

also the definition of *effects* in paragraph (d) of this section.)

(f) *Jurisdiction by law* means agency authority to approve, veto, or finance all or part of the proposal.

(g) *Major Federal action*, as defined in 42 U.S.C. 4336e (10):

(1) *In general.* The term *major Federal action* means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

(2) *Exclusion.* the term *major Federal action* does not include:

(i) A non-Federal action—

(A) With no or minimal Federal funding; or

(B) With no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project;

(ii) Funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

(iii) Loans, loan guarantees, or other forms of financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise sufficient control and responsibility over the subsequent use of such financial assistance or the effect of the action;

(iv) Business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 *et seq.*);

(v) Bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions;

(vi) Extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States; or

(vii) Activities or decisions that are non-discretionary and made in accordance with the agency's statutory authority.

(h) *Mitigation* means measures that avoid, minimize, or compensate for effects caused by a proposed action or alternatives as described in an environmental document or record of decision and that have a nexus to those effects. While NEPA requires consideration of mitigation, it does not mandate the form or assumption of any mitigation. Mitigation includes:

(1) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(2) Minimizing effects by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(3) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.

(4) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(5) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

(i) *NASA Responsible Official* is the NASA official who will ensure that planning and decision-making for each proposed Agency action complies with the regulations in this subpart and with Agency NEPA policy and guidance.

(j) *NEPA* means the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*).

(k) *Notice of intent* means a public notice that an agency will prepare an environmental document and consider public comments.

(l) *Participating agency* means a Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency participating in an environmental review or authorization of an action.

(m) *Reasonable alternatives* mean a reasonable range of alternatives that are technically and economically feasible, meet the purpose and need for the proposed action, and, where applicable, meet the goals of the agency or the non-Federal project sponsor.

(n) *Reasonably foreseeable* means sufficiently likely to occur such that a person of ordinary prudence would take it into account in reaching a decision.

(o) *Record of environmental consideration* is a brief document that is used to describe a proposed action and explain why further environmental analysis is or is not required.

(p) *Scope* consists of the range of actions, alternatives, and effects to be considered in an environmental document. The scope of a NEPA document may depend on its relationships to other NEPA documents.

(q) *Tiering* refers to the coverage of general matters in broader environmental impact statements or environmental assessments (such as national program or policy statements) with subsequent narrower statements or environmental analyses (such as regional or basin-wide program statements or ultimately site-specific statements) incorporating by reference the general discussion and concentrating solely on the issues specific to the statement subsequently prepared.

Subpart 1216.10—Severability

§ 1216.1000 Severability.

The subparts of this part are separate and severable from one another. If any

subpart or portion therein is stayed or determined to be invalid, or the applicability of any subpart or portion therein to any person or entity is held invalid, it is NASA's intention that the validity of the remainder of the subparts will not be affected, with the remaining subparts or portions therein to continue in effect.

[FR Doc. 2026–13245 Filed 6–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2026–0553]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Lake Michigan, Michigan City, IN

AGENCY: Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for navigable waters on a portion of Lake Michigan and the Michigan City Harbor in Michigan City, Indiana. This action is necessary to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by the fireworks display. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Sector Lake Michigan, or their designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 8:45 p.m. through 9:45 p.m. on July 4, 2026.

ADDRESSES: To view available documents, go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for USCG–2026–0553.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this rule, contact LT Kyle Goetz, Marine Safety Unit Chicago, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 630–341–8320, or email D09-SMB-MSUChicago-WWM@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
COTP Captain of the Port
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background and Authority

On July 4, 2026, the city of Michigan City will be hosting a fireworks display in Michigan City, IN. Hazards from fireworks displays include accidental discharge of fireworks, dangerous projectiles, and falling hot embers or other debris. The Captain of the Port Sector Lake Michigan (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with this event (fireworks display) are a safety concern for anyone within an 800-foot radius of the fireworks display. Therefore, the COTP is proposing this rule under the authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034, which is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone.

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule without prior notice and comment. As is authorized by 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. We must establish this safety zone by July 4, 2026, to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment. Therefore, we do not have enough time to solicit and respond to comments.

For the same reason, the Coast Guard finds that under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

III. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone from 8:45 p.m. through 9:45 p.m. on July 4, 2026. The safety zone will cover all navigable waters of Lake Michigan and the Michigan City Harbor within an 800-foot radius of the approximate launch position at 41°43.700' N, 086°54.617' W. Vessels and persons will not be allowed to enter the zone during this time, unless authorized by the Captain of the Port.

IV. 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. Impact on Small Entities

The regulatory flexibility analysis provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, do not apply to rules that are not subject to notice and comment. Because the Coast Guard has, for good cause, waived the notice and comment requirement that would otherwise apply to this rulemaking, the Regulatory Flexibility

Act's flexibility analysis provisions do not apply here.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), if this rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions, contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Small businesses may send comments to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards by calling 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.

B. 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).

C. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in that Order.

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.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

As required by The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538), the Coast Guard certifies that this rule will not result in an annual expenditure of \$100,000,000 or more (adjusted for inflation) by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector.

E. 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 *et seq.*), 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 is a safety zone. 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.

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; DHS Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.4.

■ 2. Add § 165.T09–0553 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0553 Safety Zone; Lake Michigan, Michigan City, IN.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of Lake Michigan and the Michigan City Harbor within an 800-foot radius of the approximate launch position at 41°43.700' N, 086°54.617' W. These coordinates are based on the North American Datum 83 (NAD 83).

(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, Sector Lake Michigan (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 on VHF–FM channel 16 or by telephone at (833) 900–2247. 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 8:45 p.m. to 9:45 p.m. on July 4, 2026.

R.N. Macon,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan.

[FR Doc. 2026–13253 Filed 6–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2026–0832]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Grand Traverse Bay, Traverse City, MI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for navigable waters of the West Arm of Grand Traverse Bay. The safety zone is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards associated with an over water fireworks and air show display. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Sector Northern Great Lakes, or their designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from July 4, 2026 from 10 p.m. to 11 p.m.

ADDRESSES: To view available documents go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for USCG–2026–0832.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this rule, contact LT Rebecca Simpson, Sector Northern Great Lakes Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 906–635–3223, or email ssmprevention@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
COTP Captain of the Port
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background and Authority

The Coast Guard received notification that fireworks will be launched from a barge on the Grand Traverse Bay near Traverse City, MI. In addition, there will

simultaneously be an airshow consisting of two planes and drones. The Captain of the Port (COTP) Sector Northern Great Lakes has determined that potential hazards associated with fireworks and air show are a safety concern for anyone within a box between the following points: 44°46'25.16" N 085°37'31.68" W; 44°46'16.25" N 085°36'37.51" W; 44°46'01.83" N 085°36'42.21" W; and 44°46'10.74" N 085°37'36.38" W. The barge for the fireworks display will be located within the box at 44°46.286' N 085°37.382' W. The COTP is issuing this rule under the authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034, which is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone.

Because of these potential hazards, the Coast Guard is issuing this rule without prior notice and comment. As is authorized by 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 this event on June 17, 2026, but we must establish this safety zone by July 4, 2026, to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment. Therefore, we do not have enough time to solicit and respond to comments.

For the same reason, the Coast Guard finds that under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

III. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone on July 4, 2026 from 10 p.m. to 11 p.m. The safety zone will cover navigable waters in Grand Traverse Bay within the following points: Point 1 at 44°46'25.16" N 085°37'31.68" W, thence to Point 2 at 44°46'16.25" N 085°36'37.51" W, thence to Point 3 at 44°46'01.83" N 085°36'42.21" W, thence to Point 4 at 44°46'10.74" N 085°37'36.38" W; thence returning to Point 1. The barge for the fireworks display will be located within the box at 44°46.286' N 085°37.382' W. Vessels and persons will not be allowed to enter the zone during this time, unless authorized by the Captain of the Port.

IV. 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. Impact on Small Entities

The regulatory flexibility analysis provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, do not apply to rules that are not subject to notice and comment. Because the Coast Guard has, for good cause, waived the notice and comment requirement that would otherwise apply to this rulemaking, the Regulatory Flexibility Act's flexibility analysis provisions do not apply here.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), if this rule will affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions, contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Small businesses may send comments to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards by calling 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.

B. 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).

C. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in that Order.

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.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

As required by The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538), the Coast Guard certifies that this rule will not result in an annual expenditure of \$100,000,000 or more (adjusted for inflation) by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector.