

Governing the ACH Network” and supplements thereto, except:

(1) Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5 and 1.2.6; Appendix Seven; Appendix Eight; and Appendix Nine (governing the enforcement of the ACH Rules and claims for compensation);

(2) Section 2.10 and Section 3.6 (governing the reclamation of benefit payments);

(3) The requirement in Appendix Three that the Effective Entry Date of a credit entry be no more than two Banking Days following the date of processing by the Originating ACH Operator (see definition of “Effective Entry Date” in Appendix Three);

(4) Section 2.2 (setting forth ODFI obligations to enter into agreements with, and perform risk management relating to, Originators and Third-Party Senders) and Section 1.6 (Security Requirements);

(5) Section 2.17.2.2–2.17.2.6 (requiring reduction of high rates of entries returned as unauthorized); and

(6) The requirements of Section 2.5.8 (International ACH Transactions) shall not apply to entries representing the payment of a Federal tax obligation by a taxpayer; and

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 3. In § 210.3, revise paragraph (b), redesignate paragraph (c) as paragraph (d), and add new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

**§ 210.3 Governing law.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Incorporation by reference.* Certain material is incorporated by reference into this part with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. To enforce any edition other than that specified in this section the Service must publish a document in the **Federal Register** and the material must be available to the public. All approved material is available for inspection at the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, 401 14th Street SW, Room 400A, Washington, DC 20227, 202–874–6680, and is available from the sources listed below. It is also available for inspection at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, email [fedreg.legal@nara.gov](mailto:fedreg.legal@nara.gov) or go to [www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html](http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html).

(1) NACHA—The Electronic Payments Association, 2550 Wasser Terrace, Suite 400, Herndon, Virginia 20171, tel. 703–561–1100, [info@nacha.org](mailto:info@nacha.org).

(i) “2019 NACHA Operating Rules & Guidelines: A Complete Guide to Rules Governing the ACH Network,”

copyright 2019. IBR approved for § 210.6

ii [Reserved]

2 [Reserved]

(c) Any amendment to the applicable ACH Rules approved by Nacha after publication of the 2019 Nacha Operating Rules & Guidelines shall not apply to Government entries unless the Service expressly accepts such amendment by publishing notice of acceptance of the amendment to this part in the **Federal Register**. An amendment to the ACH Rules that is accepted by the Service shall apply to Government entries on the effective date of the rulemaking specified by the Service in the **Federal Register** notice expressly accepting such amendment.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 4. In § 210.6, revise paragraph (g) to read as follows:

**§ 210.6 Agencies.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(g) *Point-of-purchase debit entries.* An agency may originate a Point-of-Purchase (POP) entry using a check drawn on a consumer or business account and presented at a point-of-purchase. The requirements of the 2019 Nacha Operating Rules and Guidelines, incorporated by reference, see § 210.3(b)(2), shall be met for such an entry if the Receiver presents the check at a location where the agency has posted the notice required by the ACH Rules and has provided the Receiver with a copy of the notice.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 5. In § 210.10, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

**§ 210.10 RDFI liability.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) Actual or constructive knowledge, when used in reference to an RDFI’s or agency’s knowledge of the death or incapacity of a recipient or death of a beneficiary, means that the RDFI or agency received information, by whatever means, of the death or incapacity and has had a reasonable opportunity to act on such information or that the RDFI or agency would have learned of the death or incapacity if it had followed commercially reasonable business practices. For purposes of Subpart B, an agency is presumed to have constructive knowledge of death or incapacity at the time it stops certifying recurring payments to a recipient if the agency (1) does not re-initiate payments to the recipient and (2) subsequently initiates a reclamation for one or more payments made to the recipient.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: December 11, 2019.

**David A. Lebryk,**

*Fiscal Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2019–27261 Filed 1–2–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AS–P

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 165**

[Docket Number USCG–2019–0933]

RIN 1625–AA87

**Security Zone; Cooper River; Charleston, SC**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary security zone on certain navigable waters of the Cooper River within a 500-yard radius of the South Carolina State Port Authority Cruise Ship Terminal in Charleston, SC during a visit by the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard. This action is necessary to protect personnel from potential hazards and security risk associated with the Commandant’s speaking engagement. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Charleston (COTP) or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before January 21, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–0219–0933 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, call or email Lieutenant Chad Ray, Sector Charleston Office of Waterways Management, Coast Guard; telephone (843) 740–3184, email [Chad.L.Ray@uscg.mil](mailto:Chad.L.Ray@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

## II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On November 18, 2019, Sector Charleston personnel were notified that the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard will give the State of the Coast Guard Address at the South Carolina State Port Authority Cruise Ship Terminal on the Cooper River in Charleston, SC. The security zone will impact waters of the Cooper River in Charleston, SC. The Captain of the Port Charleston (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the event would be a security concern for participants, spectators, and others on the navigable waters around the event.

Section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)) 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 being able to facilitate a full 30 day comment period with respect to this proposed rule because the Coast Guard did not receive necessary information regarding the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard’s visit near the South Carolina State Port Authority Cruise Ship Terminal in Charleston, SC until November 18, 2019. As a result, the Coast Guard did not have sufficient time to both publish an NPRM and to maintain a 30 day comment period prior to the events. There is sufficient time to allow for some amount of comment period which the Coast Guard is facilitating. A full 30 day comment period would result in a delay in the effective date of this rule and such a delay would be contrary to the public interest because immediate action is needed to necessary to protect personnel from potential hazards and security risk associated with the Commandant’s speaking engagement.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the security of persons, vessels, and the marine environment before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034.

## III. Discussion of the Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish a temporary security on the waters of the Cooper River in Charleston, South Carolina during the State of the Coast

Guard Address from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on February 20, 2020. The security zone would cover all navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the South Carolina State Port Authority Cruise Ship Terminal in Charleston, SC. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the security of persons, vessels, and these navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled address. No vessels or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. Persons and vessels desiring to enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the regulated area may contact the COTP by telephone at (843) 740–7050, or a designated representative via VHF radio on channel 16, to request authorization. If authorization to enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the regulated area is granted, all persons and vessels receiving such authorization must comply with the instructions of the COTP or a designated representative. The COTP will provide notice of the safety zone by Local Notice to Mariners, Broadcast Notice to Mariners, and on-scene designated representatives. 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: (1) Persons and vessels may enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the regulated area during the enforcement periods if authorized by Sector Charleston COTP or a designated representative; (2) vessels not able to enter, transit through, anchor

in, or remain within the regulated area without authorization from Sector Charleston COTP or a designated representative may operate in the surrounding areas during the enforcement period; (3) the Coast Guard will provide advance notification of the safety zone to the local maritime community by Local Notice to Mariners and Broadcast Notice to Mariners; and (4) the regulated area will be limited in time, scope, and only impact small designated areas of the Cooper River.

### 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 security 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 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 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 call or email 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 proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), 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 two hour security zone that will prohibit persons and vessels from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within a limited area on the Cooper River during

the State of the Coast Guard Address by Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard. It is 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 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 call or email 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 <https://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://www.regulations.gov>, call or email 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 submissions in response to this document, see DHS's Correspondence System of Records notice (84 FR 48645, September 26, 2018).

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:** 46 U.S.C. 70034, 70051; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add a temporary § 165.T07–0933 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T07–0933 Security Zone; Cooper River, Charleston, SC.

(a) Location. All waters of the Cooper River within a 500-yard radius the South Carolina State Port Authority Cruise Ship Terminal in Charleston, SC.

(b) *Definition*. The term “designated representative” means Coast Guard Patrol Commanders, including Coast Guard coxswains, petty officers, and other officers operating Coast Guard vessels, and Federal, state, and local officers designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port (COTP) Charleston in the enforcement of the regulated areas.

(c) *Regulations*. (1) All persons and vessels are prohibited from entering, transiting through, anchoring in, or remaining within the regulated area unless authorized by the COTP Charleston or a designated representative.

(2) Persons and vessels desiring to enter, transit through, anchor in, or remain within the regulated area may contact the COTP Charleston by telephone at 843–740–7050, or a designated representative via VHF radio on channel 16, to request authorization. If authorization is granted, all persons and vessels receiving such authorization must comply with the instructions of the COTP Charleston or a designated representative.

(3) The Coast Guard will provide notice of the regulated area by Marine Safety Information Bulletins, Local Notice to Mariners, Broadcast Notice to Mariners, and on-scene designated representatives.

(d) *Enforcement period*. This rule will be enforced from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on February 20, 2020.

Dated: December 26, 2019.

**J.W. Reed,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port, Charleston.*

[FR Doc. 2019-28388 Filed 1-2-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0666; FRL-10003-76—Region 7]

### Air Plan Approval; Nebraska; Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (LLCHD)

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the State of Nebraska that addresses the authority of the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (LLCHD). This proposed action will amend the Nebraska SIP by removing a portion of the SIP that addresses the authority of LLCHD regarding the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Program; specifically: Article 2. Section 19. Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (PSD) Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (LLCHD). This SIP revision will have no impact to air quality and eliminate confusion regarding the authority to issue PSD permits in Lancaster County.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before February 3, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0666 to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

**Instructions:** All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Written Comments” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William Stone, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number (913) 551-7714; email address [stone.william@epa.gov](mailto:stone.william@epa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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

### Table of Contents

- I. Written Comments
- II. What is being addressed in this document?
- III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?
- IV. What action is the EPA taking?
- V. Incorporation by Reference
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

### I. Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0666, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. 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, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

### II. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is proposing to approve a revision to Nebraska’s SIP received from the State of Nebraska on July 23, 2019. Specifically, the EPA is proposing to amend the Nebraska SIP by removing a portion of the SIP as follows: Article 2. Section 19. Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (PSD) Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department (LLCHD).

On February 14, 1996, the EPA approved SIP revisions submitted by the State of Nebraska on behalf of the LLCHD (61 FR 5699, February 14, 1996). This submittal included a complete copy of the state’s air regulations that LLCHD had adopted as its own. Although the LLCHD’s adoption of the State’s rules included the PSD regulation, the action by the EPA did not create or acknowledge a PSD program separate and apart from the State of Nebraska’s EPA-approved PSD program.

This incorporation by reference of the LLCHD Air Pollution Control Program, specifically ARTICLE 2. SECTION 19. PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION OF AIR QUALITY has created confusion about the authority to issue PSD permits in Lancaster County, Nebraska.

PSD authority in Lancaster County, Nebraska was addressed in three documents around the time of this SIP action by both EPA and the State of Nebraska. Those documents are (1) the preamble to the direct final rule, (2) the Technical Support Document (TSD) that accompanied the proposal, and (3) a letter from the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ), now the Nebraska Department of Environment and Energy (NDEE), to EPA Region 7 dated *November 9, 1995*. PSD authority in Lancaster County, Nebraska was also addressed in a delegation letter from NDEQ to LLCHD. Each of these documents is available as part of this docket.

Per the preamble to the direct final rule (61 FR 5700, February 14, 1996), the EPA herein notes that only the State program includes an approved part 51 program to issue PSD permits.

On Page 5 of the TSD EPA states:

*[A]lthough the local agencies’ adoption of the state’s rule include Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations, the EPA herein notes that only the state program includes an approved part 51 program to issue PSD permits. As part of the Class II program, the local agencies will act as agents of the state to administer and enforce requirements applicable under PSD, although only the state will actually issue these permits. This is identified in letter from NDEQ dated November 9, 1995. (TSD for Nebraska SIP revisions, November 20, 1995).*

In a letter from NDEQ to EPA Region 7, referred to in the TSD above, NDEQ states:

*[A]lthough the local agencies adoption of the Title 129 includes PSD regulations which were submitted as part of the request for approval, only the state program includes an approved part 51 program to issue PSD permits. As part of the Class II program, the local agencies will act as agents of the state to administer and enforce requirements applicable under PSD, although only the state will actually issue these permits . . . (Letter from Joe Francis, Assistant Director, NDEQ, to Art Spratlin, EPA Region 7, LLCHD, November 9, 1995).*

In a letter from NDEQ to LLCHD dated December 31, 1997, NDEQ responds to LLCHD’s request to delegate authority to implement and enforce the PSD program. NDEQ delegates the authority to LLCHD to implement and enforce all provisions of NDEQ title 129 chapter 19 with conditions including: