AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 80 Wednesday,

No. 227 November 25, 2015

Pages 73631–73942

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402 is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, see *www.ofr.gov.*

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge at *www.fdsys.gov*, a service of the U.S. Government Publishing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6:00 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, 1 (January 2, 1994) forward. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800 or 866-512-1800 (toll free). E-mail, *gpocusthelp.com.*

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $749 plus postage, or $808, plus postage, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $165, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: U.S. Government Publishing Office—New Orders, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, see *bookstore.gpo.gov.*

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 80 FR 12345.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**202–512–1806**
General online information	**202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498**

Single copies/back copies:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)**

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Subscriptions:

Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions:

Email	*FRSubscriptions@nara.gov*
Phone	**202–741–6000**

Printed on recycled paper.

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 80, No. 227

Wednesday, November 25, 2015

Agency for International Development
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Agricultural Marketing Service
RULES
Decreased Assessment Rates:
Tomatoes Grown in Florida, 73642–73644
Increased Assessment Rates:
Onions Grown in South Texas, 73640–73642
Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California, 73644–73647

Agriculture Department
See Agricultural Marketing Service
See Farm Service Agency
See Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
See Rural Business-Cooperative Service
See Rural Housing Service
See Rural Utilities Service
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau
RULES
Establishment of the Eagle Foothills Viticultural Area, 73658–73660

Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73734–73735

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73769–73770
Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority, 73766–73769

Coast Guard
PROPOSED RULES
Anchorage Regulations:
Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, CT, 73689–73692
Port of New York, 73692–73694

Commerce Department
See Foreign-Trade Zones Board
See International Trade Administration
See National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680
NOTICES
Privacy Act; Systems of Records, 73698–73700

Commodity Futures Trading Commission
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants, 73731–73732
Conflicts of Interest Policies and Procedures by Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers, 73732–73733

Comptroller of the Currency
NOTICES
Conversion Application Approvals:
Central Federal Savings and Loan Association, Rolla, Rolla, MO, 73876

Consumer Product Safety Commission
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Flammability Standards for Children's Sleepwear, 73737–73738
Requirements for Electrically Operated Toys and Children's Articles, 73738–73739
Safety Standard for Omnidirectional Citizens Band Base Station Antennas, 73736–73737
Safety Standard for Walk-Behind Power Lawn Mowers, 73735–73736

Defense Department
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73740
Arms Sales, 73740–73747
Meetings:
Judicial Proceedings since Fiscal Year 2012 Amendments Panel (Judicial Proceedings Panel), 73739

Drug Enforcement Administration
NOTICES
Decisions and Orders:
William Mikaitis, M.D., 73833–73834
Importer of Controlled Substances; Applications:
VHG Labs DBA LGC Standards Warehouse, Manchester, NH, 73830–73833

Education Department
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Energy Department
See Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Environmental Protection Agency
RULES
Pesticide Tolerances:
Aureobasidium pullulans strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941, 73661–73662
Saflufenacil, 73663–73667
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680
Petitions:
Residues of Pesticide Chemicals in or on Various Commodities, 73695–73696
NOTICES
Announcement of the Board of Directors for the National Environmental Education Foundation, 73756–73758
Meetings:
Board of Scientific Counselors Executive Committee, 73756
Farm, Ranch, and Rural Community Federal Advisory Committee; Public Teleconference, 73758–73759
Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality Final Determinations in New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, 73755–73756

Farm Service Agency
RULES
Rural Development Loan Servicing; Correction, 73647

Federal Aviation Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Airworthiness Directives:
Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines, 73681–73683
NOTICES
Meetings:
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee, 73870–73871
Petitions for Exemption; Summaries:
Cape Productions, Inc., 73870

Federal Communications Commission
RULES
Shared Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band, 73674–73675
PROPOSED RULES
FirstNet's Incumbent Relocation Proposal, 73696–73697

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
RULES
Area Risk Protection Insurance Regulations:
Basic Provisions and Forage Crop Insurance Provisions, 73637–73639

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
PROPOSED RULES
Treatment of Financial Assets Transferred in Connection with a Securitization or Participation, 73680–73681

Federal Emergency Management Agency
RULES
Suspension of Community Eligibility, 73669–73674
NOTICES
Changes in Flood Hazard Determinations, 73797–73804
Final Flood Hazard Determinations, 73804–73806

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
RULES
Emergency Operations Reliability Standards:
Undervoltage Load Shedding Reliability Standards; Definition of Remedial Action Scheme; Related Reliability Standards, 73647–73658
PROPOSED RULES
Reactive Power Requirements for Non–Synchronous Generation, 73683–73689
NOTICES
Applications:
Great Bear Hydropower, Inc., 73751–73752
Howard and Mildred Carter; Allen Rae Carter, 73754–73755
Combined Filings, 73749–73751, 73753–73754
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC; Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline, LLC; Atlantic Bridge Project, 73747–73749
Meetings:
Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline, LLC; Settlement Conference, 73755
PJM Interconnection, LLC; PJM Interconnection, LLC, and Potomac Electric Power Co.; Technical Conference, 73752–73753
Qualifying Conduit Hydropower Facilities:
Susan Raymond, 73750–73751

Federal Highway Administration
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Alexander, Pulaski, and Union Counties, IL, 73871

Federal Maritime Commission
NOTICES
Agreements Filed, 73759

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals
CMV Driver Medication Form, 73871–73874

Federal Railroad Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73874–73875

Federal Reserve System
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73760–73766
Change in Bank Control:
Acquisitions of Shares of a Bank or Bank Holding Company, 73759–73760
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 73766

Fish and Wildlife Service
NOTICES
Endangered and Threatened Species:
Incidental Take Permit Application, Low-Effect Habitat Conservation Plan and Associated Documents; Polk County, FL, 73810–73811
Permit Applications:
Endangered Species, 73808–73810

Food and Drug Administration
NOTICES
Determinations that Products Were Not Withdrawn from Sale for Reasons of Safety or Effectiveness:
TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (Acetaminophen With Codeine Phosphate) Oral Tablets, 325 Milligrams/7.5 Milligrams, etc., 73770–73771

Guidance for Industry and Staff:
Certification Process for Designated Medical Gases, 73771–73774
Meetings:
Patient-Focused Drug Development for Psoriasis, 73774–73776

Foreign-Trade Zones Board
NOTICES
Establishment of a Foreign-Trade Zone under the Alternative Site Framework:
Western Kentucky, 73700
Proposed Production Activities:
American Tactical Imports, Foreign-Trade Zone 141, Rochester, NY, 73701
Reorganizations under Alternative Site Frameworks:
Foreign-Trade Zone 38, Spartanburg County, SC, 73700–73701

Health and Human Services Department
See Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
See Food and Drug Administration
See Health Resources and Services Administration
See National Institutes of Health
RULES
Occupational Safety and Health Research and Related Activities;
Removal of Regulations Regarding Administrative Functions, Practices, and Procedures, 73667–73669
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680
NOTICES
Federal Financial Participation in State Assistance Expenditures:
Matching Shares for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and Aid to Needy Aged, Blind, or Disabled Persons for October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017, 73779–73782
Medicare Programs:
Administrative Law Judge Hearing Program for Medicare Claim and Entitlement Appeals; Quarterly Listing of Program Issuancesù July Through September 2015, 73782–73783

Health Resources and Services Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73776–73779

Homeland Security Department
See Coast Guard
See Federal Emergency Management Agency
See Transportation Security Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Housing and Urban Development Department
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Detailed Budget Form, Budget Worksheet, Application for Federal Assistance, and the Third-Party Documentation Facsimile Transmittal Form, 73807–73808

Indian Affairs Bureau
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Bureau of Indian Education Tribal Colleges and Universities; Application for Grants and Annual Report Form, 73811–73812

Interior Department
See Fish and Wildlife Service
See Indian Affairs Bureau
See Land Management Bureau
See Ocean Energy Management Bureau

International Trade Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Foreign-Trade Zone Applications, 73715–73716
Interim Procedures for Considering Requests and Comments from the Public for Textile and Apparel Safeguard Actions on Imports from Korea, 73702–73704
Interim Procedures for Considering Requests and Comments from the Public Under the Commercial Availability Provision of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, 73729–73730
Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Investigations, Orders, or Reviews:
Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand, 73726–73729
Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Australia, Brazil, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, the Republic of Turkey, and the United Kingdom, 73702
Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and The People's Republic of China, 73716–73722
Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People Republic of China, 73722–73726
Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan, 73704–73708
Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, 73708–73715
High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China; Rescission, 73701–73702
North American Free Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; First Request for Panel Review, 73726

International Trade Commission
NOTICES
Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Investigations, Orders, or Reviews:
Narrow Woven Ribbons with Woven Selvedge from China and Taiwan, 73829–73830
Complaints:
Chassis Parts Incorporating Movable Sockets and Components Thereof, 73828–73829

Justice Department
See Drug Enforcement Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Collection of Laboratory Analysis Data on Drug Samples Tested by Non-Federal, State and Local Government, Crime Laboratories, 73834–73835
Proposed Settlement Agreements under the Clean Water Act, 73835

Labor Department
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Land Management Bureau
NOTICES
Call for Nominations:
Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Advisory Committee, Utah, 73813
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
California Desert Conservation Area; Eagle Crest Pumped Storage Project, CA; Resource Management Plan, 73815–73816
Proposed Withdrawal of Sagebrush Focal Areas in Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming; Correction, 73814
Meetings:
Colorado Northwest Resource Advisory Council; Postponement, 73815
Requests for Nominations:
Central California Resource Advisory Council, 73814–73815
Coeur Alene Resource Advisory Committee, Idaho; 2015 Third Call, 73816–73817
Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council; Nominees to Complete Elected Official Term, 73814
Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board; Second Call, 73812–73813

Maritime Administration
NOTICES
Requests for Administrative Waivers of the Coastwise Trade Laws:
Vessel VAGO, 73875

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
RULES
NASA FAR Supplement; Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting, 73675–73677
NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement:
NASA Capitalization Threshold (NFS Case 2015–N004), 73678
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

National Archives and Records Administration
NOTICES
Meetings:
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, 73836
Freedom of Information Act Advisory Committee, 73836

National Institutes of Health
NOTICES
Final Human Immunodeficiency Virus Organ Policy Equity Act Safeguards and Research Criteria for Transplantation of Organs Infected with HIV, 73785–73796
Meetings:
Center for Scientific Review, 73783–73784, 73796–73797
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Amendment, 73797
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 73784
National Institute of Mental Health, 73783

National Labor Relations Board
NOTICES
Appointments of Individuals to Serve as Members of Performance Review Boards, 73836

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOTICES
Taking and Importing Marine Mammals:
Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Elliot Bay Seawall Project in Seattle, Washington, 73730–73731

National Science Foundation
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
License Renewals:
Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, 73837
Performance Review Boards for Senior Executive Service, 73837–73838

Ocean Energy Management Bureau
NOTICES
Call for Information and Nominations:
Commercial Leasing for Wind Power on the Outer Continental Shelf Offshore South Carolina, 73818–73828
Environmental Assessments; Availability, etc.:
Commercial Wind Leasing and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore South Carolina, 73817–73818

Peace Corps
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 73838–73839

Personnel Management Office
NOTICES
Meetings:
Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, 73839

Presidential Documents
PROCLAMATIONS
Special Observances:
National Child's Day (Proc. 9370), 73631–73632
National Family Week (Proc. 9371), 73937–73940
Thanksgiving Day (Proc. 9372), 73941–73942
EXECUTIVE ORDERS
Burundi; Blocking Property of Certain Persons (EO 13712), 73633–73636

Presidio Trust
NOTICES
Wireless Telecommunications SIte, 73839

Rural Business–Cooperative Service
RULES
Rural Development Loan Servicing; Correction, 73647

Rural Housing Service
RULES
Rural Development Loan Servicing; Correction, 73647

Rural Utilities Service
RULES
Rural Development Loan Servicing; Correction, 73647

Securities and Exchange Commission
NOTICES
Conditional Exemption under the Securities Exchange Act from the Confirmation Requirements for Certain Transactions In Money Market Funds, 73849–73851
Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed Rule Changes:
BATS Exchange, Inc., 73841–73849
Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc., 73839–73841
Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., 73853–73865
ICE Clear Credit LLC, 73852–73853

Social Security Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

State Department
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Reporting Requirements for Responsible Investment in Burma, 73867–73868
Blocking or Unblocking of Persons and Properties, 73866
Gifts to Federal Employees from Foreign Government Sources Reported to Employing Agencies in Calendar Year 2014, 73878–73935
Homeland Security Advisory Council—New Tasking, 73866–73867
Meetings:
Advisory Committee on International Law, 73865
Modification of Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act Measures Against a Russian Entity, 73865

Surface Transportation Board
NOTICES
Temporary Trackage Rights Exemptions:
Indiana Southern Railroad, LLC; Norfolk Southern Railway Co., 73875–73876

Trade Representative, Office of United States
NOTICES
Generalized System of Preferences:
Acceptance of a Country Practices Petition on Thailand; Hearing on Certain Country Practice Reviews, 73868–73870

Transportation Department
See Federal Aviation Administration
See Federal Highway Administration
See Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
See Federal Railroad Administration
See Maritime Administration
See Surface Transportation Board
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Transportation Security Administration
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Transportation Security Officer Medical Questionnaire, 73806–73807

Treasury Department
See Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau
See Comptroller of the Currency

Veterans Affairs Department
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, 73679–73680

Separate Parts In This Issue

Part II
State Department, 73878–73935

Part III
Presidential Documents, 73937–73942

Reader Aids

Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV electronic mailing list, go to http://listserv.access.gpo.gov and select Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings); then follow the instructions.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

3 CFR
Proclamations:
9370.....73631
9371.....73639
9372.....73641
Executive Orders:
13712.....73633

6 CFR
Proposed Rules:
46.....73679

7 CFR
407.....73637
959.....73640
966.....73642
989.....73644
1956.....73647
Proposed Rules:
1c.....73679

10 CFR
Proposed Rules:
745.....73679

12 CFR
Proposed Rules:
360.....73680

14 CFR
Proposed Rules:
39.....73681
1230.....73679

15 CFR
Proposed Rules:
27.....73679

18 CFR
40.....73647
Proposed Rules:
35.....73683

20 CFR
Proposed Rules:
431.....73679

22 CFR
Proposed Rules:
225.....73679

27 CFR
9.....73658

28 CFR
Proposed Rules:
46.....73679

29 CFR
Proposed Rules:
21.....73679

32 CFR
Proposed Rules:
219.....73679

33 CFR
Proposed Rules:
110 (2 documents).....73689, 73692

34 CFR
Proposed Rules:
97.....73679

38 CFR
Proposed Rules:
16.....73679

40 CFR
180 (2 documents).....73661, 73663
Proposed Rules:
26.....73679
180.....73695

42 CFR
80.....73667

44 CFR
64 (2 documents).....73669, 73670

45 CFR
Proposed Rules:
46.....73679
690.....73679

47 CFR
96.....73674
Proposed Rules:
90.....73696

48 CFR
1823.....73675
1845.....73678
1852 (2 documents).....73675, 73678

49 CFR
Proposed Rules:
11.....73679

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 227
Wednesday, November 25, 2015

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Proclamation 9370 of November 19, 2015

National Child's Day, 2015

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Our greatest obligation is to our daughters and sons. With unbound imagination and limitless dreams, today's young Americans will carry forward our country's legacy and shape the contours of the 21st century and beyond. On National Child's Day, we reaffirm our support for them in all they do, and we uphold our commitment to enabling them with the tools and resources necessary to write the next great chapter of our Nation's story.

All young people deserve to lead safe, healthy lives, and my Administration is working to ensure their well-being. The Affordable Care Act now requires that basic pediatric services, including oral and vision care for children, be covered under all new Health Insurance Marketplace plans. The law also prohibits insurers from excluding coverage of children due to preexisting health conditions and it allows kids to stay on their parents' health care plan until the age of 26. Ensuring the health of our children is vital to their growth and development, which is why First Lady Michelle Obama's *Let's Move!* initiative is partnering with States, local communities, schools, and the private sector to reduce childhood obesity by promoting healthy foods and encouraging physical activity. We must also continue working to ensure our neighborhoods and classrooms are free from violence and intimidation and instead filled with chances to grow, dream, and discover. I remain committed to equipping law enforcement officials with the training and resources necessary to keep our children safe while working to foster effective relationships between them and the young citizens they serve. And because climate change poses the gravest threat to future generations, we have made combating it a top national priority. We have doubled the pace at which we cut our emissions, set aside more public lands and waters than any Administration in history, and worked to wean ourselves off of our addiction to foreign oil.

Our children must have every opportunity to pursue their greatest aspirations—regardless of their background, their circumstances, or what zip code they were born into. That is why I remain committed to expanding access to high-quality early education for our youngest learners, preparing them for school and for life. Additionally, my Administration has outlined a plan to strengthen and expand our Nation's child care subsidy system to help every working family with young children obtain access to affordable, quality care for their kids—because child care is not just a side issue, it is a national economic priority that provides critical early learning support for students. We have also proposed a new tax cut of up to $3,000 per child, per year to help middle-class families offset the costs of child care. We are also making it easier for young people to attend institutions of higher learning, and we have taken steps to ensure they have access to more reliable Federal financial assistance as they pursue their degree.

Today, let us rededicate ourselves to upholding the ideal that with hard work and dedication, America's children can make of their lives what they will. By supporting our youth and encouraging them to never give up on their dreams, we can forge a brighter future for them, their children and grandchildren, and all future generations.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 20, 2015, as National Child's Day. I call upon all citizens to observe this day with appropriate activities, programs, and ceremonies, and to rededicate ourselves to creating the bright future we want for our Nation's children.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of November, in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fortieth.

[FR Doc. 2015–30157
Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]
Billing code 3295–F6–P

Presidential Documents

Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015

Blocking Property of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Burundi

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*) (NEA), section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code,

I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, find that the situation in Burundi, which has been marked by the killing of and violence against civilians, unrest, the incitement of imminent violence, and significant political repression, and which threatens the peace, security, and stability of Burundi, constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, and I hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat. I hereby order:

Section 1. (a) All property and interests in property that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of any United States person of the following persons are blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in:

(i) the persons listed in the Annex to this order; and

(ii) any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

(A) to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following in or in relation to Burundi:

(1) actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, or stability of Burundi;

(2) actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Burundi;

(3) human rights abuses;

(4) the targeting of women, children, or any civilians through the commission of acts of violence (including killing, maiming, torture, or rape or other sexual violence), abduction, forced displacement, or attacks on schools, hospitals, religious sites, or locations where civilians are seeking refuge, or through other conduct that may constitute a serious abuse or violation of human rights or a violation of international humanitarian law;

(5) actions or policies that prohibit, limit, or penalize the exercise of freedom of expression or freedom of peaceful assembly;

(6) the use or recruitment of children by armed groups or armed forces;

(7) the obstruction of the delivery or distribution of, or access to, humanitarian assistance; or

(8) attacks, attempted attacks, or threats against United Nations missions, international security presences, or other peacekeeping operations;

(B) to be a leader or official of:

(1) an entity, including any government entity or armed group, that has, or whose members have, engaged in any of the activities described in subsection (a)(ii)(A) of this section; or

(2) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order;

(C) to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of:

(1) any of the activities described in subsection (a)(ii)(A) of this section; or

(2) any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order; or

(D) to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order.

(b) The prohibitions in subsection (a) of this section apply except to the extent provided by statutes, or in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date of this order.

Sec. 2. I hereby find that the unrestricted immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of aliens determined to meet one or more of the criteria in subsection 1(a) of this order would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, and I hereby suspend entry into the United States, as immigrants or nonimmigrants, of such persons. Such persons shall be treated as persons covered by section 1 of Proclamation 8693 of July 24, 2011 (Suspension of Entry of Aliens Subject to United Nations Security Council Travel Bans and International Emergency Economic Powers Act Sanctions).

Sec. 3. I hereby determine that the making of donations of the type of articles specified in section 203(b)(2) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(2)) by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1 of this order would seriously impair my ability to deal with the national emergency declared in this order, and I hereby prohibit such donations as provided by section 1 of this order.

Sec. 4. The prohibitions in section 1 of this order include but are not limited to:

(a) the making of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order; and

(b) the receipt of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services from any such person.

Sec. 5. (a) Any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, causes a violation of, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

(b) Any conspiracy formed to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of this order:

(a) the term ''person'' means an individual or entity;

(b) the term ''entity'' means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, group, subgroup, or other organization; and

(c) the term ''United States person'' means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States.

Sec. 7. For those persons whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order who might have a constitutional presence in the United States, I find that because of the ability to transfer funds

or other assets instantaneously, prior notice to such persons of measures to be taken pursuant to this order would render those measures ineffectual. I therefore determine that for these measures to be effective in addressing the national emergency declared in this order, there need be no prior notice of a listing or determination made pursuant to section 1 of this order.

Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government consistent with applicable law. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

Sec. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to determine that circumstances no longer warrant the blocking of the property and interests in property of a person listed in the Annex to this order, and to take necessary action to give effect to that determination.

Sec. 10. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to submit the recurring and final reports to the Congress on the national emergency declared in this order, consistent with section 401(c) of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)) and section 204(c) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)).

Sec. 11. This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

Sec. 12. This order is effective at 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time on November 23, 2015.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 22, 2015.

Billing code 3295–F6–P

ANNEX

1. Alain Guillaume Bunyoni [Minister of Public Security; born January 2, 1972]
2. Cyrille Ndayirukiye [Former Defense Minister; born July 8, 1954]
3. Godefroid Niyombare [Major General; born October 18, 1969]
4. Godefroid Bizimana [born April 23, 1968]

FR Doc. 2015–30191

Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am

Billing code 4811–33–C

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 227
Wednesday, November 25, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

7 CFR Part 407

[Docket No. FCIC–15–0003]

RIN 0563–AC49

Area Risk Protection Insurance (ARPI) Regulations; ARPI Basic Provisions and ARPI Forage Crop Insurance Provisions

AGENCY: Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) amends the Area Risk Protection Insurance (ARPI) Regulations; ARPI Basic Provisions and ARPI Forage Crop Insurance Provisions. The intended effect of this action is to meet the goals of the Acreage Crop Reporting Streamlining Initiative (ACRSI), which is a United States Department of Agriculture initiative and required by Agricultural Act of 2014 (2014 Farm Bill), by aligning ARPI Forage Production with the Actual Production History Forage Production Crop Insurance Provisions and to address language contained in section 12305(b)(1)(B) of the 2014 Farm Bill that prohibits FCIC from offering the catastrophic (CAT) level of coverage for any crops or grasses used for grazing. The changes will be effective for the 2017 and succeeding crop years.

DATES: This rule is effective November 25, 2015. Written comments and opinions on this rule will be accepted until close of business January 25, 2016. FCIC will consider the comments received and may conduct additional rulemaking based on the comments.

ADDRESSES: FCIC prefers that comments be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal. You may submit comments, identified by Docket ID No. FCIC–15–0003 by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Director, Product Administration and Standards Division, Risk Management Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 419205, Kansas City, MO 64133–6205.

All comments received, including those received by mail, will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided, and can be accessed by the public. All comments must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rule. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information, see *http://www.regulations.gov.* If you are submitting comments electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal and want to attach a document, we ask that it be in a text-based format. If you want to attach a document that is a scanned Adobe PDF file, it must be scanned as text and not as an image, thus allowing FCIC to search and copy certain portions of your submissions. For questions regarding attaching a document that is a scanned Adobe PDF file, please contact the RMA Web Content Team at (816) 823–4694 or by email at *rmaweb.content@rma.usda.gov.*

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received for any dockets by the name of the person submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the complete User Notice and Privacy Notice for Regulations.gov at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!privacyNotice.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Hoffmann, Director, Product Management, Product Administration and Standards Division, Risk Management Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Beacon Facility, Stop 0812, Room 421, P.O. Box 419205, Kansas City, MO 64141–6205, telephone (816) 926–7730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Notice and Comment

We are issuing this final rule without prior notice and opportunity for comment. The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) exempts rules ''relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts'' from the statutory requirement for prior notice and opportunity for comment. 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2). However, FCIC is providing a 60-day comment period and we invite you to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written comments. We will consider the comments we receive and may conduct additional rulemaking based on the comments.

Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that this rule is not-significant for the purpose of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, it has not been reviewed by OMB.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Pursuant to the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the collections of information in this rule have been approved by OMB under control number 0563–0085.

E-Government Act Compliance

FCIC is committed to complying with the E-Government Act of 2002, to promote the use of the Internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. This rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of 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 Order 13132

It has been determined under section 1(a) of Executive Order 13132, Federalism, that this rule does not have sufficient implications to warrant consultation with the States. The provisions contained in this rule will not have a substantial direct effect on

States, or on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Executive Order 13175

This rule has been reviewed in accordance with the requirements of Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. The review reveals that this regulation will not have substantial and direct effects on Tribal governments and will not have significant Tribal implications.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

FCIC certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Program requirements for the Federal crop insurance program are the same for all producers regardless of the size of their farming operation. For instance, all producers are required to submit an application and acreage report to establish their insurance guarantees and compute premium amounts, and all producers are required to submit a notice of loss and production information to determine the amount of an indemnity payment in the event of an insured cause of crop loss. Whether a producer has 10 acres or 1000 acres, there is no difference in the kind of information collected. To ensure crop insurance is available to small entities, the Federal Crop Insurance Act authorizes FCIC to waive collection of administrative fees from limited resource farmers. FCIC believes this waiver helps to ensure that small entities are given the same opportunities as large entities to manage their risks through the use of crop insurance. A Regulatory Flexibility Analysis has not been prepared since this regulation does not have an impact on small entities, and therefore, this regulation is exempt from the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605).

Federal Assistance Program

This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.450.

Executive Order 12372

This program is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372, which require intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. See the Notice related to 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V, published at 48 FR 29115, June 24, 1983.

Executive Order 12988

This rule has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12988 on civil justice reform. The provisions of this rule will not have a retroactive effect. The provisions of this rule will preempt State and local laws to the extent such State and local laws are inconsistent herewith. With respect to any direct action taken by FCIC or action by FCIC to require the insurance provider to take specific action under the terms of the crop insurance policy, the administrative appeal provisions published at 7 CFR part 11 must be exhausted before any action against FCIC for judicial review may be brought.

Environmental Evaluation

This action is not expected to have a significant economic impact on the quality of the human environment, health, or safety. Therefore, neither an Environmental Assessment nor an Environmental Impact Statement is needed.

Background

FCIC amends the Area Risk Protection Insurance Regulations (7 CFR part 407) by revising § 407.9 Area Risk Protection Insurance Policy and § 407.13 Forage Crop Insurance Provisions to be effective for the 2017 succeeding crop years. The revisions meet certain goals of ACRSI, which include elimination of duplicate information collection, simplification of producer reporting, and incorporating language contained in section 12305(b)(1)(B) of the 2014 Farm Bill prohibiting FCIC from offering the CAT level of coverage for any crops or grasses used for grazing.

Previously, changes made to the Federal crop insurance policies codified in the Code of Federal Regulations were required to be implemented through the rulemaking process. Such action was not required by the Administrative Procedures Act because contracts were exempt from notice and comment rulemaking and the crop insurance policy is a contract. However, a prior Secretary of Agriculture published a notice in the **Federal Register** stating that the Department of Agriculture would, to the maximum extent practicable, use the notice and comment rulemaking process when making program changes, including those involving contracts. FCIC has complied with this notice over the subsequent years. Recently, the current Secretary of Agriculture has published a notice in the **Federal Register** rescinding the prior notice, thereby making contracts again exempt from the notice and comment rulemaking process. However, FCIC values the input it receives through comments and has elected to solicit comments to this final rule. FCIC will consider all of the comments that are received and may conduct additional rulemaking based on the comments.

For these reasons, these policy changes are effective upon publication at the Office of the Federal Register.

The specific revisions to Area Risk Protection Insurance Policy (7 CFR 407.9) are as follows:

1. Section 8—FCIC is revising paragraph (e)(2). The current provisions regarding the insured's ability to revise an acreage report state that consent may only be provided if the information on the acreage report is clearly transposed, or the insured provides adequate evidence that the insurance company or someone from USDA has committed an error regarding the information on the acreage report. FCIC is revising this provision to include language that gives FCIC the flexibility through the Crop Provisions or through the Special Provisions to provide additional circumstances for which insureds may revise their acreage reports. This change is necessary due to changes in the ARPI Forage Crop Provisions stated below that allow acreage reports be revised when the acreage has suffered winterkill. FCIC is also revising the paragraph to improve readability.

The specific changes to ARPI Forage crop insurance provisions (7 CFR 407.13) are as follows:

1. Section 1—FCIC is revising the definition of ''harvest.'' The definition of ''harvest'' states ''removal of the forage from the field, and rotational grazing.''

However, the 2014 Farm Bill prohibits FCIC from offering the CAT level of coverage for any crops or grasses used for grazing. Further, the Noninsured Crop Assistance Program (NAP) offers coverage at the CAT and additional levels of coverage. To avoid confusion between the benefits available, FCIC is removing the option to purchase coverage for grazing at the additional and CAT level of coverage so that forage producers are eligible for at least the CAT level of coverage offered under other USDA programs. Therefore, FCIC is removing the term ''rotational grazing,'' from the definition of ''harvest'' and removing the definition of ''rotational grazing'' so that FCIC can continue to offer the CAT level of coverage to forage producers who do not graze acreage.

2. Section 5—FCIC is moving the cancellation date, termination date and contract change date 60 days earlier: For the termination and cancellation dates,

from November 30 to September 30, and for the contact change date, from August 31 to June 30. A goal under ACRSI is to establish one acreage reporting date for each commodity that will be used for USDA programs. For perennial forage, ACRSI established two commodities for perennial forage: an established stand and fall-seeded commodity; and a spring-seeded commodity. Each commodity requires its own acreage reporting date: One in the fall and one in the spring, respectively. In order to be insured under the ARPI forage policy, perennial forage must have an established stand for insurance to attach. Therefore, its acreage reporting date needs to be in the fall in order for its acreage reporting date to align with the acreage reporting date for established stand perennial forage insured under other plans of insurance. The acreage reporting date for established stand and fall-seeded perennial forage insured under other plans of insurance FCIC offers is set at November 15 or December 15, depending on the state. The fall date is necessary for the other perennial forage plans of insurance because those plans of insurance provide coverage for damage due to winterkill. Therefore, FCIC must require producers to report their acreage prior to the possibility of an occurrence of winterkill. In order to move the acreage reporting date, which is contained in the actuarial documents, from the current date of July 15 to November 15 or December 15, depending on the state, FCIC must also make adjustments in the Crop Provisions to these other program dates: cancellation and termination dates and the contract change date. This change will make the program dates for forage insured under ARPI consistent with the program dates for forage insured under other plans of insurance.

