

consumers associated with such ancillary credit-related products.⁷

Based on available data, the Department estimates the annual total market revenue for these products at \$6,116.5 and \$3,761.7 million, respectively, or a total of \$9,878.1 million. The Department estimates that the covered borrower market for these products is .95 percent of the total market for these products, as covered borrower households represent .95 percent of total U.S. households, which implies a total possible market for covered borrowers of approximately \$93.8 million. Of these covered borrowers, the Department estimates that only a very small portion of these consumers could include the Service members and their families covered by the MLA. As an example, if the typical consumer of such a product is an enlisted Service member under 25, does not have a college degree, and owns a car, the possible market value relevant to the MLA and this interpretive rule might be more like \$21.7 million.⁸ Within this further market segment, an undetermined percentage of these products actually offer interest rates greater than 36 percent and would actually be purchased by this group, which would represent the share of products that fall under the MLA requirement. Generally, in this and other possible scenarios across age groups and other demographic characteristics, the Department anticipates the universe of products that

⁷ See Experian, "State of the Automotive Finance Market: A Look at Loans and Leases in Q4 2016," at 11, 19 (2016); Colonnade Advisors, "F&I Products Industry Market Commentary," at 2 (2016), available at coladv.com/wp-content/uploads/FI-Product-Industry-Report-April-2016.pdf; F&I and Showroom, "Tracking F&I Performance," <http://www.fi-magazine.com/article/story/2012/01/tracking-fi-i-performance.aspx> (last visited Sept. 20, 2017). The Department's research indicates that the available data regarding credit-related ancillary products in the auto lending marketplace are limited and primarily derived from informal surveys and reports.

⁸ Approximately 82 percent of Service members are enlisted; 91 percent do not have college degrees; 44 percent are under 25 years of age; and 67 percent of those under 25 own or lease at least one vehicle. The intersection of these portions creates a factor of approximately .22, which can be applied to the total market value of approximately \$93.8 million, resulting in a possible market segment of approximately \$21.7 million. This segment would then require further apportionment to reflect the share of the products therein that offer interest rates above the 36 percent cap. See 2015 Demographics Profile of the Military Community, Chapter 2, Department of Defense, available at <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2015-Demographics-Report.pdf> and Table 3202. Consumer units with reference person under age 25 by income before taxes: Average annual expenditures, Consumer Expenditure Survey, 2015–2016, Bureau of Labor Statistics, available at <https://www.bls.gov/cex/2016/CrossTabs/agebyinc/xunder25.PDF>.

exceed 36 percent interest in this category is very small and possibly negligible, especially considering the time that has passed since the final rule was issued. This number is anticipated to be even more likely to be negligible when considering the number of covered borrowers who would choose to consume this product particularly in light of the existing MLA requirement.

2 U.S.C. Ch. 25, "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act"

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532) requires agencies to assess anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule whose mandates require spending in any 1 year of \$100 million in 1995 dollars, updated annually for inflation. In 2014, that threshold is approximately \$141 million. This rule will not mandate any requirements for State, local, or tribal governments, nor will it affect private sector costs.

Public Law 96–354, "Regulatory Flexibility Act" (5 U.S.C. Ch. 6)

The Department of Defense certifies that this rule is not subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601) because it would not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended, does not require us to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Public Law 96–511, "Paperwork Reduction Act" (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

This rule does not impose reporting and record keeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Executive Order 13132, "Federalism"

This rule was analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 13132 ("Federalism"). It has been determined that it does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism summary impact statement. This rule has no substantial effect on the States, or on the current Federal-State relationship, or on the current distribution of power and responsibilities among the various local officials. Nothing in this rule preempts any State law or regulation. Therefore, the Department did not consult with State and local officials because it was not necessary.

Dated: December 11, 2017.

Patricia L. Toppings,
OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2017–26974 Filed 12–13–17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2017–1053]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Delaware River, Pipeline Removal, Marcus Hook, PA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Interim rule and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This interim rule modifies and extends the effective period of the existing temporary safety zone encompassing all navigable waters within a 250-yard radius of Commerce Construction vessels and machinery conducting diving and pipeline removal operations in the Delaware River, in the vicinity of Anchorage 7, near Marcus Hook, PA. The safety zone is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by diving and pipeline removal operations. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Delaware Bay. We invite your comments on this rulemaking.

DATES: This rule is effective without actual notice from December 14, 2017. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from December 9, 2017, through December 14, 2017. Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before January 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of Docket Number USCG–2017–1053. 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 submit comments, identified by docket number, using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for

further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this rulemaking, call or email Petty Officer Amanda Boone, Waterways Management Branch, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Delaware Bay; telephone (215) 271-4889, email *Amanda.N.Boone@uscg.mil*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
COTP Captain of the Port
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Regulatory History and Information

On November 28, 2017, the Coast Guard published a temporary safety zone titled Safety Zone; Delaware River, Pipeline Removal, Marcus Hook, PA (82 FR 56170). The temporary safety zone established a safety zone from November 21, 2017, through December 8, 2017. The safety zone covers all navigable waters within 250 yards of vessels and machinery being used by personnel to conduct diving and pipe removal operations. Due to unforeseen issues with the operation, the expected dates of work have been changed and extended to February 28, 2018.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Delaying the effective date of this rule would be impracticable because immediate action is needed to address the potential safety hazards associated with diving and pipeline removal operations.

III. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The Captain of the Port Delaware Bay has determined that potential hazards associated with diving and pipe removal operations currently underway in the Delaware River, will be a safety concern for anyone within a 250-yard radius of diving and pipe removal vessels and machinery. This rule is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone while the operations are being conducted.

IV. Discussion of Comments, Changes, and the Interim Rule

Only two changes have been made to the existing temporary rule. First, the

original end date for enforcement of the safety zone was December 8, 2017, and the end date for the enforcement of the safety zone is being changed to February 28, 2018. Second, the enforcement period regulatory text, paragraph (d), has been amended to indicate what time of day the zone will be enforced. This timeframe was discussed in the regulatory analyses statements of the temporary final rule but was not included in the regulatory text itself.

This rule establishes a safety zone from December 9, 2017, through February 28, 2018. The safety zone will cover all navigable waters within 250 yards of vessels and machinery being used by personnel to conduct diving and pipe removal operations.

V. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders (E.O.s) related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and E.O.s and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

E.O.s 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. E.O. 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under E.O. 12866. Accordingly, the 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 E.O. 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location and duration of the security zone. Vessel traffic will be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the Delaware River from December 9, 2017, through February 28, 2018. Moreover, the Coast Guard will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF-FM marine channel 16, Local Notice to Mariners, and Marine Safety Information Bulletin about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zone.

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 would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels that intend to transit the security zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section V.A above this rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

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.

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

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 would 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 Management 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 made a preliminary determination 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 that will prohibit entry within 250 yards of vessels and machinery being used by personnel to conduct diving and pipe removal operations. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(d) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. A Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this rule.

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.

VI. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period.

Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number USCG–2017–1053 for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the **Federal Register** (70 FR 15086).

Documents mentioned in this rule as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

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.T05–1053, to read as follows:

§ 165.T05–1053 Safety Zone, Delaware River; Pipeline Removal; Marcus Hook, PA.

(a) *Location.* The following areas are safety zones: All navigable waters within 250 yards of the towing vessel JOKER, Commerce Construction crane barge KELLY, and associated diving and pipe removal vessels, as well as any

associated equipment, operating in Marcus Hook Range and Anchorage No. 7 near Marcus Hook, PA, on the Delaware River.

(b) *Definitions*—(1) *Captain of the Port* means the Commander, Sector Delaware Bay or any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port to act on his behalf.

(2) *Designated representative* means any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been authorized by the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay, to assist with the enforcement of safety zones described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) *Regulations.* The general safety zone regulations found in 33 CFR part 165 subpart C apply to the safety zone created by this section.

(1) Entry into or transiting within either safety zone is prohibited unless vessels obtain permission from the Captain of the Port via VHF–FM channel 16, or make satisfactory passing arrangements via VHF–FM channels 13 or 80 with the towing vessel JOKER per this section and the rules of the Road (33 CFR subchapter E). Vessels requesting to transit shall contact the towing vessel JOKER on channel 13 or 80 at least 1 hour, as well as 30 minutes, prior to arrival.

(2) Vessels granted permission to enter and transit the safety zone must do so in accordance with any directions or orders of the Captain of the Port, his designated representative, or the towing vessel JOKER. No person or vessel may enter or remain in a safety zone without permission from the Captain of the Port or the towing vessel JOKER.

(3) There are three sections of pipeline that will be removed. The first two sections of pipeline to be removed are in Anchorage No. 7, Marcus Hook Anchorage, in the Delaware River. During removal of these sections of pipeline, the safety zone will restrict vessels from anchoring in the lower portion of Anchorage No. 7.

(4) During removal of the third section of pipeline, operations will be conducted within the main navigational channel and vessels will be required to transit through the lower portion of Anchorage No. 7. The Coast Guard will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16, Local Notice to Mariners, and Marine Safety Information Bulletin further defining specific work locations and traffic patterns.

