

This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rulemaking, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

Unfunded Mandates

This rulemaking will not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which

is the subject of this rulemaking, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 925

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: February 13, 2018.

Alfred L. Clayborne,
Regional Director, Mid-Continent Region.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR part 925 is amended as set forth below:

PART 925—MISSOURI

■ 1. The authority citation for part 925 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*

■ 2. Section 925.15 is amended in the table by adding an entry in chronological order by “Date of final publication” to read as follows:

§ 925.15 Approval of Missouri regulatory program amendments.

* * * * *

Original amendment submission date	Date of final publication	Citation/description
April 18, 2014	May 17, 2018	10 CSR 40–6.030(1)(B)1., 3., (2)(A), and (4)(C); 6.070(7)(C), (8)(M), (N), (11)(A)4., and (B); 6.100(1)(B) and (2)(A); 8.030(6)(G) and (H); and 8.040(5)(B).

■ 3. Section 925.16 is amended by adding paragraphs (v) and (w) to read as follows:

§ 925.16 Required program amendments.

* * * * *

(v) By November 19, 2018, Missouri shall submit a proposed amendment, or a description of an amendment to be proposed, along with a timetable for enactment, that will add a counterpart to 30 CFR 778.11(b)(4), pertaining to the requirement for applicant and operator information provided in the permit application, at 10 CSR 40–6.030 and 10 CSR 40–6.100.

(w) By November 19, 2018, Missouri shall submit a proposed amendment, or a description of an amendment to be proposed, along with a timetable for enactment, that will add a counterpart to 30 CFR 778.11(d)(1), pertaining to the requirement to include telephone numbers for certain individuals in the permit application, at 10 CSR 40–6.030(1)(B)–(C) and 10 CSR 40–6.100(1)(B)–(C).

[FR Doc. 2018–10482 Filed 5–16–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

32 CFR Part 733

[Docket ID: USN–2017–HQ–0006]

RIN 0703–AA96

Assistance to and Support of Dependents; Paternity Complaints

AGENCY: Department of the Navy (DoN), DoD.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule removes DoD’s regulation requiring naval personnel to provide support to dependents. It has been determined that the content of this part is internal DoD policy, and while that policy is publicly available, the part should be removed.

DATES: This rule is effective on May 17, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: CDR Amanda Myers, 703–697–1311.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: It has been determined that publication of this CFR part removal for public comment is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to public interest since it is based on removing DoD internal policies and procedures that are publically available on the Department’s website.

This part is proprietary or of unique interest to the Department of the Navy. The Military Personnel Manual (MILPERSMAN) (for the Navy) (available at <http://www.public.navy.mil/bupers-npc/>

[reference/milpersman/pages/default.aspx](http://reference.milpersman/pages/default.aspx)) and the Marine Corps Manual for Legal Administration (LEGADMINMAN) (for the Marine Corps) (available at <http://www.marines.mil/Portals/59/MCOP5800.16AWCH1-7.pdf>) are readily available online and used by commands as administrative tools to determine equitable support when there is no competent court order. There is no right afforded to the public (specifically, dependents) either by statute or internal service regulation. The MILPERSMAN and LEGADMINMAN are clear that the guidelines contained therein are tools that a commander may use to ensure good order and discipline within the unit. For these reasons, this part has been determined to be internal DoD policy and as such, it does not fall under the criteria of rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act.

This rule is not significant under Executive Order (E.O.) 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review,” therefore, E.O. 13771, “Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs” does not apply.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 733

Alimony, Child support, Claims, Military personnel, Wages.

PART 733—[REMOVED]

■ Accordingly, by the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301, 32 CFR part 733 is removed.

Dated: May 9, 2018.

E.K. Baldini,

*Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate
General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register
Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2018-10587 Filed 5-16-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0482; FRL-9978-16-OAR]

Air Plan Approval; Oregon; Regional Haze Progress Report

AGENCY: Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving a revision to the Oregon regional haze State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the state on July 18, 2017. Oregon submitted its Regional Haze Progress Report (“progress report” or “report”) and a negative declaration stating that further revision of the existing regional haze SIP is not needed at this time. Oregon submitted both the progress report and the negative declaration in the form of implementation plan revisions as required by federal regulations. The progress report addresses the federal Regional Haze Rule requirements under the Clean Air Act to submit a report describing progress in achieving reasonable progress goals established for regional haze and a determination of the adequacy of the state’s existing plan addressing regional haze.

DATES: This final rule is effective June 18, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0482. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *e.g.*, CBI or other information the disclosure of which is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and is publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Hunt at (206) 553-0256, or hunt.jeff@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document wherever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, it is intended to refer to the EPA.

I. Background Information

On March 19, 2018, the EPA proposed to approve Oregon’s Regional Haze Progress Report (83 FR 11927). An explanation of the Clean Air Act requirements, a detailed analysis of the submittal, and the EPA’s reasons for proposing approval were provided in the notice of proposed rulemaking, and will not be restated here. The public comment period for the proposal ended April 18, 2018.

II. Response to Comments

We received three comments on the rulemaking. After reviewing the comments, we have determined that the comments are outside the scope of our proposed action and fail to identify any material issue necessitating a response. For more information, please see our memorandum included in the docket for this action.

III. Final Action

The EPA is approving the Oregon Regional Haze Progress Report, submitted on July 18, 2017, as meeting the applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act and the federal Regional Haze Rule, as set forth in 40 CFR 51.308(g). The EPA has determined that the existing regional haze SIP is adequate to meet the state’s visibility goals and requires no substantive revision at this time, as set forth in 40 CFR 51.308(h). We have also determined that Oregon fulfilled the requirements in 40 CFR 51.308(i) regarding state coordination with Federal Land Managers.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Clean Air 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 Clean Air Act. 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 actions such as 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.*);

- does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);

- does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);

- is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);

- is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);

- is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because this action does not involve technical standards; and

- does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land and is also not approved to apply in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of