

uniform criterion of 16 picograms per liter.

Over the course of the next three-and-a-half years, the Commission continued to work with co-regulators on an implementation strategy for point and non-point sources to accompany the proposed uniform criterion. A notice of proposed rulemaking to amend the current PCB criteria and to invite comment on an implementation plan was issued in August 2009 (*see* 74 FR 41100). The Commission deferred action on the proposal, however, pending the refinement of implementation strategies for point sources. The updated, uniform criterion of 16 picograms per liter is now re-proposed, and a draft implementation strategy that has been revised for point sources is simultaneously published for comment.

Proposed Amendment. It is proposed to amend Table 6 in Section 3.30 of Article 3 of the *Water Quality Regulations* and *Water Code* as follows: For the parameter “PCBs (Total)”, in the column headed “Freshwater Objectives (ug/l): Fish & Water Ingestion,” by removing the number “0.0000444” and inserting “0.000016”; in the column headed “Freshwater Objectives (ug/l): Fish Ingestion Only,” by removing the number “0.0000448” and inserting “0.000016”; and in the column headed “Marine Objectives (ug/l): Fish Ingestion Only,” by removing the number “0.0000079” and inserting “0.000016”. It is further proposed to amend paragraph 410.1(c) of title 18 of the Code of Federal Regulations by replacing the date of incorporation by reference that appears there (December 8, 2010), with the date on which the Commission adopts a final rule in response to this proposal.

Water Quality Impairment for PCBs. Because high levels of PCBs have resulted in state-issued fish consumption advisories for certain species caught in the Estuary and Bay, these waters are listed by the bordering states as impaired under Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act (“CWA”), and a total maximum daily load (“TMDL”) is required to be established for them. A TMDL expresses the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still attain water quality standards. Once the TMDL is calculated, it is allocated to all sources in the watershed—point and nonpoint. In order to ensure the attainment and maintenance of water quality standards, a source must not discharge a load in excess of its allocated share of the TMDL.

The EPA established TMDLs for PCBs on behalf of the states in December of 2003 for the Delaware Estuary and in

December of 2006 for the Delaware Bay (“Stage 1 TMDLs”). Upon adoption of revised human health water quality criteria for PCBs in the Delaware Estuary and Bay, it is anticipated that EPA will establish new TMDLs (“Stage 2 TMDLs”) corresponding to the updated criteria.

Implementing PCB Load Reductions. To initiate PCB reductions, by Resolution No. 2005–9 in May 2005, the Commission amended its Water Quality Regulations (“WQR”) to establish a requirement for PCB Pollutant Minimization Plans (“PMPs”) (*see* Section 4.30.9 of the WQR, incorporated by reference at 18 CFR Part 410) (“the PMP Rule”). In accordance with the PMP Rule the largest point source dischargers of PCBs to the Delaware Estuary and Bay undertook the development and implementation of PMPs, including a variety of track-down and load reduction strategies. Ambient and effluent data collected between 2005 and 2011 show that their efforts over the past 12 years (and in some cases longer) have substantially reduced point source PCB loadings to the Estuary and Bay. However, because PCBs persist in the environment, including in soils that drain to municipal and industrial discharge facilities, most dischargers will require more time, including in some instances decades, to achieve the PCB loading reductions needed to meet their assigned wasteload allocations.

The draft document entitled *Implementation Strategy for Polychlorinated Biphenyls for Zones 2–6 of the Delaware River Estuary* (“Implementation Strategy”) builds on the approach embodied by the PMP Rule. Among other things, it attempts to better integrate PMP requirements with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program administered by the Estuary states of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania pursuant to the CWA.

Notably, the 2003 Delaware Estuary TMDL report projected that “due to the scope and complexity of the problem that has been defined through these TMDLs, achieving the estuary water quality standards for PCBs will take decades.” (EPA 2003, Executive Summary, p. xiii). Adoption of an updated, uniform criterion for the Delaware Estuary and Bay and implementation of the criterion by means of the proposed strategy will not alter this prognosis. However, the proposed criterion and Implementation Strategy are intended to align the Commission’s water quality criteria with current science and to ensure that increasingly protective pollutant levels

in fish and ambient water are achieved at an aggressive pace until the protected use—fishable waters—is restored.