3. Section 6—FCIC is removing this section and add another in its place. The current section 6 addresses when premium is earned and payable, and overrides section 7(e) in the ARPI Basic Provisions. Basic Provisions section 7(e) states that premium is earned and payable at the time coverage begins, whereas section 6 of the Forage Crop Provisions states that premium is earned and payable on the acreage reporting date. Coverage for forage begins on the date the insurance company accepts the application, which is in the fall. Currently, premium for forage is not earned and payable at the time coverage begins, but rather on the acreage reporting date, which is approximately eight months after insureds submit their applications. Premium is earned and payable on the acreage reporting date because insureds have the opportunity at acreage reporting date to opt out of coverage if they can establish that their acreage was damaged by winterkill by reporting such acreage as uninsurable on the acreage report. Insureds do not owe premium on acreage damaged by winterkill if they report such acreage on the acreage report as uninsurable. Insureds do not know if their acreage is damaged by winterkill until mid-to-late spring. If insureds report such acreage as uninsurable, then they are not required to pay premium on that acreage. FCIC proposes to remove these provisions, which then makes section 7(e) of the Basic Provisions applicable. Therefore, premium will be earned and payable at the time coverage begins. This change will make forage insured under ARPI consistent with forage insured under the APH plan of insurance. As a result of another revision discussed below, insureds will have an opportunity to revise their acreage reports after the acreage reporting date to report their acreage damaged by winterkill as uninsurable acreage if they do not wish to insure that acreage and pay premium on it.

FCIC is adding a new section 6 titled ''Report of Acreage.'' The provisions in section 6 will allow insureds to submit a revised acreage report by a date specified in the Special Provisions if they want to report their acreage damaged by winterkill as uninsurable acreage. FCIC anticipates the date specified in the Special Provisions to be May 15. Without this provision, insureds would be required to insure and pay premium on acreage they currently are not required to insure under the ARPI Forage Crop Provisions.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 407

Crop insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Final Rule

Accordingly, as set forth in the preamble, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation amends 7 CFR part 407 effective for the 2017 and succeeding crop years as follows:

PART 407—AREA RISK PROTECTION INSURANCE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 407 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1506(1), 1506(o).

■ 2. Amend § 407.9 by:

■ a. In the introductory text, removing ''2014'' and adding ''2017'' in its place; and

■ b. In section 8, revising paragraph (e)(2).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 407.9 Area risk protection insurance policy.

* * * * *

8. Report of Acreage and Production

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(2) Consent may only be provided:

(i) If the information on the acreage report is clearly transposed;

(ii) If you provide adequate evidence that we have or someone from USDA has committed an error regarding the information on your acreage report;

(iii) If allowed in the Crop Provisions; or

(iv) As otherwise provided in the Special Provisions; and

* * * * *

■ 3. Amend § 407.13 by:

■ a. In the introductory text, removing ''2014'' and adding ''2017'' in its place;

■ b. In section 1:

■ i. Revising the definition of ''Harvest''; and

■ ii. Removing the definition of ''Rotational grazing''; and

■ c. Revising sections 5 and 6.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 407.13 Area risk protection insurance for forage.

* * * * *

1. Definitions

* * * * *

Harvest. Removal of the forage from the field. Harvest does not include grazing.

* * * * *

5. Program Dates

September 30 is the cancellation and termination date for all states, unless the date is specified differently in the Special Provisions. The contract change date is June 30 for all states, unless the date is specified differently in the Special Provisions.

6. Report of Acreage

In addition to section 8(e)(2) of the Area Risk Protection Insurance Basic Provisions, regarding the ability to revise an acreage report you have submitted to us, we may provide you consent to revise your acreage report to indicate acreage damaged by winterkill that was not harvested (no cutting taken) as uninsurable acreage. You must submit a revised acreage report on or before the date specified in the Special Provisions.

Signed in Washington, DC, on November 13, 2015.

Brandon Willis,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2015–29652 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 959

[Doc. No. AMS–FV–15–0036; FV15–959–1 FR]

Onions Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule implements a recommendation from the South Texas Onion Committee (Committee) to increase the assessment rate established for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent of onions handled under the marketing order (order). The Committee locally administers the order and is comprised of producers and handlers of onions operating within the area of production. Assessments upon onion handlers are used by the Committee to fund reasonable and necessary expenses of the program. The fiscal period begins August 1 and ends July 31. The assessment rate will remain in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated.

DATES: Effective November 27, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doris Jamieson, Marketing Specialist or Christian D. Nissen, Regional Director, Southeast Marketing Field Office, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA; Telephone: (863) 324–3375, Fax: (863) 291–8614, or Email: *Doris.Jamieson@ams.usda.gov* or *Christian.Nissen@ams.usda.gov.*

Small businesses may request information on complying with this regulation by contacting Jeffrey Smutny, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Telephone: (202) 720–2491, Fax: (202) 720–8938, or Email: *Jeffrey.Smutny@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule is issued under Marketing Order No. 959, as amended (7 CFR part 959), regulating the handling of onions grown in South Texas, hereinafter referred to as the ''order.'' The order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), hereinafter referred to as the ''Act.''

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13175.

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. Under the marketing order now in effect, South Texas onion handlers are subject to assessments. Funds to administer the order are derived from such assessments. It is intended that the assessment rate as issued herein will be applicable to all assessable onions beginning August 1, 2015, and continue until amended, suspended, or terminated.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with USDA a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. Such handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided an action is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

This rule increases the assessment rate established by the Committee for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent of onions.

The South Texas onion marketing order provides authority for the Committee, with the approval of USDA, to formulate an annual budget of expenses and collect assessments from handlers to administer the program. The members of the Committee are producers and handlers of South Texas onions. They are familiar with the Committee's needs and with the costs for goods and services in their local area and are thus in a position to formulate an appropriate budget and assessment rate. The assessment rate is formulated and discussed in a public meeting. Thus, all directly affected persons have an opportunity to participate and provide input.

For the 2012–13 and subsequent fiscal periods, the Committee recommended, and USDA approved, an assessment rate that would continue in effect from fiscal period to fiscal period unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the Committee or other information available to USDA.

The Committee met on June 25, 2015, and unanimously recommended 2015–16 expenditures of $149,807 and an assessment rate of $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent of onions. Budgeted expenditures for the 2014–15 fiscal period were the same. The assessment rate of $0.05 is $0.02 higher than the rate currently in effect. With the 2015–16 crop estimated to be four million 50-pound equivalents, one million less than last year's estimate, the current assessment rate would be insufficient to cover the Committee's anticipated expenditures. Further, due to a crop failure during the 2014–15 season, the Committee has depleted its reserve funds. With the Committee's recommended $0.02 increase, assessment income should approximate $200,000. This should provide sufficient funds to cover anticipated 2015–16 expenses and add funds to the Committee's authorized reserve.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2015–16 year include $50,000 for compliance, $37,050 for administrative, and $32,942 for management. Budgeted expenses for these items were the same in 2014–15.

The assessment rate recommended by the Committee was derived by considering anticipated expenses, expected shipments of South Texas onions, and the level of funds in reserve. As mentioned earlier, onion shipments for the year are estimated at four million 50-pound equivalents which should provide $200,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments, along with interest income, should be adequate to cover budgeted expenses. Funds in the reserve (currently $23,906) will be kept within the maximum permitted by the order (approximately two fiscal periods' expenses as authorized in § 959.43).

The assessment rate established in this rule will continue in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the Committee or other available information.

Although this assessment rate will be in effect for an indefinite period, the Committee will continue to meet prior to or during each fiscal period to recommend a budget of expenses and consider recommendations for modification of the assessment rate. The dates and times of Committee meetings are available from the Committee or USDA. Committee meetings are open to the public and interested persons may express their views at these meetings. USDA will evaluate Committee recommendations and other available information to determine whether modification of the assessment rate is

needed. Further rulemaking will be undertaken as necessary. The Committee's 2015–16 budget and those for subsequent fiscal periods would be reviewed and, as appropriate, approved by USDA.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this rule on small entities. Accordingly, AMS has prepared this final regulatory flexibility analysis.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and the rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf.

There are approximately 60 producers of onions in the production area and approximately 20 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. Small agricultural producers are defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA) as those having annual receipts less than $750,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,000,000 (13 CFR 121.201).

According to Committee data and information from the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS), the average price for South Texas onions during the 2013–2014 season was around $12.00 per 50-pound equivalent and total shipments were approximately 4.4 million 50-pound equivalents. Based on this information and data on acreage and yield, the majority of South Texas onion producers would have annual receipts of less than $750,000. In addition, based on available information, more than 50 percent of South Texas onion handlers could be considered small businesses under SBA's definition. Thus, the majority of South Texas onion producers and handlers may be classified as small entities.

This rule increases the assessment rate established for the Committee and collected from handlers for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.03 to $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent of Texas onions. The Committee unanimously recommended 2015–16 expenditures of $149,807 and an assessment rate of $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent. The assessment rate of $0.05 is $0.02 higher than the 2012–13 rate. The quantity of assessable onions for the 2015–16 fiscal period is estimated at four million 50-pound equivalents. Thus, the $0.05 rate should provide $200,000 in assessment income and be adequate to meet this year's expenses.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2015–16 fiscal period include $50,000 for compliance, $37,050 for administrative, and $32,942 for management. Budgeted expenses for these items were the same during the 2014–15 fiscal period.

With the 2015–16 crop estimated to be four million 50-pound equivalents, one million less than last year's estimate, the current assessment rate would be insufficient to cover the Committee's anticipated expenditures. Further, due to a crop failure during the 2014–15 season, the Committee has depleted its reserve funds. The Committee recommended the $0.02 increase to provide sufficient funds to cover anticipated 2015–16 expenses and add funds to the Committee's authorized reserve.

Prior to arriving at this budget and assessment rate, the Committee considered information from various sources, such as the Committee's Budget and Personnel Committee. Alternative expenditure levels were discussed by this group, based upon the relative value of various activities to the South Texas onion industry. The Committee ultimately determined that 2015–16 expenditures of $149,807 were appropriate, and the recommended assessment rate, along with interest income, would generate sufficient revenue to meet its expenses.

A review of historical information and preliminary information pertaining to the upcoming season indicates that the grower price for the 2015–16 season should average around $9.55 per 50-pound equivalent of onions. Therefore, the estimated assessment revenue for the 2015–16 fiscal period as a percentage of total grower revenue could be approximately 0.52 percent for the season.

This action increases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While assessments impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are minimal and uniform on all handlers. However, these costs are offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order. In addition, the Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the South Texas onion industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the June 25, 2015, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178 (Vegetable and Specialty Crops). No changes in those requirements as a result of this action are necessary. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This rule imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large South Texas onion handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this action.

A proposed rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on September 18, 2015 (80 FR 56399). Copies of the proposed rule were also mailed or sent via facsimile to all onion handlers. Finally, the proposal was made available through the Internet by USDA and the Office of the Federal Register. A 30-day comment period ending October 19, 2015, was provided for interested persons to respond to the proposal. No comments were received.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: *http://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses.* Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Jeffrey Smutny at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the Committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it also found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication

in the **Federal Register** because the crop year began on August 1, 2015, and the marketing order requires that the rate of assessment for each fiscal period apply to all assessable onions handled during such period. Further, handlers are aware of this rule which was recommended at a public meeting. Also, a 60-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 959

Marketing agreements, Onions, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 959 is amended as follows:

PART 959—ONIONS GROWN IN SOUTH TEXAS

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 959 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 959.237 is revised to read as follows:

§ 959.237 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2015, an assessment rate of $0.05 per 50-pound equivalent is established for South Texas onions.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Rex A. Barnes,

Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–30020 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 966

[Doc. No. AMS–FV–15–0058; FV15–966–1 IR]

Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Interim rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: This rule implements a recommendation from the Florida Tomato Committee (Committee) for a decrease in the assessment rate established for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.0375 to $0.03 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes handled under the marketing order (order). The Committee locally administers the order and is comprised of producers of tomatoes operating within the area of production. Assessments upon tomato handlers are used by the Committee to fund reasonable and necessary expenses of the program. The fiscal period begins August 1 and ends July 31. The assessment rate will remain in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated.

DATES: Effective November 27, 2015. Comments received by January 25, 2016, will be considered prior to issuance of a final rule.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning this rule. Comments must be sent to the Docket Clerk, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Fax: (202) 720–8938; or Internet: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments should reference the document number and the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register** and will be available for public inspection in the Office of the Docket Clerk during regular business hours, or can be viewed at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* All comments submitted in response to this rule will be included in the record and will be made available to the public. Please be advised that the identity of the individuals or entities submitting the comments will be made public on the Internet at the address provided above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Kauffman, Marketing Specialist or Christian D. Nissen, Regional Director, Southeast Marketing Field Office, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA; Telephone: (863) 837–3375, Fax: (863) 291–8614, or Email: *Steven.Kauffman@ams.usda.gov* or *Christian.Nissen@ams.usda.gov.*

Small businesses may request information on complying with this regulation by contacting Jeffery Smutny, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Telephone: (202) 720–2491, Fax: (202) 720–8938, or Email: *Jeffery.Smutny@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule is issued under Marketing Agreement No. 125 and Order No. 966, both as amended (7 CFR part 966), regulating the handling of tomatoes grown in Florida, hereinafter referred to as the ''order.'' The order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), hereinafter referred to as the ''Act.''

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13175.

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. Under the marketing order now in effect, Florida tomato handlers are subject to assessments. Funds to administer the order are derived from such assessments. It is intended that the assessment rate as issued herein will be applicable to all assessable Florida tomatoes beginning August 1, 2015, and continue until amended, suspended, or terminated.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with USDA a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. Such handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided an action is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

This rule decreases the assessment rate established for the Committee for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.0375 to $0.03 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes.

The Florida tomato marketing order provides authority for the Committee, with the approval of USDA, to formulate an annual budget of expenses and collect assessments from handlers to administer the program. The members of the Committee are producers of Florida tomatoes. They are familiar with the Committee's needs and with the costs for goods and services in their local area and are thus in a position to formulate an appropriate budget and assessment rate. The assessment rate is formulated and discussed in a public meeting. Thus, all directly affected persons have an opportunity to participate and provide input.

For the 2013–14 and subsequent fiscal periods, the Committee recommended, and USDA approved, an assessment rate that would continue in effect from fiscal period to fiscal period unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information

submitted by the Committee or other information available to USDA.

The Committee met on August 25, 2015, and unanimously recommended 2015–16 expenditures of $1,513,177 and an assessment rate of $0.03 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. In comparison, last year's budgeted expenditures were $1,823,925. The assessment rate of $0.03 is $0.0075 lower than the rate currently in effect. The budget recommended for 2015–16 include decreases in education and promotion expenditures and personnel costs. The Committee recommended decreasing the assessment rate to more closely align assessment income to the lower budget.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2015–16 year include $435,377 for salaries, $400,000 for education and promotion, and $400,000 for research. Budgeted expenses for these items in 2014–15 were $498,500, $750,000, and $300,000, respectively.

The assessment rate recommended by the Committee was derived by reviewing anticipated expenses, shipments, funds from block grants, interest income, and available reserves. Florida tomato shipments for the year are estimated at 33 million 25-pound cartons which should provide $990,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments, along with funds from the Committee's authorized reserve, interest income, and funds from block grants, will be adequate to cover budgeted expenses. Funds in the reserve (currently $1,136,195) will be kept within the maximum permitted by the order of not to exceed one fiscal period's expenses as authorized in § 966.44.

The assessment rate established in this rule will continue in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the Committee or other available information.

Although this assessment rate is effective for an indefinite period, the Committee will continue to meet prior to or during each fiscal period to recommend a budget of expenses and consider recommendations for modification of the assessment rate. The dates and times of Committee meetings are available from the Committee or USDA. Committee meetings are open to the public and interested persons may express their views at these meetings. USDA will evaluate Committee recommendations and other available information to determine whether modification of the assessment rate is needed. Further rulemaking will be undertaken as necessary. The Committee's 2015–16 budget and those for subsequent fiscal periods will be reviewed and, as appropriate, approved by USDA.

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this rule on small entities. Accordingly, AMS has prepared this initial regulatory flexibility analysis.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and the rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf.

There are approximately 100 producers of tomatoes in the production area and approximately 80 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. Small agricultural producers are defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA) as those having annual receipts of less than $750,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,000,000 (13 CFR 121.201).

Based on industry and Committee data, the average annual price for fresh Florida tomatoes during the 2014–15 season was approximately $10.58 per 25-pound container, and total fresh shipments for the 2014–15 season were approximately 36.5 million cartons. Based on the average price, about 80 percent of handlers could be considered small businesses under SBA's definition. In addition, based on production data, grower prices as reported by the National Agricultural Statistics Service, and the total number of Florida tomato growers, the average annual grower revenue is below $750,000. Thus, the majority of handlers and producers of Florida tomatoes may be classified as small entities.

This rule decreases the assessment rate established by the Committee and collected from handlers for the 2015–16 and subsequent fiscal periods from $0.0375 to $0.03 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. The Committee unanimously recommended 2015–16 expenditures of $1,513,177 and an assessment rate of $0.03 per 25-pound carton. The assessment rate of $0.03 is $0.0075 lower than the 2013–14 rate. The quantity of assessable tomatoes for the 2015–16 season is estimated at 33 million cartons. Thus, the $0.03 rate should provide $990,000 in assessment income. Income derived from handler assessments, along with funds from the Committee's authorized reserve, interest income, and funds from block grants, will be adequate to cover budgeted expenses.

The major expenditures recommended by the Committee for the 2015–16 year include $435,377 for salaries, $400,000 for education and promotion, and $400,000 for research. Budgeted expenses for these items in 2014–15 were $498,500, $750,000, and $300,000, respectively. The Committee recommended a decrease in the assessment rate based on a reduction in expenditures for education and promotion, and personnel expenses.

Prior to arriving at this budget and assessment rate, the Committee considered information from various sources, such as the Committee Executive Subcommittee, Research Subcommittee, and Education and Promotion Subcommittee. Alternative expenditure levels were discussed by these groups, based upon the relative value of various activities to the tomato industry. The Committee ultimately determined that assessment revenue, along with grant funds, funds from reserves and interest income, would generate sufficient revenue to meet its expenses.

A review of historical information and preliminary information pertaining to the upcoming crop year indicates that the average grower price for the 2015–16 season may be around $10.50 per 25-pound carton of tomatoes. Therefore, the estimated assessment revenue for the 2015–16 crop year as a percentage of total grower revenue could be approximately 0.3 percent.

This action decreases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. Assessments are applied uniformly on all handlers, and some of the costs may be passed on to producers. However, decreasing the assessment rate reduces the burden on handlers. In addition, the Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the Florida tomato industry and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the August 25, 2015, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue. Finally, interested persons are invited to submit comments on this interim rule, including the regulatory and informational impacts of this action on small businesses.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178 Vegetable and Specialty Crops. No changes in those requirements are necessary as a result of this action. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This action imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large Florida tomato handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: *http://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses.* Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Jeffery Smutny at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the Committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it is also found and determined upon good cause that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice prior to putting this rule into effect, and that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because: (1) The 2015–16 fiscal period began on August 1, 2015, and the marketing order requires that the rate of assessment for each fiscal period apply to all assessable Florida tomatoes handled during such fiscal period; (2) the Committee needs to have sufficient funds to pay its expenses which are incurred on a continuous basis and this action decreases the assessment rate for assessable tomatoes beginning with the 2015–16 fiscal period; (3) handlers are aware of this action which was unanimously recommended by the Committee at a public meeting and is similar to other assessment rate actions issued in past years; and (4) this interim rule provides a 60-day comment period, and all comments timely received will be considered prior to finalization of this rule.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 966

Marketing agreements, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Tomatoes.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 966 is amended as follows:

PART 966—TOMATOES GROWN IN FLORIDA

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 966 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 966.234 is revised to read as follows:

§ 966.234 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2015, an assessment rate of $0.03 per 25-pound container is established for Florida tomatoes.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Rex A. Barnes,

Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–30018 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 989

[Doc. No. AMS–FV–15–0032; FV15–989–2 FR]

Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule implements a recommendation from the Raisin Administrative Committee (committee) for an increase of the assessment rate established for the 2015–16 and subsequent crop years from $14.00 to $17.00 per ton of California raisins handled under the marketing order (order). The committee locally administers the order, and is comprised of producers and handlers of raisins operating within the area of production. Assessments upon raisin handlers are used by the committee to fund reasonable and necessary expenses of the program. The crop year begins August 1 and ends July 31. The assessment rate will remain in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated.

DATES: Effective November 27, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maria Stobbe, Marketing Specialist, or Martin Engeler, Regional Director, California Marketing Field Office, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA; Telephone: (559) 487–5901, Fax: (559) 487–5906; or Email: *Maria.Stobbe@ams.usda.gov* or *Martin.Engeler@ams.usda.gov.*

Small businesses may request information on complying with this regulation by contacting Jeffrey Smutny, Marketing Order and Agreement Division, Specialty Crops Program, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 0237, Washington, DC 20250–0237; Telephone: (202) 720–2491, Fax: (202) 720–8938, or Email: *Jeffrey.Smutny@ams.usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule is issued under Marketing Agreement and Order No. 989, both as amended (7 CFR part 989), regulating the handling of raisins produced from grapes grown in California, hereinafter referred to as the ''order.'' The order is effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), hereinafter referred to as the ''Act.''

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 13175.

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. Under the marketing order now in effect, California raisin handlers are subject to assessments. Funds to administer the order are derived from assessments. It is intended that the assessment rate as issued herein will be applicable to all assessable raisins beginning on August 1, 2015, and continue until amended, suspended, or terminated.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with USDA a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and request a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. Such handler is afforded the opportunity for

a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, USDA would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction to review USDA's ruling on the petition, provided an action is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

This rule increases the assessment rate established by the committee for the 2015–16 and subsequent crop years from $14.00 to $17.00 per ton of California raisins handled.

Sections 989.79 and 989.80, respectively, of the order provide authority for the committee, with the approval of USDA, to formulate an annual budget of expenses, and to collect assessments from handlers to administer the program. The members of the committee are producers and handlers of California raisins. They are familiar with the committee's needs and with costs for goods and services in their local area, and are, thus, in a position to formulate an appropriate budget and assessment rate. The assessment rate is formulated and discussed in a public meeting. Thus, all directly affected persons have an opportunity to participate and provide input.

For the 2010–11 and subsequent crop years, the committee recommended, and USDA approved, an assessment rate that would continue in effect from crop year to crop year unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the committee or other information available to USDA.

The committee met on June 11, 2015, and recommended an assessment rate increase from $14.00 per ton to $17.00 per ton by a unanimous vote. At this meeting, the committee also recommended a budget for the 2015–16 crop year, with recommended expenses and contingency reserve totaling $5,832,496. The vote on this recommendation was also unanimous. The assessment rate of $17.00 per ton is expected to generate assessment income of $5,832,496, which should be sufficient to fund the 2015–16 expenses.

As previously stated, the committee's budget for the 2015–16 crop year is $5,832,496, and the assessment rate is $17.00 per ton, which is $3.00 per ton higher than the rate currently in effect.

The major expenditures recommended by the committee for the 2015–16 crop year include: Salaries and employee-related costs of $1,402,906; administration costs of $610,000; compliance activities costs of $30,000; research and studies costs of $129,000; operation and maintenance costs of the generic marketing programs of $3,520,178; and a contingency of $355,503. Subtracted from these expenses is $215,091, which represents reimbursable costs for the shared management of the State marketing program.

In comparison, last year's approved budgeted expenditures included: Salaries and employee-related costs of $1,337,100; administration costs of $493,500; compliance activities costs of $30,000; research and studies costs of $85,000; operation and maintenance costs of the generic marketing programs of $3,296,800; and a contingency of $100,000. Reimbursable costs for the shared management of the State marketing program of $166,860 were subtracted, resulting in a total approved budget for the 2014–15 crop year of $5,175,540.

The committee believes that more funds should be spent in promoting raisins internationally, including China. For that reason, budgeted expenses in those endeavors have been increased: Research and studies costs increased from $85,000 for the 2014–15 crop year to $129,000 for the 2015–16 crop year; and operation and maintenance costs of generic marketing programs increased from $3,296,800 for the 2014–15 crop year to $3,520,178 for the 2015–16 crop year. In addition, the committee included a contingency fund for unexpected expenses and opportunities that may occur during the year.

The quantity of assessable raisins for 2015–16 crop year was estimated to be 343,088 tons. At the assessment rate of $17.00 per ton, the anticipated assessment income would be $5,832,496. Sufficient income should be generated at the higher assessment rate for the committee to meet its anticipated expenses.

Pursuant to § 989.81(a) of the order, any unexpended assessment funds from the crop year must be credited or refunded to the handlers from whom collected.

The assessment rate established in this rule will continue in effect indefinitely unless modified, suspended, or terminated by USDA upon recommendation and information submitted by the committee or other available information.

Although this assessment rate will be in effect for an indefinite period, the committee will continue to meet prior to or during each crop year to recommend a budget of expenses and consider recommendations for modification of the assessment rate. The dates and times of committee meetings are available from the committee or USDA. Committee meetings are open to the public and interested persons may express their views at these meetings. USDA will evaluate committee recommendations and other available information to determine whether modification of the assessment rate is needed. Further rulemaking will be undertaken as necessary. The committee's 2015–16 budget and those for subsequent crop years, would be reviewed and, as appropriate, approved by USDA.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Pursuant to requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this rule on small entities. Accordingly, AMS has prepared this final regulatory flexibility analysis.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of businesses subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and the rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf.

There are approximately 3,000 producers of California raisins and approximately 20 handlers subject to regulation under the marketing order. The Small Business Administration defines small agricultural producers as those having annual receipts less than $750,000, and defines small agricultural service firms as those whose annual receipts are less than $7,000,000. (13 CFR 121.201.)

Based upon shipment data and other information provided by the committee, it may be concluded that a majority of producers and approximately 18 handlers of California raisins may be classified as small entities.

This rule increases the assessment rate established for the committee and collected from handlers for the 2015–16 and subsequent crop years from $14.00 to $17.00 per ton of assessable raisins acquired by handlers.

The committee reviewed and identified the expenses that are reasonable and necessary to continue program operations during the 2015–16 crop year. The resulting recommended budget totals $5,832,496 for the 2015–16 crop year. This represents an overall increase from the 2014–15 budget, which totaled $5,175,540. The 2015–16 budget includes additional expenditures to fund increased promotional programs

in export markets, and a contingency fund of $355,503, which provides a safety net to cover unexpected expenses and opportunities that present themselves during the 2015–16 crop year.

The quantity of assessable raisins for 2015–16 crop year was estimated to be 343,088 tons. At the assessment rate of $17.00 per ton, the anticipated assessment income would be $5,832,496. Sufficient income should be generated at the higher assessment rate for the committee to meet its anticipated expenses.

The major expenditures recommended by the committee for the 2015–16 crop year include: Salaries and employee-related costs of $1,402,906; administration costs of $610,000; compliance activities costs of $30,000; research costs of $129,000; operation and maintenance costs of generic marketing programs of $3,520,178; and a contingency of $355,503.

In comparison, last year's approved budgeted expenditures included: Salaries and employee-related costs of $1,337,100; administration costs of $493,500; compliance activities costs of $30,000; research costs of $85,000; operation and maintenance costs of generic marketing programs of $3,296,800; and a contingency of $100,000. The total budget approved for the 2014–15 crop year was $5,175,540.

The committee believes that more funds should be spent in promoting raisins internationally, including China. For that reason, expenses for research and promotion activities have been increased: Operation and maintenance costs of generic marketing programs increased from $3,296,800 for the 2014–15 crop year to $3,520,178 for the 2015–16 crop year, and research costs have increased from $85,000 for the 2014–15 crop year to $129,000 for the 2015–16 crop year. In order to fund these additional expenditures, the committee recommended an increased assessment rate.

Pursuant to § 989.81(a) of the order, any unexpended assessment funds from the crop year must be credited or refunded to the handlers from whom collected.

Prior to arriving at this budget and assessment rate, the committee considered information from various sources, such as the committee's Audit and Marketing Subcommittees. Alternative spending levels were discussed by the Marketing and Audit Subcommittees, which met on June 8, 2015 and June 11, 2015, to review the committee's financial operations.

The committee ultimately decided that the recommended budget and assessment rate were reasonable and necessary to properly administer the order.

A review of statistical data on the California raisin industry indicates that assessment revenue has consistently been less than one percent of grower revenue in recent years. With a $17.00 assessment rate, assessment revenue is expected to remain at less than one percent of grower revenue.

Regarding the impact of this action on affected entities, this action increases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While increased assessments impose additional costs on handlers regulated under the order, the rates are uniform on all handlers, and proportional to the size of their businesses. It is expected that these costs would be offset by the benefits derived from the operation of the order.

In addition, the meetings of the Audit and Marketing Subcommittees, and the full committee were widely publicized throughout the California raisin industry, and all interested persons were invited to attend the meetings and encouraged to participate in committee deliberations on all issues. Like all subcommittee and committee meetings, the June 8, 2015 and June 11, 2015, meetings were public meetings, and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the order's information collection requirements have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and assigned OMB No. 0581–0178, ''Vegetable and Specialty Crops.'' No changes in those requirements are necessary as a result of this action. Should any changes become necessary, they would be submitted to OMB for approval.

This rule imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California raisin handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies. As noted in the initial regulatory flexibility analysis, USDA has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this final rule.

AMS is committed to complying with the E-Government Act, to promote the use of the internet and other information technologies to provide increased opportunities for citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

A proposed rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on September 2, 2015 (80 FR 53022). Copies of the proposed rule were mailed or sent via facsimile or email to all raisin handlers. Finally, the proposal was made available through the Internet by USDA and the office of the Federal Register. A 30-day comment period ending October 2, 2015, was provided for interested persons to respond to the proposal. Five comments were received: Four in support of the proposed rule and one opposed. The commenter in opposition questioned the use of funds for more committee travel and expressed concern that past trips have not increased sales. The commenter is also concerned that the increase would be at the expense of producers. This action increases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While some of these additional costs may be passed on to producers, the committee, which is comprised of producers and handlers, unanimously voted to increase the assessment rate. It is expected that the increase in costs would be offset by the benefits derived by the industry, as a whole. Accordingly, no change will be made to the rule as proposed.

A small business guide on complying with fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop marketing agreements and orders may be viewed at: *http://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/moa/small-businesses*. Any questions about the compliance guide should be sent to Jeffrey Smutny at the previously mentioned address in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it is also found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because handlers are already receiving 2015–16 raisin crop from growers, and the crop year began on August 1, 2015, and the marketing order requires that the assessment rate applies to all assessable raisins received during the 2015–16 and subsequent seasons. Further, handlers are aware of this rule which was recommended at a public meeting. Also, a 30-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 989

Grapes, Marketing agreements, Raisins, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 989 is amended as follows:

PART 989—RAISINS PRODUCED FROM GRAPES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

■ 1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 989 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

■ 2. Section 989.347 is revised to read as follows:

§ 989.347 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 2015, an assessment rate of $17.00 per ton is established for assessable raisins produced from grapes grown in California.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Rex A. Barnes,

Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–30013 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Housing Service

Rural Business-Cooperative Service

Rural Utilities Service

Farm Service Agency

7 CFR Part 1956

RIN 0570–AA88

Rural Development Loan Servicing; Correction

AGENCY: Rural Housing Service, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Rural Utilities Service, and Farm Service Agency USDA.

