, 2019.

N.A. Bartolotta,

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
Ninth Coast Guard District, Acting.*

[FR Doc. 2019–08495 Filed 4–26–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2019–0213]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zone; Burke Lakefront Airport, Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a security zone for navigable waters of Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH. This security zone is necessary to protect the public and surrounding waterways from terrorist acts, sabotage, or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature. Entry of vessels or persons into the zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) Buffalo 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 June 28, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2019–0213 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://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 LT Sean Dolan, 716–843–9322, email DO9-SMB-SECBuffalo-WWM@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

Previously COTP Buffalo has had to implement emergent security zones around Burke Lakefront Airport, Cleveland, OH whenever Senior Government Officials or foreign dignitaries utilized the airport for travel into and out of Cleveland, OH. The COTP Buffalo has determined that a security zone is necessary to protect certain individuals, vessels, the public, and surrounding waterways from terrorist acts, sabotage, or other subversive acts, accidents, or other causes of a similar nature.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels, the public, and the navigable waters within the security zone before, during, and after the arrival and departure of certain individuals when notified. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231).