Appendix C to Part 5—DHS Systems of Records Exempt from the Privacy Act

* * * * *

76. The DHS/USCG–031 USCG Law Enforcement (ULE) System of Records consists of electronic and paper records and will be used by DHS and its components. The DHS/USCG–031 USCG Law Enforcement (ULE) System of Records is a repository of information held by DHS in connection with its several and varied missions and functions, including, but not limited to the enforcement of civil and criminal laws; investigations, inquiries, and proceedings there under; and national security and intelligence activities. The DHS/USCG–031 USCG Law Enforcement (ULE) System of Records contains information that is collected by, on behalf of, in support of, or in cooperation with DHS and its components and may contain personally identifiable information collected by other federal, state, local, tribal, foreign, or international government agencies.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act: 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3–4); (d); (e)(1–3); (e)(5); (e)(8); and (g). Additionally, the Secretary of Homeland Security, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act: 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d); (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (e)(4)(I); and (f).

When a record received from another system has been exempted in that source system under 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), DHS will claim the same exemptions for those records that are claimed for the original primary systems of records from which they originated and claims any additional exemptions set forth here.

Exemptions from these particular subsections are justified, on a case-by-case basis to be determined at the time a request is made, for the following reasons:

(a) From subsection (c)(3) and (4) (Accounting for Disclosures) because release of the accounting of disclosures could alert the subject to the investigation of an actual or potential criminal, civil, or regulatory violation to the existence of that investigation and reveal investigative interest on the part of DHS as well as the recipient agency. Disclosure of the accounting would therefore present a serious impediment to law enforcement efforts and/or efforts to preserve national security. Disclosure of the accounting would also permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension. Amendment of the records could interfere with ongoing investigations and law enforcement activities and would impose an unreasonable administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continually reinvestigated. In addition, permitting access and amendment to such information could disclose security-sensitive information that could be detrimental to homeland security.

(b) From subsection (d) (Notice on Subjects) because such detailed information could impede law enforcement by compromising the existence of a confidential investigation or reveal the identity of witnesses or confidential informants.

(c) From subsection (e)(1) (Relevancy and Necessity of Information) because in the course of investigations into potential violations of federal law, the accuracy of information obtained or introduced occasionally may be unclear, or the information may not be strictly relevant or necessary to a specific investigation. In the interests of effective law enforcement, it is appropriate to retain all information that may aid in establishing patterns of unlawful activity.

(d) From subsection (e)(2) (Collection of Information from Individuals) because requiring that information be collected from the subject of an investigation would alert the subject to the nature or existence of the investigation, thereby interfering with that investigation and related law enforcement activities.

(e) From subsection (e)(3) (Notice to Subjects) because such detailed information could impede law enforcement purposes. It is impossible to determine in advance what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. Compliance with subsection (e)(5) would preclude DHS agents from using their investigative training and exercise of good judgment to both conduct and report on investigations.

(f) From subsection (e)(5) (Collection of Information) because with the collection of information for law enforcement purposes, it is impossible to determine in advance what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. Compliance with subsection (e)(5) would preclude DHS agents from using their investigative training and exercise of good judgment to both conduct and report on investigations.

(j) From subsection (g) (Civil Remedies) to the extent that the system is exempt from other specific subsections of the Privacy Act.

Dated: December 1, 2016.

Jonathan R. Cantor,
Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2016–29342 Filed 12–7–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


RIN 2060–AT16

Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is extending the public comment period for the proposed rule titled “Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas” published in the Federal Register on November 10, 2016. Comments must be received on or before January 9, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established docket number EPA–HQ–OAR–2016–0598 for this action. Follow the instructions for submitting comments provided under ADDRESSES in the November 10, 2016 proposal (81 FR 78954).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information on this action, contact Robert L. Miller, Clean Air Markets Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs (Mail Code 6204M), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 343–9077; email address: Miller.RobertL@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the proposed rule titled “Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter: Revision of Federal Implementation Plan Requirements for Texas” (81 FR 78954, November 10, 2016), the EPA established a public comment period ending on December 12, 2016. The EPA received multiple requests for an extension of this period. In order to ensure that the public has sufficient time to review and comment on the proposal, the EPA is extending the public comment period to end on January 9, 2017.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Electric power plants, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen
oxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Regional haze, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur dioxide.

Dated: December 2, 2016.

Sarah Dunham,
Director, Office of Atmospheric Programs.

[FR Doc. 2016–29442 Filed 12–7–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

45 CFR Part 5b

[Docket Number NIH–2016–0001]

RIN 0925–AA63

Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Department of Health and Human Services.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS or Department), through the National Institutes of Health (NIH), proposes to exempt, from certain requirements of the Privacy Act, a subset of records in a new system of records, System No. 09–25–0225, NIH Electronic Research Administration (eRA) Records (NIH eRA Records), which covers records used in managing NIH research and development applications and awards throughout the award lifecycle. Elsewhere in today’s Federal Register, HHS has published a proposed System of Records Notice (SORN) for System No. 09–25–0225 for public notice and comment.

The subset of records proposed to be exempted is material that would inappropriately reveal the identities of referees who provide letters of recommendation and peer reviewers who provide written evaluative input and recommendations to NIH about particular funding applications under an express promise by the government that their identities in association with the written work products they authored and provided to the government will be kept confidential. Only material that would inappropriately reveal a particular referee or peer reviewer as the author of a specific work product (e.g., reference or recommendation letters, reviewer critiques, preliminary or final individual overall impact/priority scores, and/or assignment of peer reviewers to an application and other evaluative materials and data compiled by NIH/OER) is proposed to be exempted. The exemptions would protect not only an author’s name in association with their written work product but any content that could enable the author to be identified from context.

The Privacy Act provisions from which the material is proposed to be exempted are those that require the agency to provide an accounting of disclosures, access and amendment, and notification, which are contained in subsections (c)(3) and (d) of the Privacy Act.

DATES: Submit either electronic or written comments regarding this notice by February 6, 2017.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket Number NIH–2016–0001 via any of the following methods:

Electronic Submission
Submit electronic comments in the following way:
- Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions provided for submitting comments.

Written Submission
Submit written submissions in the following ways:
- Fax: 301–402–0169.
- Mail: Jerry Moore, NIH Regulations Officer, Office of Management Assessment, National Institutes of Health, 6011 Executive Boulevard, Suite 601, MSC 7669, Rockville, MD 20852–7669. To ensure timely processing of comments, the HHS/NIH is no longer accepting NPRM comments submitted to the agency by email. The HHS/NIH encourages you to continue to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described previously, in the ADDRESSES portion of this document under Electronic Submissions.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and Docket No. for this rulemaking. All comments received may be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to http://www.regulations.gov and follow the instructions provided for conducting a search, using the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Moore, NIH Regulations Officer, Office of Management Assessment, National Institutes of Health, 6011 Executive Boulevard, Suite 601, MSC 7669, Rockville, MD 20852–7669, telephone 301–496–4607, fax 301–402–0169, email jm40z@nih.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
NIH research and development award programs provide funds through contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants to support biomedical and behavioral research and development projects and centers, training, career development, small business, and loan repayment and other research programs. The NIH is responsible to Congress and the U.S. taxpayers for carrying out its research and development award programs in a manner that facilitates research cost-effectively and in compliance with applicable statutes, rules and regulations, including 42 U.S.C. 217a, 281, 282, 41 U.S.C. 423 and 45 CFR part 75. The NIH uses an award process that relies on checks and balances, separation of responsibilities, and a two-level peer review system to ensure that funding applications submitted to NIH are evaluated in a manner that is fair, equitable, timely, and free of bias. The two-level peer review system is authorized by 42 U.S.C. 216; 42 U.S.C. 282(b)(6); 42 U.S.C. 284(c)(3); and 42 U.S.C. 289a and governed by regulations at 42 CFR part 52h. "Scientific Peer Review of Research Grant Applications and Research and Development Contract Projects." The two-level system separates the scientific assessment of proposed projects from policy decisions about scientific areas to be supported and the level of resources to be allocated, which permits a more objective and complete evaluation than would result from a single level of review. The two-level review system is designed to provide NIH officials with the best available advice about scientific and technical merit as well as program priorities and policy considerations. The initial or first level review involves panels of experts established according to scientific disciplines, generally referred to as Scientific Review Groups (SRGs), whose primary function is to evaluate the scientific merit of grant applications. The second level of review of grant applications is performed by National Advisory Boards or Councils composed of both scientific and lay representatives. The recommendations made by these Boards or Councils are based not only on considerations of scientific merit as judged by the SRG but also on the relevance of a proposed project to the programs and priorities of NIH. Referees are those individuals who supply reference or other letters of recommendations for a grant or cooperative agreement applicant.

Confidential reference or peer reviewer identifying material is contained in records such as reference or