ACTION: Direct final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the published rule in the **Federal Register** of March 13, 2015, entitled ''Rural Development Loan Servicing.''

DATES: Effective November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melvin Padgett, Rural Development, Business Programs, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue SW., STOP 3226, Washington, DC 20250–3225; telephone (202) 720–1495; email *melvin.padgett@wdc.usda./gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the rule that is the subject of this correction, the Agency revised 7 CFR 1956.101 as intended, but the Agency inadvertently did not make the correct conforming change in 7 CFR 1956.147. To correct this oversight, the Agency is ''reserving'' 7 CFR 1956.147 in its entirety. This correction has no substantive effect on how debts are settled under this part.

Need for Correction

As published, the text that remains in 7 CFR 1956.147 after the March 13, 2015, rule may be misleading and cause confusion as a result of the changes made to 7 CFR 1956.101 in the March 13, 2015, rule.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1956

Loan programs—agriculture, Loan programs—housing and community development.

Accordingly, 7 CFR 1956.147 is corrected by making the following correcting amendment:

PART 1956—DEBT SETTLEMENT

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1956 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; and 7 U.S.C. 1989.

§ 1956.147 [Removed and Reserved]

■ 2. Remove and reserve § 1956.147.

Dated: November 12, 2015.

Lisa Mensah,

Under Secretary, Rural Development.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Michael Scuse,

Under Secretary, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

[FR Doc. 2015–29781 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–XY–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 40

[Docket Nos. RM15–7–000, RM15–12–000, and RM15–13–000 Order No. 818]

Revisions to Emergency Operations Reliability Standards; Revisions to Undervoltage Load Shedding Reliability Standards; Revisions to the Definition of ''Remedial Action Scheme'' and Related Reliability Standards

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission approves Reliability Standards and definitions of terms submitted in three related petitions by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), the Commission-approved Electric Reliability Organization. The Commission approves Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 (Emergency Operations) and PRC–010–1 (Undervoltage Load Shedding). The proposed Reliability Standards consolidate, streamline and clarify the existing requirements of certain currently-effective Emergency Preparedness and Operations (EOP) and Protection and Control (PRC) standards. The Commission also approves NERC's revised definition of the term Remedial Action Scheme as set forth in the NERC Glossary of Terms Used in Reliability Standards, and modifications of specified Reliability Standards to incorporate the revised definition. Further, the Commission approves the implementation plans, and the retirement of certain currently-effective Reliability Standards.

DATES: This rule will become effective January 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Juan Villar (Technical Information), Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (772) 678–6496, *Juan.Villar@ferc.gov.*

Nick Henery (Technical Information), Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8636, *Nick.Henery@ferc.gov.*

Mark Bennett (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8524, *Mark.Bennett@ferc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Order No. 818

Final Rule

(Issued November 19, 2015)

1. Pursuant to section 215 of the Federal Power Act (FPA),[1] the Commission approves Reliability Standards and definitions of terms submitted in three related petitions by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), the Commission-approved Electric Reliability Organization (ERO). In particular, the Commission approves Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 (Emergency

[1] 16 U.S.C. 824o.

Operations) and PRC–010–1 (Undervoltage Load Shedding). The Commission finds that the Reliability Standards consolidate, streamline, and clarify the existing requirements of several currently-effective Emergency Preparedness and Operations (EOP) and Protection and Control (PRC) standards, and address certain Commission directives set forth in Order No. 693.[2]

2. Further, the Commission approves NERC's revised definition of the term Remedial Action Scheme as set forth in the NERC Glossary of Terms Used in Reliability Standards (NERC Glossary), and modifications of specified Reliability Standards to incorporate the revised definition. Also, the Commission approves the associated implementation plans and assigned violation risk factors and violation severity levels for Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 and Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, as well as the retirement of certain currently-effective Reliability Standards.

I. Background

3. Section 215 of the FPA requires a Commission-certified ERO to develop mandatory and enforceable Reliability Standards, subject to Commission review and approval. Once approved, the Reliability Standards may be enforced by the ERO subject to Commission oversight or by the Commission independently. In 2006, the Commission certified NERC as the ERO pursuant to FPA section 215.[3]

4. On March 16, 2007, the Commission issued Order No. 693, approving 83 of the 107 Reliability Standards filed by NERC, including initial versions of EOP–001, EOP–002, and EOP–003.[4] In addition, the Commission directed NERC to develop certain modifications to the EOP standards. In Order No. 693, the Commission also approved several Undervoltage Load Shedding (UVLS)-related Reliability Standards, including PRC–010–0, PRC–021–1 and PRC–022–1.[5] Further, the Commission directed NERC to modify Reliability Standard PRC–010–0 to develop an ''integrated and coordinated'' approach to all protection systems.[6] In Order No. 693, the Commission approved the NERC Glossary, including NERC's currently-effective Special Protection System and Remedial Action Scheme definitions.

II. NERC Petitions

5. NERC submitted three related petitions that we address together in this Final Rule.[7]

A. NERC EOP Petition—Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 (Docket No. RM15–7–000)

6. On December 29, 2014, NERC filed a petition seeking Commission approval of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1, a revised definition of ''Energy Emergency'' and the associated violation risk factors and violation severity levels, effective date and implementation plan. NERC stated that the purpose of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 is ''to address the effects of operating Emergencies by ensuring each Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has developed Operating Plans to mitigate operating Emergencies, and that those plans are coordinated within a Reliability Coordinator area.'' [8] NERC explained that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 consolidates the requirements of three existing standards: EOP–001–2.1b, EOP–002–3.1 and EOP–003–2 ''into a single Reliability Standard that clarifies the critical requirements for Emergency Operations while ensuring strong communication and coordination across the functional entities.'' [9] NERC also asserted that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 satisfies seven Commission directives set forth in Order No. 693.[10]

7. NERC noted that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1, Requirements R2 and R6 incorporate Attachment 1, which describes three Energy Emergency levels used by the reliability coordinator and the process for communicating the condition of a balancing authority experiencing an Energy Emergency.[11]

8. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 includes six requirements, and is applicable to balancing authorities, reliability coordinators and transmission operators. Requirement R1 requires transmission operators to develop, maintain and implement reliability coordinator-reviewed operating plans to mitigate operating emergencies in its ''transmission operating area.'' [12] Requirement R1 provides that, ''as applicable,'' operating plans must: (1) Describe the roles and responsibilities for activating the operating plan; and (2) include processes to prepare for and mitigate emergencies, such as Reliability Coordinator notification, transmission system reconfiguration, and redispatch of generation. NERC explained that Requirement R1 uses the phrase ''as applicable'' to provide ''flexibility to account for regional differences and pre-existing methods for mitigating emergencies.'' [13] NERC added that an entity's decision to omit an element as not ''applicable'' must include an explanation in its plan. NERC further explained that the requirement for transmission operators to maintain operating plans includes the expectation that the plans are current and up-to-date.[14]

9. Requirement R2 requires balancing authorities to develop, maintain and implement reliability coordinator-reviewed operating plans to mitigate capacity and energy emergencies in its ''balancing authority area.'' Similar to the operating plans developed by transmission operators pursuant to the first requirement, the elements of the operating plans developed by balancing authorities allow for flexibility, provided an explanation is provided for omitted elements.[15]

10. Requirement R3 requires reliability coordinators to review the operating plans submitted by transmission operators and balancing authorities and is designed to ensure that there is appropriate coordination of reliability risks identified in the operating plans. In reviewing operating plans, reliability coordinators shall consider compatibility, coordination

---

[2] *Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Bulk-Power System,* Order No. 693, FERC Stats. and Regs. ¶ 31,242, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 693–A, 120 FERC ¶ 61,053 (2007).

[3] *North American Electric Reliability Corp.,* 116 FERC ¶ 61,062, *order on reh'g & compliance,* 117 FERC ¶ 61,126 (2006), *aff'd sub nom. Alcoa, Inc.* v. *FERC,* 564 F.3d 1342 (D.C. Cir. 2009).

[4] Order No. 693, FERC Stats. and Regs. ¶ 31,242.

[5] *Id.* PP 1509, 1560, and 1565. The Commission neither approved nor rejected proposed Reliability Standard PRC–020–1, explaining that the standard only applied to Regional Reliability Organizations. *Id.* P 1555.

[6] *Id.* P 1509.

[7] Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1 are not attached to this Final Rule, nor are the additional Reliability Standards that NERC proposes to modify to incorporate the term Remedial Action Scheme. The Reliability Standards are available on the Commission's eLibrary document retrieval system in the identified dockets and on the NERC Web site, *www.nerc.com.*

[8] NERC EOP Petition at 2.

[9] *Id.* at 3.

[10] *Id.* at 12–18.

[11] Attachment 1 describes three alert levels: Energy Emergency Alert Level 1 (all available generation resources in use, concern about sustaining required contingency reserves); Energy Emergency Alert Level 2 (load management procedures in effect, energy deficient balancing authority implements its emergency Operating Plan but maintains minimum contingency reserve requirements); and Energy Emergency Alert Level 3 (firm load interruption is imminent or in process, energy deficient balancing authority unable to maintain minimum contingency reserve requirements).

[12] Operating Plan is defined in the NERC Glossary as a ''document that identifies a group of activities that may be used to achieve some goal. An Operating Plan may contain Operating Procedures and Operating Processes . . .''

[13] NERC EOP Petition at 9.

[14] *Id.* at 8–9.

[15] *Id.*

and inter-dependency with other entity operating plans and notify transmission providers and balancing authorities if revisions to their operating plans are necessary.[16]

11. Requirement R4 requires transmission operators and balancing authorities to resolve any issues identified by the reliability coordinator and resubmit their revised operating plans within a time period specified by the reliability coordinator. Requirement R5 requires reliability coordinators to notify balancing authorities and transmission operators in its area, and neighboring reliability coordinators, within 30 minutes of receiving an emergency notification. Requirement R6 requires a reliability coordinator with a balancing authority experiencing a potential or actual Energy Emergency to declare an Energy Emergency alert in accordance with Attachment 1.

12. Proposed Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 also includes the following revised definition of Energy Emergency:

> Energy Emergency—A condition when a Load-Serving Entity or Balancing Authority has exhausted all other resource options and can no longer meet its expected Load obligations.

NERC explained that the revised definition is intended to clarify that an Energy Emergency is not limited to a load-serving entity and, based on a review of the impact on the body of NERC Reliability Standards, ''does not change the reliability intent of other requirements of Definitions.'' [17]

13. NERC proposed an effective date for Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 that is the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 12 months after the date of Commission approval, and a retirement date for currently-effective Reliability Standards EOP–001–2.1b, EOP–002–3.1 and EOP–003–2 of midnight of the day immediately prior to the effective date of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1.

B. NERC PRC Petition—Proposed Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 (Docket No. RM15–12–000)

14. On February 6, 2015, NERC filed a petition seeking approval of Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 (Undervoltage Load Shedding), a revised definition of Undervoltage Load Shedding Program (UVLS Program) for inclusion in the NERC Glossary, and the associated violation risk factors, violation severity levels, effective date and implementation plan. NERC also proposed the retirement of four PRC Reliability Standards.[18] NERC stated that the purpose of Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 is to ''establish an integrated and coordinated approach to the design, evaluation, and reliable operation of Undervoltage Load Shedding Programs'' as directed by the Commission in Order No. 693.[19]

15. NERC explained that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 is a single, comprehensive standard that addresses the same reliability principles outlined in the four currently-effective UVLS-related Reliability Standards.[20] Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 replaces the applicability to and involvement of ''Regional Reliability Organization'' in Reliability Standards PRC–020–1 and PRC–021–1 and improves upon and consolidates the four currently-effective UVLS-Related Standards into one comprehensive standard. NERC explained that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 ''reflects consideration of the 2003 Blackout Report recommendations,'' [21] particularly, Recommendation 21 for NERC to ''make more effective and wider use of system protection measures'' [22] and Recommendation 21C for NERC to ''determine the goals and principles needed to establish an integrated approach to relay protection for generators and transmission lines, as well as of UFLS and UVLS programs.'' [23]

16. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 incorporates a new definition of UVLS Program, which reads:

> Undervoltage Load Shedding Program (UVLS Program): An automatic load shedding program, consisting of distributed relays and controls, used to mitigate undervoltage conditions impacting the Bulk Electric System (BES), leading to voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading. Centrally controlled undervoltage-based load shedding is not included.

NERC explained that ''to ensure that the applicability of the proposed Reliability Standard covers undervoltage-based load shedding systems whose performance has an impact on system reliability, a UVLS Program must mitigate risk of one or more of the following: Voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading impacting the Bulk Electric System. By focusing on the enumerated risks, the definition is meant to exclude locally-applied relays that are not designed to mitigate wide-area voltage collapse.'' [24] NERC stated that the UVLS Program definition ''clearly identifies and separates centrally controlled undervoltage-based load shedding, which is now addressed by the proposed definition of Remedial Action Scheme.'' [25]

17. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 applies to planning coordinators and transmission planners because ''either may be responsible for designing and coordinating the UVLS Program . . . [and] also applies to Distribution Providers and Transmission Owners responsible for the ownership, operation and control of UVLS equipment as required by the UVLS Program established by the Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator.'' [26] NERC explained that the planning coordinator or transmission planner that establishes a UVLS Program is responsible for identifying the UVLS equipment and the necessary distribution provider and transmission owner (referred to as ''UVLS entities'' in the Applicability section) that performs the required actions.

18. NERC stated that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 ''applies only after an entity has determined the need for a UVLS Program as a result of its own planning studies.'' [27] NERC explained that the eight requirements in Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 meet four primary objectives: (1) The Reliability Standard requires applicable entities to evaluate a UVLS Program's effectiveness prior to implementation, including coordination with other protection systems and generator voltage ride-through capabilities; (2) applicable entities must comply with UVLS program specifications and implementation schedule; (3) applicable entities must perform periodic assessment and performance analysis; and (4) applicable entities must maintain and share UVLS Program data.[28]

19. Requirement R1 requires each planning coordinator or transmission planner to evaluate the viability and effectiveness of its UVLS program before implementation to confirm its effectiveness in resolving the undervoltage conditions for which it

[16] *Id.* at 10–11.

[17] *Id.* at 18.

[18] Reliability Standards PRC–010–0 (Assessment of the Design and Effectiveness of UVLS Program); PRC–020–1 (Under-Voltage Load Shedding Program Database); PRC–021–1 (Under-Voltage Load Shedding Program Data); and PRC–022–1 (Under-Voltage Load Shedding Program Performance).

[19] NERC PRC Petition at 14 (citing Order No. 693, FERC Stats & Regs ¶ 31,242 at P 1509).

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.* at 2 (citing the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force, *Final Report on the August 14, 2003 Blackout in the United States and Canada: Causes and Recommendations,* April, 2004 (2003 Blackout Report)).

[22] *Id.* at 4 (citing 2003 Blackout Report at 3, 158).

[23] *Id.* at 6.

[24] *Id.* at 16.

[25] *Id.* at 15. NERC's petition for approval of the proposed definition of Remedial Action Scheme (Docket No. RM15–13–000) is discussed below.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.* at 14.

[28] *Id.* at 17.

was designed, and that it is integrated through coordination with generator ride-through capabilities and other protection and control systems. Also, the planning coordinator or transmission planner must provide the UVLS Program specifications and implementation schedule to the applicable UVLS entities. Requirement R2 requires UVLS entities to meet the UVLS Program's specifications and implementation schedule provided by the planning coordinator or transmission planner or address any necessary corrective actions in accordance with Requirement R5.

20. Requirement R3 requires each planning coordinator or transmission planner to perform periodic comprehensive assessments at least every 60 calendar months to ensure continued effectiveness of the UVLS program, including whether the program resolves identified undervoltage issues and that it is integrated and coordinated with generator voltage ride-through capabilities and other specified protection and control systems. Requirement R4 requires each planning coordinator or transmission planner to commence a timely assessment of a voltage excursion subject to the UVLS Program, within 12 calendar months of the event, to evaluate whether the UVLS Program resolved the undervoltage issues associated with the event. Requirement R5 requires a corrective action plan for any program deficiencies identified during an assessment performed under either Requirement R3 or R4, and provide an implementation schedule to UVLS entities within three calendar months of its completion.

21. Pursuant to Requirement R6, a planning coordinator must update the data necessary to model its UVLS Program for use in event analyses and program assessments at least each calendar year. Requirement R7 requires each UVLS entity to provide data to its planning coordinator, according to the planning coordinator's format and schedule, to support maintenance of the UVLS Program database. Requirement R8 requires a planning coordinator to provide its UVLS Program database to other planning coordinators and transmission planners within its Interconnection, and other functional entities with a reliability need, within 30 calendar days of a written request.

22. NERC proposed an effective date for Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 and the definition of UVLS Program of the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 12 months after the date that the standard and definition are approved by the Commission. NERC proposed to retire PRC–010–0, PRC–020–1, PRC–021–1, and PRC–022–1 at midnight of the day immediately prior to the effective date of PRC–010–1.[29] Further, NERC explained that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 addresses reliability obligations that are set forth in Requirements R2, R4 and R7 of currently-effective Reliability Standard EOP–003–2.[30] Since NERC has proposed to retire EOP–003–2 in the petition seeking approval of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 (Docket No. RM15–7–00, discussed above), concurrent Commission action on the two petitions will prevent a possible reliability gap.

C. NERC RAS Petition—Revisions to the Definition of ''Remedial Action Scheme'' (Docket No. RM15–13–000)

23. On February 3, 2015, NERC filed a petition seeking approval of a revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme in the NERC Glossary, as well as modified Reliability Standards that incorporate the new Remedial Action Scheme definition and eliminate use of the term Special Protection System, and the associated implementation plan.[31] NERC stated that the defined terms Special Protection System and Remedial Action Scheme are currently used interchangeably throughout the NERC Regions and in various Reliability Standards. NERC explained that ''[a]lthough these defined terms share a common definition in the NERC Glossary of Terms today, their use and application have been inconsistent as a result of a lack of granularity in the definition and varied regional uses of the terms. The proposed revisions add clarity and granularity that will allow for proper identification of Remedial Action Schemes and a more consistent application of related Reliability Standards.'' [32]

24. NERC explained that the revised Remedial Action Scheme definition consists of a ''core'' definition, including a list of objectives and a separate list of exclusions for certain schemes or systems not intended to be covered by the revised definition.[33] NERC stated that a broad definition is needed because of ''all the possible scenarios an entity may develop'' for its Remedial Action Scheme and a ''very specific, narrow definition may unintentionally exclude schemes that should be covered.'' [34] Accordingly, NERC proposed the following revised ''core'' definition of Remedial Action Scheme:

> A scheme designed to detect predetermined system conditions and automatically take corrective actions that may include, but are not limited to, adjusting or tripping generation (MW and Mvar), tripping load, or reconfiguring a System(s). (sic) RAS accomplish objectives such as:
> • Meet requirements identified in the NERC Reliability Standards;
> • Maintain Bulk Electric System (BES) stability;
> • Maintain acceptable BES voltages;
> • Maintain acceptable BES power flows;
> • Limit the impact of Cascading or extreme events.

The definition then lists fourteen exclusions, describing specific schemes and systems that do not constitute a Remedial Action Scheme, because each is either a protection function, a control function, a combination of both, or used for system configuration.[35]

25. In the implementation plan, NERC proposed an effective date for the revised Reliability Standards and the revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 12 months after Commission approval.[36] NERC also proposed that, for entities with existing schemes that become newly classified as ''Remedial Action Schemes'' resulting from the application of the revised definition, the entities will have additional time of up to 24 months from the effective date to be fully compliant with all applicable Reliability Standards.[37] Further, NERC asked the Commission to take final action concurrently with the NERC petition on proposed Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 (Docket No. RM15–12–000) because ''[t]he proposed definitions of UVLS Program and Remedial Action Scheme in each project have been coordinated to cover centrally controlled UVLS as a Remedial Action Scheme. Final action by the Commission is needed

[29] *Id.* Ex. B (Implementation Plan).

[30] *Id.* at 23.

[31] NERC RAS Petition at 1–2. NERC requested approval of the following Reliability Standards to incorporate the proposed definition of Remedial Action Scheme and eliminate use of the term Special Protection System: EOP–004–3, PRC–005–3(ii), PRC–023–4, FAC–010–3, TPL–001–0.1(i), FAC–011–3, TPL–002–0(i)b, MOD–030–3, TPL–003–0(i)b, MOD–029–2a, PRC–015–1, TPL–004–0(i)a, PRC–004–WECC–2, PRC–016–1, PRC–001–1.1(i), PRC–005–2(ii), PRC–017–1. NERC did not propose any changes to the Violation Risk Factors or Violation Severity Levels for the modified standards.

[32] *Id.* at 4–5.

[33] *Id.* at 16. NERC noted that ''for each exclusion, the scheme or system could still classify as a Remedial Action Scheme if employed in a broader scheme that meets the definition of Remedial Action Scheme.''

[34] *Id.* at 17.

[35] *Id.* at 18.

[36] NERC RAS Petition, Ex. C (Implementation Plan) at 4.

[37] *Id.*

contemporaneously on both petitions to facilitate implementation and avoid a gap in coverage of centrally controlled UVLS.'' [38]

III. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

26. On June 18, 2015, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) proposing to approve the Reliability Standards and NERC Glossary definitions set forth in NERC's three petitions pertaining to EOP–011–1, PRC–010–1 and a revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme as just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential and in the public interest. [39] The Commission also proposed to approve the related violation risk factors, violation severity levels and implementation plans.

27. The Commission proposed to approve the retirement of Reliability Standards EOP–001–2.1b, EOP–002–3.1, EOP–003–2, PRC–010–0, PRC–020–1 and PRC–021–1. However, the Commission expressed concerns about whether it was appropriate to retire PRC–022–1 before a replacement Reliability Standard is approved and implemented to address the potential misoperation of UVLS equipment. Accordingly, the Commission proposed to deny NERC's request to retire Reliability Standard PRC–022–1 concurrent with the effective date of PRC–010–1.

28. In the NOPR, the Commission stated that Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1 provide greater clarity and that the consolidation of currently-effective EOP and PRC standards provides additional efficiencies for responsible entities. The Commission also agreed with NERC that the new definition of Remedial Action Scheme will improve reliability by eliminating ambiguity and encouraging the consistent identification of Remedial Action Schemes and a more consistent application of related Reliability Standards.

29. While the Commission proposed to approve Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, the Commission raised questions and sought clarification regarding an example of a ''BES subsystem'' that NERC provided in the ''Guidelines for UVLS Program Definition.'' The Commission indicated that, depending on the response from NERC and others, a directive for further modification may be appropriate.[40]

30. In response to the NOPR, the Commission received comments from: NERC, Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Peak Reliability, Transmission Access Policy Study Group (TAPS), International Transmission Company (ITC), Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company (LG&E/KU) and Idaho Power Company (Idaho Power).

IV. Discussion

31. Pursuant to FPA section 215(d)(2), we approve Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1, the revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme and NERC Glossary definitions, and associated violation risk factors and violation severity levels and implementation plans as just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential and in the public interest. The Commission believes that the modified Reliability Standards provide greater clarity, and the consolidated EOP and PRC standards will provide additional efficiencies for responsible entities. We also determine that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 adequately addresses seven Order No. 693 directives, and that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 establishes an integrated and coordinated approach to the design, evaluation and reliable operation of UVLS Programs, and therefore satisfies the Commission directive issued in Order No. 693.[41] Further, we approve the retirement of certain Reliability Standards as identified by NERC.[42]

32. We discuss below the following issues raised in the NOPR and comments: (1) The deregistration of load-serving entities and Reliability Standard EOP–011–1; (2) the scheduling and scope of reliability coordinator reviews of Operating Plans under Reliability Standard EOP–011–1; (3) the retirement of Reliability Standard PRC–022–1; (4) the term ''BES subsystem'' and related diagram in NERC's PRC Petition; and (5) other issues raised by commenters.

A. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1

1. The Deregistration of Load-Serving Entities

NOPR

33. In the NOPR, while proposing to approve Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 and a new Energy Emergency definition, the Commission stated that the removal of load-serving entities from the Reliability Standard raises questions about who would perform the roles traditionally performed by load-serving entities.[43] The NOPR explained that the Commission's decision concerning NERC's compliance filing in Docket No. RR15–4–000 related to NERC's Risk-Based Registration initiative would guide the Commission's action on this question in this proceeding.

Comments

34. NERC, EEI, TAPS, ITC and Idaho Power support the Commission's proposed approval of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1. Further, NERC, EEI and TAPS state that excluding load-serving entities from the Reliability Standard will not create a reliability gap. NERC states that currently-effective Reliability Standard EOP–002–3.1 Requirement R9 is the only requirement in the three Reliability Standards being replaced by Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 that applies to load-serving entities. NERC explains that the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB) has modified the process for E-tag specifications, removing the load-serving entities' role in making changes to the priority of transmission service requests. Therefore, the ''Standard Drafting Team did not incorporate Requirement R9 into Reliability Standard EOP–011–1, because Requirement R9 has become obsolete due to technological changes.'' [44]

35. Additionally, NERC explains that, due to the Real-time nature of energy emergencies, balancing authorities and distribution providers will handle responsibilities related to Reliability Standard EOP–002–3.1 that have been performed by load-serving entities. Referring to the Mapping Document and Application Guidelines for Reliability Standard EOP–011–1, NERC states that ''LSEs have no Real-time reliability

[38] NERC RAS Petition at 3–4.

[39] *Revisions to Emergency Operations Reliability Standards; Revisions to Undervoltage Load Shedding Reliability Standards; Revisions to the Definition of ''Remedial Action Scheme'' and Related Reliability Standards,* Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 80 FR 36,293 (June 24, 2015), 151 FERC ¶ 61,230 (2015) (NOPR).

[40] NOPR, 151 FERC ¶ 61,230 at P 27.

[41] Order No. 693, FERC Stats & Regs. ¶ 31,242 at P 1509.

[42] As noted above, the Commission in Order No. 693 did not approve or remand proposed Reliability Standard PRC–020–1 but, rather, took no action on the Reliability Standard pending the receipt of additional information. Order No. 693, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,242 at P 1555. Our approval of NERC's request renders PRC–020–1 ''retired,'' *i.e.,* withdrawn, and no longer pending before the Commission.

[43] NOPR, 151 FERC ¶ 61,230 at P 24, n.36. Currently effective EOP–002–3.1 applies, *inter alia,* to load-serving entities. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 replaces EOP–002–3.1, and applies to balancing authorities, reliability coordinators and transmission operators, but not load-serving entities.

[44] NERC Comments at 4.

functionality with respect to EEAs [Energy Emergency Alerts].'' [45]

36. TAPS and EEI agree with NERC's analysis of the roles and responsibilities of load-serving entities and that excluding them will not create any reliability gaps. TAPS states that ''there is no reliability benefit to retaining EOP–002–3.1's Requirement R9, and thus no reliability risk from eliminating the LSE obligation to comply with it.'' [46] EEI asserts that ''NERC is correct that 'tasks currently assigned to the LSE function under NERC Reliability Standards would continue to be performed by other functions subject to currently applicable LSE Reliability Standard Requirements or by market participants (including LSEs) pursuant to existing tariffs, market rules, market protocols and other market agreements.' '' [47] Regarding Operating Plans that transmission operators and balancing authorities are to develop under Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 Requirements R1 and R2, EEI states that ''it is clear that the responsible entities required to perform the activities attributed to the LSE function necessary to aid in arresting an Energy Emergency must be identified to ensure necessary mitigation can be accomplished in order to ensure reliable operation of the BES.'' [48]

37. LG&E/KU seeks clarification on two questions pertaining to the exclusion of load-serving entities from Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 ''to ensure that even if NERC's EOP proposal is accepted, [balancing authorities] will have a meaningful way of addressing any operational gaps with Energy Emergencies and LSEs.'' [49] First, LG&E/KU seeks clarification that an Energy Emergency can be isolated to a load-serving entity's inability to meet its own load obligations, as indicated in NERC's revised definition of Energy Emergency. Second, LG&E/KU seeks clarification that Operating Plans developed by balancing authorities may describe the role for load-serving entities in responding to an Energy Emergency, and may include such Operating Plans in applicable tariffs.

Commission Determination

38. Consistent with our determination in the ''risk-based registration'' proceeding, we find that the elimination of load-serving entities from Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 will not prevent the Reliability Standard from achieving its stated purposes or otherwise create reliability gaps.[50] We find that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 enhances reliability by requiring that actions necessary to mitigate capacity and energy emergencies are focused in single operating plans, and ensures communication and coordination among relevant entities during emergency operations. We are persuaded by NERC's explanation that excluding load-serving entities will not adversely impact reliability due to technological changes concerning NAESB tagging specifications, and that load-serving entities ''have no Real-time reliability functionality with respect to EEAs [Energy Emergency Alerts].'' [51] Further, as both NERC and EEI have stated, ''tasks currently assigned to the LSE function under NERC Reliability Standards would continue to be performed by other functions subject to currently applicable LSE Reliability Standard Requirements or by market participants (including LSEs) pursuant to tariffs, market rules, market protocols and other market agreements.'' [52]

39. We disagree with LG&E/KU's suggestion that the reference to load-serving entities in NERC's revised definition of Energy Emergency indicates the possibility of an ''operational gap.'' NERC revises the definition of ''Energy Emergency,'' approved in this Final Rule, as ''[a] condition when a Load-Serving Entity or Balancing Authority has exhausted all other resource options and can no longer meet its expected Load obligations.'' [53] Based on a plain reading of this definition, we agree with LG&E/KU that a load-serving entity's inability to meet its own load obligations could result in an Energy Emergency. Moreover, consistent with our findings in the RBR Compliance Order, we agree with LG&E/KU that operating plans developed by balancing authorities—including operating plans contained in applicable tariffs—may describe the role for load-serving entities in responding to an Energy Emergency.[54] EEI's observation regarding Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 Requirements R1 and R2 for transmission operators and balancing authorities to develop Operating Plans to mitigate Energy Emergencies reinforces this determination: ''[a]lthough these requirements do not specifically identify the 'who' or 'what' actions to be taken, it is clear that the responsible entities required to perform the activities attributed to the LSE function necessary to aid in arresting an energy emergency must be identified to ensure necessary mitigation can be accomplished in order to ensure reliable operation of the BES.'' [55] Accordingly, we conclude that elimination of the load-serving entity function from Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 does not result in an operational gap and, rather, provides a reasonable means of addressing Energy Emergencies.

2. The Scheduling and Scope of Reliability Coordinator Reviews of Operating Plans

40. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1, Requirement R3 obligates a reliability coordinator to review the Operating Plan(s) to mitigate operating emergencies submitted by a transmission operator or a balancing authority. Pursuant to Requirement R3.1, a reliability coordinator must, within 30 days of receipt, (i) review each Operating Plan for compatibility and inter-dependency with other transmission operator or balancing authority Operating Plans, (ii) review each Operating Plan for coordination to avoid risk to ''Wide Area'' reliability, and (iii) notify each transmission operator and balancing authority of the results of the review.

Comments

41. Peak Reliability asserts that the ''inflexible'' 30 day period for reliability coordinator reviews of operating plans in Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 Requirement R3.1 is not reasonable. According to Peak Reliability, because transmission operators have an ''open ended'' opportunity to submit operating plans under the provision, reliability coordinators cannot schedule in advance the needed resources to perform a proper review in the 30-day window. Peak Reliability notes that, in its experience, many entities update their plans at the end of the year, creating a large spike in review work at that time. Peak Reliability, therefore, recommends revising Requirement R3.1 to include language requiring ''a mutually agreed predetermined schedule'' to ensure that the reliability coordinator can efficiently allocate its

[45] *Id.* at 5–6.

[46] TAPS Comments at 4.

[47] EEI Comments at 5–6, quoting NERC's compliance filing in RR15–4–000 at 1.

[48] *Id.* at 6.

[49] LG&E/KU Comments at 2.

[50] *See North American Electric Reliability Corp.*, 153 FERC ¶ 61,024, at P 20 (2015) (RBR Compliance Order) (approving the proposed elimination of the load-serving entity function).

[51] NERC Comments at 5, quoting the EOP–011–1 Mapping Document and Application Guidelines.

[52] EEI Comments at 5–6.

[53] NERC EOP Petition, Ex. B (Implementation Plan) at 1.

[54] RBR Compliance Order, 153 FERC ¶ 61,024 at 21.

[55] EEI Comments at 6.

resources and provide a thorough review of submitted operating plans.[56]

42. Peak Reliability also seeks clarification regarding the scope of reliability coordinator review of operating plans, and whether a reliability coordinator must review each required element of an operating plan specified in Requirement R2 for ''compatibility and interdependency'' with other balancing authority and transmission operator operating plans, or ''evaluate these elements on a higher level.'' [57] Peak Reliability asserts that the ''appropriate level of review'' by reliability coordinators is ''for coordination to avoid risk to Wide Area reliability.'' Based on this assertion, Peak Reliability recommends that Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 require balancing authorities and transmission operators to identify and coordinate possible operating plan discrepancies before submission for reliability coordinator review, as currently required under Reliability Standard EOP–001–2.1b Requirement R6.[58]

Commission Determination

43. We are not persuaded by Peak Reliability's comments that the 30 day review period in Requirement R3.1 is unduly onerous. No reliability coordinator other than Peak Reliability expressed concern about the 30 day review period for operating plans in Requirement R3.1. NERC explains that transmission operators and balancing authorities must update their operating plans on an ''ongoing and as-needed basis.'' [59] The need for registered entities to update operating plans to address evolving bulk electric system conditions should prevent reliability coordinators from being overwhelmed or unduly burdened by operating plan submissions. However, if Peak Reliability experiences an ''end of the year spike in workload,'' [60] as a reliability coordinator, Peak Reliability can adjust its resource allocation to accommodate such known ''spikes'' in activity. Accordingly, we conclude the 30 day review period in Requirement R3.1 is reasonable and reject Peak Reliability's recommendation for language requiring a ''mutually agreed predetermined schedule.''

44. Additionally, we believe that Peak Reliability's concern regarding the extent of reliability coordinator Operating Plan review for ''compatibility and interdependency'' under Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 Requirement 3.1.1 is misplaced. Based on the record before us, particularly the Standard Drafting Team's decision to require reliability coordinators to review rather than approve operating plans, and the ongoing nature of emergency planning, we conclude that Requirement R3.1.1 contemplates high level assessments focused on the coordination of operating plans between and among transmission operators and balancing authorities.[61] Moreover, while Peak Reliability may request that NERC (*e.g.,* through a standard authorization request or ''SAR'') include a provision in EOP–011–1 to require coordination among transmission operators and balancing authorities prior to submitting an operating plan for reliability coordinator review, we are not persuaded to direct NERC to develop such a provision.

B. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1

1. Retirement of Reliability Standard PRC–022–1

NOPR

45. In the NOPR, while proposing to approve Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 and the retirement of PRC–010–0, PRC–020–1 and PRC–021–1, the Commission was not persuaded that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, Requirement R4 is an adequate replacement for currently-effective PRC–022–1, which contains requirements specifically addressing misoperations. Rather, the Commission proposed that Reliability Standard PRC–022–1 would remain in effect until an acceptable replacement Reliability Standard is in place to address the potential misoperation of UVLS equipment.

Comments

46. NERC states that, on June 9, 2015, it filed proposed Reliability Standards PRC–010–2 and PRC–004–5 as part of its UVLS Phase II Petition (Project 2008–02.2), which includes requirements and applicability criteria related to UVLS misoperations.[62] NERC explains that its filing requests that the Commission approve Reliability Standards PRC–004–5 and PRC–010–2 concurrently with the Commission's action on Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 ''to ensure an integrated and coordinated approach to UVLS Programs and fill the gap in Reliability Standard coverage that might be perceived through retirement of PRC–022–1.'' [63] EEI agrees, stating that NERC's filing of proposed Reliability Standards PRC–004–5 and PRC–010–2 address the Commission's concerns expressed in the NOPR.[64]

Commission Determination

47. We agree with NERC and EEI that the Delegated Letter Order approval of Reliability Standards PRC–004–5 and PRC–010–2 in Docket No. RD15–5–000 concurrent with this Final Rule precludes the need to retain currently-effective Reliability Standard PRC–022–1.[65] Accordingly, we find that Reliability Standard PRC–022–1 can be retired without creating a gap in coverage with regard to UVLS protective relay misoperations and equipment performance evaluations.

2. The Term ''BES Subsystem'' and Related Diagram

NOPR

48. In the NOPR, the Commission sought clarification of the meaning of NERC's use of the term ''BES subsystem'' in a diagram illustrating a UVLS system that would not be included in the definition of UVLS Program if the consequences of the contingency do not impact the bulk electric system, and whether it would be considered a Remedial Action Scheme.[66]

Comments

49. NERC comments that the term ''BES subsystem'' and accompanying diagram are ''intended to demonstrate that whether PRC–010–1 applies to a UVLS system depends on whether the UVLS system is used to mitigate undervoltage conditions impacting areas of the BES, leading to voltage instability, voltage collapse or Cascading.'' [67] NERC also states that ''the term 'BES subsystem' is a shorthand reference to an area of the BES that a Registered Entity is responsible for, consistent with its obligations under mandatory Reliability Standards. This reference does not revise the Commission-

[56] Peak Reliability Comments at 6–7.

[57] *Id.* at 7.

[58] *Id.* at 7–8.

[59] *See* NERC EOP Petition at 9.

[60] *See* Peak Reliability Comments at 5–6.

[61] *See* NERC EOP Petition, Exhibit G (Summary of Development History and Complete Record of Development) at 1166 (the Standard Drafting Team indicates that the provision is intended to require the reliability coordinator review of deficiencies, inconsistencies or conflicts between operating plans that would cause further system degradation during emergency conditions).

[62] Petition of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation for Approval of Proposed Reliability Standards PRC–004–5 and PRC–010–2, (Docket No. RD15–5–000).

[63] NERC Comments at 8.

[64] EEI Comments at 7.

[65] *See* Delegated Letter Order issued November 19, 2915.

[66] *See* NOPR, 151 FERC ¶ 61,230 at P 27 (including diagram).

[67] NERC Comments at 6–7.

approved definition of 'Bulk Electric System' or create a new term.'' [68]

50. NERC explains that the diagram ''is not intended to necessarily illustrate a centrally controlled UVLS (considered a [Remedial Action Scheme]), but to illustrate how Registered Entities should evaluate whether the term UVLS Program and proposed Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 applies to a UVLS system.'' [69] NERC points out that, if a UVLS system in the ''BES subsystem'' is used to mitigate undervoltage conditions impacting the BES (leading to voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading), the system would fall under the new definition of UVLS Program (or RAS if centrally controlled) and thus in the scope of Reliability Standard PRC–010–1.[70]

51. EEI states that the example of ''BES subsystem'' in the ''Guidelines for UVLS Program Definition'' does not represent a centrally controlled UVLS and therefore would not be considered a Remedial Action Scheme. EEI explains that the term UVLS Program ''is for a scheme that consists of distributed relays and controls, not for a scheme that is centrally controlled. The key point is that for a UVLS system to fall under the definition of Undervoltage Load Shedding Program, it must be used to protect the BES against voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading.'' [71] EEI also notes that the term ''BES subsystem'' is not intended to be a new NERC term, but rather ''was used in the example to illustrate a possible localized undervoltage contingency on a very small portion of the BES but not a contingency that impacts a larger area of the BES that could result in voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading.'' [72]

Commission Determination

52. Based on the explanations provided above, we determine that a directive for further modification of the example of ''BES subsystem'' and related diagram in NERC's ''Guidelines for UVLS Program Definition'' to ensure consistency with the Commission-approved definition of ''bulk electric system'' proposed in the NOPR is not necessary. Rather, we are persuaded that EEI's concern with the diagram is addressed by NERC's explanation that, depending on the role of a particular UVLS system, the diagram could illustrate an example of a UVLS Program or a centrally-controlled Remedial Action Scheme.[73]

C. Other Issues Raised By Commenters

1. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1—Applicability

53. Peak Reliability asserts that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 ''does not adequately address the operation of UVLS Programs, as it does not apply to the NERC functional entities that operate the Bulk Electric System,'' particularly, reliability coordinators, transmission operators, and balancing authorities.[74] Peak Reliability contends that UVLS Programs should be included in operational planning and real-time assessments, and that all entities responsible for operating the bulk electric system must be given access to UVLS Program databases.[75] Further, Peak Reliability requests that the Commission direct NERC to explain why Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 and Reliability Standard IRO–009–1 apply to different functional entities (since the purpose of both is to prevent instability, uncontrolled separation or cascading outages), and recommends that the treatment of UVLS in operations planning and real-time assessments be addressed.[76]

54. We are not persuaded by Peak Reliability's assertion that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 should apply to reliability coordinators, transmission operators, and balancing authorities. Rather, as NERC explains ''[t]he applicability includes both the Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner because either may be responsible for designing and coordinating the UVLS Program. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 also applies to Distribution Providers and Transmission Owners responsible for the ownership, operation and control of UVLS equipment as required by the UVLS Program established by the Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator.'' [77] As NERC's rationale above indicates, the applicability section of the Reliability Standard identities the functional entities responsible for the design, operation and control of UVLS Programs and related equipment.

55. While Peak Reliability seeks to expand applicability to functional entities so that UVLS Program databases would be shared with reliability coordinators, transmission operators, and balancing authorities, we believe that this need to expand applicability is unfounded. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, Requirement R8, provides that other functional entities with a reliability need can request UVLS data, and that such requests must be answered in 30 days.

56. Nor are we persuaded by Peak Reliability's argument that UVLS programs should be considered in operations planning and real-time operations. We understand that Peak Reliability refers to the consideration of UVLS programs in the derivation of Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROLs) for Category B contingencies as defined in the currently-effective transmission planning standard TPL–002–0b (commonly known as N–1 contingencies under normal system operation).[78] With this understanding, we disagree with Peak Reliability on the relevance of using UVLS in the derivation of IROLs for N–1 contingencies. The 2003 Canada-United States Blackout Report stated that ''[s]afety nets should not be relied upon to establish transfer limits.'' [79] This statement is consistent with the performance criteria established in TPL–002–0b and TPL–001–4, which generally prohibit the loss of non-consequential load for certain N–1 contingencies.[80] We conclude that UVLS programs under PRC–010–1 are examples of such ''safety nets'' and should not be tools used by bulk electric system operators to calculate operating limits for N–1 contingencies. Likewise, with this understanding, there is no imperative to make PRC–010–1 applicable to reliability coordinators, transmission operators, and balancing authorities.

57. Peak Reliability comments that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 ''creates some confusion of the applicability of UVLS Programs due to the similarities, and apparent overlap, in the definitions of UVLS Programs and IROLs.'' [81] We disagree. Peak Reliability's comparison of UVLS Programs with establishing and operating within IROLs is misplaced because UVLS Programs and IROLs represent separate and distinct approaches to system security. UVLS Programs act as safety nets for contingencies more severe than N–1 contingencies, such as the simultaneous

[68] *Id.* at 7.

[69] *Id.*

[70] *Id.*

[71] EEI Comments at 8.

[72] *Id.*

[73] *Id.*

[74] Peak Reliability Comments at 9.

[75] *Id.* at 9–10.

[76] *Id.* at 11–12.

[77] NERC EOP Petition at 15, and id. Ex. D (Order No. 672 Criteria) at 2–3.

[78] The Commission-approved Version 4 standard, TPL–001–4, will replace TPL–002–0b on January 1, 2016. *See Transmission Planning Reliability Standards,* Order No. 786, 145 FERC ¶ 61,051 (2013).

[79] 2003 Blackout Report at 109.

[80] *See* TPL–002–0b, Table 1, footnote b and TPL–001–4, Table 1, Footnote 12.

[81] Peak Reliability Comments at 11.

loss of two single circuits or a double-circuit line which are both Category C contingencies permitting loss of non-consequential firm load.[82] In contrast, the NERC Glossary defines IROLs as ''[a] System Operating Limit that, if violated, could lead to instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading outages that adversely impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System.'' This corresponds with the TPL–004–1 provisions requiring that the system must remain stable when experiencing an N–1 contingency (such as Category B or P1 contingencies).[83] In sum, we disagree with Peak Reliability's premise regarding similarities, and overlaps, in the definition of UVLS programs and IROLs.

2. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 —Appropriate Level of Detail in UVLS Program Assessment

58. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, Requirements R3, R4, and R5 obligate planning coordinators and transmission planners to perform an assessment of their UVLS program in various circumstances. Idaho Power contends that Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, Requirements R3, R4, and R5, do not ''specifically state what must be included in the assessment, as was included in PRC–022–1 R1.1–4'' and, therefore, do not sufficiently explain what applicable entities must include in UVLS Program assessments.[84]

59. We disagree with Idaho Power. Reliability Standard PRC–022–1 requires applicable entities to ''analyze and document all UVLS operations and misoperations,'' and specifically mentions set points and tripping times and a summary of the findings. In contrast, Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 Requirement R3, requires planning coordinators and transmission planners to perform comprehensive assessments of their UVLS Programs at least once every 5 years. Each assessment ''shall include, but is not limited to, studies and analyses that evaluate whether . . . the UVLS Program resolves the identified undervoltage issues for which the UVLS Program is designed [and] the UVLS Program is integrated through coordination with generator voltage ride-through capabilities and other protection and control systems.'' Requirement R4 requires applicable entities to assess whether UVLS programs resolve undervoltage issues associated with voltage excursions triggering UVLS programs. Pursuant to Requirement R5, planning coordinators and transmission planners must develop a corrective action plan to address UVLS program deficiencies identified during assessments performed under Requirements R3 and R4. We conclude that the comprehensive nature of the assessments required under Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 is sufficient, and precludes the need to include the specific items listed in PRC–022–1, Requirement R1.

3. Definition of Special Protection System

60. ITC supports the approval of the revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme. ITC points out that NERC proposes to move to a single definition, Remedial Action Scheme, to eliminate the use of two terms, *i.e.,* Special Protection System.[85] Thus, ITC requests that the Commission direct NERC to remove the definition of Special Protection System from the NERC Glossary to eliminate any potential for confusion.

61. We deny ITC's request that the Commission direct NERC to remove the definition of ''Special Protection System'' from the NERC Glossary. In its RAS Petition, NERC states that it ''will continue to modify the NERC Reliability Standards until all of them reference only the defined term Remedial Action Scheme. At that time, the definition of Special Protection System will be retired.'' [86] We are satisfied with NERC's approach of retiring the term ''Special Protection System'' once the Reliability Standards are fully updated to reference the revised definition of Remedial Action Scheme.

V. Information Collection Statement

62. The collection of information contained in this Final Rule is subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations under section 3507(d) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA).[87] OMB's regulations require approval of certain informational collection requirements imposed by agency rules.[88] Upon approval of a collection(s) of information, OMB will assign an OMB control number and an expiration date. Respondents subject to the filing requirements of a rule will not be penalized for failing to respond to these collections of information unless the collections of information display a valid OMB control number.

63. The Commission is submitting these reporting and recordkeeping requirements to OMB for its review and approval under section 3507(d) of the PRA. The NOPR solicited comments on the Commission's need for this information, whether the information will have practical utility, the accuracy of the provided burden estimate, ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and any suggested methods for minimizing the respondent's burden, including the use of automated information techniques. No comments were received.

A. Proposed Reliability Standard EOP–011–1

64. *Public Reporting Burden:* As of March 2015, there are 105 balancing authorities, 11 reliability coordinators and 329 transmission operators registered with NERC. These registered entities will have to comply with 6–8 new requirements in the new proposed Reliability Standard EOP–011–1. As proposed, each registered balancing authority will have to comply with Requirements R2, R4, and, under certain circumstances, R5. Each reliability coordinator will have to comply with Requirements R1 and its subparts, R2 and its subparts, R3 and its subparts, R5 and R6. Each transmission operator will have to comply with Requirements R1 and its subparts and R4.

65. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 replaces a combined total of 40 requirements or subparts that are found in Reliability Standards EOP–001–2.1b, EOP–003.1 and EOP–003–2. These three Reliability Standards are to be retired, concurrent with the effective date of Reliability Standard EOP–011–1. Accordingly, the requirements in Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 do not create any new burdens for applicable balancing authorities or transmission operators because the requirements in Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 are already burdens or tasks imposed on this set of registered entities by Reliability Standards EOP–001–2.1b, EOP–003.1 and EOP–003–2 under FERC–725A (1902–0244).

66. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 requires reliability coordinators to perform the additional tasks of reviewing, correcting, and coordinating their balancing authorities' and transmission operators' operating procedures for emergency conditions. The Commission estimates that this will add approximately 1,500 man-hours per

[82] The TPL Standards require that the system remain stable and that cascading and uncontrolled islanding shall not occur for any Category B or C contingency (*i.e.,* currently-effective TPL Standards, N–1 and N–2 contingencies) or for any Category P1 through P7 contingency (*i.e.,* TPL–001–4, N–1 and N–2 contingencies.) *See* Table 1 of any of the TPL Standards.

[83] *See* TPL Standards, Table 1.

[84] Idaho Power Comments at 2.

[85] ITC Comment at 3.

[86] NERC RAS Petition at 5.

[87] 44 U.S.C. 3507(d).

[88] 5 CFR 1320.11.

year for each reliability coordinator as described in detail in the following table:

RM15–7–000 (MANDATORY RELIABILITY STANDARDS: RELIABILITY STANDARD EOP–011–1)

	Number of applicable registered entities	Annual number of responses per respondent	Total number of responses	Average burden (hours) and cost per response	Total annual burden hours and total annual cost	Cost per respondent ($)
	(1)	(2)	(1) * (2) = (3)	(4)	(3) * (4) = (5)	(5) ÷ (1)
RC tasks necessary for EOP–011–1 compliance	11	1	21	1,500 [89] $92,387	16,500 $1,016,257	$92,387

B. Proposed Reliability Standard PRC–010–1

Public Reporting Burden: As of April 2015, there are 467 registered distribution providers and 50 transmission providers that are not overlapping in their registration with the distribution provider registration. We estimate that five percent of all distribution providers (23) and transmission providers (3) have under voltage load shedding programs that fall under the Reliability Standard. The Reliability Standard is applicable to planning coordinators and transmission planners, distribution providers, and transmission owners. However, only distribution providers and transmission owners would be responsible for the incremental compliance burden under Reliability Standard PRC–010–1, Requirement R2, as described in detail in the following table:

RM15–12–000 (MANDATORY RELIABILITY STANDARDS: RELIABILITY STANDARD PRC–010–1) [90]

	Number of applicable registered entities	Annual number of responses per respondent	Total number of responses	Average burden (hours) and cost per response	Total annual burden hours and total annual cost	Cost per respondent ($)
	(1)	(2)	(1) * (2) = (3)	(4)	(3) * (4) = (5)	(5) ÷ (1)
DP—Requirement 2	23	1	23	[91] 36 $1,960.32	828 $45,087.36	1,960
TP—Requirement 2	3	1	3	[92] 36 $1,960.32	108 $5,880.96	1,960
DP—R2 Data Retention	23	1	23	12 [93] $367.92	276 $8,462.16	368
TP—R2 Data Retention	3	1	3	12 $367.92	36 $1,103.76	368
Total					$60,534.24	

C. Remedial Action Scheme Revisions

67. *Public Reporting Burden:* The Commission approved the definition of Special Protection System (Remedial Action Scheme) in Order No. 693. We approve a revision to the previously approved definition. The revisions to the Remedial Action Scheme definition and related Reliability Standards are not expected to result in changes to the scope of systems covered by the Reliability Standards and other Reliability Standards that include the term Remedial Action Scheme. Therefore, the Commission does not expect the revisions to affect applicable entities' current reporting burden.

FERC–725G4, Mandatory Reliability Standards: Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 (Undervoltage Load Shedding).

FERC–725S, Mandatory Reliability Standards: Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 (Emergency Operations).

Action: Proposed Collection of Information.

OMB Control No: OMB Control No. 1902–0270 (FERC–725S); OMB Control No. 1902–XXXX (FERC–725G4).

Respondents: Business or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency of Responses: One time and on-going.

Necessity of the Information: The revision to NERC's definition of the term bulk electric system implements the Congressional mandate of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to develop mandatory and enforceable Reliability Standards to better ensure the reliability of the nation's Bulk-Power System. Specifically, the Reliability Standards consolidate, streamline and clarify the existing requirements of certain currently-effective Emergency Preparedness and Operations and

[89] The 1,500 hour figure is broken into 1300 hours at the engineer wage rate and 200 hours at the clerk wage rate. These estimates assume that the engineer's wage rate will be $66.35 and the clerk's wage rate will be $30.66. These figures are taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics at *http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics2_22.htm;* Occupation Code: 17–2071 (engineer) and 43–4071 (clerk).

[90] DP = distribution provider and TP = transmission provider.

[91] The 36 hour figure is broken into 24 hours at the engineer wage rate and 12 hours at the clerk wage rate. These estimates assume that the engineer's wage rate will be $66.35 and the clerk's wage rate will be $30.66. These figures are taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics at *http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics2_22.htm;* Occupation Code: 17–2071 (engineer) and 43–4071 (clerk).

[92] *Id.*

[93] Clerk's wage rate is used for managing data retention.

Protection and Control Reliability Standards.

68. *Internal review:* The Commission has reviewed the requirements pertaining to Reliability Standards PRC–010–1 and EOP–011–1 and made a determination that the requirements of these Reliability Standards are necessary to implement section 215 of the FPA. These requirements conform to the Commission's plan for efficient information collection, communication and management within the energy industry. The Commission has assured itself, by means of its internal review, that there is specific, objective support for the burden estimates associated with the information requirements.

69. Interested persons may obtain information on the reporting requirements by contacting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of the Executive Director, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426 [Attention: Ellen Brown, email: *DataClearance@ferc.gov,* phone: (202) 502–8663, fax: (202) 273–0873].

70. Comments concerning the information collections in this Final Rule and the associated burden estimates, should be sent to the Commission in this docket and may also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs [Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission]. For security reasons, comments should be sent by email to OMB at the following email address: *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov.* Please reference the docket number of this Final Rule (Docket Nos. RM15–13–000, RM15–12–000, and RM15–7–000) in your submission.

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

71. The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA) [94] generally requires a description and analysis of Proposed Rules that will have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

72. Reliability Standard EOP–011–1 is expected to impose an additional burden on 11 entities (reliability coordinators). The remaining 434 entities (balancing authorities and transmission operators and a combination thereof) will maintain the existing levels of burden. Comparison of the applicable entities with FERC's small business data indicates that approximately 7 of the 11 entities are small entities, or 63.63 percent of the respondents affected by this Reliability Standard.[95]

73. On average, each small entity affected may have a one-time cost of $92,387 representing a one-time review of the program for each entity, consisting of 1,500 man-hours at $66.35/hour (for engineer wages) and $30.66/hour (for record clerks), as explained above in the information collection statement.

74. Reliability Standard PRC–010–1 is expected to impose an additional burden on 26 entities (distribution providers and transmission providers or a combination thereof). Comparison of the applicable entities with FERC's small business data indicates that approximately 8 of the 26 entities are small entities, or 30.77 percent of the respondents affected by this Reliability Standard.

75. On average, each small entity affected may have a cost of $1,960, representing a one-time review of the program for each entity, consisting of 36 man-hours at $66.35/hour (for engineer wages) and $30.66/hour (for record clerks), as explained above in the information collection statement. Regarding the revisions to the Remedial Action Scheme definition and the related Reliability Standards including the revised definition, as discussed above, the Commission estimates that proposals will have no cost impact on applicable entities, including any small entities.

76. The Commission estimates that Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1 in this Final Rule impose an additional burden on a total of 37 entities. FERC's small business data indicates that 15 of the 37 respondents are small entities, or 40.54 percent of the respondents affected by these proposed Reliability Standards. On average, each small entity affected may have a cost of $92,387 and $1,960 (EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1 respectively), representing a one-time review of the program for each entity. We do not consider these costs to be a significant economic impact on small entities. Accordingly, the Commission certifies that Reliability Standards EOP–011–1 and PRC–010–1 will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

VII. Environmental Analysis

77. The Commission is required to prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement for any action that may have a significant adverse effect on the human environment.[96] The Commission has categorically excluded certain actions from this requirement as not having a significant effect on the human environment. Included in the exclusion are rules that are clarifying, corrective, or procedural or that do not substantially change the effect of the regulations being amended.[97] The actions proposed herein fall within this categorical exclusion in the Commission's regulations.

VIII. Document Availability

78. In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the **Federal Register**, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through the Commission's Home Page (*http://www.ferc.gov*) and in the Commission's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

79. From the Commission's Home Page on the Internet, this information is available on eLibrary. The full text of this document is available on eLibrary in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number excluding the last three digits of this document in the docket number field.

80. User assistance is available for eLibrary and the Commission's Web site during normal business hours from the Commission's Online Support at 202–502–6652 (toll free at 1–866–208–3676) or email at *ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov,* or the Public Reference Room at (202) 502–8371, TTY (202) 502–8659. Email the Public Reference Room at *public.referenceroom@ferc.gov.*

IX. Effective Date and Congressional Notification

81. This Final Rule is effective January 25, 2016. The Commission has determined, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, that this rule is not a ''major rule'' as defined in section 351 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement

[94] 5 U.S.C. 601–12.

[95] The Small Business Administration sets the threshold for what constitutes a small business. Public utilities may fall under one of several different categories, each with a size threshold based on the company's number of employees, including affiliates, the parent company, and subsidiaries. For the analysis in this NOPR, we are using a 500 employee threshold for each affected entity. Each entity is classified as Electric Bulk Power Transmission and Control (NAICS code 221121).

[96] *Regulations Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969,* Order No. 486, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,783 (1987).

[97] 18 CFR 380.4(a)(2)(ii).

Fairness Act of 1996.[98] The Commission will submit the final rule to both houses of Congress and to the General Accountability Office.

By the Commission.

Issued: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29971 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

27 CFR Part 9

[Docket No. TTB–2015–0006; T.D. TTB–131; Ref: Notice No. 150]

RIN 1513–AC18

Establishment of the Eagle Foothills Viticultural Area

AGENCY: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule; Treasury decision.

SUMMARY: The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) establishes the approximately 49,815-acre ''Eagle Foothills'' viticultural area in Gem and Ada Counties in Idaho. The viticultural area lies entirely within the established Snake River Valley viticultural area. TTB designates viticultural areas to allow vintners to better describe the origin of their wines and to allow consumers to better identify wines they may purchase.

DATES: This final rule is effective December 28, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dominique Christianson, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Box 12, Washington, DC 20005; phone 202–453–1039, ext. 278.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background on Viticultural Areas

TTB Authority

Section 105(e) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (FAA Act), 27 U.S.C. 205(e), authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations for the labeling of wine, distilled spirits, and malt beverages. The FAA Act provides that these regulations should, among other things, prohibit consumer deception and the use of misleading statements on labels and ensure that labels provide the consumer with adequate information as to the identity and quality of the product. The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) administers the FAA Act pursuant to section 1111(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, codified at 6 U.S.C. 531(d). The Secretary has delegated various authorities through Treasury Department Order 120–01, dated December 10, 2013, to the TTB Administrator to perform the functions and duties in the administration and enforcement of this law.

Part 4 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR part 4) authorizes TTB to establish definitive viticultural areas and regulate the use of their names as appellations of origin on wine labels and in wine advertisements. Part 9 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR part 9) sets forth standards for the preparation and submission of petitions for the establishment or modification of American viticultural areas (AVAs) and lists the approved AVAs.

Definition

Section 4.25(e)(1)(i) of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 4.25(e)(1)(i)) defines a viticultural area for American wine as a delimited grape-growing region having distinguishing features, as described in part 9 of the regulations, and a name and a delineated boundary, as established in part 9 of the regulations. These designations allow vintners and consumers to attribute a given quality, reputation, or other characteristic of a wine made from grapes grown in an area to the wine's geographic origin. The establishment of AVAs allows vintners to describe more accurately the origin of their wines to consumers and helps consumers to identify wines they may purchase. Establishment of an AVA is neither an approval nor an endorsement by TTB of the wine produced in that area.

Requirements

Section 4.25(e)(2) of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 4.25(e)(2)) outlines the procedure for proposing an AVA and provides that any interested party may petition TTB to establish a grape-growing region as an AVA. Section 9.12 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 9.12) prescribes standards for petitions for the establishment or modification of AVAs. Petitions to establish an AVA must include the following:

- Evidence that the area within the proposed AVA boundary is nationally or locally known by the AVA name specified in the petition;
- An explanation of the basis for defining the boundary of the proposed AVA;
- A narrative description of the features of the proposed AVA affecting viticulture, such as climate, geology, soils, physical features, and elevation, that make the proposed AVA distinctive and distinguish it from adjacent areas outside the proposed AVA boundary;
- The appropriate United States Geological Survey (USGS) map(s) showing the location of the proposed AVA, with the boundary of the proposed AVA clearly drawn thereon; and
- A detailed narrative description of the proposed AVA boundary based on USGS map markings.

Eagle Foothills Petition

TTB received a petition from Martha Cunningham, owner of the 3 Horse Ranch Vineyards, on behalf of the local grape growers and vintners, proposing the establishment of the ''Eagle Foothills'' AVA in Gem and Ada Counties, Idaho. The proposed AVA is immediately north of the city of Eagle and is approximately 10 miles northwest of the city of Boise. The Eagle Foothills AVA is located entirely within the established Snake River Valley AVA (27 CFR 9.208) and does not overlap with any other existing or proposed AVA. The original proposed name for the AVA was ''Willow Creek Idaho.'' However, TTB determined that the petition did not sufficiently demonstrate that the region is known by that name. Therefore, the petitioner submitted a request to change the proposed AVA name to ''Eagle Foothills.''

