

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165**

[Docket Number USCG–2019–0952]

RIN 1625–AA01

**Anchorage Regulations; Special Anchorages Areas Within the First Coast Guard District****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to revise the notes for its First Coast Guard District special anchorage area regulations and to remove language from the text of four of these regulations because those provisions are inconsistent with simply designating the location of a special anchorage area. These existing notes and regulatory text provisions, which contain obsolete and duplicative language, would be replaced with a note in a new section we are adding that would apply to all special anchorage area regulations in the First Coast Guard District. The note would advise interested persons that state and local regulations may apply and that they should contact other authorities, such as the local harbormaster, to ensure compliance with any such applicable regulations. These changes are primarily editorial in nature and are intended to clarify and update First Coast Guard District special anchorage area regulations. This proposed rule would not create, remove, or change any previously established special anchorage areas in the First Coast Guard District.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before June 7, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2019–0952 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, contact Mr. Craig Lapiejko, Waterways Management at First Coast Guard District, telephone 617–223–8351, email [craig.d.lapiejko@uscg.mil](mailto:craig.d.lapiejko@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  
OMB Office of Management and Budget  
SAA Special Anchorage Area  
§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

**II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis**

The First Coast Guard District has received a request to remove the note in 33 CFR 110.32—Hingham Harbor, Hingham, Massachusetts. This regulation with its note was added to 33 CFR part 110 soon after the Coast Guard was given authority for Federal anchorage regulations more than 50 years ago.

In 1967, as part of the creation of the Department of Transportation and the government restructuring that followed, authority for federal anchorage regulations was transferred from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to the Coast Guard as reflected in a rule published December 12, 1967 (32 FR 17726). We have made a copy of this rule available in the docket along with other rulemaking documents we reference that were published before 1995. At the time of transfer, the Coast Guard adopted the special anchorage area (SAA) regulations that were previously in effect. The regulations for SAAs located in the First Coast Guard District were moved from 33 CFR part 202 to 33 CFR 110.2 through 110.60. During the transfer of the SAA regulations from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to the Coast Guard we did not focus on the notes to these regulations. Over the ensuing 50 years, the SAAs within the First Coast Guard District, 33 CFR 110.2 through 110.60, have been amended numerous times as SAAs were added, amended, or removed.

In a rule published August 3, 1968 (33 FR 11079), the Coast Guard added § 110.32 to 33 CFR part 110 which created five separate SAAs in Hingham Harbor, MA. That regulation was issued in response to a request from the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Hingham, MA. The note in that regulation said that:

- These areas will be principally used by yachts and other recreational craft.
- Temporary floats or buoys for marking anchors will be allowed in the areas but fixed piles or stakes may not be placed.
- The anchoring of vessels and the placing of moorings in these areas will be under the jurisdiction of the local Harbor Master.

In a 1988 notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM)(53 FR 7949, 7950, Mar. 11, 1988), among other proposed

changes, the Coast Guard proposed to remove notes from SAA regulations including the note for 33 CFR 110.32—Hingham Harbor, Hingham, Massachusetts. Later in 1988, the Coast Guard published a supplemental NPRM (53 FR 48935, Dec. 5, 1988) to both expand its suggested revisions and address comments on the NPRM. Then in 1995, citing both the lapse of time since proposals in 1988 and the lack of resources to complete the rulemaking, the Coast Guard terminated that rulemaking (60 FR 2364, Jan. 9, 1995).

