

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2023–0309]

RIN 1625–AA00

#### Safety Zone; Henderson Bay, Henderson Harbor, NY

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a permanent safety zone for certain waters of Henderson Harbor. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on these navigable waters near Henderson Harbor, Henderson, NY, during annual reoccurrences of a fireworks display. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Buffalo or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before July 21, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2023–0309 using the Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://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 proposed rulemaking, call or email MST2 Andrew Nevenner, Waterways Management Division MSD Massena, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 315–769–5483, email [SMB-MSDMassena-WaterwaysManagement@uscg.mil](mailto:SMB-MSDMassena-WaterwaysManagement@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

##### II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On March 6, 2023, the Henderson Business and Community Council notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting a fireworks display from 9:30 through 10 p.m. on July 29, 2023,

for the Christmas in July Celebration. The fireworks are to be launched from a barge in Henderson Bay approximately 1500 yards north of the town boat ramp located on the southern shore of Henderson Harbor in Henderson Harbor, NY. Hazards from firework displays include accidental discharge of fireworks, dangerous projectiles, and falling hot embers or other debris. The Captain of the Port Buffalo (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the fireworks to be used in this display would be a safety concern for anyone within a 140-yard radius of the barge.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels and the navigable waters within a 140-yard radius of the fireworks barge before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231).

##### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish a safety zone for certain waters of Henderson Harbor for annual reoccurrences of the fireworks display, which will be announced in the **Federal Register**. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters within 140-yards of a barge in Henderson Bay located approximately 1500-yards north of the town boat ramp located on the southern shore of Henderson Harbor in Henderson Harbor, NY. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of vessels and these navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled fireworks display. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

##### 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 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. 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 size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of Henderson Bay for less than 2 hour during the evening 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 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 safety zone 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 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 proposed rule. If the proposed rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please call or email 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 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 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 call or email 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 would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the potential effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

*F. Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning

COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), 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 proposed rule involves a safety zone lasting 1.5 hours that would prohibit entry within 140 yards of a fireworks barge. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

*G. Protest Activities*

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to call or email 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.

**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–2023–0309 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 you cannot submit your material by using <https://>

[www.regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), call or email the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this proposed rule 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.

*Personal information.* 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 to the docket 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 165**

Harbors, marine safety, navigation (water), reporting and recordkeeping requirements, security measures, waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard is proposing to amend 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:** 46 U.S.C. 70034; 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. 00170.1, Revision 1.3.

- 2. In § 165.939, amend Table 165.939 by adding entry (b)(34)) to read as follows:

**§ 165.939 Safety Zones; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Buffalo Zone.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Event	Location <sup>1</sup>	Enforcement date and time <sup>2</sup>
<b>(b) July Safety Zones</b>		
* * * * *		
(34) Christmas in July Fireworks.	Henderson Harbor, NY. All waters within a 420-foot radius of the barge at position 43°86'66" N, 076°20'97" W in Henderson Harbor, NY.	On or around the last weekend of July.

<sup>1</sup> All coordinates listed in Table 165.xxx reference Datum NAD 1983.

<sup>2</sup> As noted in paragraph (a)(3) of this section, the enforcement dates and times for each of the listed safety zones are subject to change. In the event of a change, or for enforcement periods listed that do not allow a specific date or dates to be determined, the Captain of the Port will provide notice to the public by publishing a Notice of Enforcement in the **Federal Register**, as well as, issuing a Broadcast Notice to Mariner.]

Dated: May 30, 2023.

**Mark I. Kuperman,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Buffalo.*

[FR Doc. 2023-11880 Filed 6-20-23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2023-0206; FRL-11037-01-R3]

#### Air Plan Disapproval; Delaware; Removal of Excess Emissions Provisions

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to disapprove certain portions of a state implementation plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Delaware, through the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC), on November 22, 2016. The revision was submitted by Delaware in response to a national finding of substantial inadequacy and SIP call published on June 12, 2015, which included certain provisions in the Delaware SIP related to excess emissions during startup, shutdown, and malfunction (SSM) events. EPA is proposing disapproval of certain portions of the SIP revision and proposing to determine that such SIP revision does not correct the remaining deficiencies in Delaware's SIP identified in the June 12, 2015, SIP call in accordance with the requirements for SIP provisions under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act). This action addresses the remaining deficiencies identified in EPA's June 2015 SIP call that have not yet been addressed by prior EPA actions on Delaware's November 2016 SIP submission.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before July 21, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R03-OAR-2023-0206 at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), or via email to [gordon.mike@epa.gov](mailto:gordon.mike@epa.gov). For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from

[Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, 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 whose disclosure 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. 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, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit [www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets](http://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mallory Moser, Planning & Implementation Branch (3AD30), Air & Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, Four Penn Center, 1600 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. The telephone number is (215) 814-2030. Ms. Moser can also be reached via electronic mail at [moser.mallory@epa.gov](mailto:moser.mallory@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On November 22, 2016, DNREC submitted a revision to its SIP in response to a national finding of substantial inadequacy and SIP call published on June 12, 2015, which included certain provisions in the Delaware SIP related to excess emissions during SSM events.

### I. Background

#### A. EPA's 2015 SSM SIP Action

On February 22, 2013, EPA issued a **Federal Register** notice of proposed rulemaking outlining EPA's policy at the time with respect to SIP provisions related to periods of SSM. EPA analyzed specific SSM SIP provisions and explained how each one either did or did not comply with the CAA with regard to excess emission events.<sup>1</sup> For

each SIP provision that EPA determined to be inconsistent with the CAA, EPA proposed to find that the existing SIP provision was substantially inadequate to meet CAA requirements and thus proposed to issue a SIP call under CAA section 110(k)(5). On September 17, 2014, EPA issued a document supplementing and revising what the Agency had previously proposed on February 22, 2013, in light of a D.C. Circuit decision that determined the CAA precludes authority of the EPA to create affirmative defense provisions applicable to private civil suits. EPA outlined its updated policy that affirmative defense SIP provisions are not consistent with CAA requirements. EPA proposed in the supplemental proposal document to apply its revised interpretation of the CAA to specific affirmative defense SIP provisions and proposed SIP calls for those provisions where appropriate.<sup>2</sup>

On June 12, 2015, pursuant to CAA section 110(k)(5), EPA finalized "State Implementation Plans: Response to Petition for Rulemaking; Restatement and Update of EPA's SSM Policy Applicable to SIPs; Findings of Substantial Inadequacy; and SIP Calls To Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown and Malfunction," hereafter referred to as the "2015 SSM SIP Action."<sup>3</sup> The 2015 SSM SIP Action clarified, restated, and updated EPA's interpretation that SSM exemption and affirmative defense SIP provisions are inconsistent with CAA requirements. The 2015 SSM SIP Action found that certain SIP provisions in 36 states were substantially inadequate to meet CAA requirements and issued a SIP call to those states to submit SIP revisions to address the inadequacies. EPA established an 18-month deadline by which the affected states had to submit such SIP revisions. States were required to submit corrective revisions to their SIPs in response to the SIP calls by November 22, 2016.

EPA issued a Memorandum in October 2020 (2020 Memorandum), which stated that certain provisions governing SSM periods in SIPs could be viewed as consistent with CAA requirements.<sup>4</sup> Importantly, the 2020

<sup>1</sup> State Implementation Plans: Response to Petition for Rulemaking; Findings of Substantial Inadequacy; and SIP Calls To Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction, 78 FR 12460 (February 22, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> 79 FR 55920 (September 17, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> 80 FR 33840 (June 12, 2015).

<sup>4</sup> October 9, 2020, memorandum "Inclusion of Provisions Governing Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunctions in State