The proposed Eagle Foothills AVA contains approximately 49,815 acres, with 9 commercially-producing vineyards covering a total of 67 acres distributed throughout the proposed AVA. The petition states that an additional 4 acres will soon be added to an existing vineyard and that an additional 7 commercial vineyards covering approximately 472 acres are planned within the next few years.

According to the petition, the distinguishing features of the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA are its topography, climate, and soils. The proposed AVA is located within the Unwooded Alkaline Foothills ecoregion of Idaho. This ecoregion is defined as an arid, sparsely populated region of rolling foothills, benches, and alluvial fans underlain by alkaline lake bed deposits. A network of seasonal creeks flowing southwesterly through the proposed AVA have created deep gulches and a rugged terrain that has a variety of slope aspects favorable to the vineyard owners. The elevation within the proposed AVA ranges from 2,490 feet to approximately 3,400 feet, with an average elevation of 2,900 feet.

[98] *See* 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

The high elevations enable cold air to drain from the proposed AVA and pool within the lower surrounding elevations, resulting in fewer damaging frosts within the proposed AVA. The cool climate and relatively short growing season are suitable for growing early- to mid-season varieties of grapes such as Chardonnay, Pinot Gris, and Riesling. The proposed AVA contains a variety of soils, but loams, sandy loams, coarse sandy loams, and stony loams are predominant and are notable for their large, irregularly shaped, coarse grains. Due to the grains' irregular shapes, ''pockets'' of oxygen form in the soil, which promote healthy root growth and allow for rapid water drainage.

Compared with the proposed AVA, the Emmett Valley and Payette River Plain to the north are lower, flatter, and have greater population density than the proposed AVA. Due to the lower elevations, the region to the north has a warmer climate and a longer growing season than the proposed AVA. The soils in the region to the north of the proposed AVA are derived from active flood plain alluvium. These soils have a finer, more uniform texture and greater water-holding capacity than the soils of the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA.

East of the proposed AVA is the mountainous region known as the Boise Front, which has higher elevations. Due to the higher elevations, the region to the east has a shorter growing season and cooler growing season temperatures than the proposed AVA. The soils of the Boise Front are predominantly composed of granite and volcanic materials and lack the sedimentary materials found in the soils of the proposed AVA.

The Boise River Plain is to the south of the proposed AVA, and this region has lower elevations, shallow slope plains, and a longer growing season than the proposed AVA. The soils in this region are similar to the soils north of the proposed AVA, in that they are derived from flood plain alluvium and are finer than the soils within the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA.

Finally, the region to the west is also within the Boise River Plain which, as mentioned previously, has a lower elevation and warmer temperatures, which provide longer growing seasons than are found within the proposed AVA. Furthermore, when compared to the proposed AVA, the soils in the region to the west are fine-grained and the bedrock has a greater depth.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Comments Received

TTB published Notice No. 150 in the **Federal Register** on April 14, 2015 (80 FR 19908), proposing to establish the Eagle Foothills AVA. In the notice, TTB summarized the evidence from the petition regarding the name, boundary, and distinguishing features for the proposed AVA. The notice also compared the distinguishing features of the proposed AVA to the surrounding areas. For a detailed description of the evidence relating to the name, boundary, and distinguishing features of the proposed AVA, and for a detailed comparison of the distinguishing features of the proposed AVA to the surrounding areas, see Notice No. 150.

In Notice No. 150, TTB solicited comments on the accuracy of the name, boundary, and other required information submitted in support of the petition. In addition, given the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA's location within the existing Snake River Valley AVA, TTB solicited comments on whether the geographic features of the proposed AVA sufficiently differentiate it from the existing Snake River Valley AVA. Finally, TTB requested comments on whether the geographic features of the proposed AVA are so distinguishable from the surrounding Snake River Valley AVA that the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA should no longer be part of the established AVA. The comment period closed on June 15, 2015. TTB received no comments in response to Notice No. 150.

TTB Determination

After careful review of the petition, TTB finds that the evidence provided by the petitioner supports the establishment of the Eagle Foothills AVA. Accordingly, under the authority of the FAA Act, section 1111(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and part 4 of the TTB regulations, TTB establishes the ''Eagle Foothills'' AVA in Gem and Ada Counties in Idaho, effective 30 days from the publication date of this document.

TTB has also determined that the Eagle Foothills AVA will remain part of the established Snake River Valley AVA. As discussed in Notice No. 150, the proposed Eagle Foothills AVA is located along the eastern edge of the Snake River Valley AVA and shares the same broad characteristics of this AVA, in that both regions are semiarid and have vineyards that are planted on slopes to maximize sunlight exposure and minimize the risk of frost. However, the Eagle Foothills AVA receives several more inches of precipitation per year and has a slightly longer growing season. Additionally, the Snake River Valley AVA contains a large variety of diverse soils, unlike the proposed AVA which has fairly uniform soil characteristics throughout.

Boundary Description

See the narrative description of the boundary of the Eagle Foothills AVA in the regulatory text published at the end of this final rule.

Maps

The petitioner provided the required maps, and they are listed below in the regulatory text.

Impact on Current Wine Labels

Part 4 of the TTB regulations prohibits any label reference on a wine that indicates or implies an origin other than the wine's true place of origin. For a wine to be labeled with an AVA name or with a brand name that includes an AVA name, at least 85 percent of the wine must be derived from grapes grown within the area represented by that name, and the wine must meet the other conditions listed in 27 CFR 4.25(e)(3). If the wine is not eligible for labeling with an AVA name and that name appears in the brand name, then the label is not in compliance and the bottler must change the brand name and obtain approval of a new label. Similarly, if the AVA name appears in another reference on the label in a misleading manner, the bottler would have to obtain approval of a new label. Different rules apply if a wine has a brand name containing an AVA name that was used as a brand name on a label approved before July 7, 1986. See 27 CFR 4.39(i)(2) for details.

With the establishment of this AVA, its name, ''Eagle Foothills,'' will be recognized as a name of viticultural significance under § 4.39(i)(3) of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 4.39(i)(3)). The text of the regulation clarifies this point. Consequently, wine bottlers using the name ''Eagle Foothills'' in a brand name, including a trademark, or in another label reference as to the origin of the wine, will have to ensure that the product is eligible to use the AVA name as an appellation of origin.

The establishment of the Eagle Foothills AVA will not affect any existing AVA, and any bottlers using ''Snake River Valley'' as an appellation of origin or in a brand name for wines made from grapes grown within the Snake River Valley AVA will not be affected by the establishment of this new AVA. The establishment of the Eagle Foothills AVA will allow vintners to use ''Eagle Foothills'' and ''Snake

River Valley'' as appellations of origin for wines made primarily from grapes grown within the Eagle Foothills AVA if the wines meet the eligibility requirements for the appellation.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

TTB certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The regulation imposes no new reporting, recordkeeping, or other administrative requirement. Any benefit derived from the use of an AVA name would be the result of a proprietor's efforts and consumer acceptance of wines from that area. Therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required.

Executive Order 12866

It has been determined that this final rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993. Therefore, no regulatory assessment is required.

Drafting Information

Dominique Christianson of the Regulations and Rulings Division drafted this final rule.

List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Wine.

The Regulatory Amendment

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, TTB amends title 27, chapter I, part 9, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 9—AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

■ 2. Subpart C is amended by adding § 9.252 to read as follows:

§ 9.252 Eagle Foothills.

(a) *Name.* The name of the viticultural area described in this section is ''Eagle Foothills''. For purposes of part 4 of this chapter, ''Eagle Foothills'' is a term of viticultural significance.

(b) *Approved maps.* The 6 United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:24,000 scale topographic maps used to determine the boundary of the Eagle Foothills viticultural area are titled:

(1) Southwest Emmett, Idaho, 1970;

(2) Southeast Emmett, Idaho, provisional edition 1985;

(3) Pearl, Idaho, provisional edition 1985;

(4) Eagle, Idaho, 1998;

(5) Star, Idaho, 1953; and

(6) Middleton, Idaho, 1958; photorevised 1971.

(c) *Boundary.* The Eagle Foothills viticultural area is located in Gem and Ada Counties in Idaho. The boundary of the Eagle Foothills viticultural area is as described below:

(1) The beginning point is on the Southwest Emmett map at the intersection of the Ada, Gem, and Canyon County lines at the southwestern corner of section 31, T6N/R1W.

(2) From the beginning point, proceed north along the western boundary of sections 31 and 30 to the northwest corner of section 31, T6N/R1W; then

(3) Proceed north-northeast in a straight line to the marked 3,109-foot elevation point near the southwest corner of section 31, T6N/R1W; then

(4) Proceed northeast in a straight line, crossing onto the Southeast Emmett map, to the marked 3,230-foot elevation point in section 22, T6N/R1W; then

(5) Proceed east-northeast in a straight line to the marked 3,258-foot elevation point in section 23, T6N/R1W; then

(6) Proceed easterly in a straight line to the 3,493-foot elevation point in section 23, T6N/R1W; then

(7) Proceed northeast in a straight line to the 3,481-foot elevation point in section 13, T6N/R1W; then

(8) Proceed northeast in a straight line to the intersection of the marked 4-wheel drive trail with the R1W range line; then

(9) Proceed north along the R1W range line to its first intersection with the 3,400-foor elevation contour; then

(10) Proceed east along the meandering 3,400-foot elevation contour, crossing onto the Pearl map, then continuing easterly, then southerly, along the meandering 3,400-foot elevation contour, crossing Schiller Creek, the North and South Forks of Willow Creek, and Big Gulch Creek, to the first intersection of the 3,400-foot contour line with the R1E/R2E range line, which forms the eastern boundary of section 13, T5N/R1E; then

(11) Proceed southeast in a straight line to the marked 3,613-foot elevation in point Section 18, T5N/R2E; then

(12) Proceed southwest in a straight line to the marked 3,426-foot elevation point in Section 24, T5N/R1E; then

(13) Proceed west in a straight line to the marked 3,416-foot elevation point in Section 24, T5N/R1E; then

(14) Proceed west in a straight line to the marked 3,119-foot elevation point in Section 23, T5N/R1E; then

(15) Proceed south in a straight line to the marked 3,366-foot elevation point in Section 23, T5N/R1E; then

(16) Proceed southwest in a straight line, crossing onto the Eagle map, to the marked 3,372-foot elevation point in Section 26, T5N/R1E; then

(17) Proceed northwest in a straight line, crossing back onto the Pearl map, to the marked 3,228-foot elevation point in Section 22, T5N/R1E; then

(18) Proceed southwest in a straight line to the marked 3,205-foot elevation point in Section 22, T5N/R1E; then

(19) Proceed south in a straight line, crossing onto the Eagle map, to the marked 3,163-foot elevation point in Section 27, T5N/R1E; then

(20) Proceed southwest in a straight line to the marked 2,958-foot elevation point in Section 28, T5N/R1E; then

(21) Proceed southwest in a straight line to the northeast corner of section 32, T5N/R1E; then

(22) Proceed south along the eastern boundary of Section 32 to the point where the boundary joins Pearl Road, then continue south along Pearl Road to the intersection of the road with Beacon Road; then

(23) Proceed west along Beacon Road, crossing onto the Star map, to the intersection of Beacon Road with an unnamed light-duty road known locally as North Wing Road at the southern boundary of section 32, T5N/R1W; then

(24) Proceed south along North Wing Road to the intersection of the road with New Hope Road in Section 5, T4N/R1W; then

(25) Proceed west along New Hope Road, crossing onto the Middleton map, to the intersection of the road with the Ada-Canyon County line; then

(26) Proceed north along the Ada-Canyon County line, crossing onto the Southwest Emmett map, to the beginning point.

Signed: October 7, 2015.

John J. Manfreda,

Administrator.

Approved: October 28, 2015.

Timothy E. Skud,

Deputy Assistant Secretary (Tax, Trade, and Tariff Policy).

[FR Doc. 2015–29986 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–31–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2010–0099; FRL–9936–50]

Aureobasidium Pullulans Strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation amends an existing exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 to include residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 in or on all food commodities when used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices. Bio-ferm GmbH submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting an amendment of the exemption from the requirement of a tolerance that includes food commodities that are treated post-harvest. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 under FFDCA.

DATES: This regulation is effective November 25, 2015. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 25, 2016, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2010–0099, is available at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert McNally, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7511P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: *BPPDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at *http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.*

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a(g), any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2010–0099 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before January 25, 2016. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2010–0099, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html.* Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

II. Background

An exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of the *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 in or on all food commodities when applied pre-harvest and used in accordance with good agricultural practices was established and published in the **Federal Register** of February 15, 2012 (77 FR 8731) (FRL–9337–3). In the **Federal Register** of July 17, 2015 (80 FR 42462) (FRL–9929–13), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide tolerance petition (PP 4F8342) by bio-ferm GmbH, Technologiezentrum Tulln, Technopark 1, Tulln, 3430, Austria. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.1312 be amended by expanding the current exemption to also include food commodities that are treated post-harvest. Therefore an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 in or on all food commodities was proposed. The Notice of Filing referenced a summary of the petition prepared by the petitioner bio-ferm GmbH, which is available in the docket via *http://www.regulations.gov.* There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

III. Final Rule

A. EPA's Safety Determination

Section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA

determines that the exemption is ''safe.'' Section 408(c)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA defines ''safe'' to mean that ''there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.'' This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings but does not include occupational exposure. Pursuant to FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), in establishing or maintaining in effect an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, EPA must take into account the factors set forth in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C), which require EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance or tolerance exemption, and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .'' Additionally, FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D) requires that EPA consider ''available information concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues'' and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

EPA evaluated the available toxicity and exposure data on *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability, as well as the relationship of this information to human risk. A full explanation of the data upon which EPA relied and its risk assessment based on that data can be found within the October 15, 2015, document entitled ''Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) considerations for *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941''. This document, as well as other relevant information, is available in the docket for this action as described under **ADDRESSES**. Based upon its evaluation, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population, including infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941. Therefore, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 in or on all food commodities when used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices.

B. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes for the reasons contained in the October 15, 2015, document entitled ''Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) considerations for *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941'' and because EPA is establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance without any numerical limitation.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes a tolerance exemption under FFDCA section 408(d) in response to a petition submitted to EPA. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled ''Regulatory Planning and Review'' (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this action has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001), or Executive Order 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled ''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'' (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerance exemption in this action, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply.

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes. As a result, this action does not alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). As such, EPA has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, EPA has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled ''Federalism'' (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), and Executive Order 13175, entitled ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), do not apply to this action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require EPA's consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

V. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 5, 2015.

Robert McNally,

Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. Revise § 180.1312 to read as follows:

§ 180.1312 Aureobasidium pullulans strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941; exemption from the requirement of a tolerance.

An exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of *Aureobasidium pullulans* strains DSM 14940 and DSM 14941 in or on all food commodities when used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices.

[FR Doc. 2015–29888 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640; FRL–9936–71]

Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes tolerances for residues of saflufenacil in or on pomegranate. BASF Corporation requested these tolerances under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA).

DATES: This regulation is effective November 25, 2015. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before January 25, 2016, and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640, is available at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Office of Pesticide Programs Regulatory Public Docket (OPP Docket) in the Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), West William Jefferson Clinton Bldg., Rm. 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OPP Docket is (703) 305–5805. Please review the visitor instructions and additional information about the docket available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Lewis, Director, Registration Division (7505P), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (703) 305–7090; email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

B. How can I get electronic access to other related information?

You may access a frequently updated electronic version of EPA's tolerance regulations at 40 CFR part 180 through the Government Printing Office's e-CFR site at *http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title40/40tab_02.tpl.*

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a, any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing, and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before January 25, 2016. Addresses for mail and hand delivery of objections and hearing requests are provided in 40 CFR 178.25(b).

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. Submit the non-CBI copy of your objection or hearing request, identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html.* Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

II. Summary of Petitioned-For Tolerance

In the **Federal Register** of February 11, 2015, (80 FR 7559) (FRL–9921–94), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP) 4F8305 by BASF Corporation, 26 Davis Drive, P.O. Box 13528, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709–3528. The petition requested that 40 CFR 180.649 be amended by establishing tolerances for residues of the herbicide, saflufenacil (2-chloro-5-[3,6-dihydro-3-methyl-2,6-dioxo-4-(trifluoromethyl)-1(2*H*)-pyrimidinyl]-4-fluoro-*N*-[[methyl(1-methylethyl) amino]sulfonyl]benzamide) and its metabolites, in or on pomegranate at 0.03 parts per million (ppm). That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by BASF Corporation, the registrant, which is available in the docket, *http://www.regulations.gov.* Comments were received on the notice of filing. EPA's response to these comments is discussed in Unit IV.C.

III. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

Section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) of FFDCA allows EPA to establish a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the tolerance is ''safe.'' Section 408(b)(2)(A)(ii) of FFDCA defines ''safe'' to mean that ''there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.'' This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings, but does not include occupational exposure. Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .''

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has

sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for saflufenacil, including exposure resulting from the tolerances established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with saflufenacil follows.

A. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered its validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children.

The effects observed following repeated oral exposures to saflufenacil are consistent with the proposed mode of toxicity involving inhibition of protoporphyrinogen oxidase (PPO) in mammals, resulting in disruption of heme biosynthesis. Toxicological effects from subchronic and chronic toxicity studies in rats, mice and dogs consisted of decreased hematological parameters (RBC, Ht, MCV, MCH, and MCHC) at approximately the same dose level (13–39 mg/kg/day), except in the case of the dog, where the effects were seen at a slightly higher dose (50–100 mg/kg/day). In line with the absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) findings suggesting that male rats achieve a greater systemic exposure than females, males were the most sensitive sex in mice and rats, with LOAELs approximately 3–4X lower than their female counterparts. The hematological effects resulting from oral exposures to saflufenacil occurred around the same dose level from short- through long-term exposures without increasing in severity. Toxic effects were also seen in the liver (increased organ weight, centrilobular fatty change, lymphoid infiltrate) in mice, the spleen (increased organ weight and extramedullary hematopoiesis) in rats, and in both of these organs (increased iron storage in the liver and extramedullary hematopoiesis in the spleen) in dogs. These effects also occurred around the same dose level from short- through long-term exposures without a progression in severity.

Evidence for increased pre- and/or postnatal susceptibility was noted from the developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit and in the 2-generation reproduction study in the rat. Decreased fetal body weights and increased skeletal variations occurred at doses (20 mg/kg/day) that were not maternally toxic in the developmental study in rats. Similarly, in rabbits, increased liver porphyrins in fetuses were observed at doses (200 mg/kg/day) that were not maternally toxic. In the 2-generation reproductive toxicity study in rats, there was evidence of increased qualitative susceptibility based on an increased number of stillborn pups, decreased pup viability and lactation indices, decreased pre-weaning body-weight and/or body-weight gain, and changes in hematological parameters at the same dose level as less severe maternal effects consisting of decrements in food intake, body-weight, body-weight gain, and changes in organ weights and hematological parameters indicative of anemia.

In an acute neurotoxicity (ACN) study in rats, a decrease in motor activity was observed on the day of dosing at the limit dose (2,000 mg/kg/day) in males only. However, the finding was not accompanied by any neuropathological changes and was considered a reflection of a mild and transient general systemic toxicity and not a substance-specific neurotoxic effect. In the subchronic neurotoxicity (SCN) study, systemic toxicity (anemia) was seen at 1,000 ppm (66.2 mg/kg/day) and 1,350 ppm (101 mg/kg/day) in males and females, respectively. There was no evidence of neurotoxicity or neuropathology in either the acute or subchronic neurotoxicity study.

In a 28-day dermal toxicity study in rats, saflufenacil did not induce any type of dermal or systemic toxicity up to the limit dose of 1,000 mg/kg bw/day.

Based on the results of acute toxicity studies, saflufenacil was ranked low for acute toxicity via the oral, dermal, and inhalation route of exposure. It was not classified as a dermal irritant or dermal sensitizer.

In a 28-day immunotoxicity study in mice, saflufenacil failed to induce toxicity specific to the immune system at the highest dose tested (*i.e.,* 52 mg/kg bw/day).

Saflufenacil was weakly clastogenic in the *in vitro* chromosomal aberration assay in V79 cells in the presence of S9 activation; however, the response was not evident in the absence of S9 activation. It was neither mutagenic in bacterial cells nor clastogenic in rodents *in vivo.* Carcinogenicity studies in rats and mice showed no evidence of increased incidence of tumors at the tested doses. Saflufenacil is classified as ''not likely carcinogenic to humans.''

Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by saflufenacil as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies can be found at *http://www.regulations.gov* in document *Saflufenacil. ''Human Health Risk Assessment in Support of Tolerances for Residues in/on Pomegranate''* pgs. 26–30 in docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640.

B. Toxicological Points of Departure/Levels of Concern

Once a pesticide's toxicological profile is determined, EPA identifies toxicological points of departure (POD) and levels of concern to use in evaluating the risk posed by human exposure to the pesticide. For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the toxicological POD is used as the basis for derivation of reference values for risk assessment. PODs are developed based on a careful analysis of the doses in each toxicological study to determine the dose at which no adverse effects are observed (the NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (the LOAEL). Uncertainty/safety factors are used in conjunction with the POD to calculate a safe exposure level—generally referred to as a population-adjusted dose (PAD) or a reference dose (RfD)—and a safe margin of exposure (MOE). For non-threshold risks, the Agency assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of risk. Thus, the Agency estimates risk in terms of the probability of an occurrence of the adverse effect expected in a lifetime. For more information on the general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see *http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/assessing-human-health-risk-pesticides.*

A summary of the toxicological endpoints for saflufenacil used for human risk assessment is shown in Table 1 of this unit.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF TOXICOLOGICAL DOSES AND ENDPOINTS FOR SAFLUFENACIL FOR USE IN HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT

Exposure/scenario	Point of departure and uncertainty/safety factors	RfD, PAD, LOC for risk assessment	Study and toxicological effects
Acute dietary (General population including infants and children).	NOAEL = 500 mg/kg bw ..... UF_A = 10x UF_H = 10x FQPA SF = 1x	Acute RfD = 5 mg/kg ..... aPAD = 5 mg/kg	Acute Neurotoxicity Study (rat). LOAEL = 2,000 mg/kg bw based on decreased motor activity representing mild and transient systemic toxicity in males.
Chronic dietary (All populations).	NOAEL = 4.6 mg/kg/day ..... UF_A =10x UF_H = 10x FQPA SF = 1x	Chronic RfD = 0.046mg/kg/day ..... cPAD = 0.046 mg/kg/day	Chronic/Carcinogenicity (mouse). LOAEL = 13.8 mg/kg bw/day based on decreased red blood cells, hemoglobin, hematocrit, and porphyria observed in the satellite group.

FQPA SF = Food Quality Protection Act Safety Factor. LOAEL = lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level. LOC = level of concern. mg/kg/day = milligram/kilogram/day. NOAEL = no-observed-adverse-effect-level. PAD = population adjusted dose (a = acute, c = chronic). RfD = reference dose. UF = uncertainty factor. UF_A = extrapolation from animal to human (interspecies). UF_H = potential variation in sensitivity among members of the human population (intraspecies).

C. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to saflufenacil, EPA considered exposure under the petitioned-for tolerances as well as all existing saflufenacil tolerances in 40 CFR 180.649. EPA assessed dietary exposures from saflufenacil in food as follows:

i. *Acute exposure.* Quantitative acute dietary exposure and risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide, if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1-day or single exposure.

Such effects were identified for saflufenacil. In estimating acute dietary exposure, EPA used food consumption information from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, What We Eat in America, (NHANES/WWEIA; 2003–2008). As to residue levels in food, EPA used an unrefined approach by assuming that 100% of the crop is treated and that residues are present at the tolerance-level or at tolerance-levels adjusted to account for the residues of concern for risk assessment for all foods. EPA also used default processing factors using the Dietary Exposure Evaluation Model (DEEM) 7.8.

ii. *Chronic exposure.* In conducting the chronic dietary exposure assessment EPA used the same conservative assumptions that were used for the acute dietary assessment noted above.

iii. *Cancer.* Based on the data summarized in Unit III.A., EPA has concluded that saflufenacil does not pose a cancer risk to humans. Therefore, a dietary exposure assessment for the purpose of assessing cancer risk is unnecessary.

iv. *Anticipated residue and percent crop treated (PCT) information.* EPA did not use anticipated residue and/or PCT information in the dietary assessment for saflufenacil. Tolerance-level residues and/or 100% CT were assumed for all food commodities.

2. *Dietary exposure from drinking water.* The Agency used screening-level water exposure models in the dietary exposure analysis and risk assessment for saflufenacil in drinking water. These simulation models take into account data on the physical, chemical, and fate/transport characteristics of saflufenacil. Further information regarding EPA drinking water models used in pesticide exposure assessment can be found at *http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/about-water-exposure-models-used-pesticide.*

Based on the Tier 1 Rice Model and Pesticide Root Zone Model Ground Water (PRZM GW), the estimated drinking water concentrations (EDWCs) of saflufenacil for acute exposures are estimated to be 133 parts per billion (ppb) for surface water and 69.2 ppb for ground water.

The EDWCs for chronic exposures for non-cancer assessments are estimated to be 120 ppb for surface water and 51.5 ppb for ground water.

Modeled estimates of drinking water concentrations were directly entered into the dietary exposure model. For acute dietary risk assessment, the water concentration value of 133 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water. For chronic dietary risk assessment, the water concentration of value 120 ppb was used to assess the contribution to drinking water.

3. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* for lawn and garden pest control, indoor pest control, termiticides, and flea and tick control on pets).

Saflufenacil is not registered for any specific use patterns that would result in residential exposure.

4. *Cumulative effects from substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of FFDCA requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider ''available information'' concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

EPA has not found saflufenacil to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and saflufenacil does not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance action, therefore, EPA has assumed that saflufenacil does not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see EPA's Web site at *http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/cumulative-assessment-risk-pesticides.*

D. Safety Factor for Infants and Children

1. *In general.* Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold (10X) margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the database on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines based on reliable data that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. This additional margin of

safety is commonly referred to as the FQPA Safety Factor (SF). In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional safety factor when reliable data available to EPA support the choice of a different factor.

2. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity.* As discussed in III.A., there is evidence of increased pre- and/or postnatal susceptibility in the developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit and in the 2-generation reproduction study in the rat. The concern for increased susceptibility following prenatal or postnatal exposure is low because clear NOAELs/LOAELs were established for the developmental effects seen in rats and rabbits as well as for the offspring effects seen in the 2-generation reproductive toxicity study. Further, the dose-response relationship for the effects of concern are also well characterized and being used for assessing risks. The point of departure for risk assessments would be protective of the developmental and offspring effects.

3. *Conclusion.* EPA has determined that reliable data show the safety of infants and children would be adequately protected if the FQPA SF were reduced to 1X. That decision is based on the following findings:

i. The toxicity database for saflufenacil is complete.

ii. There was no evidence of neurotoxicity or neuropathology in the acute and subchronic neurotoxicity study. The decrease in motor activity observed in the acute neurotoxicity study on the day of dosing at the limit dose (2,000 mg/kg/day) in males is considered a reflection of a mild and transient general systemic toxicity and not a substance-specific neurotoxic effect. No neurotoxic effects were seen in the sub-chronic neurotoxicity study.

iii. The concern for increased susceptibility following prenatal or postnatal exposure is low because clear NOAELs/LOAELs were established for the developmental effects seen in rats and rabbits as well as for the offspring effects seen in the 2-generation reproductive toxicity study. Further, the dose-response relationship for the effects of concern are also well characterized and being used for assessing risks. The POD for risk assessments would be protective of the developmental and offspring effects.

iv. There are no residual uncertainties identified in the exposure databases. The dietary food exposure assessments were performed based on 100% CT and tolerance-level residues. EPA made conservative (protective) assumptions in the ground and surface water modeling used to assess exposure to saflufenacil in drinking water. These assessments will not underestimate the exposure and risks posed by saflufenacil.

E. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

EPA determines whether acute and chronic dietary pesticide exposures are safe by comparing aggregate exposure estimates to the acute PAD (aPAD) and chronic PAD (cPAD). For linear cancer risks, EPA calculates the lifetime probability of acquiring cancer given the estimated aggregate exposure. Short-, intermediate-, and chronic-term risks are evaluated by comparing the estimated aggregate food, water, and residential exposure to the appropriate PODs to ensure that an adequate MOE exists.

1. *Acute risk.* Using the exposure assumptions discussed in this unit for acute exposure, the acute dietary exposure from food and water to saflufenacil will occupy less than 1% of the aPAD for all infants (<1-year old), the population group receiving the greatest exposure.

2. *Chronic risk.* Using the exposure assumptions described in this unit for chronic exposure, EPA has concluded that chronic exposure to saflufenacil from food and water will utilize 20% of the cPAD for all infants (<1-year old) the population group receiving the greatest exposure. There are no residential uses for saflufenacil.

3. *Short-term and intermediate-term risk.* Short-term aggregate exposure takes into account short-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water (considered to be a background exposure level). Intermediate-term aggregate exposure takes into account intermediate-term residential exposure plus chronic exposure to food and water. Since there are no registered or proposed residential uses for saflufenacil that would result in short or intermediate-term residential exposures, and chronic dietary exposure has already been assessed under the appropriately protective cPAD (which is at least as protective as the POD used to assess short-term risk), no further assessment of short or intermediate-term risk is necessary, and EPA relies on the chronic dietary risk assessment for evaluating short and intermediate-term risk for saflufenacil.

4. *Aggregate cancer risk for U.S. population.* Based on the lack of evidence of carcinogenicity in two adequate rodent carcinogenicity studies, saflufenacil is not expected to pose a cancer risk to humans.

5. *Determination of safety.* Based on these risk assessments, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children from aggregate exposure to saflufenacil residues.

IV. Other Considerations

A. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

Adequate enforcement methodology (liquid chromatography/mass spectroscopy/mass spectroscopy (LC/MS/MS) Method D0603/02) is available to enforce the tolerance expression. The method may be requested from: Chief, Analytical Chemistry Branch, Environmental Science Center, 701 Mapes Rd., Ft. Meade, MD 20755–5350; telephone number: (410) 305–2905; email address: *residuemethods@epa.gov.*

B. International Residue Limits

In making its tolerance decisions, EPA seeks to harmonize U.S. tolerances with international standards whenever possible, consistent with U.S. food safety standards and agricultural practices. EPA considers the international maximum residue limits (MRLs) established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), as required by FFDCA section 408(b)(4). The Codex Alimentarius is a joint United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization food standards program, and it is recognized as an international food safety standards-setting organization in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. EPA may establish a tolerance that is different from a Codex MRL; however, FFDCA section 408(b)(4) requires that EPA explain the reasons for departing from the Codex level. The Codex has not established a MRL for saflufenacil on pomegranate. Therefore, harmonization of MRLs and U.S. tolerances is not an issue at this time.

C. Response to Comments

EPA received two comments to the docket, EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0640; however, only one of these public submissions was in response to the Notice of Filing for PP# 4F8305, while the remaining comment pertained to an unrelated petition in the **Federal Register** notice. For PP# 4F8305, the commenter stated that they are in support of actions to set tolerance levels for pesticides on the food we eat and that we are taking a step in the right direction by making it safer for human consumption by placing more regulations on pesticide chemicals.

EPA agrees with the commenter and will continue to regulate pesticides

under the legal framework provided by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), which allows EPA to assess the risk of pesticides and set tolerance levels for those pesticides on food commodities as deemed necessary to protect human health while still providing tools for growers so that they can meet the ever-growing food demands of this country and others.

V. Conclusion

Therefore, tolerances are established for residues of saflufenacil, (2-chloro-5-[3,6-dihydro-3-methyl-2,6-dioxo-4-(trifluoromethyl)-1(2H)-pyrimidinyl]-4-fluoro-N-[[methyl(1-methylethyl)amino]sulfonyl]benzamide) and its metabolites, in or on pomegranate at 0.03 ppm.

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action establishes a tolerance under FFDCA section 408(d) in response to a petition submitted to the Agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted these types of actions from review under Executive Order 12866, entitled ''Regulatory Planning and Review'' (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993). Because this action has been exempted from review under Executive Order 12866, this action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, entitled ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) or Executive Order 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled ''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'' (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), do not apply.

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled ''Federalism'' (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

VII. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Susan Lewis,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.649, add alphabetically the entry to the table in paragraph (a)(1) to read as follows:

§ 180.649 Saflufenacil; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * * (1) * * *

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Pomegranate	0.03
* * * * *	

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2015–29889 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

42 CFR Part 80

[Docket No. CDC–2015–0062; NIOSH–286]

RIN 0920–AA55

Occupational Safety and Health Research and Related Activities: Removal of Regulations Regarding Administrative Functions, Practices, and Procedures

AGENCY: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: With this action, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) removes its regulations pertaining to fees for direct training in occupational safety and health conducted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). As a part of the retrospective review conducted by all Federal agencies, HHS has determined that these regulations are no longer in use by NIOSH and should be removed.

DATES: This rule is effective on November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rachel Weiss, Program Analyst, 1090 Tusculum Ave., MS: C–46, Cincinnati, OH 45226; telephone (855)818–1629 (this is a toll-free number); email *NIOSHregs@cdc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Public Participation

In a notice of proposed rulemaking published on August 13, 2015 (80 FR 48473), HHS invited interested persons or organizations to submit written views, recommendations, and data regarding the removal of part 80. We received no comments on this rule.

II. Statutory Authority

HHS promulgated part 80 of title 42 to facilitate Section 21(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 670(a)(1)), which authorizes the Director of NIOSH to conduct educational programs to provide an adequate supply of qualified personnel to carry out the purposes of the OSH Act. Part 80 established tuition fees for such training, as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 483a (31 U.S.C. 9701, as revised by Public Law 97–258, September 13, 1982), which permits agencies to ''prescribe regulations establishing the charge for service or thing of value provided by the agency.'' In accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 13563, HHS conducted a retrospective analysis of its existing rules, determined Part 80 to be obsolete, and is hereby removing Part 80 from Title 42.

III. Summary of Final Rule

The provisions in Part 80 establish the NIOSH policies with respect to the charging of fees for direct training in occupational safety and health. Because NIOSH no longer offers direct training programs, these provisions are no longer needed. Removing Part 80 from Title 42 will have no effect on NIOSH procedures or practices, including the NIOSH funding of the Education and Research Centers for Occupational Safety and Health. This action is being done in accordance with Executive Order 13563, section 6, which requires that Federal agencies conduct retrospective analyses of existing rules. In conducting the analysis, HHS discovered that the Part 80 provisions were outdated.

IV. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility.

This final rule has been determined not to be a ''significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of E.O. 12866. With this action, HHS is removing part 80 from title 42. Because this final rule is entirely administrative and does not affect the economic impact, cost, or policies of any activities authorized by title 42, HHS has not prepared an economic analysis and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not reviewed this rulemaking.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.,* requires each agency to consider the potential impact of its regulations on small entities including small businesses, small governmental units, and small not-for-profit organizations. Because no substantive changes will be made to 42 CFR part 80 as a result of this action, HHS certifies that this rule has ''no significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities'' within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.,* requires an agency to invite public comment on, and to obtain OMB approval of, any regulation that requires 10 or more people to report information to the agency or to keep certain records. This rule does not contain any information collection requirements; thus, HHS has determined that the PRA does not apply to this rule.

D. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

As required by Congress under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), HHS reported the promulgation of this rule to Congress prior to its effective date.

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) directs agencies to assess the effects of Federal regulatory actions on State, local, and Tribal governments, and the private sector ''other than to the extent that such regulations incorporate requirements specifically set forth in law.'' For purposes of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, this final rule does not include any Federal mandate that may result in increased annual expenditures in excess of $100 million by State, local or Tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector.

F. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice)

This final rule has been drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12988, ''Civil Justice Reform,'' and will not unduly burden the Federal court system. This rule has been reviewed carefully to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguities.

G. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

HHS has reviewed this final rule in accordance with Executive Order 13132 regarding federalism, and has determined that it does not have ''federalism implications.'' The rule does not ''have substantial direct effects 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.''

H. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks)

In accordance with Executive Order 13045, HHS has evaluated the environmental health and safety effects of this final rule on children. HHS has determined that the rule would have no environmental health and safety effect on children.

I. Executive Order 13211 (Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use)

In accordance with Executive Order 13211, HHS has evaluated the effects of this final rule on energy supply, distribution or use, and has determined that the rule will not have a significant adverse effect.

J. Plain Writing Act of 2010

Under Public Law 111–274 (October 13, 2010), executive Departments and Agencies are required to use plain language in documents that explain to the public how to comply with a requirement the Federal Government administers or enforces. HHS has attempted to use plain language in promulgating the final rule consistent with the Federal Plain Writing Act guidelines.

Final Rule

For the reasons discussed in the preamble and under the authorities 29 U.S.C. 671, 31 U.S.C. 9701, and 42 U.S.C. 216(b), the Department of Health and Human Services amends 42 CFR chapter I by removing part 80.

PART 80—[REMOVED AND RESERVED]

■ 1. Remove and reserve part 80.

Dated: November 16, 2015.

Sylvia M. Burwell,

Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

[FR Doc. 2015–29827 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 64

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–8411]

Suspension of Community Eligibility

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule identifies communities where the sale of flood insurance has been authorized under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that are scheduled for suspension on the effective dates listed within this rule because of noncompliance with the floodplain management requirements of the program. If the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) receives documentation that the community has adopted the required floodplain management measures prior to the effective suspension date given in this rule, the suspension will not occur and a notice of this will be provided by publication in the **Federal Register** on a subsequent date. Also, information identifying the current participation status of a community can be obtained from FEMA's Community Status Book (CSB). The CSB is available at *http://www.fema.gov/fema/csb.shtm.*

DATES: The effective date of each community's scheduled suspension is the third date (''Susp.'') listed in the third column of the following tables.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you want to determine whether a particular community was suspended on the suspension date or for further information, contact Patricia Suber, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NFIP enables property owners to purchase Federal flood insurance that is not otherwise generally available from private insurers. In return, communities agree to adopt and administer local floodplain management measures aimed at protecting lives and new construction from future flooding. Section 1315 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4022, prohibits the sale of NFIP flood insurance unless an appropriate public body adopts adequate floodplain management measures with effective enforcement measures. The communities listed in this document no longer meet that statutory requirement for compliance with program regulations, 44 CFR part 59. Accordingly, the communities will be suspended on the effective date in the third column. As of that date, flood insurance will no longer be available in the community. We recognize that some of these communities may adopt and submit the required documentation of legally enforceable floodplain management measures after this rule is published but prior to the actual suspension date. These communities will not be suspended and will continue to be eligible for the sale of NFIP flood insurance. A notice withdrawing the suspension of such communities will be published in the **Federal Register**.

In addition, FEMA publishes a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) that identifies the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) in these communities. The date of the FIRM, if one has been published, is indicated in the fourth column of the table. No direct Federal financial assistance (except assistance pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act not in connection with a flood) may be provided for construction or acquisition of buildings in identified SFHAs for communities not participating in the NFIP and identified for more than a year on FEMA's initial FIRM for the community as having flood-prone areas (section 202(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4106(a), as amended). This prohibition against certain types of Federal assistance becomes effective for the communities listed on the date shown in the last column. The Administrator finds that notice and public comment procedures under 5 U.S.C. 553(b), are impracticable and unnecessary because communities listed in this final rule have been adequately notified.

Each community receives 6-month, 90-day, and 30-day notification letters addressed to the Chief Executive Officer stating that the community will be suspended unless the required floodplain management measures are met prior to the effective suspension date. Since these notifications were made, this final rule may take effect within less than 30 days.

National Environmental Policy Act. This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR part 10, Environmental Considerations. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act. The Administrator has determined that this rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, Section 1315, 42 U.S.C. 4022, prohibits flood insurance coverage unless an appropriate public body adopts adequate floodplain management measures with effective enforcement measures. The communities listed no longer comply with the statutory requirements, and after the effective date, flood insurance will no longer be available in the communities unless remedial action takes place.

Regulatory Classification. This final rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 13132, Federalism. This rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule meets the applicable standards of Executive Order 12988.

Paperwork Reduction Act. This rule does not involve any collection of information for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 64

Flood insurance, Floodplains.

Accordingly, 44 CFR part 64 is amended as follows:

PART 64—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 64 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp.; p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp.; p. 376.

§ 64.6 [Amended]

■ 2. The tables published under the authority of § 64.6 are amended as follows:

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map date	Date certain Federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Region II				
New York:				
Hoosick, Town of, Rensselaer County ..	361154	December 16, 1975, Emerg; August 1, 1987, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	January 6, 2016	January 6, 2016.
Hoosick Falls, Village of, Rensselaer County.	360674	December 26, 1974, Emerg; May 16, 1980, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Pittstown, Town of, Rensselaer County	361166	May 20, 1975, Emerg; February 1, 1988, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Schaghticoke, Town of, Rensselaer County.	361168	January 21, 1976, Emerg; July 16, 1984, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Schaghticoke, Village of, Rensselaer County.	361058	December 27, 1979, Emerg; June 11, 1982, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Valley Falls, Village of, Rensselaer County.	361469	December 19, 1975, Emerg; June 5, 1985, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Region VI				
Texas:				
Austin, City of, Travis and Williamson Counties.	480624	May 9, 1975, Emerg; September 2, 1981, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Bastrop County, Unincorporated Areas	481193	September 12, 1978, Emerg; August 19, 1991, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Mustang Ridge, City of, Caldwell and Travis Counties.	481687	N/A, Emerg; June 15, 2000, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Rollingwood, City of, Travis County	481029	February 3, 1975, Emerg; September 29, 1978, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Travis County, Unincorporated Areas ...	481026	January 29, 1976, Emerg; April 1, 1982, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
West Lake Hills, City of, Travis County	481030	March 10, 1976, Emerg; July 17, 1978, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Region IX				
California:				
Palos Verdes Estates, City of, Los Angeles County.	060145	January 29, 1971, Emerg; September 7, 1984, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Torrance, City of, Los Angeles County	060165	June 26, 1975, Emerg; December 18, 1979, Reg; January 6, 2016, Susp.	.....do	Do.

.....do = Ditto.
Code for reading third column: Emerg.—Emergency; Reg.—Regular; Susp—Suspnsion.

Dated: November 12, 2015.

Roy E. Wright

Deputy Associate Administrator, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2015–30045 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 64

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–8409]

Suspension of Community Eligibility

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule identifies communities where the sale of flood insurance has been authorized under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that are scheduled for suspension on the effective dates listed within this rule because of noncompliance with the floodplain management requirements of the program. If the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) receives documentation that the community has adopted the required floodplain management measures prior to the effective suspension date given in this rule, the suspension will not occur and a notice of this will be provided by publication in the **Federal Register** on a subsequent date. Also, information identifying the current participation status of a community can be obtained from FEMA's Community Status Book (CSB). The CSB is available at *http://www.fema.gov/fema/csb.shtm.*

DATES: The effective date of each community's scheduled suspension is the third date (''Susp.'') listed in the third column of the following tables.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you want to determine whether a particular community was suspended on the suspension date or for further information, contact Patricia Suber, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NFIP enables property owners to purchase Federal flood insurance that is not otherwise generally available from private insurers. In return, communities agree to adopt and administer local floodplain management measures aimed at protecting lives and new construction from future flooding. Section 1315 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 4022, prohibits the sale of NFIP flood insurance unless an appropriate public body adopts adequate floodplain management measures with effective enforcement measures. The communities listed in this document no longer meet that statutory requirement

for compliance with program regulations, 44 CFR part 59. Accordingly, the communities will be suspended on the effective date in the third column. As of that date, flood insurance will no longer be available in the community. We recognize that some of these communities may adopt and submit the required documentation of legally enforceable floodplain management measures after this rule is published but prior to the actual suspension date. These communities will not be suspended and will continue to be eligible for the sale of NFIP flood insurance. A notice withdrawing the suspension of such communities will be published in the **Federal Register**.

In addition, FEMA publishes a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) that identifies the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) in these communities. The date of the FIRM, if one has been published, is indicated in the fourth column of the table. No direct Federal financial assistance (except assistance pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act not in connection with a flood) may be provided for construction or acquisition of buildings in identified SFHAs for communities not participating in the NFIP and identified for more than a year on FEMA's initial FIRM for the community as having flood-prone areas (section 202(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4106(a), as amended). This prohibition against certain types of Federal assistance becomes effective for the communities listed on the date shown in the last column. The Administrator finds that notice and public comment procedures under 5 U.S.C. 553(b), are impracticable and unnecessary because communities listed in this final rule have been adequately notified.

Each community receives 6-month, 90-day, and 30-day notification letters addressed to the Chief Executive Officer stating that the community will be suspended unless the required floodplain management measures are met prior to the effective suspension date. Since these notifications were made, this final rule may take effect within less than 30 days.

National Environmental Policy Act. This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR part 10, Environmental Considerations. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act. The Administrator has determined that this rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, Section 1315, 42 U.S.C. 4022, prohibits flood insurance coverage unless an appropriate public body adopts adequate floodplain management measures with effective enforcement measures. The communities listed no longer comply with the statutory requirements, and after the effective date, flood insurance will no longer be available in the communities unless remedial action takes place.

Regulatory Classification. This final rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 13132, Federalism. This rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132.

Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This rule meets the applicable standards of Executive Order 12988.

Paperwork Reduction Act. This rule does not involve any collection of information for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 64

Flood insurance, Floodplains.

Accordingly, 44 CFR part 64 is amended as follows:

PART 64—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 64 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.;* Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp.; p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp.; p. 376.

§ 64.6 [Amended]

■ 2. The tables published under the authority of § 64.6 are amended as follows:

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map date	Date certain Federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Region III				
Pennsylvania:				
Carroll, Township of, York County	422216	September 16, 1974, Emerg; March 2, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	Dec. 16, 2015 ...	Dec. 16, 2015.
Chanceford, Township of, York County	422217	January 13, 1976, Emerg; October 15, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Codorus, Township of, York County	421142	March 26, 1974, Emerg; July 5, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Conewago, Township of, York County ..	420918	July 5, 1973, Emerg; March 18, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Cross Roads, Borough of, York County	422209	July 12, 1976, Emerg; June 1, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Delta, Borough of, York County	422211	January 20, 1976, Emerg; September 1, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Dillsburg, Borough of, York County	420919	September 16, 1975, Emerg; September 28, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Dover, Borough of, York County	422569	December 8, 1975, Emerg; December 19, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Dover, Township of, York County	420920	March 9, 1973, Emerg; March 2, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
East Hopewell, Township of, York County.	422218	April 16, 1981, Emerg; April 16, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
East Manchester, Township of, York County.	420921	June 6, 1973, Emerg; November 19, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map date	Date certain Federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Fairview, Township of, York County	420923	September 8, 1972, Emerg; February 15, 1978, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Fawn, Township of, York County	422219	March 19, 1976, Emerg; April 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Felton, Borough of, York County	420922	December 17, 1973, Emerg; April 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Franklin, Township of, York County	422220	July 31, 1975, Emerg; January 19, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Glen Rock, Borough of, York County	420924	March 16, 1973, Emerg; July 16, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Goldsboro, Borough of, York County	420925	June 6, 1973, Emerg; February 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Hallam, Borough of, York County	420926	August 7, 1973, Emerg; February 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Hanover, Borough of, York County	422212	July 2, 1974, Emerg; January 6, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Heidelberg, Township of, York County	422221	February 18, 1976, Emerg; September 30, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Hellam, Township of, York County	420927	June 27, 1973, Emerg; March 18, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Hopewell, Township of, York County	422222	April 21, 1975, Emerg; September 16, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Jackson, Township of, York County	422223	March 10, 1976, Emerg; September 30, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Jacobus, Borough of, York County	420928	August 13, 1975, Emerg; June 30, 1976, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Lewisberry, Borough of, York County ...	420929	January 27, 1976, Emerg; November 17, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Lower Chanceford, Township of, York County.	420930	June 6, 1973, Emerg; February 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Lower Windsor, Township of, York County.	421187	August 29, 1975, Emerg; March 2, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Manchester, Borough of, York County ..	422747	N/A, Emerg; September 25, 2010, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Manchester, Township of, York County	420931	January 26, 1973, Emerg; December 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Manheim, Township of, York County	422224	April 21, 1975, Emerg; April 4, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Monaghan, Township of, York County ..	422225	June 10, 1975, Emerg; August 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Mount Wolf, Borough of, York County ..	421021	August 20, 1973, Emerg; May 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
New Salem, Borough of, York County ..	422743	N/A, Emerg; September 25, 2009, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Newberry, Township of, York County ...	422226	July 19, 1974, Emerg; July 2, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
North Codorus, Township of, York County.	422227	August 6, 1975, Emerg; October 15, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
North Hopewell, Township of, York County.	422228	September 25, 1975, Emerg; April 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
North York, Borough of, York County ...	420933	March 16, 1973, Emerg; May 2, 1977, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Paradise, Township of, York County	420934	June 6, 1973, Emerg; September 2, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Peach Bottom, Township of, York County.	422229	January 16, 1975, Emerg; September 30, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Penn, Township of, York County	421025	January 16, 1974, Emerg; October 15, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Railroad, Borough of, York County	420935	May 1, 1975, Emerg; September 28, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Seven Valleys, Borough of, York County.	420936	December 13, 1974, Emerg; September 28, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Shrewsbury, Township of, York County	422230	April 1, 1976, Emerg; September 16, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Spring Garden, Township of, York County.	420937	August 27, 1973, Emerg; June 15, 1977, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Spring Grove, Borough of, York County	420938	April 17, 1975, Emerg; August 15, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map date	Date certain Federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Springettsbury, Township of, York County.	421031	November 2, 1973, Emerg; December 15, 1977, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Springfield, Township of, York County ..	422231	November 13, 1975, Emerg; April 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Warrington, Township of, York County	422232	May 31, 1979, Emerg; March 16, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Washington, Township of, York County	421150	April 4, 1974, Emerg; March 2, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Wellsville, Borough of, York County	420940	July 31, 1979, Emerg; December 31, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
West Manchester, Township of, York County.	422233	August 22, 1974, Emerg; June 15, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
West Manheim, Township of, York County.	422234	March 9, 1976, Emerg; March 16, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Windsor, Borough of, York County	420942	May 27, 1975, Emerg; November 3, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Windsor, Township of, York County	422235	September 6, 1974, Emerg; June 1, 1983, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Wrightsville, Borough of, York County ..	420943	June 6, 1973, Emerg; December 18, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Yoe, Borough of, York County	420944	July 29, 1975, Emerg; December 1, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
York, City of, York County	420945	October 6, 1972, Emerg; June 15, 1977, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
York, Township of, York County	421032	August 1, 1973, Emerg; May 17, 1989, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
York Haven, Borough of, York County ..	420946	April 13, 1978, Emerg; December 18, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Virginia:				
James City County, Unincorporated Areas.	510201	October 20, 1975, Emerg; February 6, 1991, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Williamsburg, City of, Independent City	510294	October 29, 1975, Emerg; November 20, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Region V				
Indiana:				
Mishawaka, City of, Saint Joseph County.	180227	February 24, 1975, Emerg; August 17, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Osceola, Town of, Saint Joseph County	180229	N/A, Emerg; December 14, 1992, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Saint Joseph County, Unincorporated Areas.	180224	October 22, 1971, Emerg; August 15, 1978, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Minnesota:				
Andover, City of, Anoka County	270689	June 23, 1976, Emerg; September 30, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Anoka, City of, Anoka County	275227	February 11, 1972, Emerg; November 30, 1973, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Anoka County, Unincorporated Areas ...	270005	March 19, 1974, Emerg; January 16, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Blaine, City of, Anoka and Ramsey Counties.	270007	June 11, 1974, Emerg; November 15, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Centerville, City of, Anoka County	270008	March 6, 1975, Emerg; December 4, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Circle Pines, City of, Anoka County	270009	April 15, 1974, Emerg; September 15, 1978, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Columbia Heights, City of, Anoka County.	270010	May 28, 1974, Emerg; September 29, 1978, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Columbus, City of, Anoka County	270144	N/A, Emerg; February 6, 2009, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Coon Rapids, City of, Anoka County	270011	October 20, 1972, Emerg; March 15, 1977, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
East Bethel, City of, Anoka County	270012	August 16, 1974, Emerg; May 15, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Fridley, City of, Anoka County	270013	January 21, 1974, Emerg; March 2, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Ham Lake, City of, Anoka County	270674	October 24, 1975, Emerg; July 16, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Lino Lakes, City of, Anoka County	270015	April 30, 1976, Emerg; May 17, 1982, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.

State and location	Community No.	Effective date authorization/cancellation of sale of flood insurance in community	Current effective map date	Date certain Federal assistance no longer available in SFHAs
Nowthen, City of, Anoka County	270908	N/A, Emerg; April 26, 2012, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Oak Grove, City of, Anoka County	270031	N/A, Emerg; September 5, 2008, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Ramsey, City of, Anoka County	270681	July 8, 1975, Emerg; November 1, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Spring Lake Park, City of, Anoka and Ramsey Counties.	270016	August 12, 1975, Emerg; August 24, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Saint Francis, City of, Anoka County	270017	September 29, 1975, Emerg; March 2, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Wisconsin:				
Avoca, Village of, Iowa County	550173	June 26, 1974, Emerg; September 19, 1984, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Blanchardville, Village of, Iowa and Lafayette Counties.	550227	June 16, 1975, Emerg; August 15, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Cobb, Village of, Iowa County	550176	August 25, 1975, Emerg; January 5, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Dodgeville, City of, Iowa County	550177	June 23, 1975, Emerg; July 2, 1987, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Hollandale, Village of, Iowa County	550178	September 16, 1975, Emerg; September 1, 1986, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Iowa County, Unincorporated Areas	550522	January 30, 1974, Emerg; January 17, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Linden, Village of, Iowa County	550179	April 15, 1975, Emerg; January 5, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Mineral Point, City of, Iowa County	550180	July 25, 1975, Emerg; July 16, 1987, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Muscoda, Village of, Iowa and Grant Counties.	550153	October 25, 1974, Emerg; September 8, 1999, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Ridgeway, Village of, Iowa County	550181	October 24, 1975, Emerg; January 5, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Region X				
Alaska:				
Cordova, City of, Valdez-Cordova Census Area.	020037	July 31, 1975, Emerg; April 2, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Washington:				
Castle Rock, City of, Cowlitz County	530277	May 8, 1975, Emerg; June 18, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Cowlitz County, Unincorporated Areas	530032	June 18, 1971, Emerg; August 1, 1980, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Kalama, City of, Cowlitz County	530289	July 7, 1980, Emerg; June 1, 1981, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Kelso, City of, Cowlitz County	530033	July 28, 1972, Emerg; December 4, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Longview, City of, Cowlitz County	530034	May 26, 1972, Emerg; December 18, 1979, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.
Woodland, City of, Clark and Cowlitz Counties.	530035	June 23, 1972, Emerg; February 1, 1978, Reg; December 16, 2015, Susp.	.....do	Do.

* do = Ditto.
Code for reading third column: Emerg.—Emergency; Reg.—Regular; Susp—Suspension.

Dated: November 3, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2015–30043 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 96

[GN Docket No. 12–354; FCC 15–47]

Shared Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; announcement of effective date.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) announces that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has approved, for a period of three years, the information collection requirements associated with the Commission's *Report and Order*, GN Docket No. 12–354, FCC 15–47. This document is consistent with the *Report and Order*, which stated that the Commission would publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing OMB approval and the effective date of the requirements.

DATES: 47 CFR 96.17(d); 96.21(a)(3); 96.23(b); 96.33(b); 96.35(e); 96.39(a), (c)–(g); 96.41(d)(1); 96.43(b); 96.45(b); 96.45(d), 96.51; 96.57(a)–(c); 96.59(a); 96.61; 96.63; and 96.67(b)–(c), published at 80 FR 36163, June 23, 2015, are effective on December 16, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cathy Williams, *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov*, (202) 418–2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document announces that, on November 9, 2015, OMB approved the revised information collection requirements contained in the Commission's *Report and Order*, FCC 15–47, published at 80 FR 36163, June 23, 2015. The OMB Control Number is 3060–1211. The Commission publishes this document as an announcement of the effective date of the requirements. If you have any comments on the burden estimates listed below, or how the Commission can improve the collections and reduce any burdens caused thereby, please contact Cathy Williams, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–C823, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554. Please include the OMB Control Number, 3060–1211 in your correspondence. The Commission will also accept your comments via email at *PRA@fcc.gov*.

To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

Synopsis

As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507), the FCC is notifying the public that it received OMB approval on November 9, 2015, for the revised information collection requirements contained in the Commission's rules at 47 CFR 96.17; 96.21; 96.23; 96.33; 96.35; 96.39; 96.41; 96.43; 96.45; 96.51; 96.57; 96.59; 96.61; 96.63; and 96.67. Under 5 CFR part 1320, an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a current, valid OMB Control Number.

No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act that does not display a current, valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Numbers is 3060–1211.

The foregoing notice is required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13, October 1, 1995, and 44 U.S.C. 3507.

The total annual reporting burdens and costs for the respondents are as follows:

OMB Control Number: 3060–1211.

OMB Approval Date: November 9, 2015.

OMB Expiration Date: November 30, 2018.

Title: Sections 96.17; 96.21; 96.23; 96.33; 96.35; 96.39; 96.41; 96.43; 96.45; 96.51; 96.57; 96.59; 96.61; 96.63; and 96.67, Commercial Operations in the 3550–3650 MHz Band.

Form Number: Not applicable.

Type of Review: New information collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, Not for profit institutions and State, Local or Tribal Governments.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 110,782 respondents; 136,432 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 0–.5 hours.

Frequency of Response: One-time and on occasion reporting requirements; other reporting requirements—as needed basis for the equipment safety certifications, and consistently (likely daily) responses automated via the device.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i), 154(j), 155(c), 302(a), 303, 304, 307(e), and 316.

Total Annual Burden: 37,977 hours.

Annual Cost Burden: $7,318,100.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: There is no need for confidentiality with this collection of information. The information to be collected will be made available for public inspection. Applicants may request materials or information submitted to the Commission be given confidential treatment under 47 CFR 0.459 of the Commission's rules.

Needs and Uses: The Federal Communications Commission (Commission) received approval for new OMB Control No. 3060–1211 from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The purpose of this proposal was to obtain OMB approval of rules applicable to 3550–3700 MHz (3.5 GHz) users and licensees and applicants for database administrators, as adopted by the Commission in a Report and Order (*Report and Order*) on April 17, 2015 (WT Docket No. 12–354; FCC 15–47). By the *Report and Order*, the Commission creates additional capacity for wireless broadband by adopting a new approach to spectrum management to facilitate spectrum sharing between commercial and federal users and among multiple tiers of commercial users. The order creates a Spectrum Access System (SAS), an online database that will manage and coordinate frequency use in the band through registration and other technical information. The SAS will use the information to assign frequencies, manage interference, and authorize spectrum use. The Commission will use the information to authorize the SAS Administrator(s) and ESC operator(s).

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29921 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 1823 and 1852

RIN 2700–AE16

NASA FAR Supplement: Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NASA is issuing a final rule to amend the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) to revise a clause related to safety and health measures and mishaps reporting, reduce burden on contractors, and to provide guidance on specific safety and health measures that the contractor must take when working on a Federal facility, and the remedies the Government may take for failure to maintain an effective safety and health program. The revision is part of NASA's retrospective plan under Executive Order (EO) 13563 completed in August 2011.

DATES: Effective: December 28, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marilyn E. Chambers, NASA, Office of Procurement, telephone 202.358.5154.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

NASA published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** at 80 FR 48284 on August 12, 2015, to revise both the prescription for and text of the clause at 1852.223–70, which was retitled from ''Safety and Health'' to ''Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting'' to emphasize the purpose of the clause—requiring contractors working at Federal facilities to have measures in place to protect the safety of their workers, other individuals

working at the facility, and the public. To reduce the burden on contractors, the clause prescription was revised to require it in solicitations and contracts above the simplified action threshold and to require it only for contracts involving performance at a Federal facility. The applicability to subcontracts was also revised to apply to subcontracts above the simplified acquisition threshold where performance is at a Federal facility.

Paragraph (b) of the clause lists safety and occupational health measures, recognized by the Office of Safety and Health Administration and industry, as standards for both identifying workplace hazards and for developing a plan for prevention and control of those hazards. These measures include maintaining an effective worksite safety and health program with organized and systematic methods to—

1. Comply with Federal, State, and local safety and occupational health laws and with the safety and occupational health requirements of the contract;

2. Describe and assign the responsibilities of managers, supervisors, and employees;

3. Inspect regularly for and identify, evaluate, prevent, and control hazards;

4. Orient and train employees to eliminate or avoid hazards; and

5. Periodically review the program's effectiveness. Additionally, paragraph (b) added text concerning authorized Government representatives' rights to have access to and to examine the work site and related records under the contract in order to determine the adequacy of the Contractor's safety and occupational health measures. Paragraph (d) refers to NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8621.1, Mishap and Close Call Reporting, Investigating, and Recordkeeping, which contains a listing and description of the types of mishaps (types A, B, C, or D) or close calls the contractor must report to the contracting officer. Paragraph (e) requires contractors to cooperate with any Government-authorized investigation by providing access to their employees and relevant information in their possession regarding the mishap or close call. Paragraph (f) states the Contracting Officer may notify the Contractor of any noncompliance with the health and safety requirements of the contract and require corrective action. If the contractor fails or refuses to take prompt corrective action, the Contracting Officer may—

(1) Invoke the stop-work order clause;

(2) Require the Contractor to remove and replace Contractor or subcontractor personnel who fail to comply with or violate applicable requirements;

(3) Record the Contractor's failure to comply in the appropriate databases of past performance; and

(4) Consider the Contractor's failure to comply in any responsibility determination or evaluation of past performance.

