

(CUSO) regulation (proposed rule). The proposed rule would accomplish two objectives: Expanding the list of permissible activities and services for CUSOs to include originating any type of loan that a Federal credit union (FCU) may originate; and granting the Board additional flexibility to approve permissible activities and services. The proposed rule provided a 30-day comment period that closed on March 29, 2021. To allow interested persons more time to consider and submit their comments, the Board has decided to extend the comment period for an additional 30 days.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published February 26, 2021, at 86 FR 11645, is extended. Responses to the proposed rule must now be received on or before April 30, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit written comments, identified by RIN 3133-AE95, by any of the following methods (Please send comments by one method only):

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments for the Docket NCUA–2021–0036.

- *Fax:* (703) 518–6319. Include “[Your Name]—Comments on Proposed Rule: Credit Union Service Organizations (CUSOs)” in the transmittal.

- *Mail:* Address to Melane Conyers-Ausbrooks, Secretary of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314–3428.

- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Same as mail address.

Public Inspection: You may view all public comments on the Federal eRulemaking Portal (<http://www.regulations.gov>) as submitted, except for those we cannot post for technical reasons. The NCUA will not edit or remove any identifying or contact information from the public comments submitted. Due to social distancing measures in effect, the usual opportunity to inspect paper copies of comments in the NCUA’s law library is not currently available. After social distancing measures are relaxed, visitors may make an appointment to review paper copies by calling (703) 518–6540 or emailing OGCMail@ncua.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *Policy and Analysis:* Jacob McCall, (703) 518–6624; *Legal:* Rachel Ackmann, Senior Staff Attorney, (703) 548–2601; or by mail at National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 14, 2021, the Board issued a proposed rule to amend the NCUA’s CUSO regulation. The proposed rule was published in the **Federal Register** on February 26, 2021.¹ The proposed rule would accomplish two objectives: Expanding the list of permissible activities and services for CUSOs to include originating any type of loan that an FCU may originate; and granting the Board additional flexibility to approve permissible activities and services. The NCUA also sought comment on broadening FCU investment authority in CUSOs.

The proposed rule provided a 30-day public comment period that closed on March 29, 2021. The NCUA received over 600 comments on the proposed rule. Given the number of comments received and a stated interest in an extension of the comment period, the Board believes there is significant interest in the proposed rule and that it is necessary to extend the comment period to give all interested parties sufficient time to properly address the proposed changes and questions presented in the proposed rule. The Board believes that extending the comment period for an additional 30 days is appropriate. This extension should allow interested parties more time to prepare responses to the proposed rule without delaying the rulemaking.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board on March 26, 2021.

Melane Conyers-Ausbrooks,
Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2021–06653 Filed 3–26–21; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2019–0910]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Sara, Saraland, AL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to change the operating requirements for the CSX Transportation Railroad drawbridge across Bayou Sara, mile 0.1 near Saraland, Mobile County, Alabama. This proposed rule allows the bridge

owner to operate the bridge remotely from the CSX remote control center in Mobile, AL.

DATES: Comments and relate material must reach the Coast Guard on or before September 27, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2019–0910 using Federal e-Rulemaking Portal at <https://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 Mr. Doug Blakemore, Eighth Coast Guard District Bridge Administration Branch Chief; telephone (504) 671–2128, email Douglas.A.Blakemore@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CSX CSX Transportation
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
OMB Office of Management and Budget
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Advance, Supplemental)
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The CSX Railroad Company, the owner of the bridge requested to change operation of the bridge from a tended drawbridge to a remotely operated drawbridge. The CSX Transportation Railroad drawbridge has a vertical clearance of 5’ in the closed to navigation position and operates in accordance with 33 CFR 117.105. This proposed rule will not change the operation schedule of the bridge. A copy of the bridge owners request can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov> in the Docket USCG–2019–0910.

The waterway users include recreational vessels and commercial tows; which combined requires approximately six openings a day.

CSX has completed installation of a remote operation system at the bridge and a remote control center, located in Mobile, AL. At the bridge, CSX has installed infrared cameras, closed circuit cameras and TVs, communication systems and information technology systems on the bridge that allow an operator from Mobile to monitor and control the bridge. They have also developed an operations manual that remote operators use to control each bridge.

¹ 86 FR 11645 (Feb. 26, 2021).

In the future, CSX anticipates to remotely operate an additional ten drawbridges from the CSX remote control center. As a general rule the Coast Guard will consider allowing one (1) remote operator to control up to three (3) separate bridges. This is dependent on the type of vessels that use the waterways, vessel traffic volume and environmental or geographical conditions of each bridge and waterway.

On January 22, 2020 the Coast Guard published a temporary deviation from regulations; request for comments (TD) entitled Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Sara, Saraland, AL in the **Federal Register** (85 FR 3853). This temporary deviation was issued to test the remote operations system for 60 days. The objective was to also to collect and analyze information on how the drawbridge operated from a remote location and the potential effect on vessel traffic in the area. This deviation ended March 23, 2020.

Given the duration of time from the end of the test period and the development of this NPRM, the Coast Guard is authorizing second deviation to re-test the remote operations of the bridge and its effect on waterway mobility in that area. However, this deviation will run for 180 days and simultaneously with this NPRM. Both under the same docket number. Both documents can be found at <https://www.regulations.gov> and comments can be made to either document.

During the 60 day test period, the Coast Guard did not identify any issues with the remote operation of the bridge or any negative impact to a vessels reasonable ability to use this waterway. The Coast Guard received two comments from the public during the test period. These comments can be viewed in the Docket and have been addressed throughout this NPRM or below. These comments have been summarized and evaluated by the Coast Guard.

One of the comments received expressed concern that remote operation systems have not been proven. Under 33 CFR 117.42 the Coast Guard has authorized a number of drawbridge to be remotely operated with successful results. Safety is a priority and the bridge must operate as if a drawtender were present at the bridge.

The same commenter had safety concerns that without drawtenders on site, maintenance, repairs, inspections and vessel assistance through the bridge would not be conducted. In accordance with CSX procedures, drawtenders are not allowed to perform these actions. There are also concerns about unreported strikes of the bridge by

vessels and potential trespassers at the bridge. CSX has cameras at the bridge and given that the bridge operating schedule is open on demand, the bridge must be monitored 24 hours a day. Also, vessels are required to report certain marine incidents and casualties and local law enforcement will be alerted if there is illegal activity at the bridge.

Another comment recommended that the bridge remain in the open to navigation position and close when a train is approaching. Coast Guard will consider this option and discuss with CSX during the comment and test period.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

33 CFR 117.42 sets Coast Guard drawbridge regulations. This regulation authorizes the Coast Guard District Commander to approve operations from a remote site. CSX has requested to operate the CSX Transportation Bridge across Bayou Sara from the CSX remote control center in Mobile, AL. The waterway users include recreational vessels requires approximately six openings a day.

Presently, the bridge opens on signal for the passage of vessels in accordance with 33 CFR 117.105 and this proposed rule will not change that operating schedule. This proposed rule will also not change how a request to open the bridge will be conducted. Mariners requiring an opening may do so by contacting the CSX remote control center on Channels 13/16 or by the phone number posted at the bridge.

The Coast Guard has visited the CSX remote control center several times and has confirmed that the remote operating system is effective. This proposed rule allows CSX to control the drawbridge from their remote control center and requires CSX to have the capability, including resources and manpower to return the operator to the bridge location within 3 hours following any of the below situations:

- Any component of the remote operations system fails and prevents the remote operator from being able to visually identify vessels, communicate with vessels, detect vessels immediately underneath the bridge or visually identify trains approaching the bridge.
- CSX fails to meet Federal Railway Administration (FRA) or any other government agency safety requirements.
- Anytime that CSX procedures, equipment or operators fail to safely open and close the bridge fail.
- At the direction of the District Commander.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize its analyses based on 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 ability that vessels can still transit the bridge with the bridge operator controlling the bridge from a remote location.

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, 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 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 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 will not result in such an expenditure, the Coast Guard does discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, Rev. 1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning Policy COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f) and have made. The Coast Guard has determined 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 promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table 3–1 of the U.S. Coast Guard Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are 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 <https://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <https://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 submissions in response to this document, see DHS's eRulemaking System of Records notice (85 FR 14226, March 11, 2020).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in this 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 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 § 117.105 to read as follows:

§ 117.105 Bayou Sara.

(a) The draw of the CSX Transportation Railroad bridge, mile 0.1 near Saraland,

AL shall be remotely operated by the bridge operator at CSX's bridge remote control center in Mobile, Alabama. Closed Circuit TVs, infrared detectors, communications systems and information technology systems have been installed at the bridge. Vessels can contact the CSX bridge operator via VHF–FM channel 13 or by telephone at the number displayed on the signs posted at the bridge to request an opening of the draw.

(b) CSX will return the operator to the bridge location within 3 hours following any of the below situations:

(1) Any component of the remote operations system fails and prevents the remote operator from being able to visually identify vessels, communicate with vessels, detect vessels immediately underneath the bridge or visually identify trains approaching the bridge.

(2) CSX fails to meet Federal Railway Administration (FRA) or any other government agency safety requirements.

(3) Anytime that CSX procedures, equipment or operators fail to safely open and close the bridge fail.

(4) Anytime at the direction of the District Commander.

Dated: March 16, 2021.

John P. Nadeau

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,
Eighth Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2021-06482 Filed 3-30-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 12

[EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0554; FRL-10021-
57-Region 3]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Emissions Statement Certification for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard

AGENCY: Environmental Protection
Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a state implementation plan (SIP) revision formally submitted by the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC). Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), a state's SIP must include an emission statement regulation that requires stationary sources in ozone nonattainment areas classified as marginal or above to report annual emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOC). This SIP revision provides Delaware's certification that its existing emissions statement program satisfies the emissions statement requirements of the CAA for the 2015 ozone national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). EPA is proposing to approve Delaware's emissions statement program certification for the 2015 ozone NAAQS as a SIP revision in accordance with the requirements of the CAA.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before April 30, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0554 at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to Gordon.Mike@epa.gov. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, 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. 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 <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Serena Nichols, Planning & Implementation Branch (3AD30), Air & Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. The telephone number is (215) 814-2053. Ms. Nichols can also be reached via electronic mail at Nichols.Serena@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Under the CAA, EPA establishes NAAQS for criteria pollutants in order to protect human health and the environment. In response to scientific evidence linking ozone exposure to adverse health effects, EPA promulgated the first ozone NAAQS, the 0.12 part per million (ppm) 1-hour ozone NAAQS, in 1979. See 44 FR 8202 (February 8, 1979). The CAA requires EPA to review and reevaluate the NAAQS every five years in order to consider updated information regarding the effects of the criteria pollutants on human health and the environment. On July 18, 1997, EPA promulgated a revised ozone NAAQS, referred to as the 1997 ozone NAAQS, of 0.08 ppm averaged over eight hours. 62 FR 38856. This 8-hour ozone NAAQS was determined to be more protective of public health than the previous 1979 1-hour ozone NAAQS. In 2008, EPA strengthened the 8-hour ozone NAAQS from 0.08 to 0.075 ppm. See 73 FR 16436 (March 27, 2008). In 2015, EPA further lowered the 8-hour ozone NAAQS from 0.075 ppm to 0.070 ppm. The 0.070 ppm standard is referred to as the 2015 ozone NAAQS. See 80 FR 65452 (October 26, 2015).

On June 4, 2018 and July 25, 2018, EPA designated nonattainment areas for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. 83 FR 25776 and 83 FR 35136. Effective August 3, 2018 (83 FR 25776, June 4, 2018), New Castle County, Delaware, was

designated as marginal nonattainment for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. New Castle County was designated as part of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-MD-DE 2015 ozone NAAQS nonattainment area, which includes the following counties: New Castle in Delaware; Cecil in Maryland; Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Mercer, Ocean, and Salem in New Jersey; and Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania. See 40 CFR 81.308, 81.321, 81.331, and 81.339. Delaware's Kent and Sussex Counties were designated as attainment areas for the same 2015 Ozone NAAQS. See 40 CFR 81.308.

Section 182 of the CAA identifies plan submissions and requirements for ozone nonattainment areas. Specifically, CAA section 182(a)(3)(B) requires that states develop and submit, as a revision to their SIP, rules which establish annual emission reporting requirements for certain stationary sources. Sources that are within ozone nonattainment areas must annually report the actual emissions of NO_x and VOC to the state. However, states may waive this requirement for sources that emit under 25 tons per year (tpy) of NO_x or VOC if the state provides an inventory of emissions from such class or category of sources as required by CAA sections 172 and 182. See CAA section 182(a)(3)(B)(ii).

EPA published guidance on source emissions statements in a July 1992 memorandum titled, "Guidance on the Implementation of an Emission Statement Program" ¹ and in a March 14, 2006 memorandum titled, "Emission Statement Requirements Under 8-hour Ozone NAAQS Implementation" (2006 memorandum).² In addition, on December 6, 2018, EPA issued a final rule addressing a range of nonattainment area SIP requirements for the 2015 ozone NAAQS, including the emission statement requirements of CAA section 182(a)(3)(B) (2018 final rule). 83 FR 62998, codified at 40 CFR part 51, subpart CC. The 2006 memorandum clarified that the emissions statement requirement of CAA section 182(a)(3)(B) was applicable to all areas designated nonattainment

¹ July 1992 memorandum titled, "Guidance on the Implementation of an Emission Statement Program" is available online at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/emission_statement_program_zypdf.pdf. Docket ID: EPA-R03-QAR-2020-0554.

² March 14, 2006 memorandum titled, "Emission Statement Requirements Under 8-hour Ozone NAAQS Implementation" is available online at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-07/documents/8hourozone_naaqs_031406.pdf. Docket ID: EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0554.