

by the benefit of the existing regulatory language.

On the other hand, if members of the public support a modification to the CVD expedited review regulation, Commerce seeks comments on desired changes to § 351.214(l), including methods to reduce the resources required to implement it, such as by making the conduct of a CVD expedited review discretionary, rather than mandatory or requiring that all requests for a CVD expedited review include complete initial questionnaire responses. In short, if Commerce were to retain but modify § 351.214(l), Commerce invites parties to propose modifications that would relieve Commerce of the many burdens that accompany the application of the current regulation, along with the factual, legal, and policy reasons in support of those proposals and any proposed regulatory language.

Request for Comments

We are issuing this advanced notice of proposed rulemaking to inform the public that Commerce is considering revising and codifying two of its policies and regulations. One revision involves Commerce's unaffiliated reseller policy in market economy AD administrative reviews, with a possible addition to § 351.212, and the second either removes or substantially revises Commerce's procedures in conducting an expedited CVD review pursuant to § 351.214(l). Specifically, Commerce is inviting parties to provide the following comments, including the factual, legal, and policy reasons in support of their views and any proposed regulatory language:

(1) If Commerce conducts an AD administrative review of a producer of subject merchandise in a market economy, should the AD rate applied to subject merchandise produced by the examined producer and exported by an unexamined unaffiliated reseller to the United States be the all-others rate, or the higher of the producer's AD rate and the all-others rate?

(2) In light of the resources required to administer the current CVD expedited review regulation, § 351.214(l), and the fact that the Act does not require that Commerce conduct CVD expedited reviews, should Commerce remove, retain, or modify that regulation? Further, if Commerce were to retain, but modify § 351.214(l), Commerce also invites parties to propose suggestions for modifications to the regulation that would relieve Commerce of many of the administrative burdens that accompany the application of the current regulation.

Dated: May 29, 2025.

Christopher Abbott,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2025–10158 Filed 6–3–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2025–0221]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Rainy Lake, City of Ranier, MN

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary safety zone for certain waters of Rainy Lake. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on these navigable waters near Ranier Beach Park, Ranier, MN, during a fireworks display on August 9, 2025. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Duluth 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 7, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2025–0221 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. This notice of proposed rulemaking with its plain-language, 100-word-or-less proposed rule summary will be available in this same docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email Lieutenant Zachary Fedak, Waterways Management, Marine Safety Unit Duluth, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 218–725–3818, email Zachary.A.Fedak@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 January 6, 2025, an organization notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting a fireworks display from 10–10:30 p.m. on August 9, 2025. The fireworks are to be launched from a barge in Rainy Lake approximately 250 yards northwest of Ranier Beach Park in Ranier, MN. Hazards from firework displays include accidental discharge of fireworks, dangerous projectiles, and falling hot embers or other debris. The Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Duluth (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 200-yard radius of the barge.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels and the navigable waters within a 200-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.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish a safety zone from 8 p.m. through 11 p.m. on August 9, 2025. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters within 200 yards of a barge in Rainy Lake located approximately 250 yards northwest of Ranier Beach Park in Ranier, MN. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of vessels and these navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled 10–10:30 p.m. 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.

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 section 3(f) of 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 Ranier Lake for 3 hours 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 3 hours that would prohibit entry within 200 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. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket. For instructions on locating the docket, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

Submitting comments. We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal Decision-Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. To do so, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2025–0221 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>, 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. Also, if you click on the Dockets tab and then the proposed rule, you should see a “Subscribe” option for email alerts. The option will notify you when comments are posted, or a final rule is published.

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, 70051, 70124; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.4.

- 2. Add § 165.T09–0221 to read as follows:

§ 165.T09–0221 Safety Zone; Rainy Lake, City of Ranier, MN.

(a) **Location.** The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of Rainy Lake, from surface to bottom, within a 200-yard radius of the firework barge to be positioned at 48°37'04" N, 093°20'52" W. These coordinates are based on World Geodetic System 84.

(b) **Definitions.** As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Duluth (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) **Regulations.** (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP's

representative by VHF Channel 16. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(d) **Enforcement period.** This section will be enforced from 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. on August 9, 2025.

John P. Botti,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Marine Safety Unit Duluth.

[FR Doc. 2025–10137 Filed 6–3–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2025–0058; FRL–12609–01–R9]

Air Plan Approval; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Portland Cement Kilns

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD or “District”) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from Portland cement kilns. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 7, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2025–0058 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). The 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. The 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 <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with a disability who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Elijah Gordon, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105; telephone number: (415) 972–3158; email address: gordon.elijah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rule did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of this rule?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule?
- II. The EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is the EPA evaluating the rule?
 - B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. Proposed Action and Public Comment
- III. Incorporation by Reference
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. The State's Submittal

A. What rule did the State submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the date that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted to the EPA by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Amended	Submitted
EKAPCD	425.3	Portland Cement Kilns (Oxides of Nitrogen)	11/13/2024	12/12/2024