Paragraph (g) requires the prime contractor to include the clause in subcontracts over the simplified acquisition threshold when the work will be conducted completely or partly on federally-controlled facilities.

II. Discussion and Analysis

No public comments were received in response to the proposed rule. However, during internal deliberations a couple of minor changes were made. Section 1801.106(1) was revised to add new OMB control number 2700–1060, which was assigned for reporting requirements at NFS 1852.223–70. Additionally, paragraph (f)(1) of 1852.223–70 was revised to change the phrase ''the Contracting Officer shall'' to ''the Contracting Officer will'' and to remove the term ''any necessary.'' Paragraph (f)(2) was revised to remove ''in addition to other remedies available to the Government'' and add ''the contracting officer may'' with a list of four actions, previously listed in the proposed rule, enumerated and rephrased to clearly list the action to be taken: ''invoke,'' ''require,'' ''record,'' and ''consider.'' No other revisions were made to the proposed rule.

III. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Orders (E.O.s) 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health, and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under section 6(b) of E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

IV. Regulatory Flexibility Act

NASA has prepared a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (FRFA) consistent with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et se.,* and is summarized as follows:

This rule revises NFS clause 1852.223–70 to reduce burden on contractors by (1) changing the applicability of the clause to only contracts over the simplified acquisition threshold and to only those performed on Federal facilities, and (2) by removing reporting requirements relating to mishap investigations and health and safety plans. The clause also provides guidance on specific safety and health measures the contractor must take when working on a Federal facility, and the remedies the Government may take for failure to maintain an effective safety and health program.

No comments were received on the initial regulatory flexibility analysis from small business concerns or other interested parties.

This rule will apply to small entities performing NASA contracts with an estimated value over the simplified acquisition threshold on Federal Facilities. The System for Award Management (SAM) data shows approximately 154 firms received contracts to which this clause will apply. Of those 154 firms, 84 were small businesses.

Two reporting requirements are contained in the rule. One is to notify the contracting officer of mishaps (types A, B, C, or D) or close calls as described in NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8621.1, Mishap and Close Call Reporting, Investigating, and Recordkeeping. The other is to provide a quarterly report on the number of mishaps, specifying lost time frequency rate, number of lost time injuries, exposure, and accident/incident dollar losses. This information is collected so that NASA can analyze mishap data to look for mishap trends and determine ways to improve the safety of its workforce and high-value assets and reduce the risk to its missions. This mishap information would be initially collected by a company manager or supervisor. It may be reviewed by the firm's official responsible for safety, usually an occupational health and safety. Lost time frequency rate, number of lost time injuries, exposure, and accident/incident dollar losses reports would be prepared by a safety official.

The revisions to NFS clause 1852.223–70 are designed to reduce burden on contractors by reducing the applicability of the clause and reducing the paperwork burden. The information requested in the clause is essential to the NASA health and safety program. Further and differing compliance alternatives or reporting requirements or timetables for small entities are not feasible. Having an effective safety program is crucial to all businesses as it

reduces injuries, lost time, property damage and creates a more safe and effective workplace for employees.

V. Paperwork Reduction Act

The rule contains information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35). OMB has cleared this information collection requirement under OMB Control Number 2700–0160, titled: Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR 1801, 1823, and 1852

Government procurement.

Manuel Quinones,

NASA FAR Supplement Manager.

Accordingly, 48 CFR parts 1801, 1823 and 1852 are amended as follows:

PART 1801—FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATIONS SYSTEM

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1801 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 51 U.S.C. 20113(a) and 48 CFR chapter 1.

■ 2. Section 1801.106 is revised to read as follows:

801.106 OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

(1) *NFS requirements.* The following OMB control numbers apply:

NFS Segment	OMB Control No.
1823	2700–0089
1852.223–70	2700–0160
1827	2700–0052
1843	2700–0054
NF 533	2700–0003
NF 1018	2700–0017

PART 1823—ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY, RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, AND DRUG–FREE WORKPLACE

■ 3. The authority citation for part 1823 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 51 U.S.C. 20113(a) and 48 CFR chapter 1.

■ 4. Amend section 1823.7001 by revising paragraphs (a) and (b) to read as follows:

1823.7001 NASA solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

(a) Insert the clause at 1852.223–70, Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting, in solicitations and contracts above the simplified acquisition threshold when the work will be conducted completely or partly on federally-controlled facilities.

(b) The clause prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section may be excluded with the approval of the installation official(s) responsible for matters of safety and occupational health.

* * * * *

PART 1852—SOLICITATION PROVISIONS AND CONTRACT CLAUSES

■ 5. The authority citation for part 1852 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 51 U.S.C. 20113(a) and 48 CFR chapter 1.

1852.2 [Amended]

■ 6. Amend subpart 1852.2 by removing ''1852.223–70 Safety and health'' and adding ''1852.223–70 Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting'' in its place.

■ 7. Revise section 1852.223–70 to read as follows:

1852.223–70 Safety and Health Measures and Mishap Reporting.

As prescribed in 1823.7001(a), insert the following clause:

SAFETY AND HEALTH MEASURES AND MISHAP REPORTING (DEC 2015)

(a) Safety is the freedom from those conditions that can cause death, injury, occupational illness, damage to or loss of equipment or property, or damage to the environment. NASA's safety priority is to protect: (1) The public, (2) astronauts and pilots, (3) the NASA workforce (including contractor employees working on NASA contracts), and (4) high-value equipment and property.

(b) The Contractor shall take all reasonable safety and occupational health measures in performing this contract. The Contractor shall maintain an effective worksite safety and health program with organized and systematic methods to—

(1) Comply with Federal, State, and local safety and occupational health laws and with the safety and occupational health requirements of this contract;

(2) Describe and assign the responsibilities of managers, supervisors, and employees;

(3) Inspect regularly for and identify, evaluate, prevent, and control hazards;

(4) Orient and train employees to eliminate or avoid hazards; and

(5) Periodically review the program's effectiveness. Authorized Government representatives shall have access to and the right to examine the work site and related records under this Contract in order to determine the adequacy of the Contractor's safety and occupational health measures.

(c) The Contractor shall take, or cause to be taken, any other safety, and occupational health-measures the Contracting Officer may reasonably direct. To the extent that the Contractor may be entitled to an equitable adjustment for those measures under the terms and conditions of this contract, the equitable adjustment shall be determined pursuant to the procedures of the changes clause of this contract; provided, that no adjustment shall be made under this Safety and Health clause for any change for which an equitable adjustment is expressly provided under any other clause of the contract.

(d) The Contractor shall immediately notify the Contracting Officer or a designee any Type A, B, C, or D Mishap, or close calls as defined in NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8621.1, Mishap and Close Call Reporting, Investigating, and Recordkeeping. In addition, service contractors (excluding construction contracts) shall provide quarterly reports specifying lost-time frequency rate, number of lost-time injuries, exposure, and accident/incident dollar losses as specified in the contract Schedule.

(e) The Contractor shall cooperate with any Government-authorized investigation of Type A, B, C, or D Mishaps, or Close Calls reported pursuant to paragraph (d) of this clause by providing access to employees; and relevant information in the possession of the Contractor regarding the mishap or close call.

(f)(1) The Contracting Officer may notify the Contractor of any noncompliance with this clause and specify corrective actions to be taken. When the Contracting Officer becomes aware of noncompliance that may pose a serious or imminent danger to safety and health of the public, astronauts and pilots, the NASA workforce (including contractor employees working on NASA contracts), or high value mission critical equipment or property, the Contracting Officer will notify the Contractor orally, with written confirmation. The Contractor shall promptly take corrective action.

(2) If the Contractor fails or refuses to institute prompt corrective action in accordance with subparagraph (f)(1) of this clause, the Contracting Officer may—

(i) Invoke the stop-work order clause in this contract;

(ii) Require the Contractor to remove and replace Contractor or subcontractor personnel who fail to comply with or violate applicable requirements of this clause;

(iii) Record the Contractor's failure to comply in the appropriate databases of past performance; and

(iv) Consider the Contractor's failure to comply in any responsibility determination or evaluation of past performance.

(g) The Contractor shall insert the substance of this clause, including this paragraph (g) in all subcontracts above the simplified acquisition threshold when the work will be conducted completely or partly on federally-controlled facilities.

(End of clause)

[FR Doc. 2015–29947 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 1845 and 1852

RIN 2700–AE23

NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: NASA Capitalization Threshold (NFS Case 2015–N004)

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NASA has adopted as final, without change, an interim rule amending the NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (NFS) to increase the NASA capitalization threshold from $100,000 to $500,000.

DATES: *Effective:* November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew O'Rourke, telephone 202–358–4560.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

NASA published an interim rule in the **Federal Register** at 80 FR 51957 on August 27, 2015, to amend the NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (NFS) to increase the NASA capitalization threshold from $100,000 to $500,000.

II. Discussion and Analysis

There were no public comments submitted in response to the interim rule. The interim rule has been converted to a final rule, without change.

III. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Executive Orders (E.O.s) 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under section 6(b) of E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

IV. Regulatory Flexibility Act

NASA does not expect this final rule to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et se.* A final regulatory flexibility analysis has been performed and is summarized as follows:

The increase in the NASA capitalization threshold is expected to benefit NASA contractors by reducing the administrative burden associated with financial reporting of NASA property in the custody of contractors. The legal basis for this rule is 51 U.S.C. 20113(a).

The requirements under this rule will apply to any contract award (including contracts for supplies, services, construction, and major systems) that requires the use of Government property by contractors. According to NASA Property Records in FY 2014 there were 568 contracts that required reporting of Government property by NASA contractors. Of the 568 contracts, it is estimated that approximately 20% or 114 contracts were small businesses.

The rule does not duplicate, overlap, or conflict with any other Federal rules. No alternatives were identified that would meet the objectives of the rule.

V. Paperwork Reduction Act

The rule contains information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35; however, these changes to the NFS do not impose additional information collection requirements to the paperwork burden previously approved under OMB Control Number 2700–0017, entitled NASA Property In the Custody of Contractors and OMB Control No. 9000–0075, entitled Government Property.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 1845 and 1852

Government procurement.

Manuel Quinones,

NASA FAR Supplement Manager.

■ Accordingly, the interim rule amending 48 CFR parts 1845 and 1852, which was published at 80 FR 51957, is adopted as final without change.

[FR Doc. 2015–29981 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 227
Wednesday, November 25, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

6 CFR Part 46

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7 CFR Part 1c

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

10 CFR Part 745

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

14 CFR Part 1230

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

15 CFR Part 27

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

20 CFR Part 431

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

22 CFR Part 225

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

28 CFR Part 46

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

29 CFR Part 21

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

32 CFR Part 219

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

34 CFR Part 97

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 16

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 26

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

45 CFR Part 46

RIN 0937–AA02

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

45 CFR Part 690

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

49 CFR Part 11

Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects

AGENCIES: Department of Homeland Security; Department of Agriculture; Department of Energy; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Department of Commerce; Social Security Administration; Agency for International Development; Department of Justice; Department of Labor; Department of Defense; Department of Education; Department of Veterans Affairs; Environmental Protection Agency; Department of Health and Human Services; National Science Foundation; and Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services and the other Federal Departments and Agencies listed in this document are extending the comment period on the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects notice of proposed rulemaking. The NPRM requests comment on proposed revisions to modernize, strengthen, and make more effective the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects that was promulgated as a Common Rule in 1991. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 2015.

DATES: The comment period for the NPRM published on September 8, 2015 (80 FR 53933), is extended by 30 days and thus will end on January 6, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket ID number HHS–OPHS–2015–0008, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Enter the above docket ID number in the ''Enter Keyword or ID'' field and click on ''Search.'' On the next Web page, click on ''Submit a Comment'' action and follow the instructions.
- *Mail/Hand delivery/Courier [For paper, disk, or CD–ROM submissions] to:* Jerry Menikoff, M.D., J.D., OHRP, 1101 Wootton Parkway, Suite 200, Rockville, MD 20852.

Comments received, including any personal information, will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Menikoff, M.D., J.D., Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Department of Health and Human Services, 1101 Wootton Parkway, Suite 200, Rockville, MD 20852; telephone: 240 453–6900 or 1–866–447–4777; EMAIL: *Jerry.Menikoff@hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Since the NPRM was published on September 8, 2015 (80 FR 53933), participating departments and agencies have received requests to extend the comment period to allow sufficient time for a full review of the NPRM. The departments and agencies listed in this document are committed to affording the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on the NPRM and welcome comments.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Sylvia Burwell,

Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

[FR Doc. 2015–30122 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–36–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

12 CFR Part 360

RIN 3064–AE38

Treatment of Financial Assets Transferred in Connection With a Securitization or Participation

AGENCY: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (''FDIC'').

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The FDIC is proposing a rule that would revise a provision of its Securitization Safe Harbor Rule, which relates to the treatment of financial assets transferred in connection with a securitization or participation, in order to clarify a requirement as to loss mitigation by servicers of residential mortgage loans.

DATES: Comments on the Proposed Rule must be received by January 25, 2016.

You may submit comments, identified by RIN number, by any of the following methods:

- *Agency Web site: http://www.FDIC.gov/regulations/laws/federal.* Follow instructions for submitting comments on the agency Web site.
- *Email: Comments@FDIC.gov.* Include RIN 3064–AE38 in the subject line of the message.
- *Mail:* Robert E. Feldman, Executive Secretary, Attention: Comments, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 550 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20429.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Guard station at the rear of the 550 17th Street Building (located on F Street) on business days between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All comments will be posted without change to *http://www.fdic.gov/regulations/laws/federal/,* including any personal information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George H. Williamson, Manager, Division of Resolutions and Receiverships, (571) 858–8199. Phillip E. Sloan, Counsel, Legal Division, (703) 562–6137.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

I. Background

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), in regulations codified at 12 CFR 360.6 (the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule), set forth criteria under which in its capacity as receiver or conservator of an insured depository institution the FDIC will not, in the exercise of its authority to repudiate contracts, recover or reclaim financial assets transferred in connection with securitization transactions. Asset transfers that, under the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule, are not subject to recovery or reclamation through the exercise of the FDIC's repudiation authority include those that pertain to certain grandfathered transactions, such as, for example, asset transfers made prior to December 31, 2010 that satisfied the conditions (except for the legal isolation condition addressed by the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule) for sale accounting treatment under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) in effect for reporting periods prior to November 15, 2009 and that pertain to a securitization transaction that satisfied certain other requirements. In addition, the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule provides that asset transfers that are not grandfathered, but that satisfy the conditions (except for the legal isolation condition addressed by the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule) for sale accounting treatment under GAAP in effect for reporting periods after November 15, 2009 and that pertain to a securitization transaction that satisfies all other conditions of the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule (such asset transfers, together with grandfathered asset transfers, are referred to collectively as Safe Harbor Transfers) will not be subject to FDIC recovery or reclamation actions through the exercise of the FDIC's repudiation authority. For any securitization transaction in respect of which transfers of financial assets do not qualify as Safe Harbor Transfers but which transaction satisfies all of its other requirements, the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule provides that, in the event the FDIC as receiver or conservator remains in monetary default for a specified period under a securitization due to its failure to pay or apply collections or repudiates the securitization asset transfer agreement and does not pay damages within a specified period, certain remedies can be exercised on an expedited basis.

Paragraph (b)(3)(ii) of the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule sets forth conditions relating to the servicing of residential mortgage loans. This paragraph includes a condition that the securitization documents must require that the servicer commence action to mitigate losses no later than ninety days after an asset first becomes delinquent unless all delinquencies on such asset have been cured.

In January, 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) adopted mortgage loan servicing requirements that became effective on January 10, 2014. One of the requirements, set forth in Subpart C to Regulation X, at 12 CFR 1024.41, in general prohibits a servicer from commencing a foreclosure unless the borrower's mortgage loan obligation is more than 120 days delinquent. This section of Regulation X also provides additional rules that, among other things, require a lender to further delay foreclosure if the borrower submits a loss mitigation application before the lender has commenced the foreclosure process and requires a lender to delay a foreclosure for which it has commenced the foreclosure process if a borrower has submitted a complete loss mitigation application more than 37 days before a foreclosure sale.[1]

II. Discussion

While the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule does not define what constitutes action to mitigate losses, the preamble to the notice of proposed rulemaking that preceded issuance of the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule[2] stated, ''In this connection, it is important to note that action to mitigate losses may include contact with the borrower or other steps designed to return the asset to regular payments, but does not require initiation of foreclosure or other formal enforcement proceedings.''[3] Accordingly, it should be unlikely that the 90-day loss mitigation requirement of the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule would conflict with the foreclosure commencement delays mandated by the CFPB under Regulation X. However, as there may be circumstances where commencement of foreclosure is the only available and reasonable loss mitigation action, the FDIC is proposing

[1] *See* 12 CFR 1024.41(f) and (g).

[2] 77 FR 27471 (May 17, 2010).

[3] 77 FR 27479.

to amend the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule to make clear that the Rule does not require documents governing a securitization transaction to require any action prohibited by Regulation X.

III. Policy Objective

The objective of the Proposed Rule is to facilitate regulatory compliance and ease regulatory burden by ensuring that regulations are clear and consistent with other regulatory initiatives. In particular, the objective of the Proposed Rule is to harmonize the residential loan servicing condition of the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule with the CFPB's loan servicing requirements.

IV. Request for Comment

The FDIC invites comment from all members of the public on the Proposed Rule. Comments are specifically requested on whether additional changes to the servicing provisions included in the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule need to be modified so as not to conflict with other applicable laws or regulations. The FDIC will carefully consider all comments that relate to the Proposed Rule.

V. Administrative Law Matters

A. Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) (PRA) the FDIC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The Proposed Rule would not revise the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule information collection 3064–0177 or create any new information collection pursuant to the PRA. Consequently, no submission will be made to the Office of Management and Budget for review. The FDIC requests comment on its conclusion that this NPR does not revise the Securitization Safe Harbor Rule information collection, 3064–0177.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, requires an agency to provide an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis with a proposed rule, unless the agency certifies that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603–605. The FDIC hereby certifies that the Proposed Rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, as that term applies to insured depository institutions.

C. Plain Language

Section 722 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Pub. L. 106–102, 113 Stat.1338, 1471) requires the Federal banking agencies to use plain language in all proposed and final rules published after January 1, 2000. The FDIC has sought to present the Proposed Rule in a simple and straightforward manner.

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 360

Banks, Banking, Bank deposit insurance, Holding companies, National banks, Participations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Savings associations, Securitizations.

For the reasons stated above, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation proposes to amend 12 CFR part 360 as follows:

PART 360—RESOLUTION AND RECEIVERSHIP RULES

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 360 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 1821(d)(1), 1821(d)(10)(C), 1821(d)(11), 1821(e)(1), 1821(e)(8)(D)(i), 1823(c)(4), 1823(e)(2); Sec. 401(h), Pub. L. 101–73, 103 Stat. 357.

■ 2. Revise § 360.6(b)(3)(ii)(A) to read as follows:

§ 360.6 Treatment of financial assets transferred in connection with a securitization or participation.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) * * *

(A) Servicing and other agreements must provide servicers with authority, subject to contractual oversight by any master servicer or oversight advisor, if any, to mitigate losses on financial assets consistent with maximizing the net present value of the financial asset. Servicers shall have the authority to modify assets to address reasonably foreseeable default, and to take other action to maximize the value and minimize losses on the securitized financial assets. The documents shall require that the servicers apply industry best practices for asset management and servicing. The documents shall require the servicer to act for the benefit of all investors, and not for the benefit of any particular class of investors, that the servicer maintain records of its actions to permit full review by the trustee or other representative of the investors and that the servicer must commence action to mitigate losses no later than ninety (90) days after an asset first becomes delinquent unless all delinquencies have been cured, *provided* that this requirement shall not be deemed to require that the documents include any provision concerning loss mitigation that requires any action that may conflict with the requirements of Regulation X (12 CFR part 1024), as Regulation X may by amended or modified from time to time.

* * * * *

Dated at Washington, DC, this 22nd day of October, 2015.

By order of the Board of Directors.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29821 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2006–25970; Directorate Identifier 99–NE–12–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: We propose to supersede airworthiness directive (AD) 2006–23–17, which applies to certain Turbomeca S.A. Turmo IV A and IV C turboshaft engines. AD 2006–23–17 currently requires repetitive inspections of the centrifugal compressor intake wheel (inducer) blades for cracks and corrosion, replacement of parts that fail inspection, and replacement of the TU 197 standard centrifugal compressor. This proposed AD would require the same inspections but at revised intervals, add the replacement of the TU 215 standard centrifugal compressor, and require replacement of parts that fail inspection. We are proposing this AD to prevent failure of the centrifugal compressor inducer, which could lead to an uncontained blade release, damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane.

DATES: We must receive comments on this proposed AD by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

• *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

• *Hand Delivery:* Deliver to Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

For service information identified in this proposed AD, contact Turbomeca S.A., 40220 Tarnos, France; phone: 33 (0)5 59 74 40 00; fax: 33 (0)5 59 74 45 15. You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

Examining the AD Docket

You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching for and locating Docket No. FAA–2006–25970; or in person at the Docket Management Facility between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this proposed AD, the regulatory evaluation, any comments received and other information. The street address for the Docket Office (phone: 800–647–5527) is in the **ADDRESSES** section. Comments will be available in the AD docket shortly after receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wego Wang, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: 781–238–7134; fax: 781–238–7199; email: *wego.wang@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

We invite you to send any written relevant data, views, or arguments about this NPRM. Send your comments to an address listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2006–25970; Directorate Identifier 99–NE–12–AD'' at the beginning of your comments. We specifically invite comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this NPRM. We will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this NPRM because of those comments.

We will post all comments we receive, without change, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information you provide. We will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact we receive about this NPRM.

Discussion

On November 7, 2006, we issued AD 2006–23–17, Amendment 39–14829 (71 FR 66664, November 16, 2006), (''AD 2006–23–17''), for all Turbomeca S.A. Turmo IV A and IV C turboshaft engines. AD 2006–23–17 resulted from a Turbomeca S.A. review of the engine service experience and their determination that more frequent borescope inspections (BSIs) are required on engines not modified to the TU 191, TU 197, or TU 224 standard. AD 2006–23–17 requires repetitive BSI and eddy current inspections (ECIs) or ultrasonic inspections (UIs) of centrifugal compressor intake wheel (inducer) blades and replacement of parts that fail inspection and replacement of the TU 197 standard centrifugal compressor. We issued AD 2006–23–17 to prevent centrifugal compressor intake wheel (inducer) blade cracks, which can result in engine in-flight power loss, engine shutdown, or forced landing.

Actions Since AD 2006–23–17 Was Issued

Since we issued AD 2006–23–17, a centrifugal compressor inducer blade loss occurred on an engine modified to TU 224 standard. This blade loss was due to cracks caused by impacts combined with significant erosion of the part not related to the TU 224 modification. Turbomeca S.A. has revised the inspection intervals for the centrifugal compressor (inducer) blades, and requires replacement of parts that fail inspection, and replacement of the TU 197 and TU 215 standard centrifugal compressors. This proposed AD would require repetitive BSIs, and ECIs or UIs of the centrifugal compressor inducers at revised intervals, replacement of parts that fail inspection, and replacement of the TU 197 and TU 215 standard centrifugal compressors.

Related Service Information Under 1 CFR Part 51

We reviewed Turbomeca S.A. Alert Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) No. A249–72–0100 Version H, dated May 21, 2015. The MSB describes procedures for the inspection and replacement of the centrifugal compressor inducer blades. This service information is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section of this NPRM.

FAA's Determination

We are proposing this NPRM because we evaluated all the relevant information and determined the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop in other products of the same type design.

Proposed AD Requirements

This NPRM would require repetitive BSIs, and ECIs or UIs based on the in-service requirements established for the various centrifugal compressor inducer standards, replacement of parts that fail inspection, and replacement of the TU 197 and TU 215 standard centrifugal compressors.

Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this proposed AD affects 36 engines installed on airplanes of U.S. registry. We estimate that two of these engines will require compressor replacement. We also estimate that about 40 hours per engine are required to comply with this proposed AD. The average labor rate is $85 per hour. Parts cost about $40,000 per engine. Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of this proposed AD on U.S. operators to be $202,400.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, Section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII, Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

We are issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701, ''General requirements.'' Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

We have determined that this proposed AD would not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This proposed AD would not have 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.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that the proposed regulation:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Is not a ''significant rule'' under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979),

(3) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska to the extent that it justifies making a regulatory distinction, and

(4) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA proposes to amend 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by removing airworthiness directive (AD) 2006–23–17, Amendment 39–14829 (71 FR 66664, November 16, 2006) (''2006–23–17''), and adding the following new AD:

Turbomeca S.A.: Docket No. FAA–2006–25970; Directorate Identifier 99–NE–12–AD.

(a) Comments Due Date

The FAA must receive comments on this AD action by January 25, 2016.

(b) Affected ADs

This AD replaces AD 2006–23–17.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to Turbomeca S.A. Turmo IV A and IV C turboshaft engines.

(d) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by a centrifugal compressor inducer blade loss. We are issuing this AD to prevent failure of the centrifugal compressor inducer, which could lead to an uncontained blade release, damage to the engine, and damage to the airplane.

(e) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(1) Remove the TU 197 and TU 215 standard centrifugal compressors and install the TU 224 standard centrifugal compressor, within 30 days after the effective date of this AD.

(2) Perform initial and repetitive ultrasonic inspections (UIs) or eddy current inspections (ECIs) of the centrifugal compressor (inducer). Use Accomplishment Instructions, paragraph 6.B.(1)(b) of Turbomeca S.A. Alert Mandatory Service Bulletin (MSB) No. A249 72 0100 Version H, dated May 21, 2015 to do the inspections. Use Appendix 1 of Turbomeca S.A. Alert MSB No. A249 72 0100 Version H, dated May 21, 2015 for the schedule of inspections.

(3) Perform initial and repetitive borescope inspections (BSIs) of the centrifugal compressor inducer. Use Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs 6.B.(1)(a) of Turbomeca S.A. Alert MSB No. A249 72 0100 Version H, dated May 21, 2015 to do the inspections. Use Appendix 1 of Turbomeca S.A. Alert MSB No. A249 72 0100 Version H, dated May 21, 2015 for the schedule of inspections.

(4) If, during any inspection required by paragraphs (e)(2) or (e)(3) of this AD, any crack, corrosion, or other damage is detected on the inducer, then before next flight, replace the centrifugal compressor.

(5) Accomplishment of a UI or ECI of the centrifugal compressor inducer, required by paragraph (e)(2) of this AD, is acceptable in lieu of a BSI required by paragraph (e)(3) of this AD for that engine.

(6) Replacement of a centrifugal compressor required by paragraph (e)(4) of this AD, does not constitute terminating action for the repetitive inspections required by paragraphs (e)(2) and (e)(3) of this AD.

(f) Credit for Previous Actions

You may take credit for the inspections and corrective actions required by paragraph (e)(2) and (e)(3) of this AD if you performed the inspections and corrective actions before the effective date of this AD, using Turbomeca S.A. Alert MSB No. A249 72 0100, Version G, or an earlier version.

(g) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

The Manager, Engine Certification Office, FAA, may approve AMOCs for this AD. Use the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19 to make your request. You may email your request to: *ANE-AD-AMOC@faa.gov.*

(h) Related Information

(1) For more information about this AD, contact Wego Wang, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803; phone: 781–238–7134; fax: 781–238–7199; email: *wego.wang@faa.gov.*

(2) For service information identified in this AD, contact Turbomeca S.A., 40220 Tarnos, France; phone: 33 (0)5 59 74 40 00; fax: 33 (0)5 59 74 45 15.

(3) You may view this service information at the FAA, Engine & Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 781–238–7125.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on November 18, 2015.

Colleen M. D'Alessandro,

Directorate Manager, Engine & Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–29886 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 35

[Docket No. RM16–1–000]

Reactive Power Requirements for Non-Synchronous Generation

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is proposing to eliminate the exemptions for wind generators from the requirement to provide reactive power. As a result, all newly interconnecting generators, including both synchronous and non-synchronous generators, would be required to provide reactive power. To implement this requirement, the Commission proposes to revise the *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA), Appendix G to the *pro forma* LGIA, and the *pro forma* Small Generator Interconnection Agreement (SGIA) in accordance with the Commission's regulations, which require every public utility with a non-discriminatory open access transmission tariff on file to also have on file the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA ''required by Commission rulemaking proceedings promulgating and amending such interconnection procedures and agreements.'' In this Proposal to Revise Standard Generator Interconnection Agreements (Proposal), the Commission proposes to modify both agreements to eliminate the exemptions for wind generators from the requirement to provide reactive power. As a result, all newly interconnecting generators (*i.e.,* new generators seeking to interconnect to the transmission system and all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests), both synchronous and non-synchronous, would be required to provide reactive power as a condition of interconnection as of the effective date of the final revision.

DATES: Comments are due January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments, identified by docket number, may be filed in the following ways:

• *Electronic Filing through http://www.ferc.gov.* Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format.

• *Mail/Hand Delivery*: Those unable to file electronically may mail or hand-deliver comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Instructions: For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on this process, see the Comment Procedures Section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Bak (Technical Information), Office of Energy Policy and Innovation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–6574, *brian.bak@ferc.gov*

Gretchen Kershaw (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8213, *gretchen.kershaw@ferc.gov*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Proposal To Revise Standard Generator Interconnection Agreements Issued November 19, 2015

1. In this Proposal to Revise Standard Generator Interconnection Agreements (Proposal), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is proposing to eliminate the exemptions for wind generators from the requirement to provide reactive power. As a result, all newly interconnecting generators, including both synchronous and non-synchronous, would be required to provide reactive power. Specifically, the Commission proposes to modify the two *pro forma* interconnection agreements, the Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA) and the Small Generator Interconnection Agreement (SGIA), to eliminate the current exemption for wind generators from the requirement to provide reactive power, thereby requiring all newly interconnecting generators (*i.e.,* new generators seeking to interconnect to the transmission system and all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests), both synchronous and non-synchronous, to provide reactive power. This Proposal would create comparable reactive power requirements for non-synchronous and synchronous generators, except that the Proposal requires that non-synchronous generators maintain the required power factor range only when the generator's real power output exceeds 10 percent of its nameplate capacity. Additionally, all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests would be required to provide reactive power.

2. The existing *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA both require, as a condition of interconnection, an interconnecting generator ''to design its generating facility to maintain a composite power delivery at continuous rated power output at the Point of Interconnection at a power factor [1] of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, or a different range if adopted by the Transmission Provider'' [2] (*i.e.,* the reactive power requirement). This reactive power requirement requires dynamic reactive power [3] from generators. As discussed below, however, wind generators have been exempted from the reactive power requirement absent a study finding the provision of reactive power necessary, because historically, costs for an interconnection customer to design and build a wind generator that could provide reactive power were high and could have created an obstacle to the development of wind generation.[4] However, due to technological advancements, wind generators can now provide reactive power more cheaply and the cost of providing reactive power no longer presents an obstacle to the development of wind generation.[5] The subsequent decline in the cost to wind generators of providing reactive power may make it unduly discriminatory and preferential to exempt wind generators from the reactive power requirement when other types of generators are not exempt. Further, the growing penetration of wind generators on some systems increases the potential for a deficiency in reactive power.[6] Given this potential, the Commission's current requirement that the transmission provider conduct a study to determine whether each new wind generator needs to provide reactive power may unduly place the burden of supplying reactive power on synchronous generators without a reasonable technological or cost-based basis.

3. Therefore, the Commission proposes to eliminate the existing exemptions for wind generators, and thereby require that all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators provide dynamic reactive power as a condition of interconnection. This requirement would also apply to all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests. The proposals set forth in this Proposal are intended to ensure that all generators, synchronous and non-synchronous, are treated in a not unduly discriminatory or preferential manner, as required by sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act (FPA),[7] and to ensure sufficient reactive power is available on the electric grid as more non-synchronous generators seek to interconnect.

4. The Commission seeks comment on these proposed reforms sixty (60) days after publication of this Proposal in the **Federal Register**.

Background

5. Transmission providers require reactive power to control system voltage for efficient and reliable operation of an alternating current transmission system. At times, transmission providers need generators to either supply or consume reactive power. Starting with Order No. 888,[8] which included provisions regarding reactive power from

[1] The power factor of an alternating current transmission system is the ratio of real power to apparent power. Reliable operation of a transmission system requires system operators to maintain a tight control of voltages (at all points) on the transmission system. The ability to vary the ratio of real power to apparent power (*i.e.,* adjust the power factor) allows system operators to maintain scheduled voltages within allowed for tolerances on the transmission system and maintain the reliability of the transmission system. The Commission established a required power factor range in Order No. 2003 of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging. *See Standardization of Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures,* Order No. 2003, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,146, at P 542 (2003), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 2003–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,160, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 2003–B, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,171 (2004), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 2003–C, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,190 (2005), *aff'd sub nom. Nat'l Ass'n of Regulatory Util. Comm'rs* v. *FERC,* 475 F.3d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 2007), *cert. denied,* 552 U.S. 1230 (2008).

[2] Section 9.6.1 of the *pro forma* LGIA and section 1.8.1 of the *pro forma* SGIA.

[3] Reactive power sources are generally categorized as static or dynamic based on the speed and continuity at which they can produce or absorb reactive power in response to changes in system conditions. In general, dynamic reactive power devices are characterized by faster acting and continuously variable voltage control capability.

[4] *Interconnection for Wind Energy,* Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,186, at P 51, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 661–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,198 (2005).

[5] *Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, app. 2, at 1–3 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[6] *See PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,* 151 FERC ¶ 61,097, at P 7 (2015).

[7] 16 U.S.C. 824a, 824b (2012).

[8] *Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities; Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities,* Order No. 888, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,036 (1996), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 888–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,048, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 888–B, 81 FERC ¶ 61,248 (1997), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 888–C, 82 FERC ¶ 61,046 (1998), *aff'd in relevant part sub nom. Transmission Access Policy Study Group* v. *FERC,* 225 F.3d 667 (D.C. Cir. 2000), *aff'd sub nom. New York* v. *FERC,* 535 U.S. 1 (2002).

generators as an ancillary service in Schedule 2 of the *pro forma* Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT), the Commission issued a series of orders intended to ensure that sufficient reactive power is available to maintain the reliability of the electric grid.

6. Starting with Order No. 2003, the Commission adopted standard procedures and a standard agreement for the interconnection of large generation facilities (the *pro forma* LGIA), which included the reactive power requirement.[9] The Commission recognized in Order No. 2003–A that the *pro forma* LGIA was ''designed around the needs of large synchronous generators and that generators relying on newer technologies may find that either a specific requirement is inapplicable or that it calls for a slightly different approach'' because such generators ''may have unique electrical characteristics.'' [10] Therefore, the Commission exempted wind generators from the reactive power requirement and added a blank Appendix G to the *pro forma* LGIA as a placeholder for future interconnection requirements for newer technologies.[11]

7. In June 2005, the Commission issued Order No. 661,[12] establishing interconnection requirements in Appendix G to the *pro forma* LGIA for large wind generators.[13] Recognizing that, unlike traditional synchronous generators, wind generators had to ''install costly equipment'' in order to maintain reactive power capability, the Commission in Order No. 661 preserved the exemption for large wind generators from the reactive power requirement unless the transmission provider shows, through a System Impact Study, that reactive power capability is required to ensure safety or reliability.[14] The Commission explained that this qualified exemption from the reactive power requirement for large wind generators would provide certainty to the industry and ''remove unnecessary obstacles to the increased growth of wind generation.'' [15]

8. In May 2005, the Commission issued Order No. 2006,[16] in which it adopted standard procedures and a standard agreement for the interconnection of small generation facilities (*pro forma* SGIA).[17] In Order No. 2006, the Commission completely exempted small wind generators from the reactive power requirement.[18] The Commission reasoned that, similar to large wind generators, small wind generators would face increased costs to provide reactive power that could create an obstacle to the development of small wind generators. Additionally, the Commission reasoned that small wind generators would ''have minimal impact on the Transmission Provider's electric system'' and therefore the reliability requirements for large wind generators that were eventually imposed in Order No. 661 were not needed for small wind generators.[19]

9. Since the Commission provided these exemptions from the reactive power requirement for wind generators, the equipment needed for a wind generator to provide reactive power appears to have become more commercially available and less costly, such that the cost of installing equipment that is capable of providing reactive power is comparable to the costs of a traditional generator.[20] Recognizing these factors, the Commission recently accepted a proposal by PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) to effectively remove the wind generator exemption from the PJM tariff.[21] Specifically, the Commission granted PJM an ''independent entity variation'' from Order No. 661 in accepting PJM's proposal to require interconnection customers seeking to interconnect non-synchronous generators,[22] including wind generators, to use ''enhanced inverters'' with the capability to provide reactive power.[23] The Commission observed that, ''[a]lthough there are still technical differences between non-synchronous generators [such as wind generators] and traditional generators, with regard to the provision of reactive power, those differences have significantly diminished since the Commission issued Order No. 661.'' [24] The Commission agreed with PJM ''that the technology has changed both in availability and in cost since the Commission rejected [the California Independent System Operator's] proposal in 2010,'' such that ''PJM's proposal will not present a barrier to non-synchronous resources.'' [25]

Discussion

10. The continued exemption from the reactive power requirement in the *pro forma* LGIA and the *pro forma* SGIA for newly interconnecting wind generators appears to be unjust, unreasonable, and unduly discriminatory or preferential. Older wind turbine generators consumed reactive power; however, they lacked the capability to produce and control reactive power without the use of costly equipment because they did not use inverters like other non-synchronous generators.[26] Technological advances have been made in the inverters used by wind generators.[27] Based on these improvements, requiring newly interconnecting wind generators to provide reactive power does not appear to be the obstacle to the development of

[9] Order No. 2003, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,146 at PP 1, 542.

[10] Order No. 2003–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,160 at P 407 & n.85.

[11] *Id.* Article 9.6.1 of the *pro forma* LGIA provides: ''Interconnection Customer shall design the Large Generating Facility to maintain a composite power delivery at continuous rated power output at the Point of Interconnection at a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, unless Transmission Provider has established different requirements that apply to all generators in the Control Area on a comparable basis. The requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to wind generators.''

[12] *Interconnection for Wind Energy,* Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,186, Appendix B (Appendix G—Interconnection Requirements for a Wind Generating Plant), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 661–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,198 (2005).

[13] *Id.* P 1.

[14] *Id.* PP 50–51. Appendix G states: ''A wind generating plant shall maintain a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, measured at the Point of Interconnection as defined in this LGIA, if the Transmission Provider's System Impact Study shows that such a requirement is necessary to ensure safety and reliability.''

[15] *Id.* P 50.

[16] *Standardization of Small Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures,* Order No. 2006, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,180, Attachment F (Small Generator Interconnection Agreement), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 2006–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,196 (2005), *order granting clarification,* Order No. 2006–B, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,221 (2006).

[17] *Id.* P 1.

[18] *Id.* P 387. Section 1.8.1 of the *pro forma* SGIA states: ''The Interconnection Customer shall design its Small Generating Facility to maintain a composite power delivery at continuous rated power output at the Point of Interconnection at a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, unless the Transmission Provider has established different requirements that apply to all similarly situated generators in the control area on a comparable basis. The requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to wind generators.''

[19] *Id.* P 24.

[20] *Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, app. 1, at 6, app. 2, at 4–5 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[21] *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,* 151 FERC ¶ 61,097, at P 28 (2015).

[22] Non-synchronous generators are ''connected to the bulk power system through power electronics, but do not produce power at system frequency (60 Hz).'' They ''do not operate in the same way as traditional generators and respond differently to network disturbances.'' *Id.* P 1 n.3 (citing Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,198 at P 3 n.4). Wind and solar photovoltaic generators are two examples of non-synchronous generators.

[23] *Id.* PP 1, 6.

[24] *Id.* P 28.

[25] *Id.*

[26] Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,186 at PP 50–51.

[27] Non-synchronous generators produce electricity that is not synchronized to the electric grid (*i.e.,* direct current (DC) power or alternating current (AC) power at a frequency other than 60 hertz). Inverters convert non-synchronized AC or DC power into synchronized AC power that can be transmitted on the transmission system.

wind generation that it was when the Commission issued Order Nos. 2003, 661, and 2006.[28] In particular, the wind turbines being installed today are generally Type III and Type IV inverter-based turbines,[29] which are capable of producing and controlling dynamic reactive power, which was not the case in 2005 when the Commission exempted wind generators from the reactive power requirement in Order No. 661.[30] The Commission preliminarily concludes that improvements in technology and the corresponding declining costs to newly interconnecting wind generators in providing reactive power make it unduly discriminatory and preferential to exempt such non-synchronous generators from the reactive power requirement when other types of generators are not exempt. Given the reduced costs to newly interconnecting wind generators to provide reactive power, requiring them to operate within the required power factor range would ensure they satisfy the same requirements as other generators and satisfy a basic requirement of interconnection.[31]

11. Further, the Commission is concerned that, as the penetration of wind generation continues to grow, exempting a class of generators from providing reactive power could create reliability issues if those generators represent a substantial amount of total generation, or if many of the resources that currently provide reactive power are retired from operation. Local reliability issues, due to the short distances that reactive power can be transmitted, that are not readily apparent given the current generation mix could result if a region were to lose synchronous resources that supply reactive power and the resulting generation mix consisted of a significant quantity of resources that were exempt from providing reactive power. Further, the Commission believes that maintaining this exemption may unduly place the burden of supplying reactive power on synchronous generators without a reasonable technological or cost-based distinction between synchronous and non-synchronous generators.[32]

12. Therefore, the Commission preliminarily concludes that the continued exemption from the reactive power requirement for newly interconnecting wind generators is unjust and unreasonable and unduly discriminatory and preferential. The Commission, therefore, proposes to revise the *pro forma* LGIA, Appendix G of the *pro forma* LGIA, and the *pro forma* SGIA to eliminate the exemptions for wind generators from the reactive power requirement.[33] Under this Proposal, newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators would be eligible for the same payments for reactive power as other generators.[34] Any compensation would be based on the cost of providing reactive power. We note that the cost to a wind generator of providing reactive power may not be easily estimated using existing methods that are applied to synchronous generators.[35] The Commission also proposes that transmission providers that are not public utilities will have to adopt the requirements of this Proposal as a condition of maintaining the status of their safe harbor tariff or otherwise satisfying the reciprocity requirement of Order No. 888.[36]

13. Removing the exemptions for wind generators from the reactive power requirement would specifically require all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators, and all existing non-synchronous generators proposing upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests, to design their generating facilities to maintain reactive power within a power factor range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, or the standard range established by the transmission provider and approved by the Commission, to be measured at the Point of Interconnection.[37]

14. The Commission also proposes to require that the reactive power capability installed by non-synchronous generators be dynamic. In Order No. 661, the Commission declined to require dynamic reactive power capability from wind generators, unless the System Impact Study showed that dynamic reactive power capability was needed for system reliability, reasoning that dynamic reactive power capability may not be needed in every case.[38] Based on technological advancements, the Commission no longer believes it is just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential to exempt wind generators from the requirement to provide dynamic reactive power.[39]

15. Further, the Commission proposes to require that newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators be required to design the generating facility to maintain the required power factor range only when the generator's real power output exceeds 10 percent of its nameplate capacity.[40] In requiring a generator to provide reactive power, the interconnection agreements would state: ''Non-synchronous generators shall only be required to maintain the above power factor when their output is above 10

[28] As discussed above, in exempting wind generators from the reactive power requirement, the Commission sought to avoid creating an obstacle to the development of wind generation. For example, in Order No. 661, the Commission was concerned with ''remov[ing] unnecessary obstacles to the increased growth of wind generation.'' *Id.* P 50.

[29] A Type III wind turbine is a non-synchronous wound-rotor generator that has a three phase AC field applied to the rotor from a partially-rated power-electronics converter. A Type IV wind turbine is an AC generator in which the stator windings are connected to the power system through a fully-rated power-electronics converter. Both Type III and Type IV wind turbines have inherent reactive power capabilities.

[30] *Id.* PP 50–51.

[31] *See, e.g., Sw. Power Pool, Inc.,* 119 FERC ¶ 61,199, at P 29 (''Providing reactive power within the [standard power factor range] is an obligation of a generator, and is as much an obligation of a generator as, for example, operating in accordance with Good Utility Practice.''), *order on reh'g,* 121 FERC ¶ 61,196 (2007).

[32] *See PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,* 151 FERC ¶ 61,097, at P 7 (2015); *Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, app. 1 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[33] The Commission does not propose to revise any regulatory text. The Commission proposes to revise the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA in accordance with section 35.28(f)(1) of the Commission's regulations, which provides: ''Every public utility that is required to have on file a non-discriminatory open access transmission tariff under this section must amend such tariff by adding the standard interconnection procedures and agreement and the standard small generator interconnection procedures and agreement required by Commission rulemaking proceedings promulgating and amending such interconnection procedures and agreements, or such other interconnection procedures and agreements as may be required by Commission rulemaking proceedings promulgating and amending the standard interconnection procedures and agreement and the standard small generator interconnection procedures and agreement.'' 18 CFR 35.28(f)(1) (2015). *See Integration of Variable Energy Resources,* Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331, at PP 343–345 (adopting this regulatory text effective September 11, 2012), *order on reh'g and clarification,* Order No. 764–A, 141 FERC ¶ 61,232 (2012), *order on clarification and reh'g,* Order No. 764–B, 144 FERC ¶ 61,222 (2013). While not revising regulatory text, the Commission is using the process provided for rulemaking proceedings, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 551(4)–(5) (2012).

[34] Order No. 2003–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,160 at P 416.

[35] *See Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, app. 2 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[36] Order No. 888, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,036 at 31,760–63.

[37] The *pro forma* LGIA defines ''Point of Interconnection'' as ''the point, as set forth in Appendix A to the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement, where the Interconnection Facilities connect to the Transmission Provider's Transmission System.'' Similarly, the *pro forma* SGIA defines ''Point of Interconnection'' as ''[t]he point where the Interconnection Facilities connect with the Transmission Provider's Transmission System.''

[38] *See* Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,186 at P 66.

[39] *Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, at 7 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[40] *See* Order No. 661, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,186 at P 46.

percent of the Generating Facility Capacity.'' The Commission's understanding is that the inverters used by non-synchronous generators are not capable of producing reactive power when operating below 10 percent of nameplate capacity.[41]

16. Specifically, with deleted text in brackets and added text in italics, the Commission proposes to revise section 9.6.1 of the *pro forma* LGIA to read:

> Interconnection Customer shall design the Large Generating Facility to maintain a composite power delivery at continuous rated power output at the Point of Interconnection at a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, unless Transmission Provider has established different requirements that apply to all generators in the Control Area on a comparable basis. [The requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to wind generators.] *Non-synchronous generators shall only be required to maintain the above power factor when their output is above 10 percent of the Generating Facility Capacity.*[42]

The Commission similarly proposes to revise section 1.8.1 of the *pro forma* SGIA to read:

> The Interconnection Customer shall design its Small Generating Facility to maintain a composite power delivery at continuous rated power output at the Point of Interconnection at a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, unless the Transmission Provider has established different requirements that apply to all similarly situated generators in the control area on a comparable basis. [The requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to wind generators.] *Non-synchronous generators shall only be required to maintain the above power factor when their output is above 10 percent of the generator nameplate capacity.*[43]

In addition, the Commission would strike paragraph A.ii of Appendix G to the *pro forma* LGIA, ''Technical Standards Applicable to a Wind Generation Plant.'' [44]

> A wind generating plant shall maintain a power factor within the range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, measured at the Point of Interconnection as defined in this LGIA, if the Transmission Provider's System Impact Study shows that such a requirement is necessary to ensure safety or reliability. The power factor range standard can be met by using, for example, power electronics designed to supply this level of reactive capability 606 (taking into account any limitations due to voltage level, real power output, etc.) or fixed and switched capacitors if agreed to by the Transmission Provider, or a combination of the two. The Interconnection Customer shall not disable power factor equipment while the wind plant is in operation. Wind plants shall also be able to provide sufficient dynamic voltage support in lieu of the power system stabilizer and automatic voltage regulation at the generator excitation system if the System Impact Study shows this to be required for system safety or reliability.[45]

17. The Commission proposes to apply the reactive power requirement to all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators, as well as all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests, as of the effective date of the final revision. The Commission also proposes to apply the reactive power requirement to all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators that have requested that an LGIA or SGIA be filed unexecuted with the Commission that is still pending before the Commission as of the effective date of the final revision. Thus, the requirement would not apply to non-synchronous generators that have executed an LGIA or SGIA, as relevant, prior to the effective date of the final revision, unless they propose upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests. Given that not all existing wind generators are capable of providing reactive power without incurring substantial costs to install new equipment, we do not believe it is reasonable or necessary to require those generators to provide reactive power. However, existing wind generators that make upgrades to their generation facility that require a new interconnection request will be required to conform to this new requirement.

18. The Commission seeks comments on the Proposal to remove the exemptions for wind generators from the reactive power requirement. Further, the Commission seeks comments on whether the current power factor range of 0.95 leading to 0.95 lagging, as set forth in the existing *pro forma* interconnection agreements,[46] is reasonable given the technology used by non-synchronous generators. The Commission also seeks comments on the proposed requirement that newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators only be required to produce reactive power when the generator's real power output is greater than 10 percent of nameplate capacity. And finally, we note that a non-synchronous generator will be eligible for compensation for reactive power, consistent with the compensation provisions of the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA.[47] The Commission seeks comment on whether the existing methods used to determine reactive power compensation are appropriate for wind generators and, if not, what alternatives would be appropriate.[48]

Proposed Compliance Procedures

19. To comply with the requirements of this Proposal, the Commission proposes to require each public utility [49] transmission provider to submit a compliance filing within 90 days of the effective date of the final revision in this proceeding revising its *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA subject to the Commission's jurisdiction as necessary to demonstrate that it meets the requirements set forth in this Proposal.

20. In some cases, public utility transmission providers may have provisions in their currently effective *pro forma* LGIAs and *pro forma* SGIAs related to the provision of reactive power by non-synchronous generators that the Commission has deemed to be consistent with or superior to the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA. Where these *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA provisions will be modified by the final revision, public utility transmission providers must either comply with the final revision or demonstrate that these previously-approved *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA variations continue to be consistent with or superior to the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA as modified by the final revision.

21. The Commission will assess whether each compliance filing satisfies the proposed requirements and principles stated above and issue additional orders as necessary to ensure that each public utility transmission provider meets the requirements of this Proposal and the subsequent final revision.

22. The Commission proposes that transmission providers that are not

[41] *Id.*

[42] Section 9.6.1 of the *pro forma* LGIA.

[43] Section 1.8.1 of the *pro forma* SGIA.

[44] The full text of the *pro forma* LGIA will be posted on the Commission's internet page at: *http://www.ferc.gov/industries/electric/indus-act/gi/stnd-gen.asp*. The full text of the *pro forma* SGIA will be posted on the Commission's internet page at: *http://www.ferc.gov/industries/electric/indus-act/gi/small-gen.asp*.

[45] Section A.ii of Appendix G to the *pro forma* LGIA.

[46] Section 9.6.1 of the *pro forma* LGIA and section 1.8.1 of the *pro forma* SGIA.

[47] Section 9.6.3 of the *pro forma* LGIA and section 1.8.2 of the *pro forma* SGIA.

[48] *See Payment for Reactive Power,* Commission Staff Report, Docket No. AD14–7, app. 1 (Apr. 22, 2014).

[49] For purposes of this Proposal, a public utility is a utility that owns, controls, or operates facilities used for transmitting electric energy in interstate commerce, as defined by the FPA. *See* 16 U.S.C. 824(e) (2012). A non-public utility that seeks voluntary compliance with the reciprocity condition of an OATT may satisfy that condition by filing an OATT, which includes the *pro forma* LGIA and SGIA.

public utilities will have to adopt the requirements of this Proposal and subsequent final revision as a condition of maintaining the status of their safe harbor tariff or otherwise satisfying the reciprocity requirement of Order No. 888.[50]

Information Collection Statement

23. The collection of information contained in this Proposal to Revise Standard Generator Interconnection Agreements is subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations under section 3507(d) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA).[51] OMB's regulations require approval of certain informational collection requirements imposed by an agency.[52] Upon approval of a collection(s) of information, OMB will assign an OMB control number and an expiration date. Respondents subject to the filing requirements will not be penalized for failing to respond to these collections of information unless the collections of information display a valid OMB control number.

24. The reforms proposed in this Proposal would amend the Commission's standard generator interconnection agreements in accordance with section 35.28(f)(1) of the Commission's regulations [53] to require that each public utility transmission provider amend its *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA to: (1) Eliminate the exemptions for wind generators from the requirement to provide reactive power; and (2) require that all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators, as well as all existing non-synchronous generators making upgrades to their generation facilities that require new interconnection requests, provide reactive power as a condition of interconnection, as of the effective date of the final revision. The reforms proposed in this Proposal would require filings of *pro forma* LGIAs and *pro forma* SGIAs with the Commission. The Commission anticipates the reforms proposed in this Proposal, once implemented, would not significantly change currently existing burdens on an ongoing basis. With regard to those public utility transmission providers that believe that they already comply with the reforms proposed in this Proposal, they could demonstrate their compliance in the filing required 90 days after the effective date of the final revision in this proceeding. The Commission will submit the proposed reporting requirements to OMB for its review and approval under section 3507(d) of the Paperwork Reduction Act.[54]

25. While the Commission expects the adoption of the reforms proposed in this Proposal to provide significant benefits, the Commission understands that implementation can be a complex and costly endeavor. The Commission solicits comments on the accuracy of provided burden and cost estimates and any suggested methods for minimizing the respondents' burdens.

Burden Estimate and Information Collection Costs: The Commission believes that the burden estimates below are representative of the average burden on respondents. The estimated burden and cost [55] for the requirements contained in this Proposal follow.

DATA COLLECTION—FERC 516

	Number of applicable registered entities (1)	Annual number of responses per respondent (2)	Total number of responses (1)*(2)=(3)	Average burden (hours) and cost per response [56] (4)	Total annual burden hours and total annual cost (3)*(4)=(5)
Conforming LGIA changes to incorporate proposed revisions.	132	1	132	7.5 ..... $540.00	990 hours. $71,280.00.
Conforming SGIA changes to incorporate proposed revisions.	132	1	132	7.5 ..... $540.00	990 hours. $71,280.00.
Total	.....	.....	264	15 hours $1,080	1,980 hours. $142,560.00.

Cost to Comply: The Commission has projected the total cost of compliance as follows: [57]

- Year 1: $142,560 ($1,080/utility)
- Year 2: $0

After Year 1, the reforms proposed in this Proposal, once implemented, would not significantly change existing burdens on an ongoing basis.

Title: FERC–516, Electric Rate Schedules and Tariff Filings.

Action: Proposed revisions to an information collection.

OMB Control No.: 1902–0096.

Respondents for This Proposal: Businesses or other for profit and/or not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency of Information: One-time during year one.

Necessity of Information: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission makes this Proposal to improve the reliability of the electric grid by requiring all newly interconnecting non-synchronous generators to provide reactive power and to ensure that all generators are being treated in a not unduly discriminatory or preferential manner.

Internal Review: The Commission has reviewed the proposed changes and has determined that such changes are necessary. These requirements conform to the Commission's need for efficient information collection, communication, and management within the energy industry. The Commission has specific, objective support for the burden estimates associated with the information collection requirements.

26. Interested persons may obtain information on the reporting requirements by contacting the

[50] Order No. 888, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,036 at 31,760–63.

[51] 44 U.S.C. 3507(d) (2012).

[52] 5 CFR 1320.11 (2015).

[53] 18 CFR 35.28(f)(1) (2015).

[54] 44 U.S.C. 3507(d) (2012).

[55] The estimates for cost per response are derived using the following formula: Average Burden Hours per Response * $72 per Hour = Average Cost per Response. The hourly cost figure comes from the FERC average salary of $149,489. Subject matter experts found that industry employment costs closely resemble FERC's regarding the FERC–516 information collection.

[56] $149,489/$2,080 = $71.8697 and is rounded to $72.00 per hour.

[57] The costs for Year 1 would consist of filing proposed changes to the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA with the Commission within 90 days of the effective date of the final revision plus initial implementation. The Commission does not expect any ongoing costs beyond the initial compliance in Year 1.

following: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426 [Attention: Ellen Brown, Office of the Executive Director], email: *DataClearance@ferc.gov,* phone: (202) 502–8663, fax: (202) 273–0873. Comments concerning the collection of information and the associated burden estimate(s), may also be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503 [Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, phone: (202) 395–0710, fax: (202) 395–7285]. Due to security concerns, comments should be sent electronically to the following email address: *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov*. Comments submitted to OMB should include FERC–516 and OMB Control No. 1902–0096.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

27. The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA) [58] generally requires a description and analysis of rules that will have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The RFA does not mandate any particular outcome in a rulemaking. It only requires consideration of alternatives that are less burdensome to small entities and an agency explanation of why alternatives were rejected.

28. To the extent the RFA applies to this proceeding, the Commission estimates that the total number of public utility transmission providers that would have to modify their currently effective *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA is 132. Of these, the Commission estimates the total number that are small entities is 11. The Commission estimates the average total cost of these entities will be minimal, requiring on average 15 hours, or $1,080 in expenses. The Commission does not consider this to be a significant economic impact. As a result, the Commission certifies that the reforms proposed in this Proposal would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Environmental Analysis

29. The Commission is required to prepare an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement for any action that may have a significant adverse effect on the human environment.[59] The Commission concludes that neither an Environmental Assessment nor an Environmental Impact Statement is required for this Proposal under section 380.4(a)(15) of the Commission's regulations, which provides a categorical exemption for approval of actions under sections 205 and 206 of the FPA relating to the filing of schedules containing all rates and charges for the transmission or sale of electric energy subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, plus the classification, practices, contracts and regulations that affect rates, charges, classifications, and services.[60] The revisions proposed in this Proposal would update and clarify the application of the Commission's standard interconnection requirements to wind generators. Therefore, this Proposal falls within the categorical exemptions provided in the Commission's regulations, and as a result neither an environmental impact statement nor an environmental assessment is required.

Comment Procedures

30. The Commission invites interested persons to submit comments on the matters and issues proposed in this Proposal to be adopted, including any related matters or alternative proposals that commenters may wish to discuss. Comments are due January 25, 2016. Comments must refer to Docket No. RM16–1–000, and must include the commenter's name, the organization they represent, if applicable, and their address.

31. The Commission encourages comments to be filed electronically via the eFiling link on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov.* The Commission accepts most standard word processing formats. Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format. Commenters filing electronically do not need to make a paper filing.

32. Commenters that are not able to file comments electronically must send an original of their comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

33. All comments will be placed in the Commission's public files and may be viewed, printed, or downloaded remotely as described in the Document Availability section below. Commenters on this Proposal are not required to serve copies of their comments on other commenters.

Document Availability

34. In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the **Federal Register**, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through the Commission's Home Page (*http://www.ferc.gov*) and in the Commission's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

35. From the Commission's Home Page on the Internet, this information is available on eLibrary. The full text of this document is available on eLibrary in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number of this document, excluding the last three digits, in the docket number field.

36. User assistance is available for eLibrary and the Commission's Web site during normal business hours from the Commission's Online Support at (202) 502–6652 (toll free at 1–866–208–3676) or email at *ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov,* or the Public Reference Room at (202) 502–8371, TTY (202) 502–8659. Email the Public Reference Room at *public.referenceroom@ferc.gov.*

List of Subjects in 18 CFR Part 35

Electric power rates, Electric utilities, Non-discriminatory open access transmission tariffs.

By direction of the Commission.

Issued: November 19, 2015

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29972 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[Docket Number USCG–2012–0806]

RIN 1625–AA01

Anchorage Regulations; Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, CT

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to establish three special anchorage areas in the Connecticut River in the vicinity Old Saybrook, CT. This proposed action is necessary to facilitate safe navigation in that area and provide safe and secure

[58] 5 U.S.C. 601–12 (2012).

[59] *Regulations Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969,* Order No. 486, 52 FR 47897 (Dec. 17, 1987), FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles 1986–1990 ¶ 30,783 (1987).

[60] 18 CFR 380.4(a)(15) (2015).

anchorages for vessels less than 20 meters in length. This action is intended to increase the safety of life and property in the Connecticut River in the vicinity of Old Saybrook, improve the safety of anchored vessels, and provide for the overall safe and efficient flow of vessel traffic and commerce. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2012–0806 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, contact Mr. Craig Lapiejko, Waterways Management at Coast Guard First District, telephone 617–223–8351, email *craig.d.lapiejko@uscg.mil* or Chief Ian Fallon, Waterways Management Division at Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound, telephone 203–468–4565, email *ian.m.fallon@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**
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
Pub. L. Public Law
§ Section
U.S.C.the United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

The proposed special anchorage areas are intended to reduce the risk of vessel collisions and to promote safe and efficient travel in the navigable channels of the Connecticut River adjacent to Calves Island, and also to aid the town of Old Saybrook in enforcing its mooring and boating regulations by clearly defining the mooring fields currently established by the town. All proposed coordinates are North American Datum 1983 (NAD 83).

The rule is intended to reduce the risk of vessel collisions by creating three special anchorage areas in the Connecticut River in the vicinity of the eastern portion of Old Saybrook, CT. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, and 2071.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The proposed rule would create three new special anchorage areas, referred to as special anchorage areas A, B, and C in the Connecticut River in the vicinity of the Old Saybrook, CT. Special anchorage area A is approