

scope of practice permitted under State or Federal law, other than acceptable medical sources identified in paragraph (a) of this section, are other medical sources. Examples include licensed clinical social workers, naturopaths, and chiropractors. The Board will accept and consider evidence from other medical sources about the claimant's impairment(s) and the effect on the claimant's ability to work, but the presence of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment must be established with objective medical evidence from an acceptable medical source as defined in paragraph (a) of this section.

* * * *

(e) *Evidence from treating medical sources.* A statement by or the opinion of the claimant's treating medical source will not determine whether the claimant is disabled. However, the medical evidence provided by a treating medical source will be considered by the Board in making a disability decision. A treating medical source is a medical source to whom the claimant has been going for treatment on a continuing basis. The claimant may have more than one treating medical source. The Board may use consulting physicians or other medical consultants for specialized examinations or tests, to obtain more complete evidence, and to resolve any conflicts. A consulting physician is a doctor (often a specialist) to whom the claimant is referred for an examination once or on a limited basis. (See § 220.50 for an explanation of when the Board may request a consultative examination.)

(f) *Information from non-medical sources.* Information from other sources may also help the Board understand how an impairment affects the claimant's ability to work. Other sources include—

- (1) Public and private social welfare agency personnel;
- (2) Family members, caregivers, friends, and neighbors of the claimant;
- (3) Educational personnel such as teachers, counselors, and daycare center workers;
- (4) Railroad and nonrailroad employers; and,
- (5) The claimant themselves.

Dated: June 14, 2024.

By Authority of the Board.

Stephanie Hillyard,
Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 2024–13554 Filed 6–20–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2024–0400]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Townsend Gut, Southport, ME

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to temporarily modify the operating schedule that governs the Southport (SR27) Bridge at mile 0.7 across Townsend Gut between Boothbay Harbor and Southport, ME. The bridge owner, Maine Department of Transportation (ME DOT), has submitted a request to allow the bridge to remain closed to vessel traffic. ME DOT is conducting rehabilitation of the swing bridge and the bridge will be unable to open to marine traffic due to an operational imbalance while the work is being conducted. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before July 22, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2024–0400 using Federal Decision Making 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. This notice of proposed rulemaking with its plain-language, 100-word-or-less proposed rule summary will be available in this same docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Mr. Gary Croot, First Coast Guard District, Project Officer, telephone 206–815–1364, email Gary.T.Croot@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
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
ME DOT	Maine Department of Transportation

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

The Southport Swing Bridge carries Maine State Route 27 across Townsend Gut at mile 0.7 between Boothbay Harbor, ME and Southport, ME. The bridge has a vertical clearance of 10.0 feet at Mean High Water and 52.0 feet horizontal clearance when in the closed position. Waterway users include recreational boaters and commercial fishing vessels.

The existing drawbridge operating regulation is 33 CFR 117.537 and requires the bridge to open on request, except that from April 29 through September 30, between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. the draw shall open on signal on the hour and half hour only, after an opening request is given.

ME DOT is requesting a temporary rulemaking to allow the bridge to remain in the closed to navigation position so they can conduct bridge rehabilitation which includes replacing the bridge deck, and electrical and mechanical systems upgrades. The bridge will be unable to open to marine traffic due to an operational imbalance while the work is being conducted.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard is proposing to stay 33 CFR 117.537 from 12:01 a.m. September 30, 2024, through 11:59 p.m. on May 30, 2025, and adding a new temporary section that allows the bridge to remain in the closed to navigation position during that same time period. Vessels that can pass under the bridge while in the closed position may do so. Vessels that are too large to pass under the bridge while in the closed position may navigate around Southport Island.

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 these statutes and Executive Orders.

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 proposed rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, *as amended by Executive Order 14094 (Modernizing Regulatory Review)*. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability of vessels to use an alternate route. Vessels that are able to pass under the bridge while in the closed position may continue to do so.

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 proposed 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, we do 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). 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.

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.

Submitting comments. We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal Decision Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. To do so, go to <https://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2024–0400 in the search box and click “Search.” Next, look for this document in the Search Results column, and click on it. Then click on the Comment option. 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.

Viewing material in docket. To view documents mentioned in this proposed rule as being available in the docket, find the docket as described in the previous paragraph, and then select “Supporting & Related Material” in the Document Type column. Public comments will also be placed in our online docket and can be viewed by following instructions on the <https://www.regulations.gov> Frequently Asked Questions web page. Also, 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 of any posting or updates to the docket.

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.

Personal information. 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).

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; DHS Delegation No. 00170.1. Revision No. 01.3.

■ 2. Stay § 117.537 from 12:01 a.m. on September 30, 2024, through 11:59 p.m. on May 30, 2025.

■ 3. Add § 117.T538 to read as follows:

§ 117.T538 Townsend Gut.

The draw shall not be required to open from 12:01 a.m. on September 30, 2024, through 11:59 p.m. on May 30, 2025.

M.E. Platt,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2024–13472 Filed 6–20–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 36

RIN 2900–AS08

Loan Guaranty: Adjustable Rate Mortgages, Hybrid Adjustable Rate Mortgages, and Temporary Buydown Agreements

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) proposes to amend its rules on interest rates for adjustable rate mortgage (ARM) loans and hybrid adjustable rate mortgage (h-ARM) loans. The proposed rule would ensure VA's existing interest rate regulation reflects current statutory requirements regarding these loans, in a way that makes the loans a more viable, safe product for Veterans. The proposed rule would also solidify requirements for temporary buydown agreements to help Veterans temporarily reduce their interest rates and, in effect, lower their monthly mortgage payments for a specific period of time.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 20, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted through www.regulations.gov. Except as provided below, comments received before the close of the comment period will be available at www.regulations.gov for public viewing,

inspection, or copying, including any personally identifiable or confidential business information that is included in a comment. We post the comments received before the close of the comment period on www.regulations.gov as soon as possible after they have been received. VA will not post on Regulations.gov public comments that make threats to individuals or institutions or suggest that the commenter will take actions to harm an individual. VA encourages individuals not to submit duplicative comments; however, we will post comments from multiple unique commenters even if the content is identical or nearly identical to other comments. Any public comment received after the comment period's closing date is considered late and will not be considered in the final rulemaking. In accordance with the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2023, a plain language summary (not more than 100 words in length) of this proposed rule is available at www.regulations.gov, under RIN 2900–AS08(P).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephanie Li, Assistant Director for Regulations, Legislation, Engagement and Training, and Terry Rouch, Assistant Director for Loan Policy and Valuation, Loan Guaranty Service (26), Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20420, (202) 632–8862. (This is not a toll-free telephone number.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Legal Authority

VA's home loan guaranty program assists eligible Veterans¹ to purchase, construct, improve, or refinance a home. Since the benefit was initially introduced in 1944,² Congress has enacted laws expanding the types of loans VA may guarantee. Additionally, sections 3703(c), 3710, and 3720 further provide the Secretary broad discretion in regulating the terms and conditions of loans, establishing underwriting standards, and consenting to modified loan terms such as interest rates. 38 U.S.C. 3703, 3710, and 3720. Lastly,

¹ The term “Veteran” is more expansive for the home loan program than for some other VA benefits. In addition to Veterans defined at 38 U.S.C. 101, the term includes active duty service members, members of the National Guard and Selected Reserve, surviving spouses, and spouses of those individuals who are determined missing in action or prisoners of war. See 38 U.S.C. 101, 3701, and 3702. For more information, please visit VA's website at <https://www.va.gov/housing-assistance/home-loans/eligibility/>.

² Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public Law 78–346, 58 Stat. 284.

under 38 U.S.C. 501, “[t]he Secretary has authority to prescribe all rules and regulations which are necessary or appropriate to carry out the laws administered by the Department.” Based on these authorities, VA proposes to amend 38 CFR part 36 as discussed below.

A. Adjustable Rate Mortgages and Hybrid Adjustable Rate Mortgages

Two types of loans VA may guarantee are ARM loans pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 3707 and h-ARM loans pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 3707A. Initially, Congress allowed VA to guarantee ARM and h-ARM loans under temporary programs, but VA's authority was eventually made permanent.³

B. Temporary Buydown Agreements

A temporary buydown agreement is commonly included in a mortgage contract and involves using up-front funds deposited into an escrow account to temporarily reduce the interest rate, effectively lowering the monthly mortgage payment for a specific period lasting anywhere from one to three years. These agreements are often used as a marketing tool for lenders, sellers, and builders, as they provide the Veteran with a lower payment at the beginning of their loan. The up-front funds deposited into an escrow account may be funded by the seller, lender, builder, or Veteran.

VA has in recent years permitted the use of temporary buydown agreements⁴

³ In 1992, Congress authorized VA to guarantee ARM loans beginning in fiscal year (FY) 1993. Veterans Home Loan Program Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102–547, sec. 3(a)(1), 106 Stat. 3633, 3634. This authority, which expired at the end of FY 1995, was later extended through FY 2008, then through FY 2012, and then, in 2012, made permanent. Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, Public Law 108–454, sec. 404, 118 Stat. 3598, 3616; Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008, Public Law 110–389, sec. 505, 122 Stat. 4145, 4176; Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012, Public Law 112–154, sec. 208, 126 Stat. 1165, 1179. Legislation authorizing VA to guarantee h-ARM loans was first enacted in 2002. Veterans Benefits Act of 2002, Public Law 107–330, title III, sec. 303(a), 116 Stat. 2820, 2825. The statutory authority, codified at 38 U.S.C. 3707A, expired at the end of FY 2005 but was later extended through FY 2008, and then through FY 2012. Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, Public Law 108–454, sec. 405, 118 Stat. 3616–3617; Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008, Public Law 110–389, sec. 505, 122 Stat. 4176. In 2012, Congress made permanent VA's authority to guarantee h-ARM loans. Public Law 112–154, sec. 209, 126 Stat. 1179.

⁴ When temporary buy-down agreements were still considered novel, VA was concerned that a Veteran's payment of the up-front escrows could be considered a “cash-advance fee,” in violation of the regulation at 38 CFR 36.4313. VA published administrative guidance explaining the position. See Circular 26–18–4, “Policy Reminder for Lender's Payment or Credit of Veterans Costs in VA