information that would reveal the existence of a SAR, within the loan or finance company’s corporate organizational structure for purposes consistent with Title II of the Bank Secrecy Act as determined by regulation or in guidance.

(2) Prohibition on disclosures by government authorities. A Federal, state, local, territorial, or tribal government authority, or any director, officer, employee, or agent of any of the foregoing, shall not disclose a SAR, or any information that would reveal the existence of a SAR, except as necessary to fulfill official duties consistent with Title II of the Bank Secrecy Act. For purposes of this section, official duties shall not include the disclosure of a SAR, or any information that would reveal the existence of a SAR, to a non-governmental entity in response to a request for disclosure of non-public information or a request for use in a private legal proceeding, including a request pursuant to 31 CFR 1.11.

(e) Limitation on liability. A loan or finance company, and any director, officer, employee, or agent of any loan or finance company, that makes a voluntary disclosure of any possible violation of law or regulation to a government agency or makes a disclosure pursuant to this section or any other authority, including a disclosure made jointly with another institution, shall be protected from liability for any such disclosure, or for failure to provide notice of such disclosure to any person identified in the disclosure, or both, to the full extent provided by 31 U.S.C. 5316(g)(3).

(f) Compliance. Loan or finance companies shall be examined by FinCEN or its delegates under the terms of the Bank Secrecy Act, for compliance with this section. Failure to satisfy the requirements of this section may be a violation of the Bank Secrecy Act and of this part.

(g) Applicability date. This section applies to transactions initiated after an anti-money laundering program required by section 103.142 of this part is required to be implemented.

4. Add new §103.142 to subpart I to read as follows:

§103.142 Anti-money laundering programs for loan or finance companies.

(a) Anti-money laundering program requirements for loan or finance companies. Each loan or finance company shall develop and implement a written anti-money laundering program that is reasonably designed to prevent the loan or finance company from being used to facilitate money laundering or the financing of terrorist activities. The program must be approved by senior management. A loan or finance company shall make a copy of its anti-money laundering program available to the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or its designee upon request.

(b) Minimum requirements. At a minimum, the anti-money laundering program shall:

1. Incorporate policies, procedures, and internal controls based upon the loan or finance company’s assessment of the money laundering and terrorist financing risks associated with its products and services. Policies, procedures, and internal controls developed and implemented by a loan or finance company under this section shall include provisions for complying with the applicable requirements of subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code and this part, integrating the company’s agents and brokers into its anti-money laundering program, and obtaining all relevant customer-related information necessary for an effective anti-money laundering program.

2. Designate a compliance officer who will be responsible for ensuring that:

(i) The anti-money laundering program is implemented effectively, including monitoring compliance by the company’s agents and brokers with their obligations under the program;

(ii) The anti-money laundering program is updated as necessary; and

(iii) Appropriate persons are educated and trained in accordance with paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

3. Provide for on-going training of appropriate persons concerning their responsibilities under the program. A loan or finance company may satisfy this requirement with respect to its employees, agents, and brokers by directly training such persons or verifying that such persons have received training by a competent third party with respect to the products and services offered by the loan or finance company.

4. Provide for independent testing to monitor and maintain an adequate program, including testing to determine compliance of the company’s agents and brokers with their obligations under the program. The scope and frequency of the testing shall be commensurate with the risks posed by the company’s products and services. Such testing may be conducted by a third party or by any officer or employee of the loan or finance company, other than the person designated in paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(c) Compliance. Compliance with this section shall be examined by FinCEN or its delegates, under the terms of the Bank Secrecy Act. Failure to comply with the requirements of this section may constitute a violation of the Bank Secrecy Act and of this part.

(d) Effective date. A loan or finance company must develop and implement an anti-money laundering program that complies with the requirements of this section on or before the later of six months from the effective date of the regulation, or six months after the date a loan or finance company is established and becomes subject to the requirements of this section.

5. Amend §103.170 as follows:

a. Remove paragraph (b)(1)(ii).

b. Redesignate paragraphs (b)(1)(iii) through (b)(1)(x) as paragraphs (b)(1)(ii) through (b)(1)(ix) respectively.


James H. Freis, Jr.,
Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.
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The current regulation, set out in 33 CFR 117.559, requires that the US 50 Bridge over Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, mile 0.5, at Ocean City, with a vertical clearance of 13 feet above mean high tide in the closed position, shall open on signal; except from October 1 through April 30 from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., the draw shall open if at least three hours notice is given and from May 25 through September 15, from 9:25 a.m. to 9:55 p.m., the draw shall open at 25 minutes after and 55 minutes after the hour for a maximum of five minutes to let accumulated vessel pass, except that, on Saturdays from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., the draw shall open on the hour for all waiting vessels and shall remain in the open position until all waiting vessels pass.

According to the records furnished by MdTA, draw tender logs for the past three years show that there have been little to no requests for bridge openings from October 1 to April 30, between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. By providing notice to the bridge tender before 6 p.m., mariners can plan their transits and minimize delay in accordance with the proposed rule.

Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to revise 33 CFR 117.559 for the US 50 bridge, mile 0.5, at Ocean City. The current paragraph would be divided into paragraphs (a) and (b).

Paragraph (a) would contain the proposed rule and require the drawbridge to open on signal from October 1 through April 30, from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., if notice has been given to the bridge tender before 6 p.m.

Paragraph (b) would contain the existing regulation that states the following: From May 25 through September 15 from 9:25 a.m. to 9:55 p.m. the draw shall open at 25 minutes after and 55 minutes after the hour for a maximum of five minutes to let accumulated vessel pass, except that, on Saturdays from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., the draw shall open on the hour for all waiting vessels and shall remain in the open position until all waiting vessels pass.
open position until all waiting vessels pass.

The change in the operating regulation would ensure a timely bridge opening for mariners during the off-season, from October 1 through April 30 from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.

The Atlantic Ocean is the alternate route for vessels transiting this section of Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay. Vessels with a mast height of less than 13 feet can pass underneath the bridge in the closed position at anytime.

The Coast Guard also proposes to change the waterway location at section 117.559 Isle of Wight Bay, by inserting the name Sinepuxent Bay, since this waterway is known locally as both the Isle of Wight Bay and the Sinepuxent Bay.

Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on 13 of these statutes or executive orders.

Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. The proposed changes are expected to have only a minimal impact on maritime traffic transiting the bridge.

Mariners can plan their trips in accordance with the scheduled bridge openings to minimize delays.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. 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. This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels needing to transit the bridge from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. from October 1 to April 30. This action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the rule adds minimal restrictions to the movement of navigation, by requiring mariners from October 1 to April 30, from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., to give notice to the bridge tender before 6 p.m.

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 explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Assistance for Small Entities

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 so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking. 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 Lindsey Middleton, Bridge Management Specialist, Fifth Coast Guard District, (757) 398–6629 or Lindsey.R.Middleton@uscg.mil. 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.

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).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

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, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule would not cause a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not economically significant and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

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.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use, We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their
regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

This proposed rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment because it simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

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:


2. Revise § 117.559 to read as follows:

§ 117.559 Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay

The draw of the US 50 Bridge, mile 0.5, at Ocean City, shall open on signal; except:

(a) From October 1 through April 30, from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., the draw shall open if notice has been given to the bridge tender before 6 p.m.

(b) From May 25 through September 15, from 9:25 a.m. to 9:55 p.m., the draw shall open at 25 minutes after and 55 minutes after the hour for a maximum of five minutes to let accumulated vessels pass, except that on Saturdays, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., the draw shall open on the hour for all waiting vessels and shall remain in the open position until all waiting vessels pass.

Dated: November 24, 2010.

William D. Lee,

Bore Admiral, United States Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2010–30918 Filed 12–8–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271


Oregon; Correction of Federal Authorization of the State's Hazardous Waste Management Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA Region 10 proposes to approve a correction to the State of Oregon’s federally authorized RCRA hazardous waste management program. On January 7, 2010, EPA published a final rule under docket EPA–R10–RCRA 2009–0766 granting final authorization for changes the State of Oregon made to its federally authorized RCRA Hazardous Waste Management Program. These authorized changes included, among others, the Federal Recycled Used Oil Management Standards; Clarification rule, promulgated on July 30, 2003. During a post-authorization review of the State of Oregon’s regulations, EPA identified that the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), related to the federal used oil management requirements (OAR 340–100–0002), had not been updated to include the adoption of the Federal Recycled Used Oil Management Standards; Clarification rule. Therefore, the State did not have an effective state rule and EPA inaccurately referenced this rule in the State’s Final Authorization Action published and effective on January 7, 2010. This action will correct the State of Oregon’s federally authorized program, by removing the inaccurate authorization reference to the federal Recycled Used Oil Management Standards; Clarification rule.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing on or before January 10, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R10–RCRA–2010–0947, by one of the following methods:


- E-mail: Kocourek.Nina@epa.gov.

- Fax: (206) 553–8509, to the attention of Nina Kocourek.


- Hand Delivery or Courier: Deliver your comments to: Nina Kocourek, U.S. EPA, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, Mail Stop AWT–122, Seattle, Washington 98101. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Office’s normal hours of operation.

For detailed instructions on how to submit comments, please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nina Kocourek at (206) 553–6502 or by e-mail at Kocourek.Nina@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving Oregon’s Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision though a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments to this action. Unless we get written adverse comments which oppose this approval during the comment period, the direct final rule will become effective on the date it establishes, and we will not take further action on this proposal. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. For additional information, see the direct rule which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register.

Dated: December 1, 2010.

Dennis J. McLerran,

Regional Administrator, EPA Region 10.

[FR Doc. 2010–31011 Filed 12–8–10; 8:45 am]
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