Subjects on Which Comment is Expressly Solicited. Public comment is solicited on all aspects of the proposed rule. These include but are not limited to the assumptions applied in developing the criterion as set forth in a basis and background document that is available on the DRBC Web site, DRBC.net. Comment on the proposed Implementation Strategy for the new criterion, also posted on the Web site, is simultaneously requested.

Dated: July 30, 2013.

Pamela M. Bush,
Commission Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–18810 Filed 8–2–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2013–0526]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Umpqua River, Reedsport, OR

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the operating schedule that governs the U.S. 101 Umpqua River swing bridge, mile 11.1, at Reedsport, OR. The proposed rule change is necessary to accommodate Oregon Department of Transportation’s (ODOT) extensive bridge maintenance and restoration efforts. The bridge is currently scheduled to open on signal if at least two hours notice is given. ODOT proposes to only open the bridge with a minimum of six hours notice and will limit the openings to twice daily; once in the morning and once in the evening.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 4, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2013–0526 using any one of the following methods:

(1) Federal eRulemaking Portal:
<http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) Fax: 202–493–2251.

(3) Mail or Delivery: Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE.,

Washington, DC 20590–0001. Deliveries accepted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments. To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule change, call or email Steven M. Fischer, Lieutenant Commander, Thirteenth District Bridge Program Office, Coast Guard, telephone 206–220–7277; email Steven.M.Fischer2@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Barbara Hairston, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Acronyms

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
§ Section Symbol
U.S.C. United States Code

A. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We encourage you to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted, without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

1. Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this proposed rulemaking (USCG–2013–0526), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (<http://www.regulations.gov>), or by fax, mail or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via <http://www.regulations.gov>, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your

document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number [USCG–2013–0526] in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on “Submit a Comment” on the line associated with this rulemaking. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

2. Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number (USCG–2013–0526) 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.

3. Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

4. Public Meeting

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting, but you may submit a request for a meeting that reaches the Coast Guard on or before August 20, 2013 using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

B. Basis and Purpose

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), who owns and

operates this bridge, has requested a temporary change to the existing operating regulations of the U.S. 101 Umpqua River Bridge, at Reedsport, OR to facilitate restoration of the bridge. The restoration project will entail painting, rust removal, and steel repairs which require full containment to keep paint and debris out of the Umpqua River. The bridge swing span requires a containment system that is balanced in order to allow the bridge to open properly.

In an effort to accommodate both the needs of the waterway and highway users and exercising good stewardship of public funding, ODOT requested a temporary rule change in order to reduce the burden on ODOT maintenance crews from repeatedly installing and uninstalling the containment system. The containment structure will extend ten feet below the bridge, reducing the existing clearance of the bridge from approximately 36 feet to approximately 26 feet at mean high tide.

The current operating schedule will overburden construction crews in that if the bridge needs to open, the containment system will need to be cleaned out and disassembled on both side spans of the swing span due to the need to maintain proper balance between the spans. The estimated time to clean and disassemble the containment system is approximately 2 hours.

To facilitate the bridge restoration work, and to minimize the impact on navigation, from December 1, 2013 to September 30, 2015 the drawbridge would operate as follows: the bridge shall be maintained in the closed position to perform maintenance; it would open twice daily, once at 7 a.m. and once at 6 p.m., only if an opening is requested at least six hours in advance.

The U.S. 101 Umpqua River Bridge is a swing span drawbridge, near Reedsport, OR, located at waterway mile 11.1. In the closed position, this drawbridge has a vertical clearance of 36 feet above mean high tide. Vessel traffic along this part of the Umpqua River consists of vessels ranging from occasional commercial tug and barge to small pleasure craft. ODOT has examined bridge opening logs and contacted all waterway users that have requested bridge openings throughout the last two years. The input ODOT received from waterway users indicated that the proposed change will likely have a minimal impact on users, and ODOT has attempted to mitigate identified concerns by offering to provide a location for a limited number

of vessels up to 75' in length to dock during non-opening hours down river from the U.S. 101 Umpqua River Bridge at Salmon Harbor Marina.

C. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard would temporarily revise the operating regulations at 33 CFR 117.893. The regulation currently states that the U.S. 101 Umpqua River Bridge shall open on signal if at least two hours notice is given. The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily change the regulation such that from 7 a.m. on December 1, 2013 to 11:59 p.m. on September 30, 2015, the draw of the US 101 Bridge, mile 11.1, at Reedsport, Oregon, shall open at 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. when at least 6 hours of advance notice is given.

