

minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

#### *J. 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.

#### *K. 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.

#### *L. 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.

#### *M. Technical Standards*

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

#### *N. 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 concluded this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule involves the establishment of a safety zone and is therefore 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 will be prepared and submitted after publication, and will be 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 recordkeeping 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; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. Add § 165.T09-0835 to read as follows:

#### **§ 165.T09-0835 Safety Zone; Dredging, Rouge River, Detroit, MI.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a temporary safety zone: All U.S. waters of the Rouge River, Detroit, MI from the West Jefferson Avenue Bridge at 42°16.85' N., 083°07.72' W., proceeding East approximately 400-yards to a point mid-river at 42°16.80' N., 083°07.47' W.

(b) *Enforcement period.* This rule is effective without actual notice from September 22, 2015 until 11:59 p.m. on September 24, 2015. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from 10 a.m. on August 25, 2015, until September 22, 2015.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations in § 165.23, entry into, transiting, or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Detroit (COTP), via Sector Detroit Command Center or his on-scene representative.

(2) The safety zone is closed to all vessel traffic, except as may be permitted by the COTP, via the Command Center or his on-scene representative.

(3) The “on-scene representative” of the COTP is any Coast Guard commissioned, warrant or petty officer or a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer designated by or assisting the COTP to act on his behalf.

(4) Vessel operators must contact the COTP via the Command Center to obtain permission to enter or operate within the safety zone. The COTP may be contacted via VHF Channel 16 or at 313-568-9560. Vessel operators given permission to enter or operate in the safety zone must comply with all directions given to them by the COTP, via the Sector Command Center or his on-scene representative.

Dated: August 25, 2015.

**Raymond Negron,**

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

[FR Doc. 2015-24041 Filed 9-21-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Part 81**

**[EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0608; FRL-9934-51-Region 9]**

#### **Designation for Planning Purposes; California; PM<sub>10</sub>; Technical Amendment**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule; technical amendment.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is making a technical amendment to the Code of Federal Regulations to restore the inadvertent deletion of the entry for “Rest of State” from the table listing California air quality planning area designations for particulate matter of ten microns or less (PM<sub>10</sub>).

**DATES:** This technical amendment is effective on September 22, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jerry Wamsley, EPA Region IX, (415) 947-4111, [wamsley.jerry@epa.gov](mailto:wamsley.jerry@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On March 19, 2013, the EPA published a direct final rule amending 40 CFR 81.305 to clarify the description of the Imperial Valley planning area, an area designated nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for particulate matter of ten microns or less (PM<sub>10</sub>) (78 FR 16792). In our March 19, 2013 direct final rule, we amended the entry for “Imperial Valley planning area” but did not intend to amend any other entry in the table listing PM<sub>10</sub> air quality planning area designations for the State of California. We believe, however, that the entry appearing directly after the entry for “Imperial Valley planning area” in the “California-PM-10” table and reading “Rest of State; 11/15/90; Unclassifiable” was deleted inadvertently when the entry for “Imperial Valley planning area” was amended. For example, see and compare the “California-PM-10” table within the July 1, 2012 version to the July 1, 2013 version of 40 CFR 81.305.

Consequently, the EPA is publishing this technical amendment to restore the “Rest of State” designation entry within

the 40 CFR 81.305 “California-PM-10” table as it appeared prior to our March 19, 2013 direct final action.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Dated: September 9, 2015.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

Part 81, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

#### PART 81—DESIGNATION OF AREAS FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING PURPOSES

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 81 continues to read as follows:

#### CALIFORNIA—PM-10

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

■ 2. Section 81.305 is amended in the table for “California—PM-10” by adding an entry for “Rest of State” at the end of the table to read as follows:

#### § 81.305 California.

\* \* \* \* \*

Designated Area	Designation		Classification	
	Date	Type	Date	Type
* * * * *				
Rest of State .....	11/15/90	Unclassifiable.		

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2015–24049 Filed 9–21–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

#### 41 CFR Part 102–117

[FMR Case 2014–102–2; Docket 2014–0015; Sequence 1]

RIN 3090–AJ45

#### Federal Management Regulation (FMR); Transportation Management; Transportation Reporting

**AGENCY:** Office of Government-wide Policy (OGP), General Services Administration (GSA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** GSA is amending the Federal Management Regulation (FMR) to recommend that agencies annually submit to GSA their prior fiscal year transaction level transportation data for freight and cargo, including household goods (HHG), procured either through contract or tender, as well as their transportation management information. The request for transaction level data and transportation management information is a change from the Notice of the Proposed Rulemaking’s recommendation that agencies annually submit to GSA a summary of their transportation activities.

Specifically, this rule recommends that agencies report transaction level transportation data for freight and cargo, including HHG, such as shipments by procurement method, spending, transportation service providers (TSP),

and shipping profiles. This rule also recommends that agencies report their transportation management information, such as environmental justice information, agency points of contact, and transportation officer warrant information and training data.

This rule will provide GSA the data necessary for analysis, which will assist GSA in developing enhanced Governmentwide transportation policies to make transportation management programs more efficient, cost-effective, and sustainable.

**DATES:** *Effective:* September 22, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For clarification of content, contact Ms. Lois Mandell, Office of Government-wide Policy, at (202) 501–2735 or by email at [lois.mandell@gsa.gov](mailto:lois.mandell@gsa.gov). For information pertaining to status or publication schedules, contact the Regulatory Secretariat at 202–501–4755. Please cite FMR Case 2014–102–2.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Background

In almost every purchase of supplies and equipment from vendors, something must be moved and delivered. Since the early 1860s, the Federal Government has procured transportation using either a contract or a tender of service (also called a rate tender). There are Federal transportation laws and regulations that govern each of the five modes of transportation (air, water, pipeline, rail, and ground). Each mode has advantages and disadvantages that should be evaluated for cost, sustainability, speed of delivery, etc. The expense of moving this freight or cargo, including HHG, can be managed by the agency, consolidated as a shared service across agencies, or

the TSP, depending upon the contract or tender of service terms.

Over the last several years, GSA has worked with the Governmentwide Transportation Policy Council (GTPC) to identify key transportation performance measures, data elements, and collection standards necessary for more informed decision-making. The GTPC is composed of representatives from civilian agencies and the Department of Defense, and provides guidance in the planning and development of uniform transportation policies and procedures. Best in class organizations exhibit a consistent set of behaviors to identify and implement improved processes that maximize the efficiency, cost effectiveness, and sustainability of their transportation operations. Organizations seeking continuous improvement monitor, measure, and compare their performance against other organizations to improve return on investments, generate greater savings, enhance supply chain, and improve sustainability. The GTPC supports data collection as a necessary first step to improve transportation management.

In 2009, GSA contracted for a Governmentwide transportation management study. The study concluded that “most agencies have no single point of accountability for outbound transportation, have limited transparency into actual expenditures, and usually do not identify the most appropriate procurement method.” The study also identified inadequate research into the acquisition and selection of a TSP, and a lack of standard training, expertise, and operational approaches to transportation management. A 2012 GSA study