

basis as it often is with the existing duty of candor, at least when other violations are involved.<sup>14</sup>

13. As usual, I strongly encourage anyone with the inclination or an interest in this proceeding to comment on the issues it raises.

14. In particular, I ask for comments on the fundamental question whether the proposed duty of candor creates Constitutional due process concerns because it is impermissibly vague. What conduct, exactly, is prohibited? Is there any way to cure the void-for-vagueness concerns?

15. How would a “due diligence” safe harbor work for members of the public, like the concert-going landowner who, in her communications with one of the listed entities, may be “prone to hyperbole”? Will the proposal chill public engagement with FERC and the listed jurisdictional entities? Should the Office of Public Participation offer sessions on how to qualify for the safe harbor when members of the public engage with RTOs and Utilities? I particularly encourage consumer advocates to comment on what the implications of this rule might be.

16. Further, does the Commission have the statutory authority to extend the duty of candor as far as proposed? Does the Commission’s interest in protecting the integrity of its proceedings really extend to “any entity” in “any communication” “relate[d] to a matter subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission” with the rule’s range of listed entities?

17. It may be possible to narrow the proposed duty of candor so that it would not grant the Commission such sweeping enforcement powers. I solicit comment on whether an intent or materiality requirement would allay concerns that the rule will impermissibly encompass core First Amendment protected speech.

18. Another irony: the Commission may be unlikely to get much candor from the regulated community in response to this NOPR. Most companies will be reticent to file comments in opposition to a proposed rule of candor. But voicing opposition to an impermissibly vague and broad rule that exposes a company to sweeping liability does not mean that the company supports lying to the Commission. They should not be hesitant. I strongly encourage industry comments and would be particularly interested in any experience with the application of the current duty of candor to the extent any entity is at liberty to discuss them. I also welcome a thorough analysis of our existing caselaw to fully judge how the existing duty of candor has been applied.

19. I look forward to reviewing the full record. My hope is that it will be sufficient to persuade the majority not to finalize this rule. We do not need rules for everything, especially when they are as problematically vague and broad as the proposal here.

For these reasons, I respectfully dissent.

**James P. Danly,**  
*Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 2022–16608 Filed 8–11–22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2022–0299]

RIN 1625–AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bay St. Louis, Bay St. Louis, MS

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change how the CSX Transportation railroad drawbridge across Bay St. Louis, mile 0.5, Bay St. Louis, MS will operate. The bridge will continue to open according to the drawbridge regulations but the bridge tender will operate this bridge from a remote location at the CSX railroad terminal in Mobile, Alabama. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and relate material must reach the Coast Guard on or before October 11, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2022–0299 using Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Douglas Blakemore, Eighth Coast Guard District Bridge Administration Branch Chief at (504) 671–2128 or [Douglas.A.Blakemore@uscg.mil](mailto:Douglas.A.Blakemore@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
OMB Office of Management and Budget  
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
(Advance, Supplemental)  
§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

## II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The CSX Transportation railroad drawbridge crosses Bay St. Louis, mile 0.5, Bay St. Louis, MS. The bridge will continue to open according to the drawbridge regulations but the bridge tender will operate this bridge from a remote location at the CSX railroad terminal in Mobile, AL. This bridge has a 13 foot vertical clearance at mean high water, an unlimited vertical clearance in the open to vessel position and a 100’ horizontal clearance. The bridge operates according to 33 CFR 117.5.

CSX Transportation has requested to operate this bridge remotely from their railroad terminal in Mobile, AL. A copy of the bridge owners request can be found at <https://regulations.gov> in the Docket USCG–2022–2099. CSX has installed a remote operation system at the bridge and a remote control center, located in Mobile, AL. At the bridge, CSX has installed infrared cameras, closed circuit cameras and TVs, communication systems and information technology systems on the bridge that allow an operator from Mobile to monitor and control the bridge.

This NPRM will run simultaneously with a Test Deviation; under the same name and docket number. Both documents can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov> and comments can be to either document.

This CSX drawbridge is located on Bay St. Louis, mile 0.5, Bay St. Louis, MS. It has a vertical clearance of 13’ in the closed to vessel position. The bridge operates according to 33 CFR 117.5. Bay St. Louis is used by commercial tows, barges and recreational vessel. The bridge opens for vessels about six times per day and vessels that do not need the bridge to open may pass.

## III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

33 CFR 117.42 sets Coast Guard drawbridge regulations. This regulation authorizes the Coast Guard District Commander to approve operations from a remote site. The bridge opens on signal for the passage of vessels in accordance with 33 CFR 117.5. This proposed rule will not change the operating schedule nor will it change how to request or signal for the bridge to open. Mariners requiring an opening may do so by contacting the CSX remote control center on Channels 13/16 or by the phone number posted at the bridge.

This proposed rule requires CSX to have the capability, including resources and manpower to return the operator to the bridge location following any of the below situations:

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., *Coaltrain Energy, L.P.*, 155 FERC ¶ 61,204, at P 292 (2016).

(1) Any component of the remote operations system fails and prevents the remote operator from being able to visually identify vessels, communicate with vessels, detect vessels immediately underneath the bridge or visually identify trains approaching the bridge.

(2) CSX fails to meet Federal Railway Administration (FRA) or any other government agency safety requirements; and.

(3) At the direction of the District Commander

#### IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and Executive Orders.

##### 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. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels can still transit the bridge given advanced notice.

##### B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above this proposed 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 proposed 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 rulemaking 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 proposed 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 proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

##### C. 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).

##### 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 proposed 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 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. If you believe this proposed 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 proposed rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

##### F. Environment

We have analyzed this rulemaking under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, Rev.1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning Policy COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f). The Coast Guard has 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 proposed rule promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table 3–1 of the U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are required for this rulemaking. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

#### V. 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 for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

**Submitting comments.** We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. To do so, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2022–0299 in the search box and click “Search.” Next, look for this document in the Search Results column, and click on it. Then click on the Comment option. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

**Viewing material in docket.** To view documents mentioned in this proposed

rule as being available in the docket, find the docket as described in the previous paragraph, and then select “Supporting & Related Material” in the Document Type column. Public comments will also be placed in our online docket and can be viewed by following instructions on the <https://www.regulations.gov> Frequently Asked Questions web page. We review all comments received, but we will only post comments that address the topic of the proposed rule. We may choose not to post off-topic, inappropriate, or duplicate comments that we receive. 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 of any posting or updates to the docket.

We accept anonymous comments. Comments we post to <https://www.regulations.gov> will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and submissions in response to this document, see DHS’s eRulemaking System of Records notice (85 FR 14226, March 11, 2020).

#### 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; DHS Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 117.676 to read as follows:

##### § 117.676 Bay St. Louis.

(a) The draw of the CSX Transportation Railroad bridge, mile 0.5 Bay St. Louis, MS shall be remotely operated by the bridge tender at CSX’s bridge remote control center in Mobile, Alabama and shall open promptly and fully when signaled to open. Vessels can contact the CSX bridge tender via VHF–FM channel 13 or 16 or by telephone at the number displayed on the signs posted at the bridge to request an opening of the draw.

(b) CSX will return the tender to the bridge location within 3 hours following any of the below situations:

(1) Any component of the remote operations system fails and prevents the remote operator from being able to visually identify vessels, communicate with vessels, detect vessels immediately underneath the bridge or visually identify trains approaching the bridge;

(2) CSX fails to meet Federal Railway Administration (FRA) or any other government agency safety requirements;

(3) Anytime at the direction of the District Commander.

Dated: August 5, 2022.

**R.V. Timme,**

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2022–17400 Filed 8–11–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Parts 60 and 63

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2020–0371; FRL–8202–03–OAR]

RIN 2060–AU97

#### National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Gasoline Distribution Technology Review and Standards of Performance for Bulk Gasoline Terminals Review

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; notice of data availability; request for comment; extending the comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing a notice of data availability (NODA) and extending the comment period for proposed amendments to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for Gasoline Distribution facilities and the Standards of Performance for Bulk Gasoline Terminals and proposed New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). The original proposed rule was published on June 10, 2022, with a 60-day public comment period closing August 9, 2022. With this notification, EPA is extending the public comment period for an additional 30 days, until September 12, 2022.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published June 10, 2022, at 87 FR 35608, is extended. Comments should be received by September 12, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2020–0371. Follow the detailed instructions provided under **ADDRESSES** in the **Federal Register** document of June 10, 2022 (87 FR 35608) for the submission of comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Neil Feinberg, Sector Policies and Programs Division (E143–01), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards,

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541–2214; fax number: (919) 541–0516; and email address: [feinberg.stephen@epa.gov](mailto:feinberg.stephen@epa.gov). For more information on this action please visit <https://www.epa.gov/stationary-sources-air-pollution/gasoline-distribution-mact-and-gact-national-emission-standards>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The source categories subject to the June 10, 2022, proposal are Gasoline Distribution regulated under 40 CFR part 63, subparts R and BBBB and Petroleum Transportation and Marketing regulated under 40 CFR part 60, subpart XX. The EPA proposed revised requirements for loading operations, storage vessels and equipment leaks at bulk gasoline terminals and pipeline breakout stations at major sources of hazardous air pollutant emissions under the NESHAP for the major source gasoline distribution facilities (part 63, subpart R). The EPA also proposed revised requirements for loading operations, storage vessels and equipment leaks at area source bulk gasoline terminals, bulk gasoline plants, pipeline breakout stations, and pipeline pumping stations under the NESHAP for the area source gasoline distribution facilities (part 63, subpart BBBB). The sources affected by the proposed NSPS (part 60, subpart XXa) are loading operations and equipment leaks at bulk gasoline terminals that commenced construction or modification after June 10, 2022; emissions from storage vessels are covered under a separate NSPS (part 60, subpart Kb), which was not proposed to be amended.

On July 25, 2022, Our Children’s Earth Foundation (“OCE”) requested an extension of the comment deadline for 30 to 45 days to review the proposed rules and supporting information included in the docket. OCE outlined several instances where they believed information appeared to be missing in the rulemaking docket. The EPA reviewed the rulemaking docket and concluded that, in most cases, the docket record was complete. However, we realized that we inadvertently omitted enforcement reports relied on for the proposed lower explosive limits (LEL) monitoring requirements included for internal floating roof storage vessels in that major and area source NESHAP. Following this request from OCE, EPA has decided to provide this notice of data availability (NODA) and comment period reopening to provide to notice and time for commenters to fully review the proposed rulemaking, including the additional information on LEL