

coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

#### V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit <http://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice>.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

#### 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 proposes to amend 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:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.T05–0286 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T05–0286 Safety Zone; Safety Zone; Fireworks, Delaware River, Philadelphia PA.

(a) **Location.** The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of Delaware River, adjacent to Penn's Landing, Philadelphia, PA, bounded from shoreline to shoreline, bounded on the south by a line running east to west from points along the shoreline commencing at latitude 39°56'31.2" N, longitude 075°08'28.1" W; thence westward to latitude 39°56'29.1" N, longitude 075°07'56.5" W, and bounded on the north by the Benjamin Franklin Bridge where it crosses the Delaware River. These coordinates are based on the 1984 World Geodetic System (WGS 84).

(b) **Definitions.** As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard petty officer, warrant or commissioned officer on board a Coast Guard vessel or on board a federal, state, or local law enforcement vessel assisting the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay 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 or remain in the zone, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative via VHF-FM channel 16 or 215–271–4807. 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) No vessel may take on bunkers or conduct lightering operations within the safety zone during its enforcement period(s).

(4) This section applies to all vessels except those engaged in law enforcement, aids to navigation servicing, and emergency response operations.

(d) **Enforcement.** The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the safety zone by Federal, State, and local agencies.

(e) **Enforcement period.** This zone will be enforced from approximately 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. on nights on which fireworks are being displayed from a barge beginning May 24 through May 27, 2018. Starting and ending times for the enforcement of the safety zone will be broadcast via Broadcast Notice to Mariners and published in the weekly Local Notice to Mariners.

Dated: April 26, 2018.

Scott E. Anderson,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Delaware Bay.

[FR Doc. 2018–09233 Filed 5–1–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R10–OAR–2017–0745; FRL–9977–43—Region 10]

#### Air Plan Approval; Alaska; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires each State Implementation Plan (SIP) to contain adequate provisions prohibiting emissions that will have certain adverse air quality effects in other states. On March 10, 2016, the State of Alaska made a submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to address these requirements. The EPA is proposing to approve the submission as meeting the requirement that each SIP contain adequate provisions to prohibit emissions that will contribute significantly to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 annual fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 1, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R10–OAR–2017–0745 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information the disclosure of which is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For

additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Hunt, Air Planning Unit, Office of Air and Waste (OAW-150), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98101; telephone number: (206) 553-0256; email address: [hunt.jeff@epa.gov](mailto:hunt.jeff@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean the EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

## Table of Contents

- I. What is the background of this SIP submission?
- II. What guidance is the EPA using to evaluate this SIP submission?
- III. EPA's review
- IV. What action is EPA taking?
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

## I. What is the background of this SIP submission?

This rulemaking addresses a submission from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), describing its infrastructure SIP for the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, submitted March 10, 2016. Specifically, this rulemaking addresses the portion of the submission dealing with interstate pollution transport under CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), otherwise known as the “good neighbor” provision. The requirement for states to make a SIP submission of this type arises from section 110(a)(1) of the CAA. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1), states must submit “within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof),” a plan that provides for the “implementation, maintenance, and enforcement” of such NAAQS. The statute directly imposes on states the duty to make these SIP submissions, and the requirement to make the submissions is not conditioned upon the EPA taking any action other than promulgating a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that “[e]ach such plan” submission must address. The EPA commonly refers to such state plans as “infrastructure SIPs.”

## II. What guidance is the EPA using to evaluate this SIP submission?

The EPA highlighted the statutory requirement to submit infrastructure SIPs within 3 years of promulgation of a new NAAQS in an October 2, 2007, guidance document entitled “Guidance on SIP Elements Required Under Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) for the 1997 8-hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (2007 guidance). The most recent relevant document was a memorandum published on March 17, 2016, titled “Information on the Interstate Transport ‘Good Neighbor’ Provision for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I)” (memorandum). The memorandum describes the EPA’s past approach to addressing interstate transport, and provides the EPA’s general review of relevant modeling data and air quality projections as they relate to the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The memorandum provides information relevant to the EPA Regional office review of the CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) “good neighbor” provision in infrastructure SIPs with respect to the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. This rulemaking considers information provided in that memorandum.

The memorandum also provides states and the EPA Regional offices with future year annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> design values for monitors in the United States based on quality assured and certified ambient monitoring data and air quality modeling. The memorandum further describes how these projected potential design values can be used to help determine which monitors should be further evaluated to potentially address whether emissions from other states significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS at those sites. The memorandum explains that the pertinent year for evaluating air quality for purposes of addressing interstate transport for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS is 2021, the attainment deadline for 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS nonattainment areas classified as Moderate.

Based on this approach, the potential receptors are outlined in the memorandum. Most of the potential receptors are in California, located in the San Joaquin Valley or South Coast nonattainment areas. However, there is also one potential receptor in Shoshone County, Idaho, and one potential receptor in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The memorandum also

indicates that for certain states with incomplete ambient monitoring data, additional information including the latest available data, should be analyzed to determine whether there are potential downwind air quality problems that may be impacted by transported emissions.

This rulemaking considers analysis in Alaska’s submission, as well as additional analysis conducted by the EPA during review of its submission. For more information on how we conducted our analysis, please see the technical support document (TSD) included in the docket for this action.

## III. EPA’s Review

This rulemaking proposes action on the portion of Alaska’s March 10, 2016, SIP submission addressing the good neighbor provision requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). State plans must address specific requirements of the good neighbor provisions (commonly referred to as “prongs”), including:

- Prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (prong one); and
- Prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (prong two).

The EPA has developed a consistent framework for addressing the prong one and two interstate transport requirements with respect to the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in several previous federal rulemakings. The four basic steps of that framework include: (1) Identifying downwind receptors that are expected to have problems attaining or maintaining the relevant NAAQS; (2) identifying which upwind states contribute to these identified problems in amounts sufficient to warrant further review and analysis; (3) for states identified as contributing to downwind air quality problems, identifying upwind emissions reductions necessary to prevent an upwind state from significantly contributing to nonattainment or interfering with maintenance of the relevant NAAQS downwind; and (4) for states that are found to have emissions that significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the relevant NAAQS downwind, reducing the identified upwind emissions through adoption of permanent and enforceable measures. This framework was most recently applied with respect to PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR),

designed to address both the 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, as well as the 1997 ozone standard.<sup>1</sup>

ADEC's submission focused mainly on emissions inventories, geographic factors, and prevailing meteorological conditions to demonstrate that sources in Alaska are unlikely to significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the NAAQS in other states. ADEC evaluated emissions inventories by source category for direct PM<sub>2.5</sub>, as well as the precursors nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). ADEC noted that emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> in Alaska are small in comparison to national levels. Data from the 2011 National Emissions Inventory (NEI) presented in the submission show that total NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in Alaska are approximately 0.9 percent of national emissions. Similarly, data from the 2011 NEI show that total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Alaska are approximately 0.4 percent of national emissions. With respect to direct PM<sub>2.5</sub>, ADEC noted that anthropogenic sources account for only 9 percent of Alaskan emissions, with the majority of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions occurring due to natural wildfires. ADEC also highlighted the fact that approximately 600 miles of mountainous terrain in Canada's Province of British Columbia separate the southeastern border of Alaska from the nearest state, Washington. The highest emissions of regulated air pollutants occur even further away from the contiguous 48 states in the Municipality of Anchorage (1,435 miles from Seattle, WA) and the Fairbanks North Star Borough (2,244 miles from Seattle, WA). Lastly, ADEC stated that weather patterns make long range transport of air pollutants from Alaska to the 48 contiguous states, and Hawaii, unlikely. Wind patterns emanate from the western Gulf of Alaska and travel inland towards the east into Northern Canada. For these reasons, ADEC concluded that Alaska does not contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in any other state.

Alaska developed and submitted its technical analysis before March 17, 2016, when, as discussed earlier, the EPA released a memorandum with updated modeling projections for 2017 and 2025 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> design values meant to assist states in development of 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS interstate transport SIPs. As discussed in the TSD for this action, we used the information in the

2016 memorandum and supplemental information, as discussed below, and came to the same conclusion as the state. It is reasonable to conclude that emissions from Alaska do not significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in any other state.

In our evaluation, potential downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors were identified in other states. EPA evaluated these potential receptors to determine first if, based on review of relevant data and other information, there would be downwind nonattainment or maintenance problems, and if so, whether Alaska is likely to contribute to such problems in these areas. After reviewing air quality reports, modeling results, designation letters, designation technical support documents, attainment plans and other information for these areas, we are proposing to approve the Alaska SIP as meeting CAA section 110(a)(2)(i)(I) interstate transport requirements for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

#### IV. What action is EPA taking?

The EPA is proposing to approve a portion of Alaska's March 10, 2016, submission certifying that the current Alaska SIP is sufficient to meet the interstate transport requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), specifically prongs one and two, as set forth above. The EPA is requesting comments on the proposed approval.

#### V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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 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 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).

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where 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 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).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 23, 2018.

**Chris Hladick,**

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 2018-09319 Filed 5-1-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

<sup>1</sup> Alaska was not part of the CSAPR rulemaking. The EPA approved the Alaska SIP as meeting the CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) requirements for the 1997 ozone and 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS on October 15, 2008 (73 FR 60955) and the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS on August 4, 2014 (79 FR 45103).