

responsibilities under 39 U.S.C. 601(c), including considering whether changes are needed to the regulations concerning the letter monopoly or necessary to carry out Section 601.

The Commission is soliciting comments to identify issues that may be considered when developing regulations to implement 39 U.S.C. 601. See 39 U.S.C. 601(c). All relevant comments will be considered. However, the Commission is interested in comments on the following specific issues:

1. Are the statutory requirements of 39 U.S.C. 601(a) clear and concise, or are additional regulations necessary to carry out the intent of the statute?

2. Are the statutory requirements of 39 U.S.C. 601(b) clear and concise, or are additional regulations necessary to carry out the intent of the statute?

3. Is the scope of 39 U.S.C. 601(b)(3)—permitting that the carriage of letters out of the mail provided “such carriage is within the scope of services described by regulations of the United States Postal Service (including, in particular, sections 310.1 and 320.2–320.8 of title 39 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on July 1, 2005) that purport to permit private carriage by suspension of the operation of this section (as then in effect)” —sufficiently clear and concise, or are additional regulations necessary to carry out the intent of the statute?

4. Do any terms that currently appear in 39 U.S.C. 601 require further definition?

5. Can consumers and competitors easily determine when a mailpiece is subject to monopoly protections?

6. What is the current effect of the letter monopoly on consumers, small businesses, and competitors?

7. Are the weight and/or price requirements found in 39 U.S.C. 601(b) still relevant?

8. Are the weight and/or price requirements found in 39 U.S.C. 601(b) applied uniformly?

9. Have there been any post-PAEA Postal Service regulations that appear to limit, expand, or otherwise affect the scope of the letter monopoly contrary to law?

10. Is the term “letter” clear and concise, or can any improvements be made to the definition? If so, please provide any proposed definitions and explain how the proposed definition may better implement the intent of Congress and affect the scope of the letter monopoly.

11. Do the current statutory and regulatory requirements correctly implement the intent of Congress and advance the public interest, or should

consideration be given to any changes that may be implemented by regulation?

12. How might changes to the statutory and regulatory requirements regarding the scope of the letter monopoly affect the financial condition of the Postal Service, competitors of the Postal Service, users of the Postal Service, and/or the general public interest?

13. Are there any social, economic, technological, or other trends that should be taken into account by Congress in considering the scope of the monopoly?

14. Because the Commission is tasked with developing regulations to carry out 39 U.S.C. 601, to what extent should the Commission adopt regulations that replicate, in whole or in part, the Postal Service’s regulations that appear at 39 CFR 310.1 and 320.2 through 320.8?

IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. Docket No. RM2020–4 is established for the purpose of considering amendments to the Code of Federal Regulations, title 39, chapter III, as discussed in this advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

2. Interested persons may submit comments no later than April 7, 2020.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Kenneth E. Richardson is appointed to serve as Public Representative in this proceeding.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this Order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Erica A. Barker,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2020–03156 Filed 2–14–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R07–OAR–2020–0011; FRL–10005–43–Region 7]

Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions From Portland Cement Kilns

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) received on February 15, 2019. The submission revises a Missouri regulation that

establishes nitrogen oxide (NO_x) control equipment and NO_x emission levels for Portland cement kilns. Specifically, the revisions add a definition, remove obsolete dates, update references to test methods, clarify rule language, remove unnecessary words, and make other minor edits. These revisions do not impact the stringency of the SIP and do not impact air quality. Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between State and federally-approved rules.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 19, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2020–0011 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: Tracey Casburn, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number (913) 551–7016; email address casburn.tracey@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–2020–0011, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.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 State revised title 10, division 10 of the code of state regulations, 10 CSR 10–6.380 “Control of NO_x Emissions from Portland Cement Kilns”, which establishes NO_x control equipment and NO_x emission levels for Portland cement kilns. Specifically, the revisions add a definition, remove obsolete dates, update references to test methods, clarify rule language, remove unnecessary words, and make other minor edits. 10 CSR 10–6.380 is SIP approved in the Code of Federal Regulations at 40 CFR 52.1320(c). The State submitted its revisions to 10 CSR 10–6.380 to the EPA as a SIP revision on February 15, 2019. In this action, the EPA is proposing to approve the revisions. The revisions are administrative in nature and do not impact air quality. The EPA’s analysis of the revisions can be found in the technical support document (TSD) included in this docket.

III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?

The State submission has met the public notice requirements for SIP submissions in accordance with 40 CFR 51.102. The submission also satisfied the completeness criteria of 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. The State provided public notice of the revisions from July 30, 2018, to September 6, 2018, and held a public hearing on August 30, 2018. The State received and addressed comments from the EPA. As explained in more detail in the TSD which is part of this docket, the SIP revision submission meets the substantive requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

IV. What action is the EPA taking?

The EPA is proposing to amend the Missouri SIP by approving the State’s request to revise 10 CSR 10–6.380, “Control of NO_x Emissions From Portland Cement Kilns.” Approval of

these revisions will ensure consistency between State and federally-approved rules. The EPA has determined that these changes will not adversely impact air quality.

The EPA is processing this as a proposed action because we are soliciting comments on the action. Final rulemaking will occur after consideration of any comments.

V. Incorporation by Reference

In this rule, the EPA is proposing to include regulatory text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with the requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the State’s rule as described in the proposed amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set forth below. The EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region 7 Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA’s role is to approve state choices, if they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866.
 - Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
 - Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
 - Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described

in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);

- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTA) because this rulemaking does not involve technical standards; and
- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Nitrogen oxide, Portland cement kilns.

Dated: February 11, 2020.

James Gulliford,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA proposes to amend 40 CFR part 52 as set forth below:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

- 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart AA—Missouri

- 2. In § 52.1320, the table in paragraph (c) is amended by revising entry “10–6.380” to read as follows:

§ 52.1320 Identification of plan.

* * * * *
(c) * * *

EPA-APPROVED MISSOURI REGULATIONS

Missouri citation	Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Missouri Department of Natural Resources				
*	*	*	*	*
Chapter 6—Air Quality Standards, Definitions, Sampling and Reference Methods, and Air Pollution Control Regulations for the State of Missouri				
*	*	*	*	*
10–6.380	Control of NO _x Emissions From Portland Cement Kilns.	2/28/2019	[Date of publication of the final rule in the Federal Register], [Federal Register citation of the final rule].	
*	*	*	*	*

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2020–03073 Filed 2–14–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 60, 61, and 63
 [EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0632; FRL–10004–32–Region 9]

Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and Nevada

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve updates to the Code of Federal Regulations delegation tables to reflect the current delegation status of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants in Arizona and Nevada.

DATES: Comments must be received by March 19, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2019–0632 at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to buss.jeffrey@epa.gov. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](http://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: Jeffrey Buss, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4152, buss.jeffrey@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving updates to the Code of Federal Regulations delegation tables to reflect the current delegation status of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants in Arizona and Nevada. We are approving these updates in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe this action is not controversial. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. Please note that if the EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the

remainder of the rule, the EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, see please see the direct final action.

Dated: December 23, 2019.
Elizabeth J. Adams,
 Director, Air and Radiation Division, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2020–01729 Filed 2–14–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Part 402

Office of the Secretary

45 CFR Part 102

[CMS–6061–P]

RIN 0938–AT86

Medicare Program; Medicare Secondary Payer and Certain Civil Money Penalties

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would specify how and when CMS must calculate and impose civil money penalties (CMPs) when group health plan (GHP) and non-group health plan (NGHP) responsible reporting entities