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ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish a permanent safety zone for an annually recurring marine event in the Red River, from MM 88.0 to MM 88.5. This action is necessary to protect persons and vessels from the potential safety hazards associated with a dragon boat race taking place in early May, 2016 and recurring annually thereafter. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from being in the safety zone unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP), Lower Mississippi 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 April 14, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2016–0171 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://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 LT Tyrone Conner, Sector Lower Mississippi River Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone (901) 521–4725, email Tyrone.L.Conner@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR   Code of Federal Regulations
DHS   Department of Homeland Security
E.O.  Executive order
FR   Federal Register
NPRM  Notice of proposed rulemaking
Pub. L.  Public Law
§ Section

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

This is the sixth annual Louisiana Dragon Boat Race, occurring each year on the Red River during the first few weeks in May. We have established a safety zone for the race event in past years through a temporary final rulemaking each year. For this year and subsequent years, we propose to establish the safety zone as a permanent annual recurring regulation to safeguard against the hazards associated with a race event on the Red River, near Alexandria, Louisiana.

The legal basis and authorities for this rule are found in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The purpose of this proposed safety zone is to protect both spectators and participants from the hazards associated with the race event.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP Lower Mississippi River proposes to establish a safety zone approximately 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. for approximately 10 hours on the first or second Saturday in May, recurring annually. The proposed safety zone would encompass all waters of the Red River from Mile Marker (MM) 88.0 to (MM) 88.5. All persons and vessels, except those persons and vessels participating in the dragon boat race and those vessels enforcing the areas, would be prohibited from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the safety zone. 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 (E.O.s) related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and E.O.s, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

E.O.s 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. E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under E.O. 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This regulatory action determination is based on the time, location and duration of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would be restricted from entering,
transiting, or anchoring within a small portion of the Red River during one day each May. Vessels may request permission from the COTP to deviate from the restriction and transit through the safety zone and notifications to the marine community will be made through local notice to mariners (LNM) and broadcast notice to mariners (BNM). Therefore, those operating on the waterway will be able to plan operations around the proposed safety zone and its enforcement times.

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 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 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 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 E.O. 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 E.O. 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under E.O. 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 above.

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 effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, 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 establishing a temporary safety zone for approximately 10 hours on one day in May each year on the Red River from (MM) 88.0 to (MM) 88.5. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.1D. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist and 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 proposed rule.

G. 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.

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.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov. If your material cannot be submitted using http://www.regulations.gov, contact the person in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the Federal Register (70 FR 15086).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at http://www.regulations.gov and can be viewed by following that Web site’s instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for an alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.
List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes 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:


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the course of conducting official investigations, Special Agents of the United States Postal Service Office of Inspector General frequently recover property lost or stolen from the mail and obtain custody of property needed for use as evidence in proceedings to enforce various provisions of the United States Code. In most cases, such property is returned to the owner at the conclusion of the investigation or any resulting administrative or judicial proceedings. In some cases, however, the owners fail to claim property, and it therefore remains in the custody of the Office of Inspector General after it is no longer needed. The proposed rule would establish a fair and uniform procedure to identify the owners of such property, afford them an opportunity to claim its return, and in the event a valid claim is not received, treat such property as abandoned and direct that it be sold or put to official use. Apparent owners would be notified of their right to claim property, and where no apparent owner is known and the value of the property in question exceeds $200, notice would be published on the Office of Inspector General’s Web site inviting the owner to submit a claim for its return.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 230

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Law enforcement, Property (abandoned).

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Postal Service proposes to amend 39 CFR part 230 as follows:

PART 230—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

1. The authority citation for part 230 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. App.3; 39 U.S.C. 401(2) and 1001.

2. Add the subpart C to read as follows:

Subpart C—Rules of Procedure Relating to the Disposition of Stolen Mail Matter and Property Acquired by the Office of Inspector General for Use as Evidence

Sec.

230.30 Scope.

230.31 Definitions.

230.32 Disposition of property of apparent owners where property is valued over $200.

230.33 Disposition of property of apparent owners where property is valued at $200 or less.

230.34 Disposition of property of unknown owners where property is valued over $200.

230.35 Disposition of property of unknown owners where property is valued at $200 or less.

230.36 Contraband and property subject to court order.

230.37 Determination of type of property.

230.38 Disposition of abandoned property; additional period for filing claims.

230.39 Submission of claims.

230.40 Determination of claims.

230.41 Reconsideration of claims.

230.42 Disposition of property declared abandoned where title vests in the government.

§ 230.30 Scope.

This subpart prescribes procedures governing the disposition of any property (real, personal, tangible, or intangible) obtained by the United States Postal Service Office of Inspector General (Office of Inspector General) for possible use as evidence after the need to retain such property no longer exists.