(5) All vessels must operate at the minimum safe speed necessary to maintain steerage and reduce wake.

(6) This section applies to all vessels that intend to transit through the safety

zone except vessels that are engaged in the following operations: enforcement of laws, service of aids to navigation, and emergency response.

(d) *Enforcement periods.* This section will be enforced from December 8, 2017, through February 28, 2018. Enforcement will generally be between the hours of 5 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Sunday, while the zone is in effect.

Dated: December 8, 2017.

Scott E. Anderson,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay.

[FR Doc. 2017-26935 Filed 12-13-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0677; FRL-9971-88-Region 10]

Finding of Failure To Submit a Section 110 State Implementation Plan for Interstate Transport for the 2012 Annual National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particles

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action finding that Washington State failed to submit an infrastructure State Implementation Plan (SIP) to satisfy certain interstate transport requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) with respect to the 2012 annual fine particles (PM_{2.5}) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). Specifically, these requirements pertain to significant contribution to nonattainment, or interference with maintenance, of the 2012 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS in other states. This finding of failure to submit establishes a 2-year deadline for the EPA to promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) to address the interstate transport SIP requirements pertaining to significant contribution to nonattainment and interference with maintenance unless, prior to the EPA promulgating a FIP, the state submits, and the EPA approves, a SIP that meets these requirements.

DATES: This final rule is effective on January 16, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0677. All documents in the dockets are listed on <http://www.regulations.gov>. 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, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly-available docket materials are available at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Region 10, Office of Air and Waste, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98101. The EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the individuals listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to view the hard copy of the docket. You may view the hard copy of the docket Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hunt, Air Planning Unit, Office of Air and Waste (OAW-150), EPA, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 900, Seattle, Washington 98101; (206) 553-0256; hunt.jeff@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. General Information
- II. Background and Overview
- III. Finding of Failure To Submit for Washington State
- IV. Environmental Justice Considerations
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. General Information

A. Notice and Comment Under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA)

Section 553 of the APA, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B), provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. The EPA has determined that there is good cause for making this rule final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment because no significant EPA judgment is involved in making a finding of failure to submit SIPs, or elements of SIPs, required by the CAA, where states have made no submissions or incomplete submissions, to meet the requirement. Thus, notice and public procedure are unnecessary. The EPA finds that this constitutes good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B).

B. How is the Preamble organized?

II. Background and Overview

A. Interstate Transport SIPs

CAA section 110(a) imposes an obligation upon states to submit SIPs that provide for the implementation, maintenance and enforcement of a new or revised NAAQS within 3 years

following the promulgation of that NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific requirements that states must meet in these SIP submissions, as applicable. The EPA refers to this type of SIP submission as the “infrastructure” SIP because it ensures that states can implement, maintain and enforce the air standards. Within these requirements, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) contains requirements to address interstate transport of NAAQS pollutants. A SIP revision submitted for this sub-section is referred to as an “interstate transport SIP.” In turn, section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) requires that such a plan contain adequate provisions to prohibit emissions from the state that will contribute significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in any other state (“prong 1”) or interfere with maintenance of the NAAQS in any other state (“prong 2”). Interstate transport prongs 1 and 2, also called the “good neighbor” provisions, are the requirements relevant to this finding.

Pursuant to CAA section 110(k)(1)(B), the EPA must determine no later than 6 months after the date by which a state is required to submit a SIP whether a state has made a submission that meets the minimum completeness criteria established per section 110(k)(1)(A). The EPA refers to the determination that a state has not submitted a SIP submission that meets the minimum completeness criteria as a “finding of failure to submit.” If the EPA finds a state has failed to submit a SIP to meet its statutory obligation to address section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), pursuant to section 110(c)(1) the EPA has not only the authority, but the obligation, to promulgate a FIP within 2 years to address the CAA requirement. This finding therefore starts a 2-year clock for promulgation by the EPA of a FIP, in accordance with section 110(c)(1), unless prior to such promulgation the state submits, and the EPA approves, a submittal from the state to meet the requirements of section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) for the 2012 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The EPA will work with the state subject to this finding of failure to submit and provide assistance as necessary to help the state develop an approvable submittal in a timely manner. The EPA notes this action does not start a mandatory sanctions clock pursuant to CAA section 179 because this finding of failure to submit does not pertain to a part D plan for nonattainment areas required under section 110(a)(2)(I) or a SIP call pursuant section 110(k)(5).