

Requirements Bulletin 767–32A0253 RB, dated February 6, 2024, uses the phrase “the Original Issue date of Requirements Bulletin 767–32A0253 RB,” this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(i) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(1) The Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the certification office, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (j)(1) of this AD. Information may be emailed to: *AMOC@faa.gov*.

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(3) An AMOC that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used for any repair, modification, or alteration required by this AD if it is approved by The Boeing Company Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) that has been authorized by the Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, to make those findings. To be approved, the repair method, modification deviation, or alteration deviation must meet the certification basis of the airplane, and the approval must specifically refer to this AD.

(j) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Stefanie Roesli, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3964; email: *Stefanie.N.Roesli@faa.gov*.

(2) Service information identified in this AD that is not incorporated by reference is available at the addresses specified in paragraphs (k)(3) and (4) of this AD.

(k) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of the service information listed in this paragraph under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) You must use this service information as applicable to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(i) Boeing Alert Requirements Bulletin 767–32A0253 RB, dated February 6, 2024.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For service information identified in this AD, contact Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Attention: Contractual & Data Services (C&DS), 2600 Westminister Blvd., MC 110–SK57, Seal Beach, CA 90740–5600; telephone 562–797–1717; website *myboeingfleet.com*.

(4) You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(5) You may view this material at the National Archives and Records

Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, visit *www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations* or email *fr.inspection@nara.gov*.

Issued on July 8, 2024.

Peter A. White,

Deputy Director, Integrated Certificate Management Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2024–15308 Filed 7–12–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2024–0379]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Miami River, North Fork, Miami, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to remove the operating schedule that governs the FDOT Railroad Bridge, across the Miami River, North Fork, mile 5.3, at Miami, FL. The railroad bridge is being replaced with a fixed bridge. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before August 14, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2024–0379 using Federal Decision Making Portal at *https://www.regulations.gov*.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for 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 on this proposed rule, call or email Ms. Jennifer Zercher, Bridge Management Specialist, Seventh Coast Guard District; telephone 571–607–5951, email *Jennifer.N.Zercher@uscg.mil*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
 DHS Department of Homeland Security
 FR Federal Register
 OMB Office of Management and Budget
 NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
 (Advance, Supplemental)

§ Section
 U.S.C. United States Code
 FL Florida
 FDOT Florida Department of Transportation

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The FDOT Railroad Bridge, across the Miami River, North Fork, mile 5.3, at Miami, FL, is a single bascule bridge with a 6-foot vertical clearance at mean high water in the closed position. The normal operating schedule is set forth in 33 CFR 117.307.

FDOT applied for and received a Coast Guard Bridge Permit to replace the existing moveable railroad bridge with a fixed railroad bridge. FDOT has requested the drawbridge operation regulation be removed and the bridge be allowed to remain closed to navigation in anticipation of phase one of the bridge replacement project, converting the moveable bridge to a fixed bridge, beginning August 2024.

The Miami River, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is a federal navigation project channel. On December 21, 2020, the U.S. Congress approved the deauthorization of navigational rights for the portion of the Miami River between the FDOT Railroad Bridge and the S–26 SFWMD structure with the Miami Rivel Canal provision of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (12/21/2020).

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

Under this proposed rule, the FDOT Railroad Bridge would be allowed to remain closed to navigation until the bridge replacement project is completed. The waterway from the railroad bridge to the water control structure has been deauthorized of navigational rights, therefore, impacts to navigation are not expected. Vessels that can pass beneath the bridge without an opening would be able to so at any time.

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 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 proposed rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under section 3(f) of Executive

Order 12866, as amended by Executive Order 14094 (Modernizing Regulatory Review). Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels able to transit the bridge without an opening may do so at any time.

B. 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.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge 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 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 contact 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 call for no 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 contact 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 will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning Policy COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f). The Coast Guard has 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 proposed rule promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table 3–1 of the U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are 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.

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–2024–0379 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 your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document 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 go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted, or a final rule is published of any posting or updates to the docket.

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 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 DHS Delegation No. 00170.1, Revision No. 01.3.

§ 117.307 [Removed]

■ 2. Remove § 117.307.

Dated: July 07, 2024.

Douglas M. Schofield,

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

[FR Doc. 2024–15233 Filed 7–12–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 271**

[EPA–R04–RCRA–2024–0116; FRL–11972–01–R4]

North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: North Carolina has applied to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for final authorization of changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended. The EPA has reviewed North Carolina’s application and has determined, subject to public comment, that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for final authorization. Therefore, in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, we are authorizing North Carolina for these changes as a final action without a prior proposed rule. If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 14, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–RCRA–2024–0116, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from

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, 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>.

The EPA encourages electronic submittals, but if you are unable to submit electronically or need other assistance, please contact Leah Davis, the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Please also contact Leah Davis if you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with disabilities who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you.

All documents in the docket are listed in the www.regulations.gov index. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically in www.regulations.gov. For alternative access to docket materials, please contact Leah Davis, the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leah Davis; RCRA Programs and Cleanup Branch; Land, Chemicals and Redevelopment Division; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960; telephone number: (404) 562–8562; fax number: (404) 562–9964; email address: davis.leah@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document proposes to take action on North Carolina’s changes to its hazardous waste management program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended. We have published a final action authorizing these changes in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register** because we view this as a noncontroversial action and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this action in the preamble to the final action.

If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule. If we receive adverse comment, we will withdraw the final action and it will not take effect. We would then address all public comments in a subsequent final action and base any further decision on the authorization of the State program changes after considering all comments received during the comment period.

We do not intend to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. For further information, please see the information provided in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

Dated: June 28, 2024.

Jeaneanne Gettle,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 2024–15116 Filed 7–12–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration****49 CFR Part 571**

[Docket No. NHTSA–2024–0034]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Rear Impact Guards; Rear Impact Protection; Denial of Petition for Rulemaking

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Denial of petitions for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This document denies a petition for rulemaking from Jerry and Marianne Karth, Eric Hein, and Lois Durso-Hawkins, requesting that NHTSA amend Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) No. 223, “Rear impact guards,” and FMVSS No. 224, “Rear impact protection,” to include additional requirements. The agency is denying the petition because it does not provide new or different information that would warrant initiation of a rulemaking at this time. This document also discusses NHTSA’s consideration of a similar petition from the same petitioners submitted to the docket of the July 15, 2022 final rule amending FMVSS Nos. 223 and 224.

DATES: July 15, 2024.

ADDRESSES: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: