

(3) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4)(G) and (H) require an agency to publish a **Federal Register** notice concerning its procedures for notifying an individual, at his/her request, if the system of records contains a record pertaining to him/her, how to gain access to such a record and how to contest its content. Since this system of records is being exempted from subsection (f) of the Privacy Act, concerning agency rules, and subsection (d) of the Privacy Act, concerning access to records, these requirements are inapplicable to the extent that this system of records will be exempt from subsections (f) and (d) of the Privacy Act. Although the system would be exempt from these requirements, the NLRB has published information concerning its notification, access, and contest procedures because, under certain circumstances, it may be appropriate for a subject to have access to a portion of that individual's records in this system of records.

(4) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4)(I) requires an agency to publish a **Federal Register** notice concerning the categories of sources of records in the system of records. Exemption from this provision is necessary to protect the confidentiality of the sources of information, to protect the privacy and physical safety of confidential sources and witnesses, and to avoid the disclosure of investigative techniques and procedures. Although the system will be exempt from this requirement, the agency has published source information in the accompanying notice in broad generic terms.

(5) 5 U.S.C. 552a(f) requires an agency to promulgate rules which shall establish procedures whereby an individual can be notified in response to a request if any system of records named by the individual contains a record pertaining to that individual. The application of this provision could compromise the progress of an investigation concerning the suitability, eligibility, and fitness for service of applicants for Federal employment and impede a prompt assessment of the appropriate access to the Agency's facilities. Although this system would be exempt from the requirements of subsection (f) of the Privacy Act, the Agency has promulgated rules which establish agency procedures because, under certain circumstances, it could be appropriate for an individual to have access to all or a portion of that individual's records in this system of records.

Dated: December 9, 2019.

Roxanne L. Rothschild,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019-26820 Filed 12-20-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7545-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2019-0545]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Niantic River, Niantic, CT

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is modifying the operating schedule that governs the S156 Bridge across the Niantic River, mile 0.1 at Niantic, CT. The bridge owner, the Connecticut Department of Transportation, submitted a request to allow six hours notice for night time transits during the months of November and April due to infrequent bridge openings. This final rule will approve the request and align the regulations for the S156 Bridge with other Connecticut Department of Transportation Bridges.

DATES: This rule is effective January 22, 2020.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Type USCG-2019-0545 in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Mr. Jeffrey Stieb, First Coast Guard District Bridge Management Specialist; telephone 617-223-8364, email Jeffrey.D.Stieb@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CT DOT Connecticut Department of Transportation
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
OMB Office of Management and Budget
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Advance, Supplemental)
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background Information and Regulatory History

On August 20, 2019, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed

rulemaking entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Niantic River, Niantic, CT" in the **Federal Register** (84 FR 43093). In the NPRM, incorrect clearances for the bridge were provided. The correct clearances are provided below in Section III. No comments were received in response to the NPRM and no comments were made concerning the more constrictive clearances in the NPRM.

III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under the authority of 33 U.S.C. 499. The S156 Bridge at mile 0.1 over the Niantic River at Niantic, Connecticut, has a vertical clearance of 32 feet at mean high water and 34 feet at mean low water. Vertical clearance is unlimited when the draw is open. Horizontal clearance is approximately 100 feet. Waterway users include recreational and small commercial vessels.

The existing regulation, 33 CFR 117.215(b), requires that from December 1 through March 31, from 8 p.m. to 4 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least six hours notice is given. CT DOT requested that the start of the winter schedule begin one month sooner and end one month later than presently allowed by the regulation. This rule change will align the winter operation and staffing of the three CT DOT drawbridges located in the same operational area by extending the range of months during which six hours notice is required to include November and April. This rule change will allow for more efficient and economic operation of the bridge while meeting the reasonable needs of navigation.

The bridge logs show that during the last three years only three requests to open occurred between 8 p.m. and 4 a.m. in November and no request to open were received between 8 p.m. and 4 a.m. in April. None of the requests were from commercial vessels. CT DOT and the Coast Guard conducted outreach to stakeholders with no objections received.

