

intrude on state authority and group health plan and health insurance issuer discretion; and even if the Departments were prepared to extend their authority in this manner, the establishment and maintenance of a database or the assessment, validation, and monitoring of a publicly available database would be costly and time-consuming. Further, there is no indication that such a database would provide a better method for determining UCR amounts than the methods group health plans and health insurance issuers currently use. The Departments therefore decline to adopt the suggestions of ACEP and other commenters that made similar suggestions regarding the GOT regulation.

#### IV. Collection of Information Requirements

This document does not impose information collection requirements, that is, reporting, recordkeeping or third-party disclosure requirements. Consequently, there is no need for review by the Office of Management and Budget under the authority of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*).

**Kirsten B. Wielobob,**

*Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service.*

Approved: April 25, 2018.

**David J. Kautter,**

*Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Tax Policy).*

Approved: April 25, 2018.

Signed this 25th day of April 2018.

**Preston Rutledge,**

*Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.*

Dated: April 25, 2018.

**Seema Verma,**

*Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.*

Dated: April 27, 2018.

**Alex M. Azar II,**

*Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.*

[FR Doc. 2018-09369 Filed 4-30-18; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4120-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2018-0397]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zone; Straits of Mackinac, Mackinaw City, MI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of construction equipment vessels conducting operations in the Straits of Mackinac. The safety zone is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment from potential hazards created by surveillance and repair work to electric utility cables that cross the Straits of Mackinac. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Sault Sainte Marie or a designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from May 3, 2018 until October 30, 2018. It will be enforced with actual notice from April 30, 2018, until May 3, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG-2018-0397 in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email LTJG Sean V. Murphy, Sector Sault Sainte Marie Waterways Management Chief, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 906-635-3319, email [ssmprevention@uscg.mil](mailto:ssmprevention@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
 DHS Department of Homeland Security  
 FR Federal Register  
 NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
 § Section  
 U.S.C. United States Code  
 ROV Remotely Operated Underwater Vehicle

##### II. Background Information and Regulatory History

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the

Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency, for good cause, finds that those procedures are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because visual imagery and repair of damage to the utility cables is imperative to further mitigate any risks to the environment and the public. Emergent conditions require immediate marine surveying of the area due to damage to utility cables in the Straits of Mackinac. It is impractical to publish an NPRM because of the urgent need to survey the utility cables damaged.

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 obtain visual imagery of damage to the utility cables in order to successfully effect repairs and further mitigate any risks to the environment and the public.

##### III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The Captain of the Port Sault Sainte Marie (COTP) has determined that construction vessels operating in the Straits of Mackinac, will be a safety and navigation concern for any vessel within a 500-yard radius of the operations. This rule is needed to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in the navigable waters within the safety zone while the operations are ongoing.

##### IV. Discussion of the Rule

This rule establishes a safety zone from April 30, 2018 until October 30, 2018. The safety zone will cover all navigable waters within 500 yards of construction equipment vessel working and surveying damaged utility cables in the Straits of Mackinac. The duration of the zone is intended to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in these navigable waters while operations are ongoing. The zone will be enforced at various times throughout this period. Local Broadcast Notice to mariners, via VHF-FM marine channel 16, will notify mariners when the construction vessels are conducting operations and the zone is being enforced. No vessel or person will be permitted to enter the safety zone

without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative.

## V. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

### A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 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. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this 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 Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, and location of the safety zone. Vessel traffic will be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the Straits of Mackinac during a time of year when vessel traffic is normally low. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF-FM marine channel 16 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 will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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

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.

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.

### C. Collection of Information

This rule will 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 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 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 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 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 above.

### 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 will 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 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 determined 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 500 yards of construction equipment vessels in the Straits of Mackinac surveying and conducting repairs to damaged utility cables. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60 (a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. A Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

### G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protestors. 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.

### 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.T09–0397 to read as follows:

**§ 165.T09–0397 Safety Zone; Straits of Mackinac, Mackinaw City, MI.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of the Straits of Mackinac, from surface to bottom, within a 500 yard radius around construction equipment vessels.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard petty officer, warrant officer, or commissioned officer and any Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Sault Sainte Marie (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative by VHF radio channel 16 or call 906–635–3319. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(d) *Enforcement periods.* This section is effective from April 30, 2018, until October 30, 2018. It will be enforced while construction vessels operate within the designated location in paragraph (a) of this section. Local Broadcast Notice to mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 will notify mariners when vessels are conducting operations.

Dated: April 30, 2018.

**Marko R. Broz,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Sector Sault Sainte Marie.*

[FR Doc. 2018–09407 Filed 5–2–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

[EPA–R06–OAR–2015–0851; FRL–9977–02–Region 6]

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving portions of Louisiana's State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal and a technical supplement, that address a CAA requirement that SIPs account for potential interstate transport of air pollution that significantly contributes to nonattainment or interferes with maintenance of the 2012 fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in other states. EPA finds that emissions from Louisiana sources do not contribute significantly to nonattainment in, or interfere with maintenance by, any other state with regard to the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on June 4, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R06–OAR–2015–0851. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information 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 <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sherry Fuerst, 214–665–6454, [fuerst.sherry@epa.gov](mailto:fuerst.sherry@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document “we,” “us,” and “our” means the EPA.

**I. Background**

The background for this action is discussed in detail in our February 1, 2018 proposal (83 FR 4617). In that document we proposed to approve portions of Louisiana's State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal and a technical supplement, that address a CAA requirement that SIPs account for potential interstate transport of air pollution that significantly contributes to nonattainment or interferes with maintenance of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in other states. We proposed to determine that emissions from Louisiana sources do not contribute significantly to nonattainment in, or interfere with maintenance by, any other state with regard to the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

On March 6, 2018, we received six anonymous public comments on the proposed rulemaking action. The comments are posted to the docket (EPA–R06–OAR–2015–0851). Several of the commenters provided the air quality index for March 2, 2018 for various locations across the USA and compared them to various locations across Asia. Other commenters discussed the shortcomings of the tariffs and conflict minerals law. Such comments are not relevant to the Clean Air requirements being addressed here and are outside the scope of this specific rule making action.

**II. Final Action**

We are approving the portions of the December 11, 2015 Louisiana SIP revision pertaining to emissions that significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in other states and the supplemental information provided to us on July 7, 2017. We find that emissions from Louisiana sources do not contribute significantly to nonattainment in, or interfere with maintenance by, any other state with regard to the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

**III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);