

**Regulatory Flexibility Act**

The Department of the Interior certifies that this rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal, which is the subject of this rulemaking, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. In making the determination as to whether this rulemaking would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

**Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act**

This rulemaking is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rulemaking: (a) Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million; (b) Will not

cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and (c) Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rulemaking, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

**Unfunded Mandates**

This rulemaking will not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of \$100 million or more in any given year. This determination is based upon the fact that the State submittal, which is the subject of this rulemaking, is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that

the Federal regulation did not impose an unfunded mandate.

**List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 901**

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: April 3, 2018.

**Alfred L. Clayborne,**

*Regional Director, Mid-Continent Region.*

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR part 901 is amended as set forth below:

**PART 901—ALABAMA**

- 1. The authority citation for part 901 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*

- 2. Section 901.15 is amended in the table by adding an entry FOR “ASMCRA 9–16–79 and 9–16–79(4)b” in chronological order by “Date of final publication” to read as follows:

**§ 901.15 Approval of Alabama regulatory program amendments.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Original amendment submission date	Date of final publication	Citation/description
June 12, 2015 .....	April 27, 2018	ASMCRA 9–16–79 and 9–16–79(4)b.

[FR Doc. 2018–08935 Filed 4–26–18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–05–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 110**

**[Docket Number USCG–2015–0549]**

**RIN 1625-AA01**

**Anchorage Grounds; Galveston Harbor, Bolivar Roads Channel, Galveston, Texas**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a new anchorage area, Anchorage Area Alpha (A) East in Bolivar Roads near Galveston, Texas. The establishment of this additional anchorage area would enhance navigational safety, support regional maritime security needs, and contribute to the free flow of commerce in the Houston-Galveston area.

**DATES:** This rule is effective May 29, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2015–0549 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email Lieutenant Commander (LCDR) Navin Griffin, Sector Houston–Galveston, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone (281) 464–4736, email [Navin.L.Griffin@uscg.mil](mailto:Navin.L.Griffin@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

**II. Background Information and Regulatory History**

On August 15, 2017, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) titled Anchorage

Grounds; Galveston Harbor, Bolivar Roads Channel, Galveston, Texas (82 FR 38643). There we stated why we issued the NPRM, and invited comments on our proposed regulatory action related to this Anchorage Area. During the comment period that ended, October 16, 2017, we received no comments.

**III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule**

The legal basis and authorities for this rule are found in 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236; 33 CFR 1.05–1, Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to propose, establish, and define regulatory anchorages.

After extensive discussion, including the observations of and comments from various members of the port community, the Coast Guard has determined that the establishment of Anchorage Area (A) East in the Bolivar Roads area is necessary to address port security, port congestion, and navigation safety concerns. The proposed anchorage area was once an area utilized for spoils from dredging and is equipped to safely receive deep draft vessels. This proposed anchorage is primarily intended as an overflow

anchorage for vessels that are awaiting an exam or inspection. We are amending 33 CFR 110.197 to establish Anchorage Area (A) East in order to increase the safety of life and property on navigable waters, improve the safety of vessels operating, transiting, or anchored and moored in the vicinity, and provide for the overall safe and efficient flow of vessel traffic and commerce in the area.

The Coast Guard has ascertained the view of the Galveston, TX District and Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, about the specific provisions of this rule.

#### **IV. Discussion of Comments, Changes, and the Rule**

As noted above, we received no comments on our NPRM published August 15, 2017. There are no changes in the regulatory text of this rule from the proposed rule in the NPRM.

This rule establishes a new anchorage Area known as Anchorage Area Alpha (A) East. This anchorage area is located in the Galveston Harbor and Bolivar Roads Channel, TX, just east and adjacent to established Anchorage Area (A) in 33 CFR 110.197(a)(1). The boundaries of Anchorage Area Alpha (A) East are presented in § 110.197(a)(4) in the regulatory text at the end of this document. The anchorage area is approximately 0.19 square miles.

Anchorage Area (A) East is intended for temporary use by vessels of all types. Vessels will be allowed to occupy the anchorage areas during a wide range of conditions and for a broad variety of purposes. For example, vessels would be allowed to anchor temporarily while taking on stores, transferring personnel, or engaging in bunkering operations. Vessels would also be allowed to use anchorage areas while awaiting weather and other conditions favorable to resuming their voyage. However, it is to be emphasized that this anchorage is primarily intended as an overflow anchorage for vessels that are awaiting an exam or inspection. Vessels would not be allowed to anchor so as to obstruct the passage of other vessels proceeding to and from anchorage spaces. Anchors would not be placed in the channel and no portion of the hull or rigging would be allowed to extend outside the limits of the anchorage area.

Whenever the maritime or commercial interests of the United States so require, the Captain of the Port Houston-Galveston or his designated representative may direct the movement of any vessel anchored or moored within the anchorage areas.

#### **V. Regulatory Analyses**

We developed this 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. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the location and size of the proposed anchorage grounds, as well as, historical automatic identification system (AIS) data. The impacts on routine navigation are expected to be minimal because the proposed anchorage area is located outside of the established navigation channel. When not occupied, vessels would be able to maneuver in, around, and through the anchorage. Operators on our end maneuvering their vessels around the limits of the proposed anchorage area would not be significantly impacted.

##### *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 received 00 comments from the Small Business Administration on this rulemaking. 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.

The number of small entities impacted and the extent of the impact, if any, is expected to be minimal. The anchorage area is located in an area of Bolivar Roads that is not a popular or productive fishing location. Further, the

location is in an area not routinely transited by vessels heading to, or returning from, known fishing grounds. Finally, the anchorage is located in an area that is not currently used by small entities, including small vessels, for anchoring due to the depth of water naturally present in the area.

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** section.

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.

##### *C. 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).

##### *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 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 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. If you believe this 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 rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (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 permanent anchorage area in Bolivar Roads near Galveston, Texas. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L59(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. A Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

#### 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.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage Grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

#### PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. In § 110.197, add paragraph (a)(4) to read as follows:

#### § 110.197 Galveston Harbor, Bolivar Roads Channel, Texas.

(a) \* \* \*

(4) *Anchorage Area (A) East.* The waters bounded by a line connecting the following points:

Latitude	Longitude
29°21'5.87" N	094°42'52.7" W
29°20'53.99" N	094°42'7.13" W
29°20'45.31" N	094°42'37.75" W
29°20'39.16" N	094°42'7.81" W

and thence to the point of beginning. The coordinates are based on NAD 83.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: April 23, 2018.

**Paul F. Thomas,**

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

[FR Doc. 2018–08873 Filed 4–26–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2017–0857]

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; St. Johns River, Putnam County, FL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard has issued a temporary deviation from the operating schedule that governs the Buffalo Bluff CSX Railroad Bridge across the St. Johns River, mile 94.5, at Satsuma, Putnam County, FL. This deviation will test a change to the drawbridge operation to determine whether a permanent change from manned to remote operations is feasible. This deviation will allow the bridge to operate remotely from the CSX Railroad Bridge on the Ortega River (McGirts Creek) located at mile 1.1 on the Ortega River.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective without actual notice from April 27, 2018 through 6 a.m. September 2, 2018. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from April 23, 2018, until April 27, 2018.

Comments and related materials must reach the Coast Guard on or before August 14, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2017–0857 using Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this test deviation, call or email LT Allan Storm, Sector Jacksonville, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 904–714–7616, email [Allan.H.Storm@uscg.mil](mailto:Allan.H.Storm@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The Buffalo Bluff CSX Railroad Bridge across the St. Johns River, mile 94.5, in Satsuma, Putnam County, FL is a bascule bridge. It has a vertical clearance of 7 feet at mean high water in the closed position and a horizontal clearance of 90 feet. The bridge is currently manned and maintained in the open position. This test deviation would provide for the bridge to be remotely monitored and operated. Visual monitoring of the waterway shall be maintained with the use of cameras and the detection of vessels under the span shall be accomplished with detection sensors. Marine radio communication shall be maintained with mariners near the bridge for the safety of navigation. The remote tender may also be contacted via telephone at (386) 649–8358. The span is normally in the fully open position and will display green lights to indicate that the span is fully open. When a train approaches, the remote tender shall monitor for vessels approaching the bridge. The remote tender shall warn approaching vessels via marine radio, channel 9 VHF of a bridge lowering. Provided the sensors do not detect a vessel under the span, the tender shall initiate the span lowering sequence, which includes the sounding of a horn and the displaying of red lights. The span will remain in the down position for a minimum of eight minutes or for the entire time the approach track circuit is occupied. After the train has cleared the bridge track circuit, the span shall open and the green lights will be displayed. This will allow vessels to pass through the bridge while taking into account the reasonable needs of other modes of transportation.

The Coast Guard will also inform the users of the waterways through our Local and Broadcast Notices to Mariners of the change in operating schedule for the bridge so that vessel operators can arrange their transits to minimize any