

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 M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a 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. An environmental

analysis checklist supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. This rule involves changing the location and size of an anchorage area as described in figure 2–1, paragraph (34)(f), of the Commandant Instruction. 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 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. Revise § 110.72d to read as follows:

#### § 110.72d Ashley River, SC.

All waters on the southwest portion of the Ashley River encompassed within the following points: Beginning at latitude 32°46′40″ N, longitude 79°57′27″ W; thence continuing north-northeasterly to latitude 32°46′44″ N, longitude 79°57′25″ W; thence continuing southeasterly to latitude 32°46′40″ N, longitude 79°57′22″ W; thence continuing southeasterly to latitude 32°46′27″ N, longitude 79°57′03″ W; thence continuing west-southwesterly to latitude 32°46′25″ N, longitude 79°57′09″ W; thence continuing northwesterly to the beginning point at latitude 32°46′40″ N, longitude 79°57′27″ W. All coordinates are North American Datum 1983.

Dated: September 11, 2014.

**J.H. Korn,**

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

[FR Doc. 2014–24910 Filed 10–17–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2014–0916]

RIN 1625–AA87

#### Security Zone; Cruise Ship HAMBURG, Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI and Chicago, IL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary security zone on Lake Michigan in the vicinity of both Milwaukee Harbor in Milwaukee, WI and Chicago Harbor in Chicago, IL within a 500-yard radius of the Cruise Ship HAMBURG. This security zone is intended to restrict vessels from a portion of Lake Michigan during the transit of the Cruise Ship HAMBURG to and from Milwaukee, WI and Chicago, IL. This security zone is necessary to protect the Cruise Ship HAMBURG and its occupants during its transit to and from Milwaukee, WI, and Chicago, IL.

**DATES:** This rule is effective without actual notice from October 20, 2014 until October 31, 2014 at 12:01 a.m. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from the date the rule was signed, October 1, 2014, until October 20, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket USCG–2014–0916. 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 Joseph McCollum, U.S. Coast Guard Sector Lake Michigan, at (414) 414–7148 or [Joseph.P.McCollum@uscg.mil](mailto:Joseph.P.McCollum@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 the public interest.

The final details for this event were not known to The Coast Guard 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 notice and comment period to run would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest because it would inhibit the Coast Guard’s ability to safeguard the occupants onboard the Cruise Ship HAMBURG and the ship itself.

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 regulated navigation areas and limited access areas: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Pub. L. 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

The Cruise Ship HAMBURG is expected to arrive into the Port of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI on October 1, 2014. Following the ship’s arrival to Milwaukee, the ship is expected to transit to the Port of Chicago, Chicago, IL on October 2, 2014. Further, the ship is expected to return to Lake Michigan and visit the Port of Milwaukee, WI and Chicago, IL from October 11–27, 2014. Considering the number of passengers aboard the Cruise Ship HAMBURG, the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan has established this security zone to safeguard the occupants of the ship, as well as the ship itself.

The Coast Guard anticipates that the security zone created by this temporary rule will not be in effect on each day between October 1, 2014 and October 4, 2014 and on each day between October 11, 2014 and October 27, 2014. Considering the unpredictability surrounding the exact transit times of the Cruise Ship, this rule was written with a wider range of dates and times to give the Coast Guard flexibility to accommodate changes in the Cruise Ship’s schedule between October 1,

2014 and October 4, 2014 and between October 11, 2014 and October 27, 2014.

## C. Discussion of the Final Rule

The Captain of the Port Lake Michigan has determined that this temporary security zone is necessary to ensure the safety of the Cruise Ship HAMBURG and its occupants. This security zone will be effective from 5 p.m. on October 1, 2014 until 12:01 a.m. on October 31, 2014 and will be enforced intermittently with actual notice during this time. This security zone will encompass all waters of Lake Michigan within a 500-yard radius of the Cruise Ship HAMBURG.

Entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this security 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. It is not “significant” under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

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 security zone created by this rule will be small and enforced for a short duration. Under certain conditions, moreover, vessels may still transit through the security zone when permitted by the Captain of the Port.

### 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 portion of Lake Michigan near Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Chicago, Illinois affected by the enforcement of the 500 yard security zone.

This security 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 (Public Law 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**, 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 security 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.T09–0916 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T09–0916 Security Zone; Cruise Ship HAMBURG, Lake Michigan, Milwaukee, WI and Chicago, IL.

(a) *Location.* All waters of Lake Michigan within a 500-yard radius of the Cruise Ship HAMBURG.

(b) *Effective and enforcement period.* This rule is effective from 5 p.m. on October 1, 2014 until 12:01 a.m. on October 31, 2014. This rule will be enforced intermittently with actual notice between October 1, 2014 and October 4, 2014 and between October 11, 2014 and October 27, 2014.

(c) *Regulations.*

(1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.33 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited, unless authorized by the U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port Lake Michigan or an on-scene representative. Other general requirements in § 165.33 also apply.

(2) 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 her behalf.

(3) Vessel operators desiring to enter or operate within the security zone shall 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 her on-scene representative may be contacted via VHF Channel 16. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the security zone must comply with all directions given to them by the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan, or an on-scene representative.

Dated: October 1, 2014.

**A.B. Cocanour,**

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

[FR Doc. 2014–24917 Filed 10–17–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R07–OAR–2014–0448; FRL–9918–18–Region–7]

#### Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation: Missouri; 2013 State Implementation Plan for the 2008 Lead Standard

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to approve a revision to the State