clients (or who used its own EIN immediately prior to entering into a CPEO contract with the CPEO) is not a customer, even if it has entered into a CPEO contract with the CPEO.

(7) [The text of proposed § 301.7705–1(b)(7) through (13) is the same as the text of § 301.7705–1(b)(7) through (13) published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register].

(14) Self-employed individual means an individual with net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a) and without regard to the exceptions thereunder) derived from providing services covered by a CPEO contract, whether such net earnings from self-employment are derived from providing services as a non-employee to a customer of the CPEO, from the individual’s own trade or business as a sole proprietor of the CPEO, or as an individual who is a partner in a partnership that is a customer of the CPEO, but only with regard to such net earnings.

(15) [The text of proposed § 301.7705–1(b)(15) is the same as the text of § 301.7705–1T(b)(15) published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register].

(16) Work site means a physical location at which an individual regularly performs services for a customer of a CPEO or, if there is no such location, the location from which the customer assigns work to the individual. A work site may not be the individual’s residence or a telework site unless the customer requires the individual to work at that site. For purposes of this paragraph (b)(16), work sites that are contiguous locations will be treated as a single physical location and the work site, and noncontiguous locations that are not reasonably proximate will be treated as separate physical locations and thus separate work sites. A CPEO may treat noncontiguous locations that are reasonably proximate as a single physical location and thus a single work site. Any two work sites that are separated by 35 or more miles or that operate in a different industry or industries will not be treated as reasonably proximate for purposes of this paragraph (b)(16).

(17) Work site employee—(i) In general. A work site employee means, with respect to a customer, a covered employee who performs services for such customer at a work site where at least 85 percent of the individuals performing services for the customer are covered employees of the customer.

(ii) Self-employed individuals. Solely for purposes of determining whether the 85 percent threshold described in paragraph (b)(17)(i) of this section is met, a self-employed individual described in paragraph (b)(14) of this section is treated as a covered employee if such individual would be a covered employee but for the exclusion of self-employed individuals from the definition of covered employee in paragraph (b)(5) of this section.

(iii) Excluded employees. In determining whether the 85 percent threshold described in paragraph (b)(17)(i) of this section is met, an individual that is an excluded employee described in section 414(q)(5) is not treated either as an individual providing services or a covered employee.

(iv) Treatment for calendar quarter. A covered employee will be considered a work site employee for the entirety of a calendar quarter if the employee qualifies as a work site employee at any time during that quarter.

(v) Separate determination for each work site. The determination of whether a covered employee is a work site employee is made separately with regard to each work site at which the covered employee regularly provides services and for each customer for which the covered employee is providing services. A covered employee may be determined to be a work site employee of more than one work site during a calendar quarter.

(c) [The text of proposed § 301.7705–1T(c)(1) is the same as the text of § 301.7705–1T(c)(1) published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register].

(2) Definitions related to section 3511. Paragraphs (b)(3), (5), (6), (14), (16), and (17) of this section are applicable on the date of publication of the Treasury decision adopting these rules as final or temporary regulations.

§ 301.7705–2 CPEO certification process.

The text of proposed § 301.7705–2 is the same as the text of § 301.7705–2T published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

Kirsten B. Wielobob,
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.
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Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Fox River, DePere to Oshkosh, WI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to modify the operating schedule for all drawbridges over the Fox River between DePere, WI and Oshkosh, WI. A review of the current regulation was requested by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the Fox River Navigational System Authority.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before: June 20, 2016.


See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section below for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Mr. Lee D. Soule, Bridge Management Specialist, Ninth Coast Guard District; telephone 216–902–6085, email Lee.D.Soule@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
E.O. Executive Order
FR Federal Register
NEPA National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
RFA Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980
SNPRM Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking
Pub. L. Public Law
§ Section
WIS–DOT Wisconsin Department of Transportation
FRNSA Fox River Navigational System Authority
CN–RR Canadian National Railroad

