

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165****[Docket No. USCG–2010–1004]****RIN 1625–AA87****Security Zone; Increase of Security Zones From 100 to 500 Yards; San Francisco Bay, Delta Ports, Monterey Bay, and Humboldt Bay, CA****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes a permanent increase in security zone size from 100 yards (91 meters) to 500 yards (457 meters) on the navigable waters of San Francisco Bay, Delta Ports, Monterey Bay, and Humboldt Bay, CA. Security zones are necessary to effectively protect high value assets (HVAs) such as cruise ships, high interest vessels (HIV), or tankers, as defined in 33 CFR 165.1183. A security zone is only enforceable within the limits of that zone. The limitation of the 100 yard (91 meters) security zone hinders reaction time and the ability of the coxswains to determine the target of interest's (TOI) intent, properly assess the situation, and execute protective measures for HVAs. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within the temporary security zones unless authorized by the Captain of the Port or her designated representative.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before December 3, 2010. Requests for public meetings must be received by the Coast Guard on or before November 22, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2010–1004 using any one of the following methods:

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

(2) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

(3) *Mail:* 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.

(4) *Hand delivery:* Same as mail address above, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods. 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 e-mail Lieutenant Junior Grade Allison A. Natcher, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Francisco; telephone 415–399–7442 e-mail *D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil*. If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Public Participation and Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this 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.

**Submitting Comments**

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking (USCG–2010–1004), 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 (via <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 e-mail address, or a telephone 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>, click on the “submit a comment” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Document Type” drop down menu select “Proposed Rule” and insert “USCG–2010–1004” in the “Keyword” box. Click “Search” then click on the balloon shape in the “Actions” column. 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 comments 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.

**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>, click on the “read comments” box, which will then become highlighted in blue. In the “Keyword” box insert “USCG–2010–1004” and click “Search.” Click the “Open Docket Folder” in the “Actions” column. 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. We have an agreement with the Department of Transportation to use the Docket Management Facility.

**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).

**Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one using one of the four methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why you believe a public meeting 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**.

**Background and Purpose**

Experiences during security zone enforcement operations, observations during boat tactics training, and discussions with Commanding Officers/Officers in Charge and tactical coxswains from Sector San Francisco's Level I Ports, Waterways and Coastal Security (PWCS) stations, has led Enforcement staff and field units to determine that the current 100-yard (91 meters) security zones are not adequate enough to protect a high value asset from sabotage, subversive acts,

accidents, criminal actions, or other causes of a similar nature. While enforcing a security zone, screening or reaction vessels are required to wait until a target of interest (TOI) enters the zone prior to taking preventative measures against the TOI from approaching a high value asset.

The increase of the security zones to 500 yards (457 meters) would allow reaction time to a vessel closing in at 20 knots to increase from 9 seconds (for 100 yards/91 meters) to 36 seconds (for 500 yards/457 meters). A 500 yard (457 meters) security zone would increase reaction time, allow proper assessment of the situation, and would improve the ability of the tactical coxswains to properly execute protective measures.

### Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to establish a permanent increase in security zone size from 100 yards (91 meters) to 500 yards (457 meters) of any cruise ship, tanker or HIV that is underway, anchored, or moored within the navigable waters of San Francisco Bay, Delta Ports, Monterey Bay, and Humboldt Bay, CA.

“Cruise ship,” “tanker” and “HIV” are defined under 33 CFR 165.1183 (b). Security zones are necessary to effectively protect these high value assets from sabotage or other subversive acts, accidents, criminal actions, or other causes of a similar nature. Persons and vessels will be prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within the temporary safety zones unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or her designated representative.

Security zones will be enforced by Coast Guard patrol craft and San Francisco Harbor Police as authorized by the Captain of the Port. See 33 CFR 6.04–11, Assistance of other agencies.

### Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

### 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, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that

a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary.

These regulations exist for a limited period of time on a limited portion of the waterways. Further, individuals and vessels desiring to use the affected portion of the waterways may seek permission from the Patrol Commander to use the affected areas.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. 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. We expect this rule may affect owners and operators of vessels, some of which may be small entities, intending to fish, sightsee, transit, or anchor in the waters affected by these security zones. These security zones will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for several reasons: Small vessel traffic will be able to pass safely around the area and vessels engaged in event activities, sightseeing and commercial fishing have ample space outside of the area governed by the special local regulations to engage in these activities. Small entities and the maritime public will be advised of implementation of these security zones via public notice to mariners or notice of implementation published in the **Federal Register**.

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.

### 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 so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. 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 Lieutenant Junior Grade Allison A. Natcher, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Francisco; telephone 415–399–7442 e-mail *D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil*. 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.

### 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.).

### Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

### 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 effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

### Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

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

### Environment

We have analyzed this proposed 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 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. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination is 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 proposed 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 proposes 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:** 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1(g), 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

2. Revise § 165.1183 to read as follows:

#### § 165.1183 Security Zones; Cruise Ships, Tankers and High Interest Vessels, San Francisco Bay and Delta Ports, Monterey Bay and Humboldt Bay, California.

(a) *Locations.* (1) *San Francisco Bay.* All waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 500 yards (457 meters) ahead, astern, and extending 500 yards (457 meters) along either side of any cruise ship, tanker, or HIV that is underway, anchored, or moored within the San Francisco Bay and Delta port areas shoreward of the line drawn between San Francisco Main Ship Channel buoys 7 and 8 (LLNR 4190 & 4195, positions 37°46.9' N, 122°35.4' W and 37°46.5' N, 122°35.2' W, respectively).

(2) *Monterey Bay.* All waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 500 yards (457 meters) ahead, astern, and extending 500 yards (457 meters) along either side of any cruise ship, tanker, or HIV that is underway, anchored, or moored within the Monterey Bay area shoreward of a line drawn between Santa Cruz Light (LLNR 305) to the north in position 36°57.10' N, 122°01.60' W, and Cypress Point, Monterey to the south, in position 36°34.90' N, 121°58.70' W.

(3) *Humboldt Bay.* All waters, extending from the surface to the sea floor, within 500 yards (457 meters)

ahead, astern, and extending 500 yards (457 meters) along either side of any cruise ship, tanker, or HIV that is underway, anchored, or moored within the Humboldt Bay area shoreward of a 4 nautical mile radius line drawn to the west of the Humboldt Bay Entrance Lighted Whistle Buoy HB (LLNR 8130) in position 40°46.25' N, 124°16.13' W.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section—

*Cruise ship* means any vessel over 100 gross register tons, carrying more than 12 passengers for hire which makes voyages lasting more than 24 hours, of which any part is on the high seas. Passengers from cruise ships are embarked or disembarked in the U.S. or its territories. Cruise ships do not include ferries that hold Coast Guard Certificates of Inspection endorsed for “Lakes, Bays and Sounds” that transit international waters for only short periods of time on frequent schedules.

*Designated representative* means any commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, and local, state and federal law enforcement vessels who have been authorized to act on the behalf of the Captain of the Port.

*High Interest Vessel* or *HIV* means any vessel deemed by the Captain of the Port, or higher authority, as a vessel requiring protection based upon risk assessment analysis of the vessel and is therefore escorted by a Coast Guard or other law enforcement vessel with an embarked Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer.

*Tanker* means any self-propelled tank vessel constructed or adapted primarily to carry oil or hazardous materials in bulk in the cargo spaces.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into or remaining in the zones described in paragraph (a) of this section is prohibited unless authorized by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port, San Francisco Bay, or her designated representative.

(2) Mariners seeking permission to transit through a security zone described in paragraph (a) of this section may request authorization to do so from the Patrol Commander (PATCOM), a designated representative. The PATCOM may be contacted on VHF–FM Channel 16.

(3) All persons and vessels granted permission to enter a security zone must comply with the instructions of the Captain of the Port or the designated representative.

(4) Upon being hailed by U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel by siren, radio, flashing light, or other means, the

operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

(5) The Coast Guard may be assisted by other federal, state, or local agencies.

Dated: October 19, 2010.

**C.L. Stowe,**

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

[FR Doc. 2010-27707 Filed 11-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 63

[EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0814; FRL-9219-6]

#### Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of Nevada; Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990, EPA is proposing to grant delegation of specific national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) to Clark County, Nevada.

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by December 3, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0814, by one of the following methods:

1. *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. *E-mail:* [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

3. *Mail or Deliver:* Andrew Steckel (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

**Instructions:** All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. <http://www.regulations.gov> is an "anonymous access" system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail

address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

**Docket:** The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mae Wang, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4124, [wang.mae@epa.gov](mailto:wang.mae@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This proposal concerns the delegation of unchanged NESHAP to Clark County, Nevada. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is amending regulations to reflect the current delegation status of NESHAP in Nevada. EPA is taking direct final action without prior proposal because the Agency believes this action is not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in a subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, we may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

**Authority:** This action is issued under the authority of Section 112 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7412.

Dated: October 5, 2010.

**Deborah Jordan,**

*Director, Air Division, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 2010-27804 Filed 11-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2009-0078; MO 92210-0-0009-B4]

RIN 1018-AW53

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Critical Habitat for *Astragalus jaegerianus* (Lane Mountain Milk-Vetch)

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

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

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the reopening of the comment period on our April 1, 2010, proposed revised designation of critical habitat for *Astragalus jaegerianus* (Lane Mountain milk-vetch) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). We also announce the availability of a draft economic analysis (DEA) of the proposed revised designation of critical habitat for *Astragalus jaegerianus* and an amended required determinations section of the proposal. We are reopening the comment period for an additional 30 days to allow all interested parties an opportunity to comment on the items listed above. Comments previously submitted need not be resubmitted and will be fully considered in preparation of the final rule.

**DATES:** We will consider public comments we receive on or before December 3, 2010. Comments must be received by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the closing date. Any comments that we receive after the closing date may not be considered in the final decision on this action.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on Docket No. FWS-R8-ES-2009-0078.

- *U.S. mail or hand-delivery:* Public Comments Processing, *Attn:* FWS-R8-ES-2009-0078; Division of Policy and Directives Management; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 222, Arlington, VA 22203.

We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see the Public Comments section below for more information).