

a. Would FinCEN use of such processes or procedures be practicable and appropriate?

b. Would FinCEN use of or reliance on existing processes and procedures help to lessen the costs to state, local, and tribal government agencies, or would it increase those costs?

c. Would FinCEN use of existing Federal, state, local, and tribal processes and procedures help to lessen the costs to small businesses affected by CTA requirements, or would it increase those costs?

(48) The process of forming legal entities may have ramifications that extend beyond the legal and economic consequences for legal entities themselves, and the reporting of beneficial ownership information about legal entities may have ramifications that extend beyond the effect of mobilizing such information for AML/CFT purposes. How can FinCEN best engage representatives of civil society stakeholders that may not be directly affected by a beneficial ownership information reporting rule but that are concerned for such larger ramifications?

V. Regulatory Planning and Review

This advance notice of proposed rulemaking is a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866 and has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

VI. Conclusion

Implementing an effective system to identify, collect, and permit authorized uses of beneficial ownership information will strengthen U.S. national security and the integrity of the U.S. financial system, and protect people from harm. With this ANPRM, FinCEN seeks input on how FinCEN should implement such a system, consistent with the requirements of the CTA, to maximize benefits while minimizing burdens on reporting companies. FinCEN seeks input from the public on the questions set forth above, including from regulated parties; state, local, and Tribal governments; law enforcement; regulators; other consumers of BSA data; and any other interested parties. FinCEN also welcomes comments on all aspects of the ANPRM and any other aspects of implementation of the CTA. FinCEN encourages all interested parties to provide their views.

By the Department of the Treasury.

AnnaLou Tirol,

Deputy Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

[FR Doc. 2021-06922 Filed 4-1-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2021-0131]

RIN 1625-AA87

Security Zone; Christina River, Newport, DE

AGENCY: Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a security zone for the protection of Very Important Persons (VIPs) as they transit by vehicle on the route 141 bridge over the Christina River near Newport, Delaware. The security zone will be enforced intermittently and only during times of a protected VIP transit over the bridge and will restrict vessel traffic while the zone is being enforced. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from entering or remaining within the security zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Delaware Bay 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 May 5, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2021-0131 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 Petty Officer Jennifer Padilla, Sector Delaware Bay, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 215-271-4814, Jennifer.L.Padilla@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
VIPs Very Important Persons

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

These VIP visits require the implementation of heightened security

measures for protection of VIPs who may travel on the route 141 bridge over the Christina River in Newport, Delaware. Due to the roadway passing over the Christina River, this security zone is necessary to protect VIPs, the public, and the surrounding waterway. To date in the year 2021 there have been 4 requests for security zones at this location. As a result, the Coast Guard had to issue numerous temporary security zones. Continued requests for this security zone are expected through 2024.

The purpose of this proposed rulemaking is to protect the VIPs and the public from destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage, subversive acts, or other malicious or potential terrorist acts. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034 (previously 33 U.S.C. 1231).

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Captain of the Port Delaware Bay (COTP) is proposing to establish a security zone for the protection of Very Important Persons (VIPs) as they transit by vehicle on the route 141 bridge over the Christina River near Newport, Delaware. This rule is necessary to expedite the establishment and enforcement of this security zone when short notice is provided to the COTP for VIPs traveling over the route 141 bridge. The security zone is bounded on the east by a line drawn from 39°42.55' North Latitude (N), 075°35.88' West Longitude (W), thence southerly to 39°42.50' N, 075°35.87' W proceeding from shoreline to shoreline on the Christina River in a westerly direction where it is bounded by the South James Street Bridge at 39°42.63' N, 075°36.53' W. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the security zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. 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. 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).

This regulatory action determination is based on the duration of the security zone would not significantly impact vessel traffic due to the limited amount of time it takes for the VIPs to transit over the route 141 bridge. Vessel traffic on this portion of the Christina River is typically limited to recreational traffic. When the security zone is enforced, the COTP will issue a broadcast via VHF-FM channel 16 allowing vessel traffic time to transit outside of enforcement 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 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 call or email 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 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 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, 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 security zone for the protection of Very Important Persons (VIPs) as they transit by vehicle on the route 141 bridge over the Christina River near Newport, Delaware. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L[60a] of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 1. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket. For instructions on locating the docket, see the **ADDRESSES** section of this preamble. 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. Comments we post to <https://www.regulations.gov> 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 the docket, and public comments, will be in our online docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that

website's instructions. We review all comments received, but we will only post comments that address the topic of the proposed rule. We may choose not to post off-topic, inappropriate, or duplicate comments that we receive. 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 is proposing 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, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.560 to read as follows:

§ 165.560 Security Zone; Christina River, Newport, DE.

(a) *Location.* The following area is a security zone: All waters of the Christina River, from shoreline to shoreline bounded on the east by a line drawn from 39°42.55' North Latitude (N), 075°35.88' West Longitude (W), thence southerly to 39°42.50' N, 075°35.87' W thence along the Christina River in a westerly direction and bounded by the South James Street Bridge at 39°42.63' N, 075°36.53' W. These coordinates are based on North American Datum 83 (NAD83).

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

Designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Delaware Bay (COTP) in the enforcement of the security zone.

Official Patrol Vessel means any Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, State, or local law enforcement vessel assigned or approved by the COTP.

Very Important Person (VIP) means any person for whom the United States Secret Service requests implementation of a security zone in order to supplement protection of said person(s).

(c) *Regulations.* (1) In accordance with the general regulations contained in § 165.33, entry into or movement within

this zone is prohibited unless authorized by the COTP, Sector Delaware Bay or designated representative.

(2) Only vessels or people specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay, or designated representative, may enter or remain in the regulated area. To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative on VHF–FM channel 13 or 16. Those in the security zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative. No person may swim upon or below the surface of the water of this security zone unless authorized by the COTP or his designated representative.

(3) Upon being hailed by an official patrol vessel or the designated representative, by siren, radio, flashing light or other means, the operator of the vessel shall proceed as directed. Failure to comply with lawful direction may result in expulsion from the regulated area, citation for failure to comply, or both.

(d) *Enforcement.* This security zone will be enforced with actual notice by the U.S. Coast Guard representatives on scene, as well as other methods listed in § 165.7. The Coast Guard will enforce the security zone created by this section only when it is necessary for the protection of VIPs traveling across the route 141 bridge in Newport, Delaware. The U.S. Coast Guard may be additionally assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the zone by Federal, State, and local agencies.

Dated: March 24, 2021.

Jonathan D. Theel,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay.

[FR Doc. 2021–06637 Filed 4–2–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2020–0476; FRL–10021–53–Region 9]

Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, East Kern Air Pollution Control District, and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District; Combustion Sources

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve

revisions to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD), East Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD), and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from boilers, steam generating units, process heaters, and stationary internal combustion engines. We are proposing to approve local rules to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by May 5, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2020–0476 at <https://www.regulations.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). 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 <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with disabilities who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Gong, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105. By phone at (415) 972–3073 and by email at gong.kevin@epa.gov.

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