

subject to U.S. jurisdiction is authorized.

■ 3. Add new § 515.579 to subpart E to read as follows:

§ 515.579 Third-country diplomatic and consular funds transfers.

Depository institutions, as defined in § 515.333, are authorized to process funds transfers for the operating expenses or other official business of third-country diplomatic or consular missions in Cuba.

Dated: November 26, 2012.

Adam J. Szubin,

Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.

[FR Doc. 2012–29100 Filed 11–30–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG–2012–0386]

RIN 1625–AA08

Special Local Regulation; Kelley's Island Swim, Lake Erie; Kelley's Island, Lakeside, OH

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is amending its regulations in 33 CFR part 100 by adding a Special Local Regulation within the Captain of the Port Detroit Zone. This regulation is intended to regulate vessel movement in portions of Lake Erie during the annual Kelley's Island Swim. This special local regulated area is necessary to protect swimmers from vessel traffic.

DATES: This final rule is effective January 2, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket number USCG–2012–0386. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on “Open Docket Folder” on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or

email LTJG Benjamin Nessia, Response Department, Marine Safety Unit Toledo, Coast Guard; telephone (419) 418–6040, email Benjamin.B.Nessia@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
TFR Temporary Final Rule

A. Regulatory History and Information

On June 5, 2012, the Coast Guard published an NPRM entitled Special Local Regulation; Kelley's Island Swim, Lake Erie; Kelley's Island, Lakeside, OH in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 33130). We did not receive any comments in response to the proposed rule. No public meeting was requested and none was held.

B. Basis and Purpose

Each year an organized swimming event takes place in Lake Erie in which individuals swim the four miles between Lakeside and Kelley's Island, OH. The Captain of the Port Detroit has determined that swimmers in close proximity to watercraft and in the shipping channel pose extra and unusual hazards to public safety and property. Thus, the Captain of the Port Detroit has determined that establishing a Special Local Regulation around the location of the race's course will help ensure the safety of persons and property at these events and help minimize the associated risks.

C. Discussion of Comment, Changes and the Final Rule

To mitigate the dangers presented by a large number of swimmers crossing a shipping channel during a four mile competition, the Captain of the Port Detroit has determined that establishing a Special Local Regulation is necessary. Thus, the Coast Guard is amending 33 CFR part 100 by adding § 100.921 to establish a permanent Special Local Regulation. The affected area encompasses all the waters of Lake Erie between Lakeside, OH and Kelley's Island, OH bound by a line extending from a point on land at the Lakeside dock at positions 41°32'51.96" N; 082°45'3.15" W and 41°32'52.21" N; 082°45'2.19" W and a line extending to Kelley's Island dock to positions 41°35'24.59" N; 082°42'16.61" W and 41°35'24.44" N; 082°42'16.04" W (Datum: NAD 83). The precise times and

dates of enforcement for this regulated area will be determined annually.

The Captain of the Port Detroit will use all appropriate means to notify the public when the Special Local Regulation in this rule will be enforced. Such means may include publication in the **Federal Register**, Broadcast Notice to Mariners, Local Notice to Mariners, or, upon request, by facsimile (fax). Also, the Captain of the Port will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners notifying the public if enforcement of the affected area in this section is cancelled prematurely.

No comments were received in response to and there are no changes to the rule as proposed by the NPRM published June 5, 2012.

D. Regulatory Analyses

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

1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not “significant” under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We conclude that this rule is not a significant regulatory action because we anticipate 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 regulated area established by this rule will be relatively small and enforced for relatively short time. Also, the regulated area is designed to minimize its impact on navigable waters. Furthermore, this regulated area has been designed to allow vessels to transit the area affected by this regulation, provided vessel operators meet the requirements set forth by this rule. Thus, restrictions on vessel movements within any particular area are expected to be minimal. On the whole, the Coast Guard expects insignificant adverse impact to mariners from the activation of this regulated area.

2. Impact on Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this 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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in the above portion of Lake Erie, Lakeside, OH between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. on the dates of the event, which will be determined annually. The special local regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This rule will be in effect for 4 hours on the day of the event, and vessels wishing to transit through the affected area may do so with caution. The Coast Guard will give notice to the public via a local Notice to Mariners that the regulation is in effect. Additionally, the COTP will suspend enforcement of the special local regulation if the event for which the special local regulation is established ends earlier than the time expected.

3. 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 rule. If this 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**, above.

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.

4. Collection of Information

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

5. 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 rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

6. 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.

7. Taking of Private Property

This rule will 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.

8. Civil Justice Reform

This 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.

9. Protection of Children

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

10. Indian Tribal Governments

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 Federal Government and Indian tribes.

11. Energy Effects

This action is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

12. Technical Standards

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

13. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide 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. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(h) of the Instruction and during the annual permitting process for this dragon boat racing event an environmental analysis will be conducted to include the effects of this Special Local Regulation.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

PART 100—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233.

■ 2. Add § 100.921 to read as follows:

§ 100.921 Special Local Regulation; Kelley’s Island Swim, Lake Erie, Lakeside, OH.

(a) *Regulated area.* The regulated area includes all U.S. navigable waters of lake Erie, Lakeside, OH, contained by a line connecting the following points: two points on land at the Lakeside dock, 41°32′51.96″ N/082°45′3.15″ W and 41°32′52.21″ N/082°45′2.19″ W, and two points on Kelley’s Island at the Kelley’s Island Dock, 41°35′24.59″ N/082°42′16.61″ W, and 41°35′24.44″ N/082°42′16.04″ W (Datum: NAD 83).

(b) *Special Local Regulations.* The regulations of § 100.901 apply. Vessels transiting within the regulated area shall travel at a no-wake speed and remain vigilant for swimmers. Additionally, vessels shall yield right-of-way for event participants and event safety craft and shall follow directions given by event representatives during the event.

(c) *Enforcement period.* These Special Local Regulations will be enforced annually. The exact enforcement date and times will be published annually in the **Federal Register** via a Notice of Enforcement.

Dated: November 19, 2012.

J.E. Ogden,

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

[FR Doc. 2012–29134 Filed 11–30–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2010–0954; FRL–9757–3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan; Federal Implementation Plan for Regional Haze

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is finalizing action on a State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal from the State of Michigan dated November 5, 2010, addressing regional haze for the first implementation period (ending in 2018). This action is being taken in accordance with the Clean Air Act and EPA's rules for states to prevent and remedy future and existing anthropogenic impairment of visibility in mandatory Class I areas through a regional haze program. EPA finds that Michigan meets several regional haze planning requirements, including identification of affected Class I areas, provision of a monitoring plan, consultation with other parties, and adoption of a long-term strategy providing for reasonable progress except to the extent Michigan's plan failed to require best available retrofit technology (BART). As part of this action, EPA finds that the State's submittal addressed BART for some sources but failed to satisfy BART for two sources, namely St. Marys Cement (SMC) and Escanaba Paper Company (Escanaba Paper). EPA is promulgating a Federal

Implementation Plan (FIP) including nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emission limits for these two sources in addition to sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emission limits for SMC to satisfy these requirements.

DATES: This final rule is effective on January 2, 2013.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2010–0954. All documents are listed on the www.regulations.gov Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, i.e., 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 either electronically through www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. We recommend that you telephone Charles Hatten, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 886–6031 before visiting the Region 5 office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Hatten, Environmental Engineer, Control Strategies Section, at 312–886–6031, hatten.charles@epa.gov, regarding all elements of the action, or John Summerhays, Environmental Scientist, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, at 312–886–6067, summerhays.john@epa.gov, regarding issues relating to BART. Both contacts may be reached by mail at Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

- I. Synopsis of Proposed Rule
- II. Public Comments and EPA's Responses
- III. What are EPA's final BART determinations?
 - A. SMC
 - B. Escanaba Paper
- IV. What actions is EPA taking?
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Synopsis of Proposed Rule

Michigan submitted a plan to address regional haze on November 5, 2010. This plan was intended to address the requirements in Clean Air Act section 169A, as interpreted in EPA's Regional Haze Rule as codified in Title 40 Code

of Federal Regulations (CFR) 51.308. The Regional Haze Rule was promulgated on July 1, 1999 (64 FR 35713), with further significant provisions promulgated on July 6, 2005 (70 FR 39104), that provided guidance related to BART.

On August 6, 2012 (77 FR 46912), EPA proposed action on Michigan's submittal addressing the Regional Haze Rule for the first implementation period, ending in 2018. That action described the nature of the regional haze problem and the statutory and regulatory background for EPA's review of Michigan's regional haze plan. The action also described at length the regional haze requirements, including requirements for mandating BART, consultation with other states in establishing goals representing reasonable further progress in mitigating anthropogenic visibility impairment, and adoption of limitations as necessary to implement a long-term strategy for reducing visibility impairment.

EPA proposed to approve Michigan's identification of five non-electric generating unit (non-EGU) sources as having sufficient impact to warrant being subject to emission limits representing BART. The five non-EGU BART-eligible sources included Lafarge Midwest, Inc.; SMC; Escanaba Paper (referenced in the proposed rulemaking as NewPage Paper Company); Smurfit Stone Container Corp.; and Tilden Mining Company.

Michigan made source-specific determinations of BART for these non-EGU sources. In the August 6, 2012 proposed rulemaking, EPA proposed to approve Michigan's BART requirements for some of the non-EGUs, based on a Federal consent decree requiring new controls for SO₂ and NO_x emissions for the Lafarge Midwest plant and based on existing limits at Smurfit Stone. EPA proposed to disapprove Michigan's plan for BART at SMC's facility in Charlevoix (SMC-Charlevoix) and at Escanaba Paper's facility in Escanaba. Specifically, EPA proposed to disapprove the NO_x and SO₂ BART determination for the cement kiln and associated equipment at SMC-Charlevoix and the NO_x BART determination for Boiler 8 and 9 at Escanaba Paper. Further, EPA proposed a FIP to impose BART NO_x and SO₂ limits for the cement kiln and associated equipment for SMC-Charlevoix, and BART NO_x limits for Boilers 8 and 9 at Escanaba Paper. EPA proposed no action regarding Tilden Mining, since that facility is a taconite plant that is being addressed in a separate action that also addresses taconite plants in Minnesota.