D. 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 or executive orders.

1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed 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 Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. The Coast Guard has made this finding based on the fact that all requested bridge openings will be granted with advance notification and vessels that can safely transit under the bridge may do so at any time.

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. 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. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels needing to transit

the bridge between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. Down river dock access will be made available during closure hours for vessels awaiting transit, and all vessels that can safely transit under the bridge may do so at any time.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this 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.

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 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**, above. 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.

4. 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).

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 proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it 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 proposed 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 proposed rule would 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 proposed 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 proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

11. Indian Tribal Governments

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.

12. Energy Effects

This proposed rule 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 proposed 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 guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

E. 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; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Amend temporarily § 117.893 to read as follows:

§ 117.893 Umpqua River.

(a) From 7 a.m. on December 1, 2013 to 11:59 p.m. on September 30, 2015, the draw of the US 101 Bridge, mile 11.1, at Reedsport, Oregon, shall open at 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. when at least 6 hours of advance notice is given.

Dated: July 23, 2013.

R.T. Gromlich,

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

[FR Doc. 2013–18741 Filed 8–2–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

36 CFR Part 1250

[FDMS No. NARA–13–0003; Agency No. NARA–2013–037]

RIN 3095–AB73

NARA Records Subject to FOIA

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: NARA proposes to revise its regulation governing Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) access to NARA's archival holdings and NARA's own operational records. The proposed revisions include clarification of which records are subject to the FOIA and NARA's authority to grant access, and adjustments to NARA's FOIA procedures to incorporate changes resulting from the OPEN FOIA Act of 2009, the OPEN Government Act of 2007, and the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996 (EFOIA). The proposed rule will affect individuals and organizations that file FOIA requests for NARA operational records and archival holdings.

DATES: Submit comments on or before October 4, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by RIN 3095–AB73, by any of the following methods:

■ **Federal eRulemaking Portal:**

<http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

■ **Email:**

kimberly.keravuori@nara.gov. Include RIN 3095–AB73 in the subject line of the message.

■ **Fax:** 301–837–0319.

■ **Mail:** (For paper, disk, or CD–ROM submissions. Include RIN 3095–AB73 on the submission) Regulations Comments Desk, Strategy Division (SP); Suite 4100; National Archives Records Administration; 8601 Adelphi Road; College Park, MD 20740–6001.

■ **Hand delivery or courier:** Deliver comments to 8601 Adelphi Road; College Park, MD.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking (RIN 3095–AB73). All comments received may be published without changes, including any personal information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kimberly Keravuori, by telephone at 301–837–3151, by email to kimberly.keravuori@nara.gov, or by mail to Kimberly Keravuori, Regulations Program Manager; Strategy Division

(SP), Suite 4100; National Archives and Records Administration; 8601 Adelphi Road; College Park, MD 20740–6001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Types of Records and FOIA Access

Unlike most agencies, NARA has two categories of records governed by FOIA: NARA's own operational records and archival holdings of the Federal government. Among the archival holdings, the FOIA applies only to executive branch records in NARA's legal custody and to Presidential records created since 1981. Presidential materials in NARA's custody that were created before 1981 were donated to the Federal government by the President who created them, except that Nixon presidential materials are governed by the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act (see Part 1275). Access to those records is governed by the deed of gift pertaining to those records, and they are therefore not subject to the FOIA.

NARA cannot grant FOIA access to the following archival holdings. Access to these holdings must be granted by the organizations that created them:

- Executive agency records stored in NARA's federal records centers remain in the legal custody of the agencies that created them. Access to these records can be granted only by the creating agency.
- The records of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate at NARA remain in the legal custody of the Congress. Access to those records is governed by the Secretary of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.
- Records of the Supreme Court of the United States at NARA remain in the legal custody of the Supreme Court, and it controls access to these records. Section 1250.6 refers requesters to other NARA regulations governing access to these records and to the records of other Federal legislative and judicial branch agencies, which are not subject to FOIA.

Changes Due to OPEN Government and OPEN FOIA Acts

Changes resulting from the OPEN Government Act of 2007 (Pub. L. 110–175) and OPEN FOIA Act of 2009 (Pub. L. 111–83) are found throughout the proposed rule.

The new § 1250.2 reflects NARA's open access mission and culture, which are defined by a presumption of openness and by discretionary disclosures of information.

Section 1250.3 adds the definition of a FOIA Public Liaison and expanded definition of a news media representative. These two additions are requirements under the OPEN