In response to the 2019 request to remove the note for § 110.32, we decided to adopt the sound reasoning given in 1988 to remove both that note and notes for all other regulations for SAAs in the First Coast Guard District. In the 1988 supplemental NPRM (53 FR 48935, Dec. 5, 1988), we stated that the Coast Guard does not regulate vessel activities within SAAs as it does in anchorage grounds, and that the only effect of designating a SAA under the authority of 33 U.S.C. 2071 is that vessels under 20 meters in length (65 feet) anchored in these areas do not have to exhibit the lights and shapes or sound signals required by Rules 30 and 35 of the Inland Rules.<sup>1</sup> We also noted in the supplemental NPRM (53 FR 48935, Dec. 5, 1988) that other vessel activity within these SAAs may be regulated by local authorities as long as the local regulations do not conflict with Federal regulations which may be promulgated under other statutory authority. Earlier that year, in the NPRM (53 FR 7949, 7950, Mar. 11, 1988), we noted that inclusion of references to state or local ordinances in part 110 is not desirable because it makes it appear as though the Coast Guard has incorporated these ordinances into the Federal regulations.

This proposed rule is being issued under authority in 33 U.S.C. 2071. That authority has been delegated to the Coast Guard by Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, and to District Commanders by 33 CFR 1.05–1(e).

**III. Discussion of Proposed Rule**

This proposed rule would remove existing notes in regulations for SAAs in the First Coast Guard District and remove the regulatory provisions in § 110.25, § 110.29, § 110.50d, and § 110.60 that do not designate the location of SAAs. Additionally, we would add § 110.3, entitled, “First Coast Guard District Special Anchorage Areas.” Its text would identify SAA

<sup>1</sup> Currently these two rules may be found in 33 CFR 83.30 and 83.35.

regulations for the First Coast Guard District (§ 110.4 through § 110.60) and its note would advise those planning to use a SAA in the First District that state ordinances, local ordinances, or both, may apply to those anchoring there and that the local harbor master is often the best source of information about any such ordinances. These ordinances may involve, for example, compliance with direction from the local harbor master when placing or using moorings within the anchorage.

These changes are primarily editorial in nature and are intended to clarify and update the notes in this part. This rule does not create, remove, or change any SAA. Vessels less than 65 feet in length, when at anchor in these SAAs, are not required to sound signals or display anchorage lights or shapes when at anchor.

This proposed rule would remove notes from the following sections in 33 CFR part 110 that designate SAAs in the First Coast Guard District:

- § 110.4, Penobscot Bay, Maine.
- § 110.5, Casco Bay, Maine.
- § 110.6, Portland Harbor, Portland, Maine (between Little Diamond Island and Great Diamond Island).
- § 110.8, Lake Champlain, New York and Vermont.
- § 110.26, Marblehead Harbor, Marblehead, Massachusetts.
- § 110.29, Boston Inner Harbor, Massachusetts.
- § 110.30, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts.
- § 110.31, Hull Bay and Allerton Harbor at Hull, Massachusetts.
- § 110.32, Hingham Harbor, Hingham, Massachusetts.
- § 110.37, Sesuit Harbor, Dennis, Massachusetts.
- § 110.38, Edgartown Harbor, Massachusetts.
- § 110.45a, Mattapoissett Harbor, Mattapoissett, Massachusetts.
- § 110.50, Stonington Harbor, Connecticut.
- § 110.50a, Fishers Island Sound, Stonington, Connecticut.
- § 110.50b, Mystic Harbor, Groton and Stonington, Connecticut.
- § 110.50c, Mumford Cove, Groton, Connecticut.
- § 110.51, Groton, Connecticut.
- § 110.52, Thames River, New London, Connecticut.
- § 110.53, Niantic, Connecticut.
- § 110.55, Connecticut River, Connecticut.
- § 110.55a, Five Mile River, Norwalk and Darien, Connecticut.
- § 110.55b, Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.
- § 110.56, Noroton Harbor, Darien, Connecticut.
- § 110.58, Cos Cob Harbor, Greenwich, Connecticut.
- § 110.59, Eastern Long Island, New York.
- § 110.60, Captain of the Port, New York.

For a specific listing of the notes being removed, please review the

proposed regulatory text at the end of this NPRM.

Additionally, this proposed rule would remove regulatory text from four CFR sections because that text is inconsistent with simply designating the location of a SAA. In § 110.25, Salem Sound, Massachusetts, we propose to remove the last two sentences of paragraph (c). In § 110.29, Boston Inner Harbor, Massachusetts, we propose to remove paragraph (d)(2). In § 110.50d, Mystic Harbor, Noank, Connecticut, we propose to remove paragraph (b). Finally, in § 110.60, Captain of the Port, New York, we would remove paragraphs (c)(13)(i), (d)(7)(i), and (d)(9)(i).

#### 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 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 NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM 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.

These changes are primarily editorial in nature and are intended to clarify and update notes for First Coast Guard District SAA regulations and to remove regulatory text in four CFR sections that is not needed to designate the location of SAAs. This proposed rule would not create, remove, or change any previously established SAAs in the First Coast Guard District.

##### 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. We reach this conclusion based on the reasons stated in section IV.A above.

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 call or email 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 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 call or email 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 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 Directive 023–01 and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), 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 would remove existing notes in regulations for SAAs in the First Coast Guard District and remove regulatory text in four CFR sections that is not needed to designate the location of SAAs. These existing notes and provisions in regulatory text, would be replaced with a note in a newly added section that would apply to all SAA regulations in the First Coast Guard District. The note would advise those planning to use a SAA in the First Coast Guard District that state ordinances, local ordinances, or both, may apply to those anchoring there and that the local harbor master is often the best source of information about any such ordinances. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph A3 of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is 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.

#### **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 <https://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, call or email 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 <https://www.regulations.gov> and 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).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. Additionally, 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.

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

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

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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, 2071; 46 U.S.C. 70034; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 110.3 to read as follows:

#### **§ 110.3 First Coast Guard District Special Anchorage Areas.**

Regulations designating special anchorage areas in the First Coast Guard District appear in § 110.4 through § 110.60.

**Note to § 110.3:** Those planning to use these special anchorage areas are advised that state ordinances, local ordinances, or both, may apply. The local harbor master is often the best source of information about any such ordinances.

#### **§ 110.4 [Amended]**

■ 3. In § 110.4, remove the notes to paragraph (a), (b), (c) and (d)

#### **§ 110.5 [Amended]**

■ 4. In § 110.5, remove the notes following paragraphs (a–1), (d), (e) and (f).

#### **§ 110.6 [Amended]**

■ 5. In § 110.6, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.8 [Amended]**

■ 6. In § 110.8, remove the notes following paragraphs (c–2) and (i).

#### **§ 110.25 [Amended]**

■ 7. In § 110.25, remove the last two sentences in paragraph (c).

#### **§ 110.26 [Amended]**

■ 8. In § 110.26, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.29 [Amended]**

■ 9. In § 110.29, redesignate paragraph (d)(1) as paragraph (d), remove paragraph (d)(2), and remove the note to paragraph (d).

#### **§ 110.30 [Amended]**

■ 10. In § 110.30, remove the notes to paragraphs (b), (h), (k) through (q).

#### **§ 110.31 [Amended]**

■ 11. In § 110.31, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.32 [Amended]**

■ 12. In § 110.32, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.37 [Amended]**

■ 13. In § 110.37, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.38 [Amended]**

■ 14. In § 110.38, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.45a [Amended]**

■ 15. In § 110.45a, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.50 [Amended]**

■ 16. In § 110.50, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.50a [Amended]**

■ 17. In § 110.50a, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.50b [Amended]**

■ 18. In § 110.50b, remove the note for the section.

#### **§ 110.50c [Amended]**

■ 19. In § 110.50c, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.50d [Amended]**

■ 20. In § 110.50d, redesignate paragraph (a) as an undesignated paragraph and remove paragraph (b).

**§ 110.51 [Amended]**

■ 21. In § 110.51, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.52 [Amended]**

■ 22. In § 110.52, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.53 [Amended]**

■ 23. In § 110.53, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.55 [Amended]**

■ 24. In § 110.55, remove the notes following paragraph (b), (c), (e), (e-1), (e-2) and (g).

**§ 110.55a [Amended]**

■ 25. In § 110.55a, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.55b [Amended]**

■ 26. In § 110.55b, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.56 [Amended]**

■ 27. In § 110.56, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.58 [Amended]**

■ 28. In § 110.58, remove the note for the section.

**§ 110.59 [Amended]**

■ 29. In § 110.59, remove the note following paragraph (g).

**§ 110.60 [Amended]**

■ 30. In § 110.60, remove the notes to paragraphs (a)(2) and (13); (b)(5) and (6); (c)(3); (5) and (6); (d)(2), and (5), and remove paragraphs (c)(13)(i) and (ii), (d)(7)(i) and (ii), and (d)(9)(i) and (ii).

Dated: March 22, 2021.

**T.G. Allan Jr.,**

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

[FR Doc. 2021-06487 Filed 4-7-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**
**40 CFR Part 81**

[EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0148; FRL-10022-15-Region 9]

**Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; San Diego County Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Severe**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a request from the State of California to reclassify the San Diego County ozone nonattainment area from “Serious” to “Severe” for the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and from “Moderate” to “Severe” for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. Following consultation with tribes, the EPA is also proposing to reclassify in the same manner as state land, reservation areas of Indian country and any other area of Indian country within it where the EPA or a tribe has demonstrated that the tribe has jurisdiction located within the boundaries of the San Diego County ozone nonattainment area. Upon final reclassification of the San Diego County ozone nonattainment area as a Severe area for the 2008 and 2015 ozone NAAQS, the applicable attainment dates would be as expeditious as practicable but no later than July 20, 2027, for the 2008 ozone NAAQS, and August 3, 2033, for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. With respect to Severe state implementation plan (SIP) element submittal dates that have passed, the EPA is proposing to establish a deadline of no later than 12 months from the effective date of reclassification for submittal of revisions to the San Diego County portion of the California SIP to meet additional requirements for Severe ozone nonattainment areas to the extent that such revisions have not already been submitted.

**DATES:** Any comments on this proposal must arrive by May 10, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0148, at <http://www.regulations.gov>. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](http://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, or 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, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For 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>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** T. Khoi Nguyen, Air Planning Office (AIR-2), EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 947-4120, or by email at [nguyen.thien@epa.gov](mailto:nguyen.thien@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to the EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. Reclassification as Severe Nonattainment and Severe Area SIP Requirements
  - A. Reclassification as Severe and Applicable Attainment Dates
  - B. Clean Air Act Requirements for Severe Ozone Nonattainment Area Plans
- II. Reclassification of Areas of Indian Country
- III. Summary of Proposed Action and Request for Public Comment
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. Reclassification as Severe Nonattainment and Severe Area SIP Requirements**

*A. Reclassification as Severe and Applicable Attainment Dates*

Effective July 20, 2012, the EPA designated and classified the San Diego County ozone nonattainment area in California under the CAA as “Marginal” nonattainment for the 2008 ozone NAAQS.<sup>1</sup> The San Diego County ozone nonattainment area included 18 tribal reservations located within the geographic boundary of the county. Our classification of San Diego County as a Marginal ozone nonattainment area established a requirement that the area attain the 2008 ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than three years from the date of designation as nonattainment, *i.e.*, July 20, 2015. In May 2016, the EPA determined that San Diego County failed to attain the 2008 ozone NAAQS by the Marginal attainment date and

<sup>1</sup> 77 FR 30088 (May 21, 2012). The 2008 ozone NAAQS is 0.075 parts per million (ppm), daily maximum 8-hour average. The 2008 ozone NAAQS is met at an ambient air quality monitoring site when the 3-year average of the annual fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentration is less than or equal to 0.075 ppm. See 40 CFR 50.15.