

The Regulatory Amendment

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, TTB amends title 27, chapter I, part 9, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 9—AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

- 2. Section 9.169 is amended by:
- a. Redesignating paragraphs (c)(15) through (22) as paragraphs (c)(31) through (38);
 - b. Revising paragraph (c)(14); and
 - c. Adding new paragraphs (c)(15) through (30).

The additions and revision read as follows:

§ 9.169 Red Hills Lake County.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(14) Proceed about 0.4 mile northwesterly along Harrington Flat Road to its intersection with Bottle Rock Road in section 18, T21N, R8W; then

(15) Proceed southerly along Bottle Rock Road approximately 2,500 feet to its intersection with an unnamed, unimproved dirt road near the marked 2,928-foot elevation; then

(16) Proceed west along the unimproved dirt road to its intersection with the 2,800-foot elevation contour; then

(17) Proceed northwesterly, then northerly along the meandering 2,800-foot elevation contour to its intersection with the northern boundary of section 18, T12N, R8W; then

(18) Proceed easterly along the northern boundary of section 18 to its intersection with Bottle Rock Road; then

(19) Proceed north along Bottle Rock Road to its intersection with an unnamed trail in section 7, T12N, R8W; then

(20) Proceed west in a straight line to the western boundary of section 7, T12N, R8W; then

(21) Proceed north along the western boundary of section 7 to the southeastern corner of section 1, T12N, R9W; then

(22) Proceed west along the southern boundary of section 1 to its intersection with the 2,600-foot elevation contour; then

(23) Proceed north in a straight line to the intersection with an unnamed, unimproved dirt road known locally as Helen Road; then

(24) Proceed west in a straight line to the fourth intersection with the 2,560-foot elevation contour in section 1, T12N, R9W; then

(25) Proceed south in a straight line to the southern boundary of section 1; then

(26) Proceed west along the southern boundary of section 1 to its intersection with the western boundary of section 1; then

(27) Proceed north along the western boundary of section 1 to its intersection with the northern boundary of section 1; then

(28) Proceed east along the northern boundary of section 1 to its intersection with the 2,000-foot elevation contour; then

(29) Proceed southeasterly along the 2,000-foot elevation contour to its intersection with Bottle Rock Road; then

(30) Proceed northwesterly along Bottle Rock Road to its intersection with Cole Creek Road to the west and an unnamed, unimproved road to the east in section 25, T13N, R9W; then

* * * * *

Signed: January 22, 2024.

Mary G. Ryan,
Administrator.

Approved: January 23, 2024.

Thomas C. West, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Tax Policy).

[FR Doc. 2024–01877 Filed 2–2–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2023–0658]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is modifying the operating schedule that governs the Roosevelt (US1) Bridge, across the Okeechobee Waterway, mile 7.5, at Stuart, FL. This action is necessary to allow the drawbridge to operate on demand, as outlined in the Record of Decision for the high-level fixed US1 Roosevelt Bridge which was constructed in 1997. Additionally, with the increase in railway activity on the adjacent railroad bridge, this modification will allow the drawbridges to operate in concert. The drawbridge name in the existing regulation is incorrect and will be changed in this Final Rule.

DATES: This rule is effective March 6, 2024.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Type the docket number (USCG–2023–0658) in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH”. In the Document Type column, select “Supporting & Related Material.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Ms. Jennifer Zercher, Bridge Management Specialist, Seventh Coast Guard District; telephone 305–415–6740, email Jennifer.N.Zercher@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
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
FL Florida
FDOT Florida Department of Transportation

II. Background Information and Regulatory History

The drawbridge name in the regulation, Roosevelt (US1) Bridge, is incorrect and will be permanently changed in the CFR and referred to for the remainder of the Final Rule as SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge.

The SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge was included in previously published notices and a general deviation with a request for comments in the **Federal Register**, under docket number USCG–2022–0222. These actions were taken to gather comments on waterway usage and the operation of the Florida East Coast Railroad Bridge and the SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge at Stuart, FL.

On May 3, 2022, under docket USCG–2022–0222, the Coast Guard published a Notification of Inquiry entitled, “Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, FL” in the **Federal Register** (87 FR 26145). On June 10, 2022, a Supplemental Notification of Inquiry entitled, “Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, FL” was published in the **Federal Register** (87 FR 35472). We received a total 2,358 comments on those publications and those comments pertaining to SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge were addressed in the NPRM. On June 8, 2023, under docket USCG–2022–0222, the Coast Guard published a Temporary Deviation entitled, “Drawbridge Operation

Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, FL” in the **Federal Register** (88 FR 37470). During the test period, 342 comments were received and those comments pertaining to SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge were addressed in the NPRM.

On October 27, 2023, under docket USCG–2023–0658, the Coast Guard published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking entitled Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, FL” in the **Federal Register** (88 FR 73808). There, the Coast Guard stated why it issued the NPRM and invited comments on the proposed regulatory action related to this regulatory change. During the comment period that ended November 27, 2023, we received zero comments.

III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority 33 U.S.C. 499. The SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge, across the OWW, mile 7.5, at Stuart, Florida, is a double-leaf bascule bridge with a 14-foot vertical clearance at mean high water in the closed position. The normal operating schedule for the bridge is set forth in 33 CFR 117.317(d). Navigation on the waterway is commercial and recreational.

The drawbridge was required to operate on demand as outlined in the Record of Decision for the high-level fixed US1 Roosevelt Bridge which was constructed in 1997. The drawbridge was operating on demand until June 2020 when emergency repairs to the US1 Roosevelt Bridge necessitated the drawbridge operate on scheduled openings. It was then discovered the drawbridge operating regulation was not removed from the CFR in 1997 as required. After emergency repairs were completed on the US1 Roosevelt Bridge, the bridge owner, FDOT, continued to operate the drawbridge per 33 CFR 117.317(d). Given the previous requirement to operate on demand, the increase in railway activity on the adjacent railroad bridge, and the unique operation of the railroad bridge, the Coast Guard is modifying the operating regulation to allow the drawbridges to operate in concert.

IV. Discussion of Comments, Changes and the Final Rule

The Coast Guard provided a comment period of 30 days, and no comments were received. The current regulation provides for the drawbridge to remain closed to navigation during specified times and to operate on scheduled openings at other times. This final rule allows for the drawbridge to operate on demand and in concert with adjacent

railroad drawbridge. Vessels that can pass beneath the drawbridge without an opening may do so at any time.

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

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 proposed rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, as amended by Executive Order 14094 (Modernizing Regulatory Review). 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).

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels can transit the drawbridge on demand and vessels able to pass without an opening may do so at any time.

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 zero comments 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.

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** 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 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.

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, Rev.1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning Policy 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). The Coast Guard has 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 promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges and is categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table3-1 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.

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. 00170.1. Revision No. 01.3.

■ 2. Amend § 117.317 by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 117.317 Okeechobee Waterway

* * * * *

(d) The SR 707 (Dixie Highway) Bridge, mile 7.5 at Stuart, shall open on

signal; except when the adjacent railroad bridge is in the closed position, the draw need not open. The draw must open immediately upon opening of the railroad bridge to pass all accumulated vessels requesting an opening.

* * * * *

Dated: January 31, 2024.

Douglas M. Schofield,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Coast Guard Seventh District.

[FR Doc. 2024-02187 Filed 2-2-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0422; FRL-11353-02-R9]

Air Plan Revisions; California; Butte County Air Quality Management District; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2015 8-Hour Ozone Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve revisions to the Butte County Air Quality Management District ("District") portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions address the nonattainment new source review (NNSR) requirements for the 2015 ozone national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or "standard"). We are approving the SIP revisions pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA or "Act") and its implementing regulations.

DATES: This rule is effective March 6, 2024.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0422. 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 (CBI) or other information whose disclosure 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 through https://www.regulations.gov, or please contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section for additional availability information. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with a disability who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shaheerah Kelly, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone: (415) 947-4156 or by email at kelly.shaheerah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. Proposed Action
II. Public Comments and EPA Responses
III. EPA Action
IV. Incorporation by Reference
V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Proposed Action

On October 17, 2023 (88 FR 71518), the EPA proposed to approve the rule listed in Table 1 into the California SIP. The amended rule was submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the agency that serves as the governor's designee for California SIP submittals.

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Table with 5 columns: Rule, Title, Amendment date, Submittal date, Cover letter date. Row 1: Rule 432, Federal New Source Review (FNSR), 4/22/2021, 8/3/2021, 8/3/2021

The District's SIP-approved nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) program, established in Rule 432, "Federal New Source Review (FNSR)" (amended March 23, 2017) ("Rule 432"), applies to the construction and modification of stationary sources, including major stationary sources in nonattainment areas under its

jurisdiction.¹ The District submitted the August 3, 2021 SIP revision primarily to demonstrate that Rule 432 complies with the 2015 ozone NAAQS NNSR SIP requirements in 40 CFR 51.165. The only revision to Rule 432 from the SIP-removed NNSR program was the removal of provisions related to

interpollutant trading due to a recent court decision that vacated the interpollutant trading program.²

We proposed to approve this rule because we determined that it complies with the relevant CAA requirements applicable to the Butte County

¹ 83 FR 26222 (June 6, 2018).

² Sierra Club v. EPA, 21 F.4th 815 (D.C. Cir. 2021) and 86 FR 37918 (July 19, 2021).