IV. Discussion of Comments, Changes and the Final Rule

The Coast Guard provided 60 days for comment and no comments were received. There are no changes in the regulatory text of this rule from the proposed rule in the NPRM.

The final rule provides that from November 1 through April 30, between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least six hours notice is given. It is our opinion that the proposed rule meets the reasonable needs of marine traffic.

V. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this 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 protesters.

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 rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, it 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 fact that only three vessel transits would have been affected over the past three years. We believe that this change to the drawbridge operation regulation at 33 CFR 117.215(b) will meet the reasonable needs of navigation.

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 received no comment from the Small Business Administration on this rule. 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.

The bridge will continue to open on signal with six hours notice between the hours of 8 p.m. and 4 a.m. during the months of November and April. Based on the last three years of records, an average of one vessel annually will be affected by the change. While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section V.A above, this rule will not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

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 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.

C. Collection of Information

This rule calls 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 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 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. If you believe this rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please call or email 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series) which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f). We have made a 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 rule promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This action is categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table 3–1 of the U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are required for this 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.

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; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. Revise § 117.215(b) to read as follows:

§ 117.215 Niantic River.

* * * * *

(b) The draw of the S156 Bridge, mile 0.1, at Niantic, shall open on signal; except that, from 7 a.m. to 8 a.m., and 4 p.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays, the draw shall open only for the passage of commercial vessels. From November 1 through April 30, from 8 p.m. to 4 a.m., the draw shall open on signal if at least six hours notice is given by calling the number posted at the bridge.

Dated: December 4, 2019.

R.W. Warren,

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

[FR Doc. 2019-27272 Filed 12-20-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2018-0810; FRL-10003-25-Region 10]

Air Plan Approval; AK: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Whenever a new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standard is promulgated, the Clean Air Act requires states to submit plans for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such standard, commonly referred to as infrastructure requirements. On October 25, 2018, the State of Alaska submitted such a plan for the ozone standard revised on October 1, 2015. In this action, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving the Alaska plan as meeting applicable infrastructure requirements.

DATES: This final rule is effective January 22, 2020.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2018-0810. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *e.g.*, Confidential Business Information or other information the disclosure of which 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 at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER**

INFORMATION CONTACT section for additional availability information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristin Hall (15-H13), Air and Radiation Division, EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue (Suite 155), Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 553-6357, hall.kristin@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document wherever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, it refers to the EPA.

Table of Contents

I. Background
II. Final Action
III. Statutory and Executive Order Review

I. Background

On October 25, 2018, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) made a submission addressing the infrastructure requirements of CAA section 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 2015 ozone NAAQS.¹ On October 15, 2019, we proposed to approve Alaska’s infrastructure SIP submission (84 FR 55094). The reasons for our proposed approval are included in the proposal and will not be restated here. The public comment period for the proposal closed on November 14, 2019, and we received one supportive comment. The full text of the comment may be found in the docket for this action.

II. Final Action

We are approving the Alaska SIP as meeting the following CAA section 110(a)(2) infrastructure elements for the 2015 ozone NAAQS: (A), (B), (C), (D)(i)(II), (D)(ii), (E), (F), (G), (H), (J), (K), (L), and (M). This action is being taken under section 110 of the CAA.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Review

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves State law as meeting Federal requirements and does not

¹ Alaska’s October 25, 2018 submission addresses CAA sections 110(a)(1) and (2) infrastructure requirements for the 2015 ozone NAAQS and includes regulatory updates and permitting rule revisions for approval into the SIP. We approved the regulatory updates and permitting rule revisions in a separate rulemaking on August 29, 2019 (84 FR 45419). We are also addressing the interstate transport portion of the infrastructure requirements related to CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) in a separate action proposed on June 5, 2019 (84 FR 26041).

impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by State law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
- Does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a