The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because it is impracticable. The Coast Guard was notified of the military exercise on April 7, 2021, and due to the evolving dynamic nature of the on-the-water exercise it was determined on May 4, 2021, that immediate action is needed to respond to the potential safety hazards associated with the exercise. The COTP determined this regulation is necessary to ensure the safety of the public. The Coast Guard lacks sufficient time to provide a reasonable comment period and then consider those comments before issuing the rule.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the Federal Register. Delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to the public interest because this regulation is needed on May 13, 2021, less than 30 days after the Coast Guard received final details of the exercise, in order to ensure safety of the public, mariners, and exercise participants.

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034, (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231). The Captain of the Port Puget Sector Sound (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the on-the-water military exercise on May 13, 2021, will be a safety concern for anyone within a 1,000-yard radius of the Pierce County ferry Steilacoom II and the exercise participants. This rule is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the moving safety zone.

This rule establishes a moving safety zone from 8:30 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. on May 13, 2021. The moving safety zone will cover all navigable waters within 1,000 yards of Pierce County ferry Steilacoom II. Part of this exercise includes the use of high speed Coast Guard and law enforcement vessel maneuvers and the use of blank fire ammunition. The duration of the zone is intended to protect mariners from the hazards associated with military training operations. No vessel or person will be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. As used in this section, a designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Puget Sound (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

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 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. This rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on size, location, and duration of the safety zone. Vessel traffic will be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the Puget sound for a 6 hour period. The Coast Guard will
transmit a Safety Marine Information Broadcast to mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 regarding the safety zone enforcement and publish in the Local Notice to Mariners information about the safety zone. In addition, the rule allows mariners to seek permission to enter the zone. To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative by VHF Channel 16. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

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 rule will 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 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 call or email the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

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 will 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 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.

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 Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined 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 a moving safety zone lasting only 6 hours that will prohibit entry within 1,000 yards of Pierce County ferry Steilacoom II. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60 of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to call or email 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 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

§ 165.T13–0313 Safety Zone; Pierce County Ferry Steilacoom II, Puget Sound, WA.

(a) Location. The following area is a moving safety zone: All navigable waters within a 1,000-yard radius around the Pierce County ferry Steilacoom II.

(b) Definitions. As used in this section, a designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Sector Puget Sound (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) Regulations.

(1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative by VHF Channel 16. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(d) Enforcement period. This section will be enforced from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on May 13, 2021.
SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a state implementation plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on March 10, 2020. This revision pertains to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PADEP) amendments to 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 (General Provisions) and 127 (Construction, Modification, Reactivation and Operation of Sources) to implement Federal NNSR provisions for 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Specifically, the SIP revision establishes that emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and ammonia are precursors to PM$_{2.5}$ for new and modified major sources emitting PM$_{2.5}$ in nonattainment areas for PM$_{2.5}$ in Pennsylvania; establishes a significant impact level for PM$_{2.5}$; proposes emission offset ratios for emissions of VOC and ammonia as PM$_{2.5}$ precursors; and amends relevant definitions. The formal SIP revision was submitted by PADEP on March 10, 2020. EPA has revised the NAAQS for PM$_{2.5}$ on multiple occasions, most recently in 2012. On December 14, 2012, the annual primary standard for PM$_{2.5}$ was lowered from 15 micrograms per meter cubed (µg/m$^3$) to 12 µg/m$^3$. See 76 FR 3087 (January 15, 2011). The existing 24-hour standards (primary and secondary) were retained at 35 µg/m$^3$, as was the annual secondary standard of 15 µg/m$^3$. Upon promulgation of the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS, EPA formally classified all of Delaware County and Lebanon County, Pennsylvania as moderate nonattainment for the 2012 annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard. See 80 FR 2206 (January 15, 2015).1 For areas designated as nonattainment for one or more NAAQS, the SIP must include preconstruction permit requirements for new or modified major stationary sources of such nonattainment pollutant(s), commonly referred to as “Nonattainment New Source Review.” See CAA section 172(c)(5).

A. Summary of SIP Revision

25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 and 127 address NNSR permit requirements for major sources of PM$_{2.5}$. PADEP’s SIP revision has been amended to implement additional provisions pertaining to precursors, as promulgated in EPA’s rule entitled Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards: State Implementation Plan Requirements (2016 Implementation Rule). 81 FR 58010 (August 24, 2016). As required by EPA’s 2016 Implementation Rule, which implements the D.C. Circuit court’s January 2013 decision in NRDC v. EPA,3 areas classified as nonattainment for any PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS are required to comply with the parts of CAA part section 189(e) that require the control of major sources of PM$_{10}$ precursors (and hence under the court decision, PM$_{2.5}$ precursors) “except where the Administrator determines that such sources do not contribute significantly to PM$_{10}$ levels which exceed the standard in the area.” The 2016 Implementation Rule added the definitions of (1) “regulated NSR pollutant” with regard to PM$_{2.5}$ precursors; (2) “major stationary source” with regard to major sources of direct PM$_{2.5}$ emissions and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors locating in PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas classified as moderate and serious; and (3) “significant” with regard to emissions of direct PM$_{2.5}$ and its precursors.

B. EPA’s Proposed Action

At proposal, EPA evaluated the revised portions 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 and 127 to determine if the revisions meet current applicable requirements for a PM$_{2.5}$ NNSR permit program, as revised by EPA’s 2016 Implementation Rule. 25 Pa. Code 121.1—(1) contains revisions to clarify that 25 Pa. Code applies to major polluting facilities that will emit PM$_{2.5}$ or its precursors in areas designated as nonattainment.

1 Allegheny County, Pennsylvania sources are regulated under the Allegheny County Health Department’s Article XXI, not PADEP 25 Pa. Code.

2 EPA subsequently issued Additional Air Quality Designations and Technical Amendment to Correct Inadvertent Error in Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM$_{2.5}$), which impacted Delaware and Lebanon counties. 80 FR 18535, 18549 (April 7, 2015). 3 This requirement was codified in 40 CFR 51.165(a)(11). See 81 FR 58010 (August 24, 2016).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Johansen, Permits Branch (3AD10), Air & Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. The telephone number is (215) 814–2156. Ms. Johansen can also be reached via electronic mail at johansen.amy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: I. Background

On March 9, 2021 (86 FR 13511), EPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In the NPRM, EPA proposed approval of amendments to 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 (General Provisions) and 127 (Construction, Modification, Reactivation and Operation of Sources) to implement Federal NNSR provisions for the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS. Specifically, the SIP revision establishes that emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and ammonia are precursors to PM$_{2.5}$ for new and modified major sources emitting PM$_{2.5}$ in Pennsylvania; establishes a significant impact level for PM$_{2.5}$; proposes emission offset ratios for emissions of VOC and ammonia as PM$_{2.5}$ precursors; and amends relevant definitions. The formal SIP revision was submitted by PADEP on March 10, 2020. EPA has revised the NAAQS for PM$_{2.5}$ on multiple occasions, most recently in 2012. On December 14, 2012, the annual primary standard for PM$_{2.5}$ was lowered from 15 micrograms per meter cubed (µg/m$^3$) to 12 µg/m$^3$. See 76 FR 3087 (January 15, 2011). The existing 24-hour standards (primary and secondary) were retained at 35 µg/m$^3$, as was the annual secondary standard of 15 µg/m$^3$. Upon promulgation of the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS, EPA formally classified all of Delaware County and Lebanon County, Pennsylvania as moderate nonattainment for the 2012 annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard. See 80 FR 2206 (January 15, 2015). For areas designated as nonattainment for one or more NAAQS, the SIP must include preconstruction permit requirements for new or modified major stationary sources of such nonattainment pollutant(s), commonly referred to as “Nonattainment New Source Review.” See CAA section 172(c)(5).

PADEP’s SIP revision revises NNSR permit requirements for major sources of PM$_{2.5}$. Specifically, PADEP’s 25 Pa. Code Chapters 121 and 127 have been amended to implement additional provisions pertaining to PM$_{2.5}$ precursors, as promulgated in EPA’s rule entitled Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards: State Implementation Plan Requirements (2016 Implementation Rule). 81 FR 58010 (August 24, 2016). As required by EPA’s 2016 Implementation Rule, which implements the D.C. Circuit court’s January 2013 decision in NRDC v. EPA,3 areas classified as nonattainment for any PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS are required to comply with the parts of CAA part section 189(e) that require the control of major sources of PM$_{10}$ precursors (and hence under the court decision, PM$_{2.5}$ precursors) “except where the Administrator determines that such sources do not contribute significantly to PM$_{10}$ levels which exceed the standard in the area.” The 2016 Implementation Rule amended the definitions of (1) “regulated NSR pollutant” with regard to PM$_{2.5}$ precursors; (2) “major stationary source” with regard to major sources of direct PM$_{2.5}$ emissions and PM$_{2.5}$ precursors locating in PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas classified as moderate and serious; and (3) “significant” with regard to emissions of direct PM$_{2.5}$ and its precursors.