

does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders.

The Coast Guard does not consider this rule to be “significant” under that Order because it is an administrative change and does not affect the way vessels operate on the waterway.

## 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 have no effect on small entities since this drawbridge has been removed and the regulation governing draw operations for this bridge is no longer applicable. There is no new restriction or regulation being imposed by this rule; therefore, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

## 3. Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

## 4. 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 have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

## 5. 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.

## 6. 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.

## 7. 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.

## 8. 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.

## 9. 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 might disproportionately affect children.

## 10. 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.

## 11. 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.

## 12. Technical Standards

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

## 13. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security

Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have concluded 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 removing 33 CFR 117.1089(b) from the regulations. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule.

## List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 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; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

### § 117.1089 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 117.1089 remove and reserve paragraph (b).

Dated: April 20, 2015.

**F.M. Midgett,**

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

[FR Doc. 2015–10238 Filed 4–30–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2015–0333]

RIN 1625–AA00

### Safety Zone; Floating Construction Platform, Chicago River, Chicago, IL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the South Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois. This temporary safety zone is intended to restrict vessels from a designated portion of the South

Branch of the Chicago River due to the transit of a floating construction platform on April 26, 2015, or alternatively on a later date. This temporary safety zone is necessary to protect the surrounding public and vessels from the hazards associated with the transit of the floating construction platform.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from May 1, 2015 until May 9, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket USCG–2015–0333. 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, contact or email MST1 John Ng, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Unit Chicago, at (630) 986–2122 or [John.H.Ng@uscg.mil](mailto:John.H.Ng@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Cheryl Collins, 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  
TFR Temporary Final Rule

**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 with respect to this rule because doing so would be impracticable and contrary to public interest. On April 22, 2015, the Coast Guard established a temporary safety zone to accommodate the transit of the floating construction platform, which was scheduled for April 19, 2015

(USCG–2015–0277). However, we recently learned that scheduled transit would be postponed to April 26, 2015. We did not know of this change and the final details for this event until there was insufficient time remaining before the event to publish an NPRM. Thus, delaying the effective date of this rule to wait for a comment period to run would be both impracticable and contrary to the public interest because it would inhibit the Coast Guard’s ability to protect participants, spectators and vessels from the hazards associated with this operation, which are discussed further below.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this temporary rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** for the same reasons discussed in the preceding paragraph, waiting for a 30 day notice period to run would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

**B. Basis and Purpose**

The legal basis for this rule is the Coast Guard’s authority to establish safety zones: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

On April 26, 2015, or alternatively on a later date on or prior to May 9, 2015, a floating construction platform will transit up the South Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois from the Canal Street Bridge to the Lake Street Bridge. The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan has determined that the transit of the floating construction platform poses a significant risk to public safety and property. Such hazards include limited maneuverability and restricted visibility associated with the transit of a floating construction platform.

**C. Discussion of the Final Rule**

With the aforementioned hazards in mind, the Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan, has determined that this temporary safety zone is necessary to ensure the safety of vessels during the transit of the floating construction platform on the South Branch of the Chicago River. This rule was enforced from 5:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on April 26, 2015. However, enforcement may occur on a later date within this effective period due to an unanticipated delay. In the event of a postponement, advanced notice of the enforcement time will be provided through Broadcast Notice to Mariners. The safety zone will encompass all waters of South Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, IL, from the Canal Street Bridge to the Lake Street Bridge.

Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within the safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated on-scene representative. The Captain of the Port or a designated on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16.

**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 conclude that this rule is not a significant regulatory action because we anticipate that it will have minimal impact on the economy, will not interfere with other agencies, will not adversely alter the budget of any grant or loan recipients, and will not raise any novel legal or policy issues. The safety zone created by this rule will only impact a small area of the Chicago River and will be enforced for an estimated period of seven hours on one day between April 25, 2015 and May 9, 2015. Under certain conditions, moreover, vessels may still transit through the safety zone when permitted by the Captain of the Port or a designated on-scene representative.

*2. Impact on Small Entities*

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered the impact of this temporary rule on small entities. 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 the affected portion of the South Branch of the Chicago River between 5:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. on April 26, 2015, or alternatively on a later date.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities for the reasons cited in the *Regulatory Planning and Review* section. Additionally, before the enforcement of the zone, we would issue local Broadcast Notice to Mariners so vessel owners and operators can plan accordingly.

### 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 this 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 and, therefore it 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 record keeping 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. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapters 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.T09–0333 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–0333 Safety Zone; Floating Construction Platform, Chicago River, Chicago, IL.

(a) *Location.* All waters of the South Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, IL, from Canal Street Bridge to Lake Street Bridge.

(b) *Effective and Enforcement Period.* This rule is effective from May 1, 2015 until May 9, 2015. This rule was enforced on April 26, 2015, by actual notice. This rule may be enforced by actual or constructive notice after publication until May 9, 2015.

(c) *Regulations.*

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless

authorized by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated on-scene representative.

(2) This safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or a designated on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer who has been designated by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan to act on his or her behalf.

(4) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the safety zone must contact the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative to obtain permission to do so. The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative.

Dated: April 22, 2015.

**K.M. Moser,**

*Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Captain of the Port, Lake Michigan.*

[FR Doc. 2015-10215 Filed 4-30-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

### 38 CFR Part 63

RIN 2900-AO71

#### Health Care for Homeless Veterans Program

**AGENCY:** Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) amends its medical regulations concerning eligibility for the Health Care for Homeless Veterans (HCHV) program. The HCHV program provides per diem payments to non-VA community-based facilities that provide housing, outreach services, case management services, and rehabilitative services, and may provide care and/or treatment to homeless veterans who are enrolled in or eligible for VA health care. The rule modifies VA’s HCHV regulations to conform to changes enacted in the Honoring America’s Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012. Specifically, the rule removes the requirement that homeless veterans be diagnosed with a serious mental illness or substance use

disorder to qualify for the HCHV program. This change makes the program available to all homeless veterans who are enrolled in or eligible for VA health care. The rule also updates the definition of homeless to match in part the one used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The rule further clarifies that the services provided by the HCHV program through non-VA community-based providers must include case management services, including non-clinical case management, as appropriate.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective June 1, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Robert Hallett, Health Care for Homeless Veterans Manager, c/o Bedford VA Medical Center, Veterans Health Administration, 200 Springs Road, Bldg. 17, Bedford, MA 01730; (781) 687-3187. (This is not a toll-free number.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The HCHV program is authorized by section 2031 of title 38, United States Code (U.S.C.), under which VA may provide to eligible veterans outreach; care, treatment, and rehabilitative services (directly or by contract in community-based treatment facilities, including halfway houses); and therapeutic transitional housing assistance, under 38 U.S.C. 2032, in conjunction with work therapy under 38 U.S.C. 1718(a)–(b). Under current regulations, only veterans who are homeless, enrolled in the VA health care system or eligible for VA health care under title 38, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), § 17.36 or 17.37, and have a serious mental illness and/or substance use disorder are eligible for the program. 38 CFR 63.3(a).

In a document published in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 2014 (79 FR 27826), VA proposed to amend part 63 of 38 CFR to remove the requirement that homeless veterans must suffer from a serious mental illness or substance use disorder to be eligible for HCHV, to modify the definition of the term “homeless” to match in part the definition used by HUD, and to require HCHV providers to offer case management services to homeless veterans, as appropriate. We provided a 60-day comment period, which ended on July 14, 2014. We received seven comments, all of which supported the proposed changes to part 63.

One commenter stated that it is shameful that homeless veterans have to be diagnosed with an illness before they can receive the benefits they have earned through military service. Before the enactment of Public Law 112–154, § 302, 126 Stat. 1164, 1184 (Aug. 6,

2012), VA only had authority to provide HCHV services to veterans with serious mental illness, including veterans who are homeless. As amended, the law authorizes VA to make services under the HCHV program available to all homeless veterans VA provides care and services to, regardless of whether they have a serious mental illness. VA fully supports the change in law, and agrees with the commenter that benefits for homeless veterans provided through the HCHV program should not be predicated on a diagnosis of serious mental illness. This regulation will remove that requirement, thereby allowing all eligible homeless veterans to receive services. VA is not making a change based on this comment.

Another commenter asked VA to make the changes in the proposed rule, stating that homeless veterans should be provided resources through the HCHV program regardless of whether or not they have a mental illness. Another commenter stated her wholehearted support for the proposed amendment. Another commenter stated the proposed changes need to be passed. We appreciate the commenters taking the time to review this rulemaking.

Another commenter expressed support for the rule and noted that the proposed change could reduce the social stigma many homeless veterans who do not suffer from a serious mental illness feel about seeking assistance to address their homelessness. Another commenter noted that removing the requirement of a diagnosis for mental illness would also help homeless veterans with serious mental illness access the program, as they may not have been willing to acknowledge their disability before. We agree and believe that these changes will help more homeless veterans, both those with and without a serious mental illness, access the health care services they need through the HCHV program.

One commenter expressed support for the proposed changes, but identified two concerns. First, the commenter urged VA to request increased funding and resources to accommodate the number of new enrollees that would be eligible as a result of the proposed rule. Second, the commenter stated their concern that the proposed rule could have the unintended effect of disadvantaging homeless veterans with a serious mental illness if HCHV providers find that veterans without a mental illness are easier to place or receive the bulk of the services available. While the first comment is somewhat outside the scope of this rule, VA will take into account the changes made as a result of this rule when