

Columbia River or his designated representative.

(c) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 6:40 p.m. to 9 p.m. on October 27, 2018.

Dated: September 19, 2018.

D.F. Berliner,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port Columbia River.

[FR Doc. 2018–21759 Filed 10–4–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2018–0893]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; APA Convention Fireworks; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for navigable waters within a 420-foot radius of the launch site at 101 Erieside Avenue, Cleveland, OH. This safety zone is intended to restrict vessels from a portion of Lake Erie during the APA 70th Anniversary Convention fireworks displays. This temporary safety zone is necessary to protect mariners and vessels from the navigational hazards associated with a fireworks display. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Buffalo.

DATES: This rule is effective without actual notice from 9 a.m. on October 5, 2018 until 10:45 p.m. on October 5, 2018. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from 9:15 p.m. October 3, 2018, until 9 a.m. on October 5, 2018.

ADDRESSES: To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2018–0893 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email LT Ryan Junod, Chief of Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Unit Cleveland; telephone 216–937–0124, email ryan.s.junod@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 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 find that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to 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 the event sponsor did not submit notice to the Coast Guard with sufficient time remaining before the event to publish an NPRM. Thus, delaying the effective date of this rule to wait for a comment period to run would be contrary to the public interest by inhibiting the Coast Guard’s ability to protect spectators and vessels from the hazards associated with a maritime fireworks display.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this temporary rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because doing so would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Delaying the effective date would be contrary to the rule’s objectives of ensuring safety of life on the navigable waters and protection of persons and vessels near the maritime fireworks display.

III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The Captain of the Port Buffalo, NY (COTP) has determined that a fireworks display presents significant risks to the public safety and property. Such hazards include premature and accidental detonations, dangerous projectiles, and falling or burning debris. This rule is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone while the fireworks display takes place.

IV. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone from 9:15 p.m. through 10:15 p.m. on October 3, 2018, and 9:45 p.m. through 10:45 p.m. on October 5, 2018. The

safety zone will cover all navigable waters within a 420-foot radius of: 41°30’33.4” N, 081°41’58.0” W at 101 Erieside Avenue, Cleveland, OH.

Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative. The Captain of the Port or his designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

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, 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. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. 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), and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on our anticipation that it will have minimal impact on the economy, will not interfere with other agencies, will not adversely alter the budget of any grant or loan recipients, and will not raise any novel legal or policy issues. The safety zone created by this rule will be relatively small and enforced for a relatively short time. Also, the safety zone is designed to minimize its impact on navigable waters. Furthermore, the safety zone has been designed to allow vessels to transit around it. Thus, restrictions on vessel movement within that particular area are expected to be minimal. Under certain conditions, moreover, vessels may still transit through the safety zone when permitted by the Captain of the Port.

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 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 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. If you believe this rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section above.

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 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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 one hour that will prohibit entry within 420 feet of the launch area for the fireworks display. 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. 01. A Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact 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

- 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.T09–0893 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0893 Safety Zone; APA Convention Fireworks; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH.

(a) *Location.* This zone will encompass all waters Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH contained within a 420-foot radius of the fireworks launch site located at position 41°30'33.4" N, 081°41'58.0" W.

(b) *Effective and enforcement period.* This regulation will be enforced from 9:15 p.m. until 10:15 p.m., October 3, 2018, and from 9:45 p.m. until 10:45 p.m. on October 5, 2018.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Buffalo is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Buffalo to act on his behalf.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone shall contact the Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port Buffalo or his on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Buffalo, or his on-scene representative.

Dated: October 2, 2018.

Joseph S. Dufresne,

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

[FR Doc. 2018-21717 Filed 10-4-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0373; FRL-9984-96-Region 3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a State implementation plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of West Virginia. This revision pertains to the infrastructure requirement for interstate transport of pollution with respect to the 2012 fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). EPA is approving this revision in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: This final rule is effective on November 5, 2018.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID Number EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0373. 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph Schulingkamp, (215) 814-2021, or by email at schulingkamp.joseph@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On November 17, 2015, the State of West Virginia, through the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP), submitted a SIP revision addressing all required infrastructure elements under CAA section 110(a) for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. As stated in the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published on August 3, 2018, EPA has previously taken action on other portions of the November 17, 2015 submittal addressing requirements in CAA section 110(a)(2) for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, and EPA is taking rulemaking action herein on only the portion of the November 12, 2015 submittal addressing requirements in CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) (prongs 1 and 2). See 83 FR 38112. In addition, EPA stated in the NPRM that the Agency had proposed separate action on the portion of the November 12, 2015 submittal addressing requirements in CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 4). See 83 FR 27734 (June 14, 2018) (proposing approval of the November 12, 2015 submittal for prong 4). EPA is not at this time taking final action on the 2015 SIP submittal addressing prong 4. For more information on particulate pollution, EPA's infrastructure requirements, and interstate transport requirements, see Section I of the August 3, 2018 NPRM.

II. Summary of SIP Revision and EPA Analysis

West Virginia's November 17, 2015 SIP submittal stated that the current West Virginia SIP contains adequate measures to ensure that the State will not cause significant contribution to nonattainment in, or interfere with the maintenance of, any other State with respect to the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. West Virginia refers to the measures detailed in the section pertaining to requirements in CAA section 110(a)(2)(A), which included numerous SIP-approved measures and other federally enforceable measures, under the CAA, that apply to sources of PM_{2.5} and its precursors within West Virginia.

In evaluating whether the measures identified by West Virginia addressed CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i), EPA used the information in the memorandum dated March 17, 2016, entitled, "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 from Stephen D. Page, Director, EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/>

[2016-08/documents/good-neighbor-memo_implementation.pdf](#) (the 2016 PM_{2.5} Memorandum). This 2016 PM_{2.5} Memorandum is included in the docket for this rulemaking action. After considering the 2016 PM_{2.5} Memorandum and additional information, EPA came to the same conclusion as West Virginia and proposed in the NPRM that West Virginia's emissions do not significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance in another State with respect to the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

A detailed summary of West Virginia's submittal, EPA's review, and the rationale for EPA's conclusion approving the November 17, 2015 submittal as addressing requirements of prongs 1 and 2 are explained in the NPRM and the technical support document (TSD) that accompanied the NPRM and will not be restated here. The TSD is available online at www.regulations.gov, Docket number EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0373.

III. Response to Comments

EPA received a total of three comments on the August 3, 2018 NPRM. Two comments generally discussed matters irrelevant to this rulemaking. As these two comments did not concern any of the specific issues raised in the NPRM or address EPA's rationale for the proposed approval of West Virginia's submittal, EPA provides no response to these comments. EPA did receive one relevant comment; that comment, and EPA's response is discussed in this Section of this rulemaking action.

Comment: The commenter first stated that EPA did not need to analyze interstate transport of PM_{2.5} emissions from West Virginia to California, Idaho, or Florida, and further questioned the likelihood of West Virginia's PM_{2.5} emissions impacting those three States. The commenter then stated that EPA's time and limited resources would be better spent on other more meaningful issues, especially since it took three years to develop the analysis EPA presented.

Response: First, with respect to the period of time for EPA's analysis, CAA section 110(a)(1) requires all States to submit a SIP addressing the elements of CAA section 110(a)(2), including CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) on interstate transport, within three years of EPA promulgating a new or revised NAAQS. Further, CAA section 110(k)(2) and (3) requires EPA action on the SIP submission within twelve months of EPA finding the SIP submission complete. Therefore, the submission of a SIP addressing interstate transport requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS