

**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.T08–0619 to read as follows:

**§ 165.T08–0619 Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Markers 94 to 95, New Orleans, LA.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of the Lower Mississippi River between mile marker (MM) 94 and MM 95 above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA.

(b) *Effective period.* This rule is effective from 9 p.m. through 10 p.m. on October 6, 2018.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector New Orleans (COTP) or designated representative. A designated representative is a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the U.S. Coast Guard assigned to units under the operational control of USCG Sector New Orleans.

(2) Vessels requiring entry into this safety zone must request permission from the COTP or a designated representative. They may be contacted on VHF–FM Channel 16 or 67.

(3) Persons and vessels permitted to enter this safety zone must transit at their slowest safe speed and comply with all lawful directions issued by the COTP or the designated representative.

(d) *Information broadcasts.* The COTP or a designated representative will inform the public of the enforcement times and date for this safety zone through Broadcast Notices to Mariners (BNMs), Local Notices to Mariners (LNMs), and/or Marine Safety Information Broadcasts (MSIBs) as appropriate.

Dated: July 12, 2018.

**Kristi M. Luttrell,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Sector New Orleans.*

[FR Doc. 2018–15439 Filed 7–18–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****National Park Service****36 CFR Part 13**

**[NPS–AKRO–25874; PPAKAKROZ5, PPMRLE1Y.L00000]**

**RIN 1024–AE38**

**Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves—Extension of Public Comment Period**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service is extending the public comment period for the proposed rule to amend its regulations for sport hunting and trapping in National Preserves in Alaska. Extending the comment period for 45 days will allow more time for the public to review the proposal and submit comments.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published on May 22, 2018 (83 FR 23621), is extended. Comments must be received by 11:59 p.m. EST on September 6, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) 1024–AE38, by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail or hand deliver to:* National Park Service, Regional Director, Alaska Regional Office, 240 West 5th Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501.
- *Instructions:* Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or in any way other than those specified above. All submissions received must include the words “National Park Service” or “NPS” and must include the docket number or RIN (1024–AE38) for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

- *Docket:* For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and enter “1024–AE38” in the search box.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Herbert C. Frost, Regional Director, Alaska Regional Office, 240 West 5th Ave., Anchorage, AK 99501. Phone (907) 644–3510. Email: [AKR\\_Regulations@nps.gov](mailto:AKR_Regulations@nps.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On May 22, 2018, the National Park Service (NPS) published in the **Federal Register** (83 FR 23621) a proposed rule to amend

its regulations for sport hunting and trapping in National Preserves in Alaska. This proposed rule would remove a regulatory provision issued by the NPS in 2015 that prohibited certain sport hunting practices that are otherwise permitted by the State of Alaska. These proposed changes are consistent with Secretary of the Interior Orders 3347 and 3356. The public comment period for this proposal is scheduled to close on July 23, 2018. In order to give the public additional time to review and comment on the proposal, the NPS is extending the public comment period for 45 days until September 6, 2018. If you already commented on the proposed rule you do not have to resubmit your comments.

**P. Daniel Smith,**

*Deputy Director, Exercising the Authority of the Director.*

[FR Doc. 2018–15420 Filed 7–18–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–EJ–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0505; FRL–9981–01—Region 10]**

**Air Plan Approval; Oregon; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires each State Implementation Plan (SIP) to contain adequate provisions prohibiting emissions that will have certain adverse air quality effects in other states. On October 20, 2015, the State of Oregon made a submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to address these requirements. The EPA is proposing to approve the submission as meeting the requirement that each SIP contain adequate provisions to prohibit emissions that will contribute significantly to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 annual fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) in any other state.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before August 20, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0505 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be

edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information the disclosure of which is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Hunt, Air Planning Unit, Office of Air and Waste (OAW-150), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 155, Seattle, WA 98101; telephone number: (206) 553-0256; email address: [hunt.jeff@epa.gov](mailto:hunt.jeff@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean the EPA. This supplementary information section is arranged as follows:

**Table of Contents**

- I. What is the background of this SIP submission?
- II. What guidance or information is the EPA using to evaluate this SIP submission?
- III. The EPA’s Review
- IV. What action is the EPA taking?
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. What is the background of this SIP submission?**

This rulemaking addresses a submission from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) assessing interstate transport requirements for the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The requirement for states to make a SIP submission of this type arises from section 110(a)(1) of the CAA. Pursuant to section 110(a)(1), states must submit within 3 years (or such shorter period as the Administrator may prescribe) after the promulgation of a national primary ambient air quality standard (or any revision thereof), a plan that provides for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such NAAQS. The statute directly imposes on states the duty to make these SIP submissions,

and the requirement to make the submissions is not conditioned upon the EPA taking any action other than promulgating a new or revised NAAQS. Section 110(a)(2) includes a list of specific elements that “[e]ach such plan” submission must address. The EPA commonly refers to such state plans as “infrastructure SIPs.” Specifically, this rulemaking addresses the requirements under CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), otherwise known as the “good neighbor” provision, which requires SIPs to contain adequate provisions to prohibit emissions that will contribute significantly to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the NAAQS in any other state.

**II. What guidance or information is the EPA using to evaluate this SIP submission?**

The most recent relevant document was a memorandum published on March 17, 2016, titled “Information on the Interstate Transport “Good Neighbor” Provision for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards under Clean Air Act Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I)” (memorandum). The memorandum describes the EPA’s past approach to addressing interstate transport, and provides the EPA’s general review of relevant modeling data and air quality projections as they relate to the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. The memorandum provides information relevant to the EPA regional office review of the CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) “good neighbor” provision in infrastructure SIPs with respect to the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. This rulemaking considers information provided in that memorandum.

The memorandum also provides states and the EPA regional offices with future year annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> design values for monitors in the United States based on quality assured and certified ambient monitoring data and air quality modeling. The memorandum describes how these projected potential design values can be used to help determine which monitors should be further evaluated to potentially address whether emissions from other states significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS at those sites. The memorandum explains that the pertinent year for evaluating air quality for purposes of addressing interstate transport for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS is 2021, the attainment deadline for 2012

PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS nonattainment areas classified as Moderate.

Based on this approach, the potential receptors are outlined in the memorandum. Most of the potential receptors are in California, located in the San Joaquin Valley or South Coast nonattainment areas. However, there is also one potential receptor in Shoshone County, Idaho, and one potential receptor in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The memorandum also indicates that for certain states with incomplete ambient monitoring data, additional information including the latest available data should be analyzed to determine whether there are potential downwind air quality problems that may be impacted by transported emissions.

This rulemaking considers analysis in Oregon’s submission, as well as additional analysis conducted by the EPA during review of its submission. For more information on how we conducted our analysis, please see the technical support document (TSD) included in the docket for this action.

**III. The EPA’s Review**

This rulemaking proposes action on Oregon’s October 20, 2015, SIP submission addressing the good neighbor provision requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I). State plans must address specific requirements of the good neighbor provisions (commonly referred to as “prongs”), including:

- Prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (prong one); and
- Prohibiting any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (prong two).

The EPA has developed a consistent framework for addressing the prong one and two interstate transport requirements with respect to the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in several previous federal rulemakings. The four basic steps of that framework include: (1) Identifying downwind receptors that are expected to have problems attaining or maintaining the relevant NAAQS; (2) identifying which upwind states contribute to these identified problems in amounts sufficient to warrant further review and analysis; (3) for states identified as contributing to downwind air quality problems, identifying upwind emissions reductions necessary to prevent an upwind state from significantly contributing to nonattainment or interfering with

maintenance of the relevant NAAQS downwind; and (4) for states that are found to have emissions that significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the relevant NAAQS downwind, reducing the identified upwind emissions through adoption of permanent and enforceable measures. This framework was applied with respect to PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR), designed to address both the 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, as well as the 1997 ozone standard.<sup>1</sup>

In its submission, ODEQ reviewed air quality monitoring data for several surrounding western states to identify potential downwind receptors that may have problems attaining or maintaining the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. ODEQ then reviewed geographical distance, topography, meteorology (local stagnation events), air monitoring trends, industrial source emissions near the state border, and Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP) modeling to determine if emissions from Oregon may impact these specific areas. From this analysis and consultation with neighboring state air agencies, ODEQ concluded that Oregon does not significantly contribute to nonattainment or interfere with maintenance of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in any other state.

As discussed in the TSD for this action, we came to the same conclusion as the state. In our evaluation, potential downwind nonattainment and maintenance receptors were identified in other states. The EPA evaluated these potential receptors to determine first if, based on review of relevant data and other information, there would be downwind nonattainment or maintenance problems, and if so, whether Oregon contributes to such problems in these areas. After reviewing air quality reports, modeling results, designation letters, designation technical support documents, attainment plans and other information for these areas, we find there is no contribution sufficient to warrant additional SIP measures. Therefore, we are proposing to approve the Oregon SIP as meeting CAA section 110(a)(2)(i)(I) interstate transport requirements for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

<sup>1</sup> Oregon was not part of the CSAPR rulemaking. The EPA approved the Oregon SIP as meeting the CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I) requirements for the 1997 ozone and 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS on June 9, 2011 (76 FR 33650) and the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS on January 16, 2015 (80 FR 2313).

#### IV. What action is the EPA taking?

The EPA is proposing to approve ODEQ's October 20, 2015, submission certifying that the Oregon SIP is sufficient to meet the interstate transport requirements of CAA section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), specifically prongs one and two, as set forth above. The EPA is requesting comments on the proposed approval.

#### V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the CAA 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.*);
- 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 application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and

- Does not provide 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).

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where 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 and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: July 3, 2018.

**Chris Hladick,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 2018-15353 Filed 7-18-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 74

[MB Docket No. 18-119; DA 18-669]

### FM Translator Interference: Media Bureau Grants Extension of Time To File Comments and Reply Comments

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces that the Media Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission granted the Motion for Extension of Time to extend the comment and reply comment deadlines, filed by Beasley Media Group, LLC; Educational Media Foundation; Gradick Communications, LLC; iHeart Communications, Inc.; Neuhoff Corp.; Radio One Licenses, LLC/Urban One, Inc.; and Withers Broadcasting Companies (Petitioners), in MB Docket 18-119.

**DATES:** Comments may be filed on or before August 6, 2018, and reply comments may be filed on or before September 5, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, pursuant to Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.415, 1.419, by any of the following methods: