

Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule. If the rule will 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 safety zone lasting 2 hours that will prohibit entry within all navigable waters of the Maumee River within a 150-yard radius of Toledo Country Club in Toledo, OH. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket. For instructions on locating the docket, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble.

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

- 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051, 70124; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.4.

- 2. Add § 165.T09–0735 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0735 Safety Zone; Maumee River, Toledo, OH

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of the Maumee River within a 150-yard radius of Toledo Country Club in Toledo, OH.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section, *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 (COTP) Detroit 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's designated representative.

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

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 9 p.m. to 11 p.m. on August 29, 2025.

Dated: August 19, 2025.

Richard P. Armstrong,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Detroit.

[FR Doc. 2025–16196 Filed 8–22–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2025–0578]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone; West of Cyril E. King Airport, St. Thomas, VI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for navigable waters west of the Cyril E. King Airport in St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands. The safety zone is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by the proximity of the low flying aircrafts to vessels in the vicinity of the waters off the Cyril E. King Airport in St. Thomas, USVI. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Sector San Juan.

DATES: This rule is effective without actual notice from August 25, 2025 through September 30, 2025. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from August 5, 2025, until August 25, 2025.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <https://>

www.regulations.gov, type USCG-2025-0578 in the search box and click “Search.” Next, in the Document Type column, select “Supporting & Related Material.”

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this rule, call or email Lieutenant Commander Rachel E. Thomas, Sector San Juan, Waterways Management Division Chief, Coast Guard; telephone (571) 613-1417, email Rachel.E.Thomas@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 Information and Regulatory History

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule under the authority in 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B). This statutory 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.” The Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because there is an immediate need to mitigate the risk of vessels transiting between private port authority managed yellow buoys & the end of the St. Thomas Cyril E. King runway because of their proximity to the low flying aircrafts. Prompt action is needed to respond to the potential safety hazards associated with vessels transiting in the proximity of the runway of Cyril E. King Airport in St. Thomas, USVI. It is impracticable to publish an NPRM because we must establish this safety zone by August 5, 2025 or as soon as practicable after this date.

Also, 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 impracticable because prompt action is needed to respond to the potential safety hazards associated with vessels transiting between private port authority managed yellow buoys & the end of the St. Thomas Cyril E. King runway and their proximity to the low flying aircrafts.

III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034. The

Captain of the Port Sector San Juan (COTP) has determined potential hazards associated with vessels transiting between private port authority managed yellow buoys & the end of the St. Thomas Cyril E. King runway and their proximity to the low flying aircrafts. There is a safety concern for any vessel transiting within approximately 400 yards from shore directly west of the airport’s runway. This rule is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone while a permanent solution is being assessed by the FAA, St. Thomas airport, and Coast Guard.

IV. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone from August 5, 2025, through September 30, 2025. The safety zone will cover all navigable waters within 400 yards from shore directly west of the airport’s runway within the two private port authority managed yellow buoys located at 18°20.288' N—64°59.343' W and 18°20.116' N—64°59.343' W. The duration of the zone is intended to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in these navigable waters while the risks are assessed and solutions are proposed. No vessel or person will be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP San Juan or a designated representative.

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 (Regulatory Planning and Review) and 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review) 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.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not designated this rule a “significant regulatory action,” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, OMB has not reviewed it.

This regulatory action determination is based on: (1) the safety of personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by

vessels transiting in the proximity of the approach to the Cyril E. King airport’s runway; (2) although vessels may not enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the safety zone without authorization from the COTP or a designated representative, they may operate in the surrounding area outside the safety zone during the enforcement period.

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 will 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 safety zone that will prohibit entry within 400 yards from shore directly west of the airport's runway within the two private port authority managed yellow buoys. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A Record of Environmental Consideration

supporting this determination is available in the docket. For instructions on locating the docket, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble.

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

- 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051, 70124; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.4.

- 2. Add § 165.T07–0578 to read as follows:

§ 165.T07–0578 Safety Zone; West of Cyril E. King Airport, St. Thomas, VI.

(a) **Location.** The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters within 400 yards from shore directly west of the airport's runway within the two private port authority managed yellow buoys located at 18°20.288' N–64°59.343' W and 18°20.116' N–64°59.343' W.

(b) **Definitions.** As used in this section, *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 (COTP) San Juan 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 telephone at (787) 289–2041, or a designated representative via VHF–FM radio on channel 16 to request authorization. If authorization is granted, all persons and vessels receiving such authorization must comply with the instructions of the COTP San Juan or a designated representative. 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.

(3) The Coast Guard will provide notice of the regulated area by Local Notice to Mariners, Broadcast Notice to

Mariners via VHF–FM channel 16, or the COTP's designated representative.

(e) **Enforcement period.** This section will be enforced from August 5, 2025, through October 31, 2025.

Dated: August 5, 2025.

Robert E. Stiles,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port, Sector San Juan.

[FR Doc. 2025–16194 Filed 8–22–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0184; FRL–12577–01–R4]

Florida; Approval of State Plan for Control of Emissions From Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency is taking final action to approve a state plan submitted by the State of Florida, through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) on May 31, 2017, that was supplemented on December 19, 2017, and February 2, 2018, for implementing and enforcing the Emissions Guidelines (EG) applicable to existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) units. The State plan provides for implementation and enforcement of the EG, as finalized by the EPA on February 7, 2013, and amended on June 23, 2016, applicable to existing CISWI units for which construction commenced on or before June 4, 2010, or for which modification or reconstruction commenced after June 4, 2010, but no later than August 7, 2013. The Florida State plan establishes emission limits, monitoring, operating, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements for affected CISWI units.

DATES: This rule is effective on September 24, 2025. The incorporation by reference of certain material listed in the rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of September 24, 2025.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2018–0184. All documents in the docket are listed on the *regulations.gov* website. Although listed in the index, some information may not be publicly available, *i.e.*, Confidential Business Information (CBI)