

in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

To view documents mentioned in this proposed rule as being available in the docket, find the docket as described in the previous paragraph, and then select “Supporting & Related Material” in the Document Type column. Public comments will also be placed in our online docket and can be viewed by following instructions on the <https://www.regulations.gov> Frequently Asked Questions web page. We review all comments received, but we will only post comments that address the topic of the proposed rule. We may choose not to post off-topic, inappropriate, or duplicate comments that we receive.

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 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 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 § 117.1087 by adding paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 117.1087 Fox River.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) All drawbridges between mile 37.52 and 58.01, are authorized to be operated remotely, and are required to operate and maintain a VHF–FM Marine Radio.

* * * * *

M.J. Johnston,

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

[FR Doc. 2022–06803 Filed 3–30–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2022–0062]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone, Saint Simons Sound, GA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to remove an existing temporary safety zone which was put in place in response to the grounding of the M/V GOLDEN RAY. Salvage operations pertaining to the M/V GOLDEN RAY have concluded, therefore a safety zone is no longer required. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before May 2, 2022.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2022–0062 using the Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email MST1 Ashley Schad, Marine Safety Unit Savannah Office of Waterways Management, Coast Guard, 912–652–4188 extension 242, or email Ashley.M.Schad@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

COTP Captain of the Port
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 September 19, 2019, an emergency safety zone was put into place to protect vessels using the waterway from response and salvage operations pertaining to the capsizing of the M/V GOLDEN RAY.¹ On January 25, 2022 the Unified Command in charge of the M/V GOLDEN RAY response and salvage operations notified the COTP, Marine Safety Unit Savannah that

salvage operations have concluded, therefore the safety zone in Saint Simons Sound is no longer required.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to remove the safety zone previously established in response to the capsizing of the M/V GOLDEN RAY. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231).

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to remove the temporary safety zone which was put into place on September 19, 2019, in response to the grounding of the M/V GOLDEN RAY (located at 31°07′39.66 North, 081°24′10.58 West, between Saint Simons Lighthouse and the north end of Jekyll Island, in the vicinity of green buoy #19). By removing the safety zone, all waterway users, including commercial, private, and recreational vessels would have unrestricted access to the waterway. The temporary zone was originally established with the intention that it would be removed once all response and salvage resources were demobilized and removed from the waterway pertaining to the capsizing of the M/V GOLDEN RAY. On January 25, 2022, it was determined that all response and salvage resources and assets were no longer in the vicinity of the safety zone and removal of the M/V GOLDEN RAY was complete. Removal of environmental protective barriers including cofferdams and precautionary containment boom were also completed.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on waterway usage and the temporary nature of the previously established safety zone. While the temporary safety zone that we are proposing for removal was in place for

¹ 84 FR 51413.

more than two years, it was never intended to be permanent. There were many obstructions and hazards in the waterway, including the M/V GOLDEN RAY and other artificial obstructions that were used in its salvage and the associated pollution prevention measures. These obstructions created a necessity for the temporary safety zone, but the obstructions have been removed, therefore there is no longer a need for the temporary safety zone. Once the temporary safety zone is removed, all waterway users will regain unrestricted access to the waterway.

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.

This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator as full access to the waterway would be reestablished and would not prevent any vessel from entering the previously established safety zone.

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 removing a previously established temporary safety zone.

Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L(60b) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to call or email the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

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

Submitting comments. We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. To do so, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2022–0062 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. 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 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: 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, Revision No. 01.2.

§ 165.T07–0794 [Removed]

- 2. Remove § 165.T07–0794.

Dated: March 8, 2022.

K.A Broyles,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Savannah, GA.

[FR Doc. 2022–06797 Filed 3–30–22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2022–0139]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Columbia River, Richland, WA

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 the Columbia River. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of participants and the maritime public during a high-speed boat race. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit non-participant persons and vessel from being in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Columbia River 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 May 2, 2022.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2022–0139 using the Federal Decision Making Portal at [https://](https://www.regulations.gov)

www.regulations.gov. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email LCDR Sean Morrison, Waterways Management Division, Marine Safety Unit Portland, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 503–240–9319, email D13-SMB-MSUPortlandWWM@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
COTP Captain of the Port Columbia River

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On November 3, 2021, Northwest Powerboat Association notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting a high-speed boat race from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on June 24, 2022 through June 26, 2022. These boats will be traveling at a rate of speed greater than usual boat traffic, and will be utilizing all of the waterway in the vicinity of Howard Amon Park, between mile markers 337 and 338. The Captain of the Port Columbia River (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the high speed boat race would be a safety concern for anyone in the regulated area.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in these navigable waters in the vicinity of Howard Amon Park, between mile markers 337 and 338, for the duration of the 3-day event. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231).

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish a safety zone that will be subject to enforcement from 7:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. on June 24, 2022 through June 26, 2022. The safety zone will cover all navigable waters of the Columbia River from surface to bottom, in the vicinity of Howard Amon Park, between mile markers 337 and 338. The duration of the zone is intended to protect personnel, vessels, and the marine environment in these navigable waters for the duration of the 3-day event. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the regulated area without

obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, and duration of the safety zone. This regulatory action will only impact a small 1-mile section of the Columbia River. Moreover, the Coast Guard will issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone and the rule allows 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