

income, and whether the resident was elderly or disabled.

HUD is considering revising HUD's regulations at 24 CFR 960.261 (Restriction on eviction of families based on income) in a manner that would continue to give PHAs discretion on when to evict or terminate the tenancies of over-income families but narrow that discretion by providing circumstances that would require a PHA to terminate tenancy or evict an over-income family. Specifically, HUD is considering whether a family whose income significantly exceeds the income limit and has exceeded such limit for a sustained period of time must be notified by the PHA that the family will be evicted or tenancy terminated. HUD is also considering what a reasonable period of time to find alternative housing would be.

HUD is not considering whether to alter the existing statutorily based exceptions to eviction or termination of tenancy related to income limits. Specifically, a family over the income limits who has a valid contract for participation in a Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program administered under HUD regulations in 24 CFR part 984 would not be subject to eviction or termination of tenancy. Additionally, a PHA may not evict a family over the income limits if the family is currently receiving the earned income disallowance authorized by the 1937 Act (*See* 42 U.S.C. 1473a(d)) and implemented through HUD regulations in 24 CFR 960.255 and 24 CFR 960.261(b).

## II. Request for Comments

In a letter provided to PHAs on September 3, 2015, HUD strongly recommended that PHAs adopt local over-income policies while considering many factors, including, but not limited to how over-income is defined, income stability, length of time to provide a safety net for fluctuating incomes, preference for return and hardship policies.<sup>2</sup> In anticipation of a proposed rulemaking, HUD specifically solicits comment on the following issues:

1. How should HUD define income that "significantly" exceeds the income limit for public housing residency? Should such higher amount be determined by dollar amount, by a percentage, or as a function of the current income limit, and what should the amount be?

2. Should area cost of living and family finances be taken into

consideration when determining whether an individual or family no longer needs public housing assistance? Are there limits to the circumstances in which said data should be requested and applied in a determination?

3. What period of time in which an individual or family has had income that significantly exceeds the income limits should be determined as indicative that the individual or family no longer needs public housing assistance?

4. How should local housing market conditions or housing authority wait list data be considered?

5. What period of time should be allowed for an individual or family to find alternative housing?

6. Are there exceptions to eviction or termination of tenancy that HUD should consider beyond those listed in HUD's regulation in 24 CFR 960.261?

7. Should HUD allow over-income individuals or families to remain in public housing, while paying unsubsidized or fair market, rent? How would such a provision impact PHA operations and finances?

8. Should HUD require a local appeals process for individuals or families deemed over-income?

9. Where over-income policies have been implemented, what were the results to public housing residents and PHAs? What were the specific positive and negative impacts?

10. What financial impact would over-income policies have on PHA operations, and how can any negative impacts be mitigated?

11. What are the potential costs and benefits to public housing residents and PHAs that could result from the forcible eviction of public housing tenants?

12. What evidence currently exists in favor of or against the adoption of this type of policy?

It is the responsibility of HUD and PHAs to ensure that public housing units are available to those who need HUD assistance. All comments directed to steps that HUD and PHAs can take to ensure availability of public housing units for individuals and families meeting the income limits are welcome.

Dated: January 25, 2016.

**Lourdes Castro Ramírez,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.*

[FR Doc. 2016-01921 Filed 2-2-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-67-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2015-1011]

RIN 1625-AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Broad Creek, Laurel, DE

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change the operating schedule that governs the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge over Broad Creek, mile 8.0, at Laurel, DE. This proposed rule will change the current regulation requiring a four-hour advance notice and allow the bridge to remain in the closed position for the passage of vessels.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before March 21, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2015-1011 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 proposed rule, call or email Mrs. Jessica Shea, Fifth Coast Guard District (dpb), at (757) 398-6422, email [jessica.c.shea2@uscg.mil](mailto:jessica.c.shea2@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
DHS Department of Homeland Security  
E.O. Executive order  
FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
Pub. L. Public Law  
§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

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

The current operating schedule for the bridge is set out in 33 CFR 117.233 (a) issued September 11, 2006. As outlined in this regulation, the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge shall open on signal if at least four hours notice is given. The Fifth Coast Guard District Commander received a request from the bridge owner in July 2015 to consider making a permanent change to the operating regulation for the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge per 33 CFR 117.8(a).

<sup>2</sup>This letter can be found at [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/public\\_indian\\_housing/programs/ph](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph).

This proposed rulemaking aligns the new schedule with the observed lack of marine traffic that requires a bridge opening and the operating regulations for the Poplar Street and US Highway 13A, which also cross Broad Creek. The proposed change would amend the existing regulation to state that the bridge need not open.

The Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge over Broad Creek, mile 8.0, at Laurel, DE, has a vertical clearance of fourteen feet above mean high water in the closed position and is unlimited in the open position. The charted depth at the bridge is four feet. The existing structure is a swing bridge that was authorized in 1910. The structure has been used by trains since it was completed in 1915; however, the bridge owner reported that no openings have been requested since it was acquired by Norfolk Southern in 1999.

Milford Fertilizer had a dock that was used by commercial traffic upstream of the railroad bridge when the existing structure was issued a bridge permit in 1910. Prior to publishing this NPRM, the Coast Guard contacted the fertilizer company to determine if there would be any impacts to their operations. The fertilizer plant modified the operations conducted in this location and has not used the dock since the 1970s. There is no record of any other commercial maritime traffic on Broad Creek, DE. There are residential docks and municipal boat ramps downstream of the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge. Recreational traffic is present during the boating season with the peak during the summer months.

### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

This NPRM proposes to change the status of the Norfolk Southern Railroad Bridge to need not open for the passage of vessels. In order to align the operating schedule of the bridge with observed marine traffic, the proposed change amends the regulation to state that the bridge need not open. The lack of requests from vessels for bridge openings since 1999 illustrate that the vessels that use this waterway can safely navigate while the drawbridge is in the closed-to-navigation position.

### IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders (E.O.s) related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and E.O.s and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

#### A. Regulatory Planning and Review

E.O.s 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. E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under E.O. 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. Based on current maritime traffic, using Norfolk Southern documentation and notes in the Coast Guard bridge files, there will be few, if any, vessels impacted by this proposed change as there has not been a requested opening since 1999.

#### B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 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. While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge may be small entities, since there have been no requests for openings since 1999, this proposed rule would 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 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 contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, above. 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 call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

#### D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Government

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 E.O. 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 contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section above.

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

#### F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of

actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed 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.

#### 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 <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact 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 <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the **Federal Register** (70 FR 15086).

Documents mentioned in this document, and all public comments, are in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that Web site'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 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

#### PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Revise § 117.233(a) to read as follows:

#### § 117.233 Broad Creek.

(a) The draw of the Norfolk Southern bridge at mile 8.0, at Laurel, need not open for the passage of vessels.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: January 14, 2016.

**Stephen P. Metruck,**

*Rear Admiral, United States Coast Guard Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2016–01897 Filed 2–2–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 679

[Docket No. 150629562–6025–01]

RIN 0648–BF25

#### Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bycatch Management in the Bering Sea Pollock Fishery

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS proposes regulations to implement Amendment 110 to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (FMP). If approved, Amendment 110 and this proposed rule would improve the management of Chinook and chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery by creating a comprehensive salmon bycatch

avoidance program. This action is necessary to minimize Chinook and chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea pollock fishery to the extent practicable while maintaining the potential for the full harvest of the pollock total allowable catch within specified prohibited species catch limits. Amendment 110 is intended to promote the goals and objectives of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the FMP, and other applicable laws.

**DATES:** Comments must be received no later than March 4, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments on this document, identified by NOAA–NMFS–2015–0081 of the following methods:

- **Electronic Submission:** Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)/#!docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2015-0081, click the “Comment Now!” icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

- **Mail:** Submit written comments to Glenn Merrill, Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Alaska Region NMFS, Attn: Ellen Sebastian. Mail comments to P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802–1668.

**Instructions:** Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name, address), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter “N/A” in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

Electronic copies of Amendment 110 and the Environmental Assessment/Regulatory Impact Review/Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (EA/RIR/IRFA) prepared for this action (collectively the “Analysis”) may be obtained from [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

Written comments regarding the burden-hour estimates or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirements contained in this rule may be submitted by mail to NMFS Alaska Region, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802–1668, Attn: Ellen Sebastian, Records Officer; in person at NMFS Alaska Region, 709 West 9th Street, Room 420A, Juneau, AK; and by email