

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**
**Coast Guard**
**33 CFR Part 165**
**[Docket No. USCG–2013–0074]**
**RIN 1625–AA00**
**Safety Zone; BWRC Spring Classic, Parker, AZ**
**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone within the Lake Moovalya region of the navigable waters of the Colorado River in Parker, Arizona for the Blue Water Resort and Casino Spring Classic. This temporary safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, participating vessels, and other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 6 a.m. on April 5, 2013, until 6 p.m. on April 7, 2013. It will be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on April 5, 6, and 7, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket [USCG–2013–0074]. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email Petty Officer Deborah Metzger, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego, Coast Guard; telephone 619–278–7656, email [D11-PF-MarineEventsSanDiego@uscg.mil](mailto:D11-PF-MarineEventsSanDiego@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:**
**Table of Acronyms**

DHS Department of Homeland Security

FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

**A. Regulatory History and Information**

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because delay would be impracticable. Immediate action is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels, spectators, participants, and others in the vicinity of the marine event on the dates and times this rule will be in effect.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), for the same reasons mentioned above, the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Delaying the effective date would be contrary to the public interest and impracticable, since immediate action is needed to ensure the public’s safety.

**B. Basis and Purpose**

The legal basis for this temporary rule is the Ports and Waterways Safety Act which authorizes the Coast Guard to establish safety zones (33 U.S.C 1221 et seq.).

The Southern California Speedboat Club is sponsoring the Blue Water Resort and Casino Spring Classic, which is held on the Lake Moovalya region of the Colorado River in Parker, Arizona. This temporary safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, sponsor vessels, and other vessels and users of the waterway. This event involves powerboats racing along a circular course. The size of the boats varies from 10 to 21 feet in length. Approximately 85 boats will be participating in this event. The sponsor will provide two patrol boats and two rescue boats to act as river closure boats that help facilitate the event and ensure public safety.

**C. Discussion of the Final Rule**

The Coast Guard is establishing a safety zone that will be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on April 5, 2013, through April 7, 2013. This safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the crews, spectators, participants, and

other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels will be prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or his designated representative. This temporary safety zone includes the waters of the Colorado River between Headgate Dam and 0.5 miles north of the Blue Water Marina in Parker, Arizona. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

**D. Regulatory Analyses**

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

**1. Regulatory Planning and Review**

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. This determination is based on the size and location of the safety zone. Commercial vessels will not be hindered by the safety zone. Recreational vessels may transit through the established safety zone if authorized to do so by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

**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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule will affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in a portion of the Colorado River from 6

a.m. to 6 p.m. on April 5, 2013, through April 7, 2013.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Although the safety zone would apply to the entire width of the river, traffic would be allowed to pass through the zone with the permission of the designated representative. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

### 3. Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, above.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

### 4. Collection of Information

This rule will not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

### 5. Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and determined that this rule does not have implications for federalism.

### 6. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the

person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

### 7. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### 8. Taking of Private Property

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

### 9. Civil Justice Reform

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

### 10. Protection of Children

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

### 11. Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

### 12. Energy Effects

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

### 13. Technical Standards

This rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not

consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

### 14. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined 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 rule involves the establishment of a safety zone. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this rule.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security Measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

### PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1226, 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 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. Add § 165.T11–552 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T11–552 Safety zone; BWRC Spring Classic, Parker, AZ.

(a) *Location.* This temporary safety zone includes the waters of the Colorado River between Headgate Dam and 0.5 miles north of the Blue Water Marina in Parker, Arizona.

(b) *Enforcement Periods.* This section will be in effect from 6 a.m. on April 5, 2013 to 6 p.m. on April 7, 2013. It will be enforced from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. each day (April 5, 6 and 7, 2013). Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a Local Notice to Mariners (LNM). If the event concludes prior to the scheduled termination time, the Captain of the Port will cease

enforcement of this safety zone and will announce that fact via Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

(c) *Definitions.* The following definition applies to this section: *designated representative* means any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer 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.

(d) *Regulations.* (1) Entry into, transit through or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port of San Diego or his designated representative.

(2) Mariners requesting permission to transit through the safety zone may request authorization to do so from the Patrol Commander. The Patrol Commander may be contacted on VHF-FM Channel 23.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or his 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: March 20, 2013.

**S.M. Mahoney,**

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

[FR Doc. 2013-07745 Filed 4-2-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0807; FRL-9783-6]

### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Ohio Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; correcting amendment.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects an error in the codification in an October 26, 2010, final rule under the Clean Air Act. This rule approved revisions to Ohio regulations that consolidated air quality standards in a new chapter of rules and adjusted the rule references accordingly in various related rules. Of particular note is a revision that adjusted the provision for

measurements for comparison with the particulate matter air quality standards. EPA erroneously codified approval of the entirety of the rule, which may be misread as having inadvertently approved several other provisions which were not addressed in the October 26, 2010 final rule, and which EPA in separate rulemaking had proposed to disapprove. Therefore, EPA is correcting its action to clarify the codification to show that only one paragraph of this rule was approved. This action simply makes the codification consistent with the approval.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on April 3, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Summerhays, Environmental Scientist, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6067, [summerhays.john@epa.gov](mailto:summerhays.john@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 26, 2010, EPA published a final approval of Ohio rules consolidating the State's air quality standards into Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) 3745-25 and modifying an assortment of related rules, mostly providing test methods for measurements used to assess attainment of those standards, so that these related rules would properly reference the relocated air quality standard rules. This action was published at 75 FR 65572 as a direct final rule.

In codifying the approval of these rules, EPA erroneously appeared to approve the entirety of the modified rules, even though in some cases only one paragraph was addressed or modified. OAC 3745-17-03 included pertinent revisions in paragraph (A) specifying test methods for the particulate matter air quality standards. However, OAC 3745-17-03 also included numerous unrelated revisions that had not been previously approved, most notably including revisions that EPA had proposed to disapprove (see 70 FR 36901, published June 27, 2005). EPA's notice of direct final rulemaking published October 26, 2010, provided no discussion of the issues related to the other sections of OAC 3745-17-03, reflecting the fact that EPA intended only to approve and codify the revisions in OAC 3745-17-03(A). Therefore, EPA today is correcting the codification for that action to indicate that only OAC 3745-17-03(A) of that rule is approved. This makes the codification match the approval.

## Correction

In the codification published in the **Federal Register** on October 26, 2010 (75 FR 65572), on page 65574 in the second column, the paragraph numbered (c)(138)(i)(A), erroneously reading: "Ohio Administrative Code Rule 3745-17-03 'Measurement methods and procedures,' effective April 18, 2009," is corrected to read: "Paragraph (A) of Ohio Administrative Code Rule 3745-17-03, 'Measurement methods and procedures,' effective April 18, 2009."

Section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for public comment. EPA has determined that there is good cause for making today's rule final without prior proposal and opportunity for comment because EPA is merely correcting an incorrect codification in a previous action. The corrected codification reflects the revisions that EPA approved in its direct final rule. We find that this constitutes good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B). Thus, notice and opportunity for public comment are unnecessary.

## Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and is therefore not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)). Because the agency has made a "good cause" finding that this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedures Act or any other statute as indicated in the Supplementary Information section above, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), or to sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4). In addition, this action does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments or impose a significant intergovernmental mandate, as described in sections 203 and 204 of UMRA. This rule also does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and