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 have determined that it 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 will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed 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

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

This proposed rule is not a "significant energy action" 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.lD, 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. This proposed rule promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. 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 § 117.1005 to read as follows:

#### §117.1005 Chincoteague Channel.

The draw of the SR 175 Bridge, mile 3.5, at Chincoteague shall open on demand; except from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. on the last consecutive Wednesday and Thursday in July the bridge need not open.

Dated: January 8, 2015.

#### Stephen P. Metruck,

Rear Admiral, United States Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District. [FR Doc. 2015–01333 Filed 1–23–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0033; FRL-9921-78-Region 6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; General Definitions

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the New Mexico State Implementation Plan (SIP) related to the General Definitions section of the New Mexico SIP that were submitted by the State of New Mexico on June 11, 2009. EPA has evaluated the SIP revisions for New Mexico and determined these revisions are consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (Act or CAA). EPA is proposing approval under section 110 of the Act.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before February 25, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Ms. Tracie Donaldson, Air Permits Section (6PD–R), Environmental Protection Agency, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the ADDRESSES section of

the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Tracie Donaldson, (214) 665–6633; email address donaldson.tracie@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: January 6, 2015.

#### Ron Curry,

Regional Administrator, Region 6. [FR Doc. 2015–00773 Filed 1–23–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[EPA-R04-RCRA-2014-0710; FRL-9921-91-Region 4]

### Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Georgia has applied to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for final authorization of changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). These changes correspond to certain Federal rules promulgated between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2011 (also known as RCRA Clusters XVIII through XXI). With this proposed rule, EPA is proposing to grant final authorization to Georgia for these changes.

**DATES:** Comments must be received in writing by February 25, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-

RCRA-2014-0710, by one of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
  - Email: gleaton.gwen@epa.gov.
- Fax: (404) 562–9964 (prior to faxing, please notify the EPA contact listed below).
- Mail: Send written comments to Gwendolyn Gleaton, Permits and State Programs Section, RCRA Programs and Materials Management Branch, RCRA Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.
- Hand Delivery or Courier: Deliver your comments to Gwendolyn Gleaton, Permits and State Programs Section, RCRA Programs and Materials Management Branch, RCRA Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Please see the immediate final rule in the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gwendolyn Gleaton, Permits and State Programs Section, RCRA Programs and Materials Management Branch, RCRA Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960; telephone number: (404) 562–8500; fax number: (404) 562–9964; email address: gleaton.gwen@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Along with this proposed rule, EPA is publishing an immediate final rule in the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's Federal Register pursuant to which EPA is authorizing these changes. EPA did not issue a proposed rule before today because EPA believes this action is not controversial and does not expect comments that oppose it. EPA has explained the reasons for this authorization in the direct final rule. Unless EPA receives written comments that oppose this authorization during the comment period, the direct final rule in today's Federal Register will become effective on the date it establishes, and EPA will not take further action on this proposal. If EPA receives comments that oppose this action, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will then respond to public comments

in a later final rule based on this proposed rule. You may not have another opportunity to comment on these State program changes. If you want to comment on this action, you must do so at this time. For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register**.

Dated: January 13, 2015.

#### Heather McTeer Toney,

 $Regional\ Administrator\ Region\ 4.$  [FR Doc. 2015–01039 Filed 1–23–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 14-255; RM-11742; DA 15-12]

# Radio Broadcasting Services; Shelter Island, New York

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document requests comments on a Petition for Rule Making filed by Red Wolf Broadcasting Corporation, proposing to amend the FM Table of Allotments, § 73.202(b) of the Commission's rules, by allotting Channel 277A at Shelter Island, New York, as a first local service. A staff engineering analysis indicates that Channel 277A can be allotted to Shelter Island consistent with the minimum distance separation requirements of the Commission's rules with a site restriction located 12 kilometers (7.5 miles) south of the community. The reference coordinates are 40-57-54 NL and 72-22-59 WL.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before March 2, 2015, and reply comments on or before March 17, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner as follows: Scott Woodworth, Esq., Edinger Associates PLLC, 1875 I Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20006.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Rolanda F. Smith, Media Bureau, (202) 418–2700.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MB Docket No. 14–255, adopted January 8, 2015, and