

(b) For each commercial use request, fees will be limited to reasonable standard charges for document search, review, and duplication.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 10. Amend § 303.14 by revising paragraphs (a)(5)(i) and (ii) to read as follows:

**§ 303.14 Procedures for responding to a subpoena.**

(a) \* \* \*

(5) \* \* \*

(i) Congressional requests or subpoenas for testimony or documents;

(ii) Employees or former employees making appearances solely in their private capacity in legal or administrative proceedings that do not relate to the Agency (such as cases arising out of traffic accidents or domestic relations). Any question whether the appearance relates solely to the employee's or former employee's private capacity should be referred to the Office of the General Counsel.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: August 1, 2013.

**James Pimpedly,**

*Chief, Administrative Services, Management.*

[FR Doc. 2013-19050 Filed 8-6-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6051-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG-2012-1069]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zones; Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to disestablish the existing Safety Zone for the Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA. Since the implementation of the regulation, physical changes have occurred within the confines of the safety zone, making the provisions of the safety zone no longer applicable.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before September 6, 2013. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before August 28, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2012-1069 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal eRulemaking 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 four 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 rule, call or email Mr. Mark Cutter, Coast Guard Sector Boston Waterways Management Division, telephone 617-223-4000, email [Mark.E.Cutter@uscg.mil](mailto:Mark.E.Cutter@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Barbara Hairston, 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  
COTP Captain of the Port

##### **A. 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.

###### *1. Submitting Comments*

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG-2012-1069), 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 at via <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, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, 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 email address, or a telephone 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>, type the docket number (USCG-2012-1069) in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on the "Submit a Comment" on the line associated with this rulemaking.

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 comments 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.

###### *2. 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>, type the docket number (USCG-2012-1069) 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.

###### *3. 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).

###### *4. Public Meeting*

The Coast Guard does not currently plan to hold public meetings. However, a public meeting may be requested by using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why you believe a public meeting 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**.

## B. Regulatory History and Information

On Thursday, January 31, 2013, the Coast Guard published an Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 6782). The USCG received three written comments in response to this ANPRM. Also, the USCG held two public meetings in which verbal comments were received. The minutes of these public meetings are available in the docket. On the whole, the written and verbal comments received support the disestablishment of 33 CFR 165.120 and its safety zone. Moreover, no comment was received in favor of keeping this safety zone. The Coast Guard considered all comments when crafting this proposed rule.

## C. Basis and Purpose

The legal basis for the proposed rule is 33 U.S.C. 1231, 1233; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, and 160.5; Public Law 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to define regulatory safety zones.

The original Chelsea Street Bridge was a bascule-type bridge owned by the City of Boston and constructed in 1939. It spanned the Chelsea River providing a means for vehicles to travel between Chelsea, MA and East Boston, MA. Several petroleum-product transfer facilities are located on the Chelsea River, upstream and downstream of the Chelsea Street Bridge. Transit of tank vessels through the bridge is necessary to access the petroleum facilities upstream of the bridge. The narrow, ninety-six foot horizontal span created a narrow passage through the bridge for larger vessels. Adding to the difficulty is the close proximity of neighboring shore structures and, at times, vessels moored at the Sunoco Logistics facility downstream of the bridge on the East Boston side. These factors led to the establishment of the present safety zone regulation which restricts the passage of certain vessels through the Chelsea Street Bridge based on vessel dimensional criteria, assist tug support, and daylight restrictions.

Since the implementation of the regulations, physical changes have occurred within the confines of the safety zone. A new vertical lift span bridge with a 175-foot vertical clearance and a 175-foot horizontal navigable channel span has been constructed in place of the old Chelsea Street Bridge. The federal navigational channel has

been expanded to a width of 175 feet. Six new permanent fixed lighted aids to navigation structures have been installed in the immediate area of the bridge to best mark the new channel.

## D. Comments and Discussion of Proposed Rule

The three written comments received in the docket were all in favor of disestablishing the safety zone. Two of those written comments were from the Boston Harbor Pilots Association and there was one joint comment from the three oil terminals up river of the safety zone; Global Partners LP, Gulf Oil Limited Partnership, and Irving Oil Terminals Inc. All the verbal comments received in the public meetings were in favor of disestablishing the safety zone. These comments can be seen in the docket under meeting minutes.

For all of the reasons discussed above, the Coast Guard proposes to disestablish the safety zone contained in 33 CFR 165.120, Safety Zone: Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA by removing that section completely.

## E. Regulatory Analyses

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

### 1. 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, 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. We expect the economic impact of this rule to be minimal because removing this safety zone would lessen the restriction on vessels transiting this area.

### 2. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 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 proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: vessel owners and operators in the affected waterway.

The proposed rule would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because, as mentioned in the *Regulatory Planning and Review* section, it proposes to entirely remove 33 CFR 165.120 and its safety zone and thus, lessen the restriction on vessels transiting in the affected area.

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.

### 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 proposed rule so that. 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 under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. 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.

### 4. 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.).

### 5. Federalism

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 proposed rule under that Order and determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism.

### 6. 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.

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

#### 8. *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.

#### 9. *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.

#### 10. *Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks*

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.

#### 11. *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.

#### 12. *Energy Effects*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

#### 13. *Technical Standards*

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

#### 14. *Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed 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 may be one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment.

This proposed rule involves disestablishing a safety zone, so this action may be categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(g) of the Instruction.

We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

#### List of Subjects

##### 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine Safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, and 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; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

##### **§ 165.120 [Removed]**

■ 2. Remove § 165.120 Safety Zone: Chelsea River, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA.

Dated: July 22, 2013.

**J.C. O'Connor III,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Boston.*

[FR Doc. 2013–19104 Filed 8–6–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Parts 52 and 81**

[EPA–R05–OAR–2012–0564; FRL–9844–2]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Canton-Massillon Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Standards for Fine Particulate Matter**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** On June 26, 2012, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency submitted a request for EPA to redesignate the Canton-Massillon area (Stark County), Ohio, nonattainment area to attainment of the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour standards for fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). EPA is proposing to grant Ohio's request. EPA is proposing to determine that the Canton-Massillon area attains the 1997 annual and the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, based on the most recent three years of certified air quality data. EPA is proposing to approve, as revisions to the Ohio state implementation plan (SIP), the state's plan for maintaining the 1997 annual and 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS or standard) through 2025 for the area. EPA is proposing to approve the 2005 and 2008 emissions inventories for the Canton-Massillon area as meeting the comprehensive emissions inventory requirement of the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act). Ohio's maintenance plan submission includes a motor vehicle emission budget (MVEB) for the mobile source contribution of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) to the Canton-Massillon area for transportation conformity purposes; EPA is proposing to approve the MVEBs for 2015 and 2025 into the Ohio SIP for transportation conformity purposes.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 6, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2012–0564, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. *E-Mail*: [blakley.pamela@epa.gov](mailto:blakley.pamela@epa.gov).

3. *Fax*: (312) 692–2450.

4. *Mail*: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.