II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis

This proposed rule was requested by WIS–DOT and FRNSA to align drawbridge operating schedules with lock schedules, and make the yearly
schedules permanent and easier to follow for the entire river system. The drawbridge and lock schedules that have been set each year by local authorities have generally followed the same dates as the dates in this proposed rule for the beginning and end of the navigation season; April through October. These periods are generally accepted as the established annual schedules by vessel operators and bridge operators on the river system. With no current winter schedule for drawbridges, this proposed rule will also establish permanent winter operating schedules for all drawbridges over Fox River between DePere and Oshkosh, WI.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The Coast Guard proposes to amend the Fox River regulation at 33 CFR 117.1087. This proposed rule removes George Street Bridge from the regulation, establishes consistent annual dates for drawbridge schedules between river mile 58.3, eliminates currently exempted bridge opening times during certain days and times in Oshkosh, makes permanent the requirement for vessels to provide 2-hours advance notice between midnight and 8 a.m., and establishes the winter bridge operating schedules throughout the entire river system.

Currently, the regulation for Fox River drawbridges includes the opening schedule for drawbridges in Green Bay, WI, where large commercial vessel traffic continues to transit. This proposed rule does not include any changes to the schedules for drawbridges over the commercial ship channel in Green Bay.

The sections of the current regulation that includes all other drawbridges between river mile 7.13 in DePere, WI at the DePere Pedestrian Bridge, to river mile 58.3 in Oshkosh, WI, describe inconsistent dates and times for required drawbridge openings, particularly for the four highway drawbridges in Oshkosh. They also include a reference to George Street Bridge at mile 7.27. George Street Bridge has been removed since the last update of these regulations. The Oshkosh drawbridges in the current regulation contain exemptions during certain dates and times where the drawbridges are not required to open for vessels or vessels must provide advance notice prior to passing during nighttime hours.

This proposed rule establishes the requirement for all drawbridges, except the Canadian National Railroad (CN–RR) Bridge at mile 7.27 in Oshkosh, to open on signal between the hours of 8 a.m. and midnight each day from April 27 to October 7 every year. This schedule would match the lock schedule established by FRNSA and drawbridge schedules used by WIS–DOT. Between the hours of midnight and 8 a.m., except for the CN–RR Bridge in Oshkosh, all drawbridges would open for vessels if at least 2-hours advance notice of arrival is provided. The CN–RR Bridge at mile 55.72 in Oshkosh is located where Fox River feeds into the southwest section of Lake Winnebago. The portion of Fox River in the Oshkosh area, and Lake Winnebago, are among the busiest portions of the Fox River System for recreational vessel traffic. The CN–RR Bridge provides 6 feet of vertical clearance in the closed position and prevents most vessels from passing under the bridge, thereby requiring the drawbridge to open regularly for vessels. This is also the location of first responders and public safety vessels that may require the bridge to open at any time to perform rescue or emergency operations on Lake Winnebago. Vessels in distress or seeking shelter from weather on Lake Winnebago may also need the CN–RR Bridge to open at any time. A delay in bridge openings at this location may endanger life or property and is therefore exempted from the proposed 2-hour advance notice requirement from vessels for all other drawbridges between midnight and 8 a.m.

All drawbridges would be required to open if at least 12-hours advance notice is provided prior to passing between October 8 and April 26 each year. The proposed dates, times, and conditions have been accepted by local authorities for approximately 10 years and are generally accepted by vessel operators in the area as established conditions. The proposed dates, times, and conditions have also been reviewed and accepted by WIS–DOT and FRNSA during the development of this NPRM.

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 and 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 ability that vessels can still transit the bridge given advanced notice during times when vessel traffic is at its lowest. The proposed drawbridge schedule is virtually the same as has been used by vessel operators in the area for approximately 10 years.

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. This proposed rule standardizes drawbridge schedules that have been in place and would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator because the bridges will open with advance notice during low traffic times on the waterway or when ice conditions hinder normal navigation.

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 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, above. 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 Government

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 \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, 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 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. 4321–4370f), 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. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorized excluded from further review, under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2–1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not 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.

G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the \section{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 \section{DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION}

34 CFR Chapter III

[Docket ID ED–2016–OSERS–0018; CFDA Number: 84.160D.]

Proposed Priority—Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind Program

AGENCY: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

ACTION: Proposed priority.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative