

management of offenders committed to the custody of the Attorney General or the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and its economic impact is limited to the Bureau's appropriated funds.

#### Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

#### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by § 804 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

#### List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 571

Prisoners.

Accordingly, the interim rule on this subject amending 28 CFR part 571 that was published on March 23, 2010 (75 FR 13680) is adopted as final without change.

L.C. Eichenlaub,

Deputy Director, Bureau of Prisons.

[FR Doc. 2015-16635 Filed 7-6-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-05-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG-2015-0422]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zone: Underwater Vessel Testing, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone in the navigable waters of San Francisco Bay in San Francisco, CA near Hunters

Point, in support of the Underwater Vessel Testing. This safety zone is established to ensure the safety of the testing participants and mariners transiting the area. Unauthorized persons or vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or remaining in the safety zone without permission of the Captain of the Port or their designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective without actual notice from July 7, 2015 until October 31, 2015. For purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from July 1, 2015 until July 7, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket USCG-2015-0422. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12-140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this temporary rule, call or email Lieutenant Marcia Medina, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Francisco; telephone (415) 399-7443 or email at [D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil](mailto:D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone (202)366-9826.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register

#### A. Regulatory History and Information

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final 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." The Coast Guard received the information about the event on May 11, 2015, and the event would occur before the rulemaking process would be completed. Due to the short timeframe for issuing this safety zone, we find that it is impracticable to solicit comments for this temporary final rule.

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** for similar reasons listed above. Due to the time constraints noted, it is impracticable to give 30 days notice before the effective date of this rule.

#### B. Basis and Purpose

The legal basis for the proposed rule is 33 U.S.C 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191, 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, 160.5; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to establish safety zones.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense will host Underwater Vessel Testing periodically between July 1 through October 31, 2015 in the navigable waters of San Francisco Bay in San Francisco, CA near Hunter's Point. The safety zone is needed to establish a temporary restricted area on the waters surrounding the testing. A restricted area is necessary to ensure the safety of mariners transiting the area.

#### C. Discussion of the Final Rule

The Coast Guard will enforce a safety zone in navigable waters around the testing. The Underwater Vessel Testing Safety Zone establishes a temporary restricted area on the water within an area connecting the following points: 37°43'30" N., 122°21'6" W.; 37°43'53" N., 122°19'17" W.; 37°41'34" N., 122°20'30" W.; 37°41'56" N., 122°18'42" W.; thence back to the point of origin (NAD 83). Periods of enforcement will be requested by the Office of the Secretary of Defense with one week notice and approved by the COTP. This safety zone will be enforced for a duration of 6 to up to 72 hours as announced via Broadcast Notice to Mariners periodically between July 1 through October 31, 2015. At the conclusion of the testing evolution the safety zone shall terminate for each evolution.

The effect of the temporary safety zone will be to restrict navigation in the vicinity of the testing. Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the restricted area. These regulations are needed to keep vessels away from the vicinity of the testing to ensure the safety of mariners transiting the area.

#### D. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses

based on these statutes and executive orders.

### 1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders.

We expect the economic impact of this rule will not rise to the level of necessitating a full Regulatory Evaluation. The safety zone is limited in duration, and is limited to a narrowly tailored geographic area. In addition, although this rule restricts access to the waters encompassed by the safety zone, the effect of this rule will not be significant because the local waterway users will be notified via public Broadcast Notice to Mariners to ensure the safety zone will result in minimum impact. The entities most likely to be affected are waterfront facilities, commercial vessels, and pleasure craft engaged in recreational activities.

### 2. 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.

This rule may affect owners and operators of waterfront facilities, commercial vessels, and pleasure craft engaged in recreational activities and sightseeing. This safety zone would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. This safety zone would be activated, and thus subject to enforcement, for a limited duration. When the safety zone is activated, vessel traffic could pass safely around the safety zone. The maritime public will be advised in advance of this safety zone via Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

### 3. Assistance for Small Entities

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**, above.

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.

### 4. 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).

### 5. Federalism

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 determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism.

### 6. Protest Activities

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

### 7. 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.

### 8. Taking of Private Property

This rule will not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

### 9. Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

### 10. Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

### 11. Indian Tribal Governments

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.

### 12. Energy Effects

This action is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

### 13. Technical Standards

This rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

### 14. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded 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 of limited size and duration. This

rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this rule.

#### 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.T11–681 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T11–681 Safety zone; Underwater Vessel Testing, San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA.

(a) *Location*. This temporary safety zone will encompass the navigable waters of the South San Francisco Bay within an area connecting the following points: 37°43′30″ N., 122°21′6″ W.; 37°43′53″ N., 122°19′17″ W.; 37°41′34″ N., 122°20′30″ W.; 37°41′56″ N., 122°18′42″ W. (NAD 83); thence back to the point of origin (NAD 83), as depicted in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Chart 18651.

(b) *Enforcement period*. The zone described in paragraph (a) of this section will be enforced for a duration of 6 to up to 72 hours, as announced via Broadcast Notice to Mariners, periodically between on July 1 through October 31, 2015. The Captain of the Port San Francisco (COTP) will notify the maritime community of periods during which this zone will be enforced via Broadcast Notice to Mariners in accordance with § 165.7.

(c) *Definitions*. As used in this section, “designated representative” means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer on a Coast Guard vessel or a Federal, State, or local officer designated by or

assisting the COTP in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(d) *Regulations*. (1) Under the general regulations in subpart C of this part, entry into, transiting or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the COTP or a designated representative.

(2) The safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the COTP or a designated representative.

(3) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the COTP or a designated representative to obtain permission to do so. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the COTP or a designated representative. Persons and vessels may request permission to enter the safety zone on VHF–23A or through the 24-hour Command Center at telephone (415) 399–3547.

Dated: May 18, 2015.

**Gregory G. Stump,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port San Francisco.*

[FR Doc. 2015–16621 Filed 7–6–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–15–P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R06–OAR–2014–0378; FRL–9929–81–Region 6]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Plantwide Applicability Limit Permitting Revisions

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving one revision to the Arkansas State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the Arkansas Governor to the EPA on January 7, 2014. This submittal revises the Arkansas Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permitting Program to incorporate by reference federal plantwide applicability limit (PAL) permitting provisions to enable the State of Arkansas to issue PSD PALs to sources with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The EPA has determined that the January 7, 2014 revision to the Arkansas SIP is consistent with federal requirements for PSD permitting. The

EPA is also approving ministerial changes to the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) to reflect recent EPA SIP approvals to the Arkansas PSD program and to show that SIP deficiencies identified in prior partial disapprovals have been addressed. We are finalizing this action under section 110 and part C of title I of the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on August 6, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R06–OAR–2014–0378. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. 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 EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Adina Wiley, 214–665–2115, [wiley.adina@epa.gov](mailto:wiley.adina@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document wherever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean the EPA.

#### I. Background

The background for this action is discussed in detail in our April 27, 2015 proposal. See 80 FR 23245. In that document, we proposed to approve the January 7, 2014, Arkansas SIP revision; a submittal that included PSD permitting provisions adopted on June 28, 2013, at the Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission’s (“Commission”) Regulation Number 19, Regulations of the Arkansas Plan of Implementation for Air Pollution Control (hereinafter Regulation 19 at 19.904(A)(1) and (G)(1)). These revisions to the PSD program provide the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) the ability to issue GHG PSD PALs consistent with the “Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Step 3 and GHG Plantwide Applicability Limits Final Rule” (77 FR 41051) and recent litigation surrounding the permitting of GHGs.<sup>1</sup> The January 7,

<sup>1</sup> As explained more fully in our April 27, 2015, proposed rulemaking; the U.S. Supreme Court