

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-25725 Filed 10-27-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Part 177

[CBP Dec. 16-19]

RIN 1515-AE17

New Mailing Address for the National Commodity Specialist Division, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade; Technical Correction

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations to reflect that the mail room servicing the Director, National Commodity Specialist Division, Regulations and Rulings, in the Office of Trade, has relocated within New York, and a new location has been established to receive non-electronic correspondence. E-rulings procedures will remain the same and are not affected by the change in office location. **DATES:** Final rule effective October 28, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Mack, Director, National Commodity Specialist Division, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, (646) 733-3001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 14, 2016, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) published a notice in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 1960), announcing a temporary change of office location effective January 28, 2016, due to the relocation of the National Commodity Specialist Division (NCSA). In that notice, CBP stated that it would update its regulation once the relocation of the NCSA is complete. The relocation is now completed and a permanent address is established. As such, CBP is revising section 177.2(a) of title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (19 CFR 177.2(a)) to reflect the new mailing address. Starting October 28, 2016, all non-electronic correspondence to the NCSA should be sent to the following address: Director,

National Commodity Specialist Division, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, 201 Varick Street, Suite 501, New York, New York 10014. E-rulings procedures will remain the same and are not affected by the change in office location.

Inapplicability of Notice and Delayed Effective Date Requirements

Because the technical correction set forth in this document merely updates a mailing address, CBP finds that good cause exists for dispensing with notice and public procedure as unnecessary under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A). For this same reason, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), CBP finds that good cause exists for dispensing with the requirement for a delayed effective date.

Executive Order 12866

The amendment does not meet the criteria for a “significant regulatory action” as specified in Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because this document is not subject to the notice and public procedure requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553, it is not subject to the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

Signing Authority

This document is limited to a technical correction of the CBP regulations. Accordingly, it is being signed under the authority of 19 CFR 0.1(b)(1).

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 177

Administrative practice and procedure, Customs duties and inspection, Government procurement, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Amendments to the Regulations

For the reasons set forth above, part 177 of the CBP Regulations (19 CFR part 177) is amended as set forth below.

PART 177—ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS

■ 1. The general authority citation for part 177 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 19 U.S.C. 66, 1202 (General Note 3(i), Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States), 1502, 1624, 1625.

§ 177.2 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 177.2, paragraph (a), the third sentence is amended by removing the words “New York, New York 10119, Attn: Classification Ruling Requests, New York, New York 10048, or to any

service port office of the Customs and Border Protection” and adding in its place the words “201 Varick Street, Suite 501, New York, New York 10014”.

Dated: October 25, 2016.

R. Gil Kerlikowske,
Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

[FR Doc. 2016-26075 Filed 10-27-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-14-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

29 CFR Part 20

RIN 1290-AA27

Administrative Wage Garnishment Procedures

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule will allow the U.S. Department of Labor (Department) to garnish the disposable wages of non-federal workers who are indebted to the Department without first obtaining a court order. It implements the administrative wage garnishment provisions contained in the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (DCIA) in accordance with the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

DATES: This final rule is effective on October 28, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shelia Alexander, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, (202) 693-4472; or Rachel Rikleen, Office of the Solicitor, (202) 693-5702.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Debt Collection Improvement Act Requirements and Background

Section 31001(o) of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (DCIA), which is codified at 31 U.S.C. 3720D, authorizes federal agencies to use administrative procedure to garnish the disposable pay of an individual to collect delinquent non-tax debt owed to the United States in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Wage garnishment is a process whereby an employer withholds amounts from an employee's wages and pays those amounts to the employee's creditor pursuant to a withholding order. Under the DCIA, agencies may garnish up to 15% of a delinquent non-tax debtor's disposable wages. Prior to the enactment of the DCIA, agencies were generally required to obtain a court

judgment before garnishing the wages of non-Federal employees.

The DCIA requires the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations implementing the administrative wage garnishment requirements. These implementing regulations, which are at 31 CFR 285.11, provide for due process for nontax debtors and require agencies to publish regulations for administrative wage garnishment hearings. Pursuant to 31 CFR 285.11(f), federal agencies must either prescribe regulations for the conduct of an administrative wage garnishment hearing consistent with the procedures set forth in section 285.11 or adopt section 285.11 without change by reference. Through this rule, the Department has decided to issue its own regulations consistent with the procedural requirements of section 285.11.

This final rule governs only administrative wage garnishment. Nothing in this regulation precludes the use of collection remedies not contained in the regulation. The Department and other federal agencies may simultaneously use multiple collection remedies to collect a debt, except as prohibited by law.

The Department may, but is not required to, promulgate additional policies, procedures, and understandings consistent with this regulation and other applicable Federal laws, policies, and procedures, subject to the approval of the Department's Chief Financial Officer or their delegate. The Department does not intend for its components, agencies, and entities to be able to adopt different policies, procedures, or understandings.

II. Discussion of Comments

In response to its Interim Final Rule (IFR) concerning Administrative Wage Garnishment (80 FR 60797 October 8, 2015), the Department received five comments from private citizens and an industry association. The comments focused primarily on three subject areas: The justification for the regulation, due process concerns, and the burden of proof requirements.

Two commenters asked why the regulation is necessary, arguing that the Department must explain why the current debt collection tool are insufficient. The Department has determined that it is legally obligated to prescribe regulations for the conduct of administrative wage garnishment. On May 6, 1998 (63 FR 25136), the Department of the Treasury published a final rule implementing the statutory administrative wage garnishment requirements at 31 CFR 285.11. Paragraph (f) of 31 CFR 285.11 provides

that “[a]gencies shall prescribe regulations for the conduct of administrative wage garnishment hearings consistent with this section or shall adopt this section without change by reference.” This regulatory obligation is what necessitates this final rule. No changes were made to the final rule in response to the comments received regarding the regulation's justification.

The Department received four comments raising concerns related to due process. In general, these comments argued that garnishing wages through an administrative process, instead of through the courts, would remove protections for debtors and may cause unnecessary hardships to impoverished individuals. The Department has determined the regulation protects due process rights that must be afforded to a debtor when an agency seeks to collect a debt, including the ability to verify, challenge, and compromise claims, and provide access to administrative appeals procedures. Under section 20.205, debtors must be notified of the potential of a wage garnishment. Under section 20.206, a hearing must be held prior to the issuance of a withholding order if the debtor submits a timely request. The Department will provide the debtor with an opportunity to inspect and copy records related to the debt, and to establish a repayment agreement under section 20.205. All of these requirements protect the due process rights of the debtors, and, as a result, no changes have been made to the final rule in response to comments received.

As for concerns about imposing untenable burdens on debtors, the proposed rule included multiple provisions to protect against this outcome. For example, under section 20.210, the Department may not garnish the wages of a debtor who has been involuntarily separated from employment until that individual has been re-employed continuously for at least 12 months. Additionally, section 20.209 sets out clear limits on the amounts the Department may seek to garnish, and section 20.211 allows the debtor to request adjustments to the garnishment based on new financial hardships. The Department has determined that these protections are sufficient to ensure that no undue burden is put on impoverished debtors.

One commenter indicated the rule should be modified to require “an oral, in-person, face-to-face meeting.” Currently, under section 20.206, a hearing may be conducted in writing, by telephone or other communications technology, or in person. The commenter was concerned that anything other than a face to face meeting would

fail to demonstrate the individuals' situation and would harm the process. Under 31 CFR 285.11(f)(3)(ii), “[a]ll travel expenses incurred by the debtor in connection with an in-person hearing will be borne by the debtor.” The Department has determined requiring debtors to appear in-person would constitute an unconscionable financial burden on debtors and serve as an unreasonable obstacle to appropriate disputes. The Department notes that in-person hearings are not required to ensure that due process is served. As a result, no changes have been made to the final rule in response to comments received.

Finally, one commenter raised a concern about the burden of proof requirements found in section 20.206(f). The commenter contends that the section does not describe requirements for what documentation the Department must produce to “establish the existence of the debt and the amount of the debt” and that more information would be necessary for a court-ordered garnishment. Under section 20.206(f), the Department will have the initial burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, the existence or amount of the debt by submitting a certified copy of the adjudication or other document. By requiring this documentation, the Department has set a standard for the kind of document that will be acceptable to meet its burden of proof. This documentation requirement is equivalent to the proof that would be needed in some courts for a garnishment order. Additionally, this rule parallels existing regulations of other agencies, including the Department of the Treasury, those promulgated by other Federal agencies, and the Federal Claims Collection Standards (FCCS), as required by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

III. Summary of Key Aspects of the Rule

This rule allows the Department to initiate proceedings administratively to garnish the wages of a delinquent debtor. It applies to debts owed to the Department or in connection with any program administered by the Department. The administrative wage garnishment process will be applied consistently throughout the Department.

The Department can enter into agreements, such as memoranda of understanding, with other Federal agencies permitting that agency to administer part or all of the Department's administrative wage garnishment process. Nothing in this regulation requires the Department to duplicate notices or administrative

proceedings required by contract, this regulation, or other laws or regulations. Thus, for example, the Department is not required to provide a debtor with two hearings on the same issue merely because two different collection tools are used, each of which requires that the debtor be provided with a hearing.

Section 20.205 lists the notice requirements, which includes an explanation of the debtor's rights. The debtor is allowed to inspect Department records related to the debt, enter into a written repayment agreement, and have a hearing.

Under section 20.206, a debtor can request one of two types of available hearings—a paper hearing or an oral hearing. The format of oral hearings is not limited to in-person and telephone hearings, it may include new forms of technology. The hearing official has the authority to determine the kind of hearing and the amount of time allotted each hearing.

If a hearing is held, the Department can meet its initial burden by offering documentation, including a copy of the debt adjudication, which demonstrates the existence of the debt and its amount as is required under section 20.206(f). Once the Department has established its prima facie case, the debtor can dispute the existence or amount of the debt. For example, debtors can meet their burden by demonstrating that they are not the person who owes a debt to the Department, that they have not received payments from the Department or have not been fined by the Department, or that they have already paid the debt.

Additionally, the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA), 5 U.S.C. 8101–8193, contains a provision that precludes administrative and judicial review of agency determinations, which normally includes a repayment schedule. As a result, for hearings related to FECA debts, once the Department has made its prima facie case, the debtor has only two limited grounds on which he or she can demonstrate that an administrative wage garnishment is not appropriate. The debtor may not challenge the underlying merits of the determination that created the debt.

Section 20.207 outlines the timing and elements of the withholding order to the debtor's employer. Pursuant to section 20.208, employers must complete and return a certification noting, in addition to other information, that they have received the withholding order and verifying the debtor's employment.

Section 20.209 describes how much the Department can withhold through administrative wage garnishment,

which is up to 15% of the debtor's disposable pay, and the employer's administrative wage garnishment duties. A withholding order for family support would always have priority over an administrative wage garnishment order. If there are multiple federal garnishment orders, priority depends on which garnishment order was first obtained. When a debtor's disposable pay is already subject to one or more withholding orders with higher or equal priority with the Department's administrative wage garnishment order, the amount that the employer must withhold and remit to the Department would not be more than an amount calculated by subtracting the amount(s) withheld under the other withholding order(s) from 25% of the debtor's disposable pay. For example, if the employer is withholding 20% of a debtor's disposable pay for a family support or prior withholding order, the amount withheld for the subsequent withholding order issued under this section is limited to 5% of the debtor's disposable pay. When the family support or prior withholding order terminates, the amount withheld for the subsequent withholding order issued under this section may be increased to 15%.

Finally, sections 20.210 and 20.211 provide protections to employees that are facing financial hardships. Section 20.210 prohibits the Department from garnishing the wages of a debtor who was involuntarily separated from employment. The debtor has the obligation under this section to inform the Department of the involuntary separation. Section 20.211 outlines how a debtor can request a review of their garnishment due to materially changed circumstances that have created a financial hardship.

IV. Compliance With Statutory and Regulatory Requirements for Rulemakings

The Administrative Procedure Act. The Department has determined this rule involves an agency procedure or practice, and therefore no notice of proposed rulemaking is required under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) at 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A) and (B).

This rule parallels the existing operational regulations of other agencies to effectuate the collection of non-tariff and nontax debts to implement 31 U.S.C. 3711. Because this rule parallels existing, long-standing rules that have already been subject to APA notice and comment procedures, we believe that publishing this rule with the usual notice and comment procedures is unnecessary. Accordingly, the

Department has determined that prior notice and public comment procedures would be unnecessary pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B).

The Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department has determined that the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, as amended, 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*, do not apply to any collections of information contained in this rule because any such collections of information are made during the conduct of administrative action taken by an agency against specific individuals or entities. 5 CFR 1320.4(a)(2). In the IFR, the Department specifically invited comments about this determination, but none were received.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act. The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), Public Law 96–354, as amended (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), requires administrative agencies to consider the effect of their actions on small entities, including small businesses. As a procedural rule, the requirements of the RFA pertaining to regulatory flexibility analysis do not apply. However, even if the RFA were to apply, the Department certifies that this rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities as defined in RFA. Although small entities will be subject to this regulation and to the certification requirement in this rule, the requirements will not have a significant economic impact on these entities. Employers of delinquent debtors must certify certain information about the debtor such as the debtor's employment status and earnings. This information is contained in the employer's payroll records. Therefore, it will not take a significant amount of time or result in a significant cost for an employer to complete the certification form. Even if an employer is served withholding orders on several employees over the course of a year, the cost imposed on the employer to complete the certifications would not have a significant economic impact on that entity. Employers are not required to vary their normal pay cycles in order to comply with a withholding order issued pursuant to this rule.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104–4, requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on state, local, and tribal governments or the private sector. This rule contains no Federal mandates, as defined by Title II of the UMRA, for State, local, and tribal governments or the private sector. Therefore, this rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of UMRA.

Executive Orders 12866, 12988, and 13132. This rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined in Executive Order 12866. The rule has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12988. This rule preempts state laws that are inconsistent with its provisions. Before a judicial action may be brought concerning this rule or action taken under this rule, all administrative remedies must be exhausted. This regulation will not have a substantial direct effect on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of Government. Therefore, in accordance with E.O. 13132, it is determined this regulation does not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 20

Administrative wage garnishment, Debt collection, Labor.

Signed at Washington, DC, on this 17th day of October, 2016.

Thomas E. Perez,
U.S. Secretary of Labor.

PART 20—FEDERAL CLAIMS COLLECTION

■ Accordingly, the interim rule amending 29 CFR part 20 which was published at 80 FR 60797 on October 8, 2015, is adopted as a final rule without change.

[FR Doc. 2016–26093 Filed 10–27–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–7C–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R06–OAR–2012–0263; FRL–9953–46–Region 6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Disapproval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Particulate Matter Less Than 2.5 Micrometers—Significant Impact Levels and Significant Monitoring Concentration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is disapproving the severable portions of the February 6, 2012, Oklahoma State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal which establish certain *de minimis* thresholds for

particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM_{2.5}) in the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting requirements. Specifically, we are disapproving provisions that adopt and implement the PM_{2.5} significant impact levels (SILs) and significant monitoring concentration (SMC); both of which were vacated by a federal court and subsequently removed from federal PSD regulations. We are disapproving the submitted provisions as inconsistent with federal laws and regulations for the permitting of PM_{2.5}. The EPA is finalizing this disapproval under section 110 and part C of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: This rule is effective on November 28, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R06–OAR–2012–0263. All documents in the docket are listed on the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adina Wiley, (214) 665–2115, wiley.adina@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document wherever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean the EPA.

I. Background

The background for this action is discussed in detail in our August 11, 2016, proposed disapproval at 81 FR 53098. In that document, we proposed to disapprove the severable portions of the February 6, 2012, Oklahoma SIP submittal which establish the voluntary PM_{2.5} SILs provision and SMC. We presented our preliminary determination that these submitted revisions to the Oklahoma SIP must be disapproved because they establish permitting SIP requirements that are inconsistent with the federal statutory and regulatory permitting requirements for PM_{2.5}. We did not receive any comments regarding our proposed disapproval

II. Final Action

We are disapproving the following severable portions of the February 6, 2012, Oklahoma SIP submittal establishing the voluntary PM_{2.5} SILs provision and SMC. We are taking this final action under section 110 and part C of the CAA.

- Substantive revisions to the Oklahoma SIP at OAC 252:100–8–33(c)(1)(C) establishing the PM_{2.5} SMC as submitted on February 6, 2012; and
- Substantive revisions to the Oklahoma PSD program in OAC 252:100–8–35(a)(2) establishing the PM_{2.5} PSD SILs provision as submitted on February 6, 2012.

The EPA is disapproving the revisions listed because the submitted provisions are inconsistent with the federal statutory and regulatory permitting requirements for PM_{2.5}. Upon the effective date of this final disapproval, owners or operators of a proposed source or modification will continue to satisfy the source impact analysis provisions for PM_{2.5} as required under the Oklahoma SIP at OAC 252:100–8–35(a)(1). Additionally, the State of Oklahoma will continue to have the necessary authority to require monitoring of PM_{2.5} under the Oklahoma SIP at OAC 252:100–8–35.1(b)(3), consistent with the provisions of 40 CFR 52.21(m). This final disapproval does not require the EPA to promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan, because the Oklahoma PSD SIP program continues to satisfy the Federal PSD SIP requirements for PM_{2.5} monitoring and source impact analysis. We are finalizing this disapproval under section 110 and part C of the Act; as such, the EPA will not impose sanctions as a result of this final disapproval.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

This action is not a significant regulatory action and was therefore not submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA. There is no burden imposed under the PRA because this action disapproves submitted revisions that are no longer consistent with federal laws and regulations for the regulation and permitting of PM_{2.5}.