

*Civil Justice Reform*

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

*Protection of Children*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

*Indian Tribal Governments*

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would 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.

*Energy Effects*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a "significant energy action" under that order because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

*Technical Standards*

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or

adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

*Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment because it simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

**List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117**

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 33 CFR 117.739 paragraph (e) to read as follows:

**§ 117.739 Passaic River.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) The draw of the Amtrak Dock Bridge, mile 5.0, at Harrison, shall open on signal after at least a twenty four hour advance notice is given by calling the number posted at the bridge; except that, from 7:20 a.m. to 9:20 a.m. and from 4:30 p.m. to 6:50 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays, the draw need not be opened for the passage of vessel traffic. At all other times, a bridge opening may be delayed no more than ten minutes for the passage of rail traffic, unless the draw tender and the vessel operator agree to a longer delay.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: June 10, 2011.

**Daniel A. Neptun,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2011-15807 Filed 6-23-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 117**

[Docket No. USCG-2011-0335]

RIN 1625-AA09

**Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Apponagansett River, Dartmouth, MA**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change the drawbridge operation regulations that govern the operation of the Padanaram Bridge across the Apponagansett River, mile 1.0, at Dartmouth, Massachusetts. The owner of the bridge has requested relief from crewing the bridge in the early morning hours when there have been no requests to open the bridge. It is expected that this change to the regulations would provide relief to the bridge owner while continuing to meet the reasonable needs of navigation.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before August 23, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2011-0335 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal Rulemaking Portal:*

<http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) *Fax:* 202-493-2251.

(3) *Mail:* Docket Management Facility (M-30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

(4) *Hand delivery:* Same as mail address above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202-366-9329.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these methods. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or e-mail Mr. John W.

McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District Bridge Program, telephone (617) 223-8364, e-mail [john.w.mcdonald@uscg.mil](mailto:john.w.mcdonald@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202-366-9826.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted, without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

#### Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG-2011-0335), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (<http://www.regulations.gov>), or by fax, mail or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via <http://www.regulations.gov>, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand delivery, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an e-mail address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the "submit a comment" box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the "Document Type" drop down menu select "Proposed Rules" and insert "USCG-2011-0335" in the "Keyword" box. Click "Search" then click on the balloon shape in the "Actions" column. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½"; by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during

the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

#### Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, click on the "read comments" box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the "Keyword" box insert "USCG-2011-0335" and click "Search." Click the "Open Docket Folder" in the "Actions" column. You may also visit either the Docket Management Facility in Room W12-140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation to use the Docket Management Facility.

#### Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

#### Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

#### Basis and Purpose

The Padanaram Bridge, mile 1.0, across the Apponagansett River at Dartmouth, Massachusetts, has a vertical clearance in the closed position of 9 feet at mean high water and 12 feet at mean low water. The drawbridge operation regulations are listed at 33 CFR 117.587.

The existing drawbridge operation regulations require the draw to open on signal 1 May through 31 October from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m., daily. At all other times the bridge shall open if at least four hours advance notice is given.

The Coast Guard received a request from the owner of the bridge, the Town of Dartmouth, to change the drawbridge operation regulations concerning the daily hours the bridge is crewed from 1 May through 31 October. The bridge

owner desires to crew the bridge from 6 a.m. through 9 p.m. instead of 5 a.m. through 9 p.m., daily.

A review of the bridge opening logs reveals that the bridge has not received any requests to open between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m. since 2009.

As a result of the above information the Coast Guard believes it is reasonable for the bridge owner to crew the Padanaram Bridge from 6 a.m. through 9 p.m., 1 May through 31 October, since there have been no recent requests to open the bridge before 6 a.m.

#### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR 117.587(a) and (a)(1) by changing the time the bridge will open on signal between 1 May and 31 October. Presently the bridge opens on signal from 5 a.m. through 9 p.m., daily. This action would change that time period to 6 a.m. through 9 p.m., daily. All other requirements of the regulation would remain unchanged.

#### Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

#### Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be minimal. Although this regulation may have some impact on the public, the potential impact will be minimized for the following reasons:

The bridge has not received any recent requests to open between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m., daily, between May 1 and October 31. The vessels moored upstream from the bridge are recreational vessels and not commercial operators.

#### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. 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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels needing to transit through the bridge between 1 May through 31 October from 5 a.m. to 6 a.m. This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons:

The bridge has not received any requests to open between 5 a.m. and 6 a.m., daily, between May 1 and October 31, since 2009.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

#### *Assistance for Small Entities*

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 proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. 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 Mr. John W. McDonald, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District Bridge Program, telephone 617–223–8364 or e-mail [John.w.mcdonald@uscg.mil](mailto:John.w.mcdonald@uscg.mil).

The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

#### *Collection of Information*

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.).

#### *Federalism*

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of

compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

#### *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 proposed rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### *Taking of Private Property*

This proposed rule would not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

#### *Civil Justice Reform*

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

#### *Protection of Children*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

#### *Indian Tribal Governments*

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would 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.

#### *Energy Effects*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because

it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

#### *Technical Standards*

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

#### *Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment because it simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

#### **List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117**

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Amend § 117.587 by revising paragraphs (a) introductory text and (a)(1) to read as follows:

**§ 117.587 Apponagansett River.**

(a) The draw of the Padanaram Bridge, mile 1.0, shall open on signal from 1 May through 31 October, between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m., daily, as follows:

(1) The bridge shall open on signal, twice an hour, on the hour and half hour between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. and between 8 p.m. and 9 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: June 10, 2011.

**Daniel A. Neptun,**

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

[FR Doc. 2011–15809 Filed 6–23–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0412; FRL–9324–1]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern oxides of nitrogen

(NO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter (PM) emissions from glass melting furnaces. We are approving a local rule that regulates these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by July 25, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2011–0412, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *E-mail:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

3. *Mail or deliver:* Andrew Steckel (Air–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

*Instructions:* All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. <http://www.regulations.gov> is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Docket: Generally, documents in the docket for this action are available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed at <http://www.regulations.gov>, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material, large maps), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Idalia Pérez, EPA Region IX, (415) 972–3248, [perez.idalia@epa.gov](mailto:perez.idalia@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. The State’s Submittal
  - A. What rule did the State submit?
  - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
  - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revision?
- II. EPA’s Evaluation and Action
  - A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
  - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
  - C. EPA Recommendations to Further Improve the Rule
  - D. Public Comment and Final Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. The State’s Submittal**

*A. What rule did the State submit?*

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the date that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD .....	4354	Glass Melting Furnaces .....	09/16/10	04/05/11

On May 6, 2011, EPA determined that the submittal for SJVUAPCD Rule 4354 met the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 Appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

*B. Are there other versions of this rule?*

We approved an earlier version of Rule 4354 into the SIP on August 17, 2006 (72 FR 41894). The SJVUAPCD adopted revisions to the SIP-approved version on October 16, 2008 but did not submit it to us.

*C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revision?*

NO<sub>x</sub> helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and PM, which harm human health and the environment. PM contributes to effects that are harmful to human health and the environment, including premature mortality, aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, decreased lung function, visibility impairment, and damage to vegetation and ecosystems. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires

States to submit regulations that control NO<sub>x</sub> and PM emissions. Rule 4354 limits NO<sub>x</sub>, oxides of sulfur (SO<sub>x</sub>), PM<sub>10</sub>, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from glass melting furnaces. EPA’s technical support document (TSD) has more information about this rule.