

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 165****[Docket Number USCG–2016–0836]****RIN 1625–AA00****Safety Zones; San Francisco, CA****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is adding, amending, and deleting several permanent safety zones located in the Captain of the Port San Francisco zone that are established to protect public safety during annual firework displays. These changes will update listed events to accurately reflect the firework display locations. This regulation prohibits the movement of vessels within the established firework display areas unless authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP) San Francisco or a designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective May 1, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2016–0836 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 Junior Grade Christina Ramirez, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Francisco; telephone 415–399–2001, email [D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil](mailto:D11-PF-MarineEvents@uscg.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Table of Abbreviations**

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
COTP Captain of the Port  
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 January 18, 2017 we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled *Safety Zones; San Francisco, CA*, in the **Federal Register** (83 FR 5482). There we stated why we issued the NPRM, and invited comments on our proposed regulatory action related to the amended fireworks safety zones. We received no adverse comments on the NPRM nor did we receive a request for public meeting. A public meeting was not held.

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

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The Captain of the Port San Francisco (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the current outdated fireworks events, if not updated, pose safety concerns for event crew, spectators, participants of the event, participating vessels, and other users and vessels of the waterway. One of the published annual fireworks events that requires safety zones does not currently reflect the accurate location of the respective display sites. Three annual fireworks events that require safety zones are not published in 33 CFR 165.1191 and one published fireworks event has not occurred since 2009. Safety zones which accurately reflect the location of each event are necessary to provide for the safety of the crew, spectators, participants of the event, participating vessels, and other users and vessels of the waterway from the hazards associated with firework displays. The effect of these proposed safety zones will be to restrict general navigation in the vicinity of the events, from the start of each event until the conclusion of that event. Except for the persons or vessels authorized by the COTP San Francisco or a designated representative, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area. These regulations are needed to keep spectators and vessels a safe distance away from the fireworks displays to ensure the safety of participants, spectators, and transiting vessels.

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

As noted above, we received no adverse comments on our NPRM published on January 18, 2017. We received one comment supporting the Coast Guard's efforts to safeguard vessels. There are no changes in the regulatory text of this rule from the proposed rule in the NPRM.

This rule amends Table 1 in § 1191 to update one event to reflect the current event location, delete one event fireworks event which has not occurred since 2009, and permanently publish three annual events. These events are listed numerically in Table 1 of this section: Respectively items (9), (2), and the addition of (28), (29), and (30).

**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**

E.O.s 12866 (“Regulatory Planning and Review”) and 13563 (“Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”) 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 including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity. E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. Executive Order 13771 (“Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs”), directs agencies to reduce regulation and control regulatory costs and provides that “for every one new regulation issued, at least two prior regulations be identified for elimination, and that the cost of planned regulations be prudently managed and controlled through a budgeting process.”

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not designated this rule a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not reviewed it.

As this rule is not a significant regulatory action, this rule is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771. See OMB's Memorandum titled “Interim Guidance Implementing Section 2 of the Executive Order of January 30, 2017 titled ‘Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs’” (February 2, 2017).

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of each safety zone. Vessel traffic would be able to safely transit around each safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the COTP San Francisco zone for less than 1 hour during the evening when vessel traffic is normally low. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Local Notice to Mariner and Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zones.

**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 rule will 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 V.A above this rule will 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 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 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 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 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 Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, 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 rule involves a safety zones lasting less than 1 hour that would prohibit entry within a radial distance of no more than 1,000 feet of

a fireworks barge. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID. 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 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.

#### 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, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. In § 165.1191, in Table 1 to § 165.1191, remove and reserve item 2, revise item 9, and add items 28, 29, and 30 to read as follows:

#### § 165.1191 Northern California and Lake Tahoe Area Annual Fireworks Events.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### Table 1 to § 165.1191

\* \* \* \* \*

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2. [Reserved]						
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

#### 9. Fourth of July Fireworks, City of Richmond

Sponsor .....	Various Sponsors.
Event Description .....	Fireworks Display.
Date .....	Week of July 4th.
Location .....	A barge located in Richmond Harbor in approximate position 37°54'40" N., 122°21'05" W., Richmond, CA.

Regulated Area ..... 100-foot radius around the fireworks barge during the loading, transit, setup, and until the commencement of the scheduled display. Increases to a 560-foot radius upon commencement of the fireworks display.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 28. Execpro Services Fourth of July Fireworks

Sponsor ..... Execpro Services Inc.  
Event Description ..... Fireworks Display.  
Date ..... Week of July 4th.  
Location ..... Off-shore from Incline Village, NV.  
Regulated Area ..... 100-foot radius around the fireworks barge during the loading, transit, setup, and until the commencement of the scheduled display. Increases to a 1,000-foot radius upon commencement of the fireworks display.

## 29. Monte Foundation Fireworks, Lake Tahoe

Sponsor ..... Monte Foundation.  
Event Description ..... Fireworks Display.  
Date ..... Week of Labor Day.  
Location ..... Carnelian Bay, Lake Tahoe, CA.  
Regulated Area ..... 100-foot radius around the fireworks barge during the loading, transit, setup, and until the commencement of the scheduled display. Increases to a 1,000-foot radius upon commencement of the fireworks display.

## 30. Sausalito Lighted Boat Parade Fireworks

Sponsor ..... Various Sponsors.  
Event Description ..... Fireworks Display.  
Date ..... A Saturday or Sunday in December.  
Location ..... Off-shore from Sausalito Point, Sausalito, CA.  
Regulated Area ..... 100-foot radius around the fireworks barge during the loading, transit, setup, and until the commencement of the scheduled display. Increases to a 1,000-foot radius upon commencement of the fireworks display.

Dated: March 9, 2017.

**Anthony J. Ceraolo,**  
*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the  
Port of San Francisco.*

[FR Doc. 2017-06287 Filed 3-29-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

#### 33 CFR Part 334

#### Gulf of Mexico, Apalachicola Bay, East Bay, St. Andrew Bay and St. Andrew Sound at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida; Restricted Areas

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is amending its regulations by revising an existing restricted area regulation and establishing a new restricted area along portions of the Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB) facility shoreline that will be activated on a temporary basis. The duration of temporary restricted area activations will be limited to those periods where it is warranted or required by specific and credible security threats and will be inactive at all other times. The restricted area will be partitioned using 23 pairs of

coordinates to facilitate quick geographic recognition. Tyndall AFB is surrounded on three sides by water with approximately 129 miles of unprotected coastline. This includes several areas where the lack of security or lack of restriction on access to these areas leaves Tyndall AFB personnel and resources vulnerable to security threats. This amendment is necessary to implement an enhanced threat security plan for Tyndall AFB which will allow temporary activation of one or more portions of the restricted area as necessary to provide the appropriate level of security required to address the specific and credible threat triggering the need for activation.

**DATES:** Effective: May 1, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Attn: CECW-CO (David B. Olson), 441 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20314-1000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David Olson, Headquarters, Operations and Regulatory Community of Practice, Washington, DC at 202-761-4922 or Mr. Ed Sarfert, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District, Regulatory Division, at 850-439-9533.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Executive Summary

External reviews of security at Tyndall AFB identified the lack of jurisdiction to respond to threats from the waterways as a major weakness. Tyndall AFB does not currently have

the authority to restrict access to the shoreline of Tyndall AFB if needed to respond to a security threat. The purpose of this regulatory action is to establish a restricted area in the waters surrounding portions of Tyndall AFB that will only be activated on a temporary basis in response to specific and credible security threats. Additionally this amendment provides an administrative correction to the existing regulation at 33 CFR 334.660.

The Corps' authority to establish the restricted area is Section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1917 (40 Stat 266; 33 U.S.C. 1) and Chapter XIX of the Army Appropriations Act of 1919 (40 Stat. 892; 33 U.S.C. 3).

#### Background

Pursuant to its authorities in Section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1917 (40 Stat 266; 33 U.S.C. 1) and Chapter XIX of the Army Appropriations Act of 1919 (40 Stat 892; 33 U.S.C. 3) the Corps is amending the regulations at 33 CFR part 334 by adding § 334.665 and revising § 334.660. Adding § 334.665 will establish a restricted area in the waters surrounding Tyndall AFB. This amendment will allow the Installation Commander, Tyndall AFB to temporarily restrict the passage of persons, watercraft, and vessels in waters contiguous to this facility when a specific and credible security threat is identified, providing greater security for personnel and equipment during those