

seeks comments on the relative value of limiting the use of SAFMRs to those agencies exhibiting a pattern of HCV tenant concentration in high-poverty areas versus using SAFMRs for all PHAs servicing an area where HCV tenants are concentrated in high-poverty areas.

5. *Voluntary participation: Should a PHA be allowed to use SAFMRs even if the PHA or the underlying metropolitan area would not qualify for the use of SAFMRs?* Qualification thresholds as discussed above will invariably result in “near misses” of areas or PHAs falling just below qualification thresholds, but where PHAs may see value in the SAFMR approach for addressing voucher concentration, or providing better access to opportunity. HUD seeks comment on whether the choice to use SAFMRs should be entirely up to individual PHAs, or if participation should be limited in some way.

6. *PBV Use of SAFMRs: Should SAFMRs be applied to PBVs at least for future PBV projects?* HUD seeks comment on whether the SAFMRs should be applied to PBV assistance as well as tenant-based rental assistance. Under the PBV program, one of the limitations on the amount of subsidy that may be paid is that the rent to owner may not exceed 110 percent of the applicable FMR (or an exception payment standard approved by the Secretary) for the unit bedroom size minus any utility allowance. As a result, the use of SAFMRs for future PBV projects could potentially increase the number of PBV units that are located in areas of opportunity, because the SAFMRs would recognize the higher rents that are prevalent in more desirable neighborhoods, rather than applying the same 110 percent FMR limitation to all PBV projects throughout the entire metro area, regardless of the project’s location.

Because the 110 percent FMR rent limitation applies not only to the initial rent to owner but also to the re-determined rent to owner during the term of the HAP contract, a change to SAFMRs could impact the rents for existing PBV projects and could have an adverse impact on some PBV projects. Should the applicability of SAFMRs to PBV be limited to future PBV projects (or limited in some other manner) so that the change would not potentially impact the rents of existing PBV projects?

7. *Success Rate Payment Standards: In addition to using Small Area FMRs as a tool to alleviate concentrations of voucher tenants in high poverty areas, should Small Area FMRs also be used in areas that qualify for success rate payment standards?* HUD seeks

comment on whether the Success Rate Payment Standard regulations (24 CFR 982.503(e)) should continue to use 50th percentile FMRs or if these areas would also benefit from operating under Small Area FMRs. Raising the level of rents across an entire FMR area to the 50th percentile may be necessary in areas where current success rates are low; consequently, the Department could continue to produce 50th percentile rents for this purpose. Such an area may not have enough of a rent differential and/or may not be in a metropolitan area and may benefit from the higher payment standard, up to 110 percent of the 50th percentile rent.

8. *Relevant PHA Experience:* What information do PHAs currently using SAFMRs (Dallas area and SAFMR Demonstration PHAs), or other PHAs that have used SAFMRs for helping set Housing Choice Voucher payment standards (such as PHAs in the Moving to Work Demonstration) have regarding their use of Small Area FMRs? HUD is seeking information about the impacts of implementing Small Area FMRs, including (but not limited to) administrative burden, tenant outcomes and landlord participation.

Environmental Impact

A Finding of No Significant Impact with respect to the environment as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321–4374) is unnecessary, since the Housing Choice Voucher Program is categorically excluded from the Department’s National Environmental Policy Act procedures under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(d).

Regulatory Review—Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), a determination must be made whether a regulatory action is significant and therefore, subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in accordance with the requirements of the order. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulations and Regulatory Review) directs executive agencies to analyze regulations that are “outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome, and to modify, streamline, expand, or repeal them in accordance with what has been learned. Executive Order 13563 also directs that, where relevant, feasible, and consistent with regulatory objectives, and to the extent permitted by law, agencies are to identify and consider regulatory approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public. This advance notice of proposed rulemaking was

reviewed by OMB and determined to likely result in a “significant regulatory action,” as defined in section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, and potentially an “economically significant action,” as provided in section 3(f)(1) of that Order.

The docket file is available for public inspection in the Regulations Division, Office of the General Counsel, 451 7th Street SW., Room 10276, Washington, DC 20410–0500. Due to security measures at the HUD Headquarters building, please schedule an appointment to review the docket file by calling the Regulations Division at 202–708–3055 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with speech or hearing impairments may access this number via TTY by calling the Federal Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

Dated: May 27, 2015.

Katherine M. O’Regan,

Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research.

[FR Doc. 2015–13430 Filed 6–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Secretary

31 CFR Part 1

RIN 1505–AC50

Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) amends this part to partially exempt a new Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) system of records entitled “Treasury/CC .800—Office of Inspector General Investigations System” from certain provisions of the Privacy Act.

DATES: Comments must be received no later than July 2, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Because paper mail in the Washington, DC area and at the OCC is subject to delay, commenters are encouraged to submit comments by email, if possible. Please use the title “Proposed Rule for New Privacy Act System of Records” to facilitate the organization and distribution of the comments. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Email:* regs.comments@occ.treas.gov.
- *Mail:* Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th

Street SW., Suite 3E-218, Mail Stop 9W-11, Washington, DC 20219.

- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* 400 7th Street SW., Suite 3E-218, Mail Stop 9W-11, Washington, DC 20219.

- *Fax:* (571) 465-4326.

Instructions: You must include "OCC" as the agency name and the docket number in your comment. In general, OCC will enter all comments received into the docket without change, including any business or personal information that you provide such as name and address information, email addresses, or phone numbers. Comments received, including attachments and other supporting materials, are part of the public record and subject to public disclosure. Do not enclose any information in your comment or supporting materials that you consider confidential or inappropriate for public disclosure.

You may review comments and other related materials that pertain to this notice by appearing personally to inspect and photocopy comments at the OCC, 400 7th Street SW., Washington, DC. For security reasons, the OCC requires that visitors make an appointment to inspect comments. You may do so by calling (202) 649-6700. Upon arrival, visitors will be required to present valid government-issued photo identification and to submit to security screening in order to inspect and photocopy comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kristin Merritt, Special Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 400 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20219.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2), the head of an agency may promulgate rules to exempt a system of records from certain provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a if the system is investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes. Treasury is hereby giving notice of a proposed rule to exempt "Treasury/CC .800-Office of Inspector General Investigations System" from certain provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2). The proposed exemption pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) is from provisions (c)(3), (d)(1)-(4), (e)(1), (e)(4)(G)-(I), and (f) because the system contains investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes. The following are the reasons why this system of records maintained by the OCC is exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) of the Privacy Act of 1974:

(1) 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3). This provision of the Privacy Act provides for the release of the disclosure accounting required by 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(1) and (2)

to the individual named in the record at his/her request. The reasons for exempting this system of records from the foregoing provision are:

(i) The release of disclosure accounting would put the subject of an investigation on notice that an investigation exists and that such person is the subject of that investigation.

(ii) Such release would provide the subject of an investigation with an accurate accounting of the date, nature, and purpose of each disclosure and the name and address of the person or agency to which disclosure was made. The release of such information to the subject of an investigation would provide the subject with significant information concerning the nature of the investigation and could result in the alteration or destruction of documentary evidence, the improper influencing of witnesses, and other activities that could impede or compromise the investigation.

(iii) Release to the individual of the disclosure accounting would alert the individual as to which agencies were investigating the subject and the scope of the investigation and could aid the individual in impeding or compromising investigations by those agencies.

(2) 5 U.S.C. 552a(d)(1)-(4), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), and (f). These provisions of the Privacy Act relate to an individual's right to be notified of:

(i) The existence of records pertaining to such individual;

(ii) Requirements for identifying an individual who requested access to records;

(iii) The agency procedures relating to access to and amendment of records;

(iv) The content of the information contained in such records; and

(v) The civil remedies available to the individual in the event of an adverse determination by an agency concerning access to or amendment of information contained in record systems.

The reasons for exempting this system of records from the foregoing provisions are that notifying an individual (at the individual's request) of the existence of an investigative file pertaining to such individual or granting access to, or the right to amend, such an investigative file pertaining to such individual could allow individuals to learn whether they have been identified as suspects or subjects of an investigation. Such knowledge would impair and interfere with the OCC's, the OIG's, and other agencies' investigative, enforcement, or criminal proceedings because individuals could:

(i) Take steps to avoid detection;

(ii) Inform associates that an investigation is in process;

(iii) Learn the nature of the investigation;

(iv) Begin, continue, or resume illegal conduct upon learning that they are not identified in the system of records;

(iv) Destroy evidence needed to prove the violation;

(v) Constitute an unwarranted invasion of the personal privacy of others;

(vi) Disclose the identity of confidential sources and reveal confidential information supplied by such sources; or

(vii) Disclose investigative techniques and procedures.

(3) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(1). This provision of the Privacy Act requires each agency to maintain in its records only such information about an individual as is relevant and necessary to accomplish a purpose of the agency required to be accomplished by statute or executive order. The reasons for exempting this system of records from the foregoing requirements is that: At the time that the OCC collects information it often lacks sufficient time to determine whether the information is relevant and necessary to accomplish the purposes of an investigation. Therefore, what appears relevant and necessary when first received may subsequently be determined to be irrelevant or unnecessary. It is only after the information is evaluated that the relevance and necessity of such information can be established with certainty.

(4) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4)(I). This provision of the Privacy Act requires the publication of the categories of sources of records in each system of records. The reasons for claiming an exemption from this provision are as follows:

(i) Revealing categories of sources of information could disclose investigative techniques and procedures.

(ii) Revealing categories of sources of information could cause sources who supply information to investigators to refrain from giving such information because of fear of reprisal, or fear of breach of promises of anonymity and confidentiality.

(iii) Revealing categories of sources could cause informers to refuse to give full information to investigators for fear of having their identities as sources disclosed.

Treasury will publish the notice of the proposed new system of records separately in the **Federal Register**.

Pursuant to Executive Order 12866, it has been determined that this proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action, and therefore, does not require a

regulatory impact analysis. Because no notice of proposed rulemaking is required, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, do not apply.

The regulation will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, it is determined that this proposed rule does not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, it is hereby certified that these regulations will not significantly affect a substantial number of small entities. The proposed rule imposes no duties or obligations on small entities.

List of Subjects in 31 CFR Part 1

Privacy.

Part 1, subpart C of title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 1—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301 and 31 U.S.C. 321. Subpart A also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552 as amended. Subpart C also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552a.

■ 2. Section 1.36 paragraph (g)(1)(iii) is amended by adding the following text to the table in numerical order.

§ 1.36 Systems exempt in whole or in part from provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a and this part.

- (g) * * *
(1) * * *
(iii) * * *

Table with 2 columns: Number, Name of system. Row 1: CC .800, Office of Inspector General Investigations System.

Dated: May 12, 2015.

Helen Goff Foster, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Privacy, Transparency, and Records.

[FR Doc. 2015–13166 Filed 6–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–33–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2013–0824; FRL–9928–34–Region 5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Part 3 Rules

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving revisions to the Part 3 rules into the Michigan State Implementation Plan (SIP). On December 13, 2013, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) submitted to EPA for approval revisions to Part 3, Emission Limitations and Prohibitions—Particulate Matter (PM), for open burning and electro-static precipitators (ESPs). The revisions for open burning eliminate specific provisions to allow household waste burning, and add a provision to allow for burning of fruit and vegetable storage bins for pest or disease control with specific location limitations. The SIP request also removes rule 330 dealing with operation parameters for electrostatic precipitators because of redundancy, and rule 349 dealing with compliance dates for coke ovens because it is now obsolete. EPA is approving this SIP revision because it will not interfere with attainment or maintenance of the fine particulate matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 2, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2013–0824, by one of the following methods:

- 1. www.regulations.gov: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. Email: blakley.pamela@epa.gov.
3. Fax: (312) 692–2450.
4. Mail: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18)), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.
5. Hand Delivery: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18)), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The

Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Final Rules section of this Federal Register for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carolyn Persoon, Environmental Engineer, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18)), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312)353–8290, persoon.carolyn@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Final Rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the state’s SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. 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 based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this Federal Register.

Dated: May 18, 2015.

Susan Hedman,

Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 2015–13119 Filed 6–1–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[EPA–R10–RCRA–2015–0307; FRL–9928–38–Region 10]

Idaho: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).