

persons engaged in the trade of antiquities beyond the consideration of a monetary threshold?

16. Which aspects of the current regulatory framework applicable to financial institutions should apply to persons engaged in the trade in antiquities?

a. Should FinCEN consider extending all or only some elements of AML/CFT program requirements now applicable to financial institutions to the trade in antiquities, including: (i) A system of internal controls to ensure ongoing compliance, (ii) independent testing for compliance to be conducted by internal financial institution personnel or by an outside party, (iii) designation of an individual or individuals responsible for coordinating and monitoring day-to-day compliance, or (iv) training for appropriate personnel?

b. How could know-your-customer requirements, such as customer due diligence or customer identification programs, apply in the transaction process in the trade in antiquities? What would be the effect on industry of imposing customer verification and identification requirements on sellers, purchasers, and others involved in the trade in antiquities? How would the application of know-your-customer requirements to this industry assist in preventing money laundering, terrorist financing, and other illicit financial activity?

c. What, if any, difficulties are associated with requiring the disclosure of or otherwise obtaining beneficial ownership information for legal entities engaged in the trade of antiquities, including foreign legal entities that may be outside the scope of current or future U.S. beneficial ownership reporting requirements?

d. What should be the requirements for filing SARs related to antiquities? What should FinCEN consider in implementing any requirements for filing SARs related to antiquities?

e. How many natural persons and legal entities might be affected by FinCEN's application of BSA requirements to persons engaged in the trade in antiquities, and what is the estimated hourly and annual burden, if any, for each such person, for each of the obligations described above? How could FinCEN minimize the burdens associated with these obligations, if any, through its decisions about the form or content of the rule while still ensuring the appropriate management and mitigation of AML/CFT risk?

## B. Regulatory Planning and Review

This ANPRM is a significant regulatory action under Executive Order

12866 and has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

## C. Conclusion

With this ANPRM, FinCEN seeks input on the questions set forth above. FinCEN welcomes comments on all aspects of the ANPRM, and all interested parties are encouraged to provide their views.

Dated: September 20, 2021.

**Himamauli Das,**

*Acting Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.*

[FR Doc. 2021–20731 Filed 9–23–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–02–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2021–0430; FRL–9060–01–R4]

### Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Minor Revisions to Cotton Ginning Operations Rule

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the State of North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality, via a letter dated April 13, 2021, and received by EPA on April 14, 2021. This revision contains minor clarifying and typographical edits to North Carolina's cotton ginning operations rule. EPA is proposing to approve these changes pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before October 25, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2021–0430 at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. 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, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit [www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets](http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets).

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Pearlene Williams, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air and Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The telephone number is (404) 562–9144. Ms. Williams can also be reached via electronic mail at [williams.pearlene@epa.gov](mailto:williams.pearlene@epa.gov).

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### I. Overview

On April 14, 2021, the State of North Carolina submitted changes to the North Carolina SIP for EPA approval. EPA is proposing to approve these changes to 15A North Carolina Administrative Code (NCAC) Subchapter 02D,<sup>1</sup> Rule .0542—*Control of Particulate Emissions from Cotton Ginning Operations* which establishes control requirements for particulate emissions from cotton ginning operations.

### II. Analysis of North Carolina's SIP Revision

North Carolina's SIP revision contains minor clarifying and typographical edits to the text of Rule .0542.<sup>2</sup> For example, the revision adjusts the citation format for cited rules; corrects several typographical errors; adds text clarifying the meaning of certain words and phrases; and corrects a citation error. EPA has preliminarily determined that these changes do not interfere with attainment and maintenance of the national ambient air quality standards or any other applicable requirement of the Act because they are minor in nature. For these reasons, EPA is proposing to approve the changes to this rule.

### III. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, EPA is proposing to include in a final EPA rule regulatory

<sup>1</sup> In the table of North Carolina regulations federally approved into the SIP at 40 CFR 52.1770(c), 15A NCAC 02D is referred to as "Subchapter 2D Air Pollution Control Requirements."

<sup>2</sup> See North Carolina's April 14, 2021 SIP revision at pp. 82–86 (of the pdf file available in the docket for this proposed rulemaking) to review a redline version of the rule showing all of the proposed changes.

text that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with the requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference 15A NCAC Subchapter 02D, Rule .0542—*Control of Particulate Emissions from Cotton Ginning Operations*, with a state-effective date of November 1, 2020. These changes are proposed to make minor clarifying and typographical edits to the rule. EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and at the EPA Region 4 office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

#### IV. Proposed Action

EPA is proposing to approve the aforementioned revisions to Rule .0542—*Control of Particulate Emissions from Cotton Ginning Operations*. EPA is proposing to approve these changes because they are consistent with the CAA.

#### V. 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. See 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided they meet the criteria of the CAA. This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this proposed 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);
- 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 Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; 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 as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: September 20, 2021.

**John Blevins,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

[FR Doc. 2021-20648 Filed 9-23-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0707; FRL-9059-01-R4]

#### Air Plan Approval; North Carolina: Mecklenburg Ambient Air Quality Standards

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision to the Mecklenburg County portion of the North Carolina SIP,

hereinafter referred to as the Mecklenburg Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The revision was submitted by the State of North Carolina, through the North Carolina Division Air Quality (NCDAQ), on behalf of Mecklenburg County Air Quality (MCAQ) via a letter dated April 24, 2020, and was received by EPA on June 19, 2020. The revision updates several Mecklenburg County Air Pollution Control Ordinance (MCAPCO) ambient air quality rules incorporated into the LIP and adds one new rule for fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). EPA is proposing to approve these changes pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before October 25, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0707, at [www.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://Regulations.gov). 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, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit [www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets](http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pearlene Williams, Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air and Radiation Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. The telephone number is (404) 562-9144. Ms. Williams can also be reached via electronic mail at [williams.pearlene@epa.gov](mailto:williams.pearlene@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Background

The Mecklenburg County LIP was originally submitted to EPA on June 14, 1990, and EPA approved the plan on May 2, 1991. See 56 FR 20140. Mecklenburg County prepared three