

PART 220—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 220 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 10 U.S.C. 1095(f), 1097b(b) and 1079b.

■ 2. Amend § 220.8 by:

■ a. Revising paragraphs (b), (c)(1), (5), (f)(2), (5) and (6),

■ b. Adding new paragraph (f)(8); and

■ c. Removing in paragraph (d) the wording “inpatient hospital care” and adding in its place “care.”

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 220.8 Reasonable charges.

* * * * *

(b) *Inpatient institutional and professional services on or after October 1, 2017.* Reasonable charges for inpatient institutional services provided on or after October 1, 2017, are based on either of two methods as determined by the ASD(HA). The first uses the CHAMPUS Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) payment system rates under 32 CFR 199.14(a)(1). Certain adjustments are made to reflect differences between the CHAMPUS payment system and MHS billing solutions. Among these are to include in the inpatient hospital service charges adjustments related to direct medical education and capital costs (which in the CHAMPUS system are handled as annual pass through payments). Additional adjustments are made for long stay outlier cases. The second method uses Itemized Resource Utilization (IRU) rates based on the cost to provide inpatient institutional resources. Like the CHAMPUS system, inpatient professional services are not included in the inpatient institutional services charges calculated under either methodology, but are billed separately in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section. In lieu of either method described in this paragraph (b), the method in effect prior to April 1, 2003 (described in paragraph (c) of this section), may continue to be used for a period of time after April 1, 2003, if the ASD(HA) determines that effective implementation requires a temporary deferral.

(c) *Inpatient institutional and inpatient professional services before April 1, 2003.* (1) *In general.* Prior to April 1, 2003, the computation of reasonable charges for inpatient institutional and professional services is reasonable costs based on diagnosis related groups (DRGs). Costs shall be based on the inpatient full reimbursement rate per hospital discharge, weighted to reflect the intensity of the principal diagnosis

involved. The average charge per case shall be published annually as an inpatient standardized amount. A relative weight for each DRG shall be the same as the DRG weights published annually for hospital reimbursement rates under CHAMPUS pursuant to 32 CFR 199.14(a)(1). The method in effect prior to April 1, 2003 (as described in this paragraph (c)), may continue to be used for a period of time after April 1, 2003, if the ASD(HA) determines that effective implementation requires a temporary deferral of the method described in paragraph (b) of this section.

* * * * *

(5) *Identification of professional and institutional charges.* For purposes of billing third party payers other than automobile liability and no-fault insurance carriers, inpatient billings are subdivided into two categories:

(i) Institutional charges (which refer to routine service charges associated with the facility encounter or hospital stay and ancillary charges).

* * * * *

(f) * * *

* * * * *

(2) With respect to inpatient institutional charges in the Burn Center at Brooke Army Medical Center, the ASD(HA) may establish an adjustment to the rate otherwise applicable under the payment methodologies under this section to reflect unique attributes of the Burn Center.

* * * * *

(5) The charge for immunizations, allergin extracts, allergic condition tests, and the administration of certain medications when these services are provided by or through a facility of the Uniformed Services or a separate immunizations or shot clinic, are based either on CHAMPUS prevailing rates or on IRU rates based on the cost to provide these items, exclusive of any costs considered for purposes of any outpatient visit. A separate charge shall be made for each immunization, injection or medication administered.

(6) The charges for pharmacy, durable medical equipment and supply resources are based either on CHAMPUS prevailing rates or on IRU rates based on the cost to provide these items, exclusive of any costs considered for purposes of any outpatient visit. A separate charge shall be made for each item provided.

* * * * *

(8) Ambulatory (outpatient) institutional services on or after October 1, 2017. Reasonable charges for institutional facility charges for ambulatory services provided on or after

October 1, 2017, are based on any of three methods as determined by the ASD(HA). The first uses the CHAMPUS Ambulatory Payment Classification (APC) and Ambulatory Surgery Center (ASC) payment system rates under 32 CFR 199.14(a)(1)(ii) and (iii) and 32 CFR 199.14(d) respectively. The second uses a bundled MHS Ambulatory Procedure Visit (APV) payment system rate charge reflected by the average cost of providing an APV exclusive of professional services. The third method uses IRU rates based on the cost to provide ambulatory institutional resources. Like the CHAMPUS system, ambulatory professional services are not included in the ambulatory institutional facility charges calculated under any of the three methodologies, but are billed separately in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section.

* * * * *

Dated: December 11, 2018.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2018–27186 Filed 12–17–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2018–1065]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Oregon Inlet, Dare County, NC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of Oregon Inlet in Dare County, North Carolina in support of demolition of the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge. This temporary safety zone is intended to protect mariners, vessels, and demolition crews from the hazards associated with demolishing the old bridge, and will restrict vessel traffic on portions of Oregon Inlet near active demolition work and demolition equipment. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit vessels or persons from being in the safety zone. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before January 17, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–

2018–1065 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://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 Petty Officer Matthew Tyson, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard Sector North Carolina, Wilmington, NC; telephone: (910) 772–2221, email: Matthew.I.Tyson@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
 § Section
 U.S.C. United States Code
 COTP Captain of the Port

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On November 26, 2018, the North Carolina Department of Transportation provided the Coast Guard with details concerning the demolition of the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge from February 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020. Demolition will not follow a set schedule due to sea conditions, equipment needs, and vessel navigation considerations. In addition, demolition will take place in two locations at once due to equipment types and demolition methods. A moving safety zone is proposed in Oregon Inlet within 100 yards of active demolition work and demolition equipment. Demolition work will take place at various points along the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, which follows a line beginning at approximate position 35°46′47″ N, 75°32′41″ W, then southeast to 35°46′37″ N, 75°32′33″ W, then southeast to 35°46′09″ N, 75°31′59″ W, then southeast to 35°46′03″ N, 75°31′51″ W, then southeast to 35°46′01″ N, 75°31′40″ W. (NAD 1983) in Dare County, North Carolina. The Captain of the Port (COTP) North Carolina has determined that potential safety hazards associated with the demolition would be a concern for anyone transiting through Oregon Inlet.

The purpose of this rule is to protect persons, vessels, and the marine environment on the navigable waters in Oregon Inlet during the demolition of the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a moving safety zone to be enforced during active demolition work from February 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020. Demolition will not follow a set schedule due to sea conditions, equipment needs, and vessel navigation considerations. In addition, demolition will take place in two locations at once due to equipment types and demolition methods. When the safety zone is active, the exact times will be announced via Broadcast Notices to Mariners at least 48 hours prior to enforcement. The moving safety zone will include all navigable waters within 100 yards of active demolition work and demolition equipment in Oregon Inlet along the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, which follows a line beginning at approximate position 35°46′47″ N, 75°32′41″ W, then southeast to 35°46′37″ N, 75°32′33″ W, then southeast to 35°46′09″ N, 75°31′59″ W, then southeast to 35°46′03″ N, 75°31′51″ W, then southeast to 35°46′01″ N, 75°31′40″ W. (NAD 1983). This zone is intended to protect persons, vessels, and the marine environment on the navigable waters in Oregon Inlet during the demolition of the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge. No vessel or person will be permitted to enter the safety zone during the designated times. There will be alternative navigation options for vessel traffic when a moving safety zone covers all or part of the navigation channel. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

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.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, and duration of the proposed safety zone. Vessel traffic will not be allowed to enter or transit portions of Oregon Inlet during active demolition work from February 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020. The specific enforcement times for active demolition work will be broadcast at least 48 hours in advance and vessels will be able to transit Oregon Inlet at all other times. The Coast Guard will issue a Local Notice to Mariners and transmit a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 regarding the safety zone. There will be alternative navigation options for vessel traffic when a moving safety zone covers all or part of the navigation channel. Vessel traffic in this portion of Oregon Inlet will fluctuate between high, medium, and low depending on the time of the year. This rule does not allow vessels to request permission to enter the moving safety zone covering the active demolition areas within Oregon Inlet during the designated times.

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.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the safety zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above, 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** 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 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 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 Commandant Instruction M16475.1D,

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 involves a 100-yard radius moving safety zone lasting from February 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020 that would prohibit entry into a portion of Oregon Inlet for bridge demolition. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. 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.

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 <https://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and

the docket, visit <https://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice>.

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 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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.T05–1065 to read as follows:

§ 165.T05–1065 Safety Zone; Oregon Inlet, Dare County, NC.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: all navigable waters of Oregon Inlet, within 100 yards of active demolition work and demolition equipment, along the old Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, which follows a line beginning at approximate position 35°46'47" N, 75°32'41" W, then southeast to 35°46'37" N, 75°32'33" W, then southeast to 35°46'09" N, 75°31'59" W, then southeast to 35°46'03" N, 75°31'51" W, then southeast to 35°46'01" N, 75°31'40" W (NAD 1983) in Dare County, NC.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section—

Designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard commissioned, warrant, or petty officer designated by the Captain of the Port North Carolina (COTP) for the enforcement of the safety zone.

Captain of the Port means the Commander, Sector North Carolina.

Demolition crews means persons and vessels involved in support of demolition.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) The general regulations governing safety zones in § 165.23 apply to the area described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(2) With the exception of demolition crews, entry into or remaining in this safety zone is prohibited.

(3) All vessels within this safety zone when this section becomes effective must depart the zone immediately.

(4) The Captain of the Port, North Carolina can be reached through the Coast Guard Sector North Carolina Command Duty Officer, Wilmington, North Carolina at telephone number 910-343-3882.

(5) The Coast Guard and designated security vessels enforcing the safety zone can be contacted on VHF-FM marine band radio channel 13 (165.65 MHz) and channel 16 (156.8 MHz).

(d) *Enforcement.* The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the safety zone by Federal, State, and local agencies.

(e) *Enforcement Period.* This regulation will be enforced from February 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020

(f) *Public Notification.* The Coast Guard will notify the public of the active enforcement times at least 48 hours in advance by transmitting Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF-FM marine channel 16.

Dated: December 7, 2018.

Bion B. Stewart,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port North Carolina.

[FR Doc. 2018-27385 Filed 12-17-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0728; FRL-9988-01-Region 9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Plumas County; Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve most elements of the state implementation plan (SIP) revisions submitted by California to address Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”) requirements for the 2012 annual fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or “standards”) in the Plumas County Moderate PM_{2.5} nonattainment area (“Portola nonattainment area”). The SIP revisions are the “Portola Fine Particulate Matter

(PM_{2.5}) Attainment Plan” submitted on February 28, 2017, and the 2019 and 2022 transportation conformity motor vehicle emission budgets (“budgets”) submitted on December 20, 2017. We refer to these submittals collectively as the “Portola PM_{2.5} Plan” or “Plan.” The EPA is proposing to approve the following elements of the Portola PM_{2.5} Plan: The 2013 base year emissions inventories, the reasonably available control measure/reasonably available control technology (RACM/RACT) demonstration, the attainment demonstration, the reasonable further progress (RFP) demonstration, the quantitative milestones, and the budgets for 2019 and 2021. The EPA is not proposing any action at this time on the contingency measures in the Portola PM_{2.5} Plan.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by January 17, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0728 at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to John Ungvarsky, at Ungvarsky.john@epa.gov. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be removed or edited from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, 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, 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 <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Ungvarsky, EPA Region IX, (415) 972-3963, ungvarsky.john@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

I. Background for Proposed Action

- II. Clean Air Act Requirements for Moderate PM_{2.5} Nonattainment Area Plans
- III. Completeness Review of the Portola PM_{2.5} Attainment Plan
- IV. Review of the Portola PM_{2.5} Plan
- V. Summary of Proposed Actions and Request for Public Comment
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background for Proposed Action

Under section 109 of the CAA, the EPA has established NAAQS for certain pervasive air pollutants (referred to as “criteria pollutants”) and conducts periodic reviews of the NAAQS to determine whether they should be revised or whether new NAAQS should be established. The EPA sets the NAAQS for criteria pollutants at levels required to protect public health and welfare.¹ Particulate matter is one of the criteria pollutants for which the EPA has established health-based standards. The CAA requires states to submit regulations that control particulate matter emissions.

Particulate matter includes particles with diameters that are generally 2.5 microns or smaller (PM_{2.5}) and particles with diameters that are generally 10 microns or smaller (PM₁₀). It contributes to effects that are harmful to human health and the environment, including premature mortality, aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, decreased lung function, visibility impairment, and damage to vegetation and ecosystems. Individuals particularly sensitive to PM_{2.5} exposure include older adults, people with heart and lung disease, and children.² PM_{2.5} can be emitted by sources directly into the atmosphere as a solid or liquid particle (“primary PM_{2.5}” or “direct PM_{2.5}”) or can be formed in the atmosphere (“secondary PM_{2.5}”) as a result of various chemical reactions among precursor pollutants from sources such as nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), volatile organic compounds (VOC), and ammonia.³

On July 18, 1997, the EPA revised the NAAQS for particulate matter to add new standards for PM_{2.5}.⁴ The EPA established primary and secondary annual and 24-hour standards for PM_{2.5}. The annual standard was set at 15.0 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³)

¹ For a given air pollutant, “primary” national ambient air quality standards are those determined by the EPA as requisite to protect the public health. “Secondary” standards are those determined by the EPA as requisite to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects associated with the presence of such air pollutant in the ambient air. CAA section 109(b).

² 78 FR 3086, 3088 (January 15, 2013).

³ EPA, Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter, No. EPA/600/P-99/002aF and EPA/600/P-99/002bF, October 2004.

⁴ 62 FR 38652.