

penalties, civil remedies, or counterintelligence measures. Access to the accounting of disclosures could also interfere with a civil or administrative action or investigation which may impede in those actions or investigations. Access also could reveal the identity of confidential sources incident to Federal employment, military service, contract, and security clearance determinations.

(ii) *Subsection (c)(4)*. This subsection is inapplicable to the extent that an exemption is being claimed for subsection (d).

(iii) *Subsection (d)(1)*. Disclosure of records in the system could reveal the identity of confidential sources and result in an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of others. Disclosure may also reveal information relating to actual or potential criminal investigations. Disclosure of classified national security information would cause damage to the national security of the United States. Disclosure could also interfere with a civil or administrative action or investigation; reveal the identity of confidential sources incident to Federal employment, military service, contract, and security clearance determinations; and reveal the confidentiality and integrity of Federal testing materials and evaluation materials used for military promotions when furnished by a confidential source.

(iv) *Subsection (d)(2)*. Amendment of the records could interfere with ongoing criminal or civil law enforcement proceedings and impose an impossible administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated.

(v) *Subsections (d)(3) and (4)*. These subsections are inapplicable to the extent exemption is claimed from (d)(1) and (2).

(vi) *Subsection (e)(1)*. It is often impossible to determine in advance if investigatory records contained in this system are accurate, relevant, timely and complete, but, in the interests of effective law enforcement and counterintelligence, it is necessary to retain this information to aid in establishing patterns of activity and provide investigative leads.

(vii) *Subsection (e)(2)*. To collect information from the subject individual could serve notice that he or she is the subject of a criminal investigation and thereby present a serious impediment to such investigations.

(viii) *Subsection (e)(3)*. To inform individuals as required by this subsection could reveal the existence of a criminal investigation and compromise investigative efforts.

(ix) *Subsection (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I)*. These subsections are inapplicable to the extent exemption is claimed from (d)(1) and (2).

(x) *Subsection (e)(5)*. It is often impossible to determine in advance if investigatory records contained in this system are accurate, relevant, timely and complete, but, in the interests of effective law enforcement, it is necessary to retain this information to aid in establishing patterns of activity and provide investigative leads.

(xi) *Subsection (e)(8)*. To serve notice could give persons sufficient warning to evade investigative efforts.

(xii) *Subsection (g)*. This subsection is inapplicable to the extent that the system is exempt from other specific subsections of the Privacy Act.

(4) In addition, in the course of carrying out analysis for insider threats, exempt records from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case records maintained in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those other systems of records are maintained into this system, the DoD claims the same exemptions for the records from those other systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary system of which they are a part.

Dated: May 13, 2016.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2016-11702 Filed 5-18-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2016-0286]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile 44.1 to 45.1, Kittanning, Pennsylvania

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to establish a temporary safety zone for all navigable waters of the Allegheny River mile 44.1 to mile 45.1. This action is needed to protect personnel, spectators, participants, and vessels from potential hazards associated with boat races. Access to this safety zone would be limited to those participating in or working with the race sponsors unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Pittsburgh 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 June 20, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2016-0287 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://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 MST1 Jennifer Haggins, Marine Safety Unit Pittsburgh, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 412-221-0807, email [Jennifer.L.Haggins@uscg.mil](mailto:Jennifer.L.Haggins@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

##### II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On March 24, 2016, the Three Rivers Outboard Racing Association notified the Coast Guard that it will be conducting boat races from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. daily beginning on August 19, 2016 and through August 21, 2016. The boat races are scheduled to take place on the Allegheny River from mile 44.1 to 45.1. The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels, participants, race spectators, and those working in the boat racing event. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231.

##### III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a safety zone from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. daily beginning on August 19, 2016 and through August 21, 2016. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters of the Allegheny River from mile 44.1 to mile 45.1. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of vessels, participants, race spectators, and those working the boat racing event on navigable waters. Access to this safety zone would be limited to those participating in or working with the race sponsors. No other vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety 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. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. 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.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, and duration, of the safety zone and the low traffic nature of this area. The safety zone will close a small section of the Allegheny River for ten hours a day for three days; however, there is little traffic in the area. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow other waterway users to seek permission to enter the zone. Requests to transit the safety zone area would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

##### 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 safety 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 (Public Law 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 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 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 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 Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, 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 safety zone lasting less than two hours that would prohibit entry into the safety zone. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist and Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. 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 <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://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 <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the **Federal Register** (70 FR 15086).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that Web site'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 165

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes 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:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 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.T08–0286 to read as follows:

##### **§ 165.T08–0286 Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile 44.1 to Mile 45.1, Kittanning, PA.**

(a) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All navigable waters of the Allegheny River mile 44.1 to mile 45.1.

(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 Pittsburgh (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) *Regulations.* (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in § 165.23 of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this

section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative at 412–221–0807. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(d) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. beginning on August 19, 2016 and through August 21, 2016.

(e) *Informational Broadcasts.* The COTP or a designated representative will inform the public through broadcast notices to mariners of the enforcement period for the safety zone as well as any changes in the dates and times of enforcement.

Dated: April 27, 2016.

**L. McClain, Jr.,**

*Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Pittsburgh.*

[FR Doc. 2016–11822 Filed 5–18–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 35

[EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0120; FRL–9946–59–Region 9]

##### **Clean Air Act Grant: South Coast Air Quality Management District; Opportunity for Public Hearing**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed action; determination with request for comments and notice of opportunity for public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has made a proposed determination that the reduction in expenditures of non-Federal funds for the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) in support of its continuing air program under section 105 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) for the calendar year 2015 is a result of non-selective reductions in expenditures. This determination, when final, will permit the SCAQMD to receive grant funding for FY2016 from the EPA under section 105 of the Clean Air Act.

**DATES:** Comments and/or requests for a public hearing must be received by the EPA at the address stated below by June 20, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. [EPA–R09–OAR–2016–0120] at <http://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to

[Lance.Gary@epa.gov](mailto:Lance.Gary@epa.gov). For comments submitted at [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://www.Regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, 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 <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gary Lance, EPA Region IX, Grants and Program Integration Office, Air Division, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901; phone: (415) 972–3992, fax: (415) 947–3579 or email address at [lance.gary@epa.gov](mailto:lance.gary@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 105 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) provides grant support for the continuing air programs of eligible state, local, and tribal agencies. In accordance with 40 CFR 35.145(a), the Regional Administrator may provide air pollution control agencies up to three-fifths of the approved costs of implementing programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Section 105 contains two cost-sharing provisions which recipients must meet to qualify for a CAA section 105 grant. An eligible entity must meet a minimum 40% match. In addition, to remain eligible for section 105 funds, an eligible entity must continue to meet the minimum match requirement as well as meet a maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement under section 105(c)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7405.

Program activities relevant to the match consist of both recurring and non-recurring (unique, one-time only) expenses. The MOE provision requires that a state or local agency spend at least the same dollar level of funds as it did in the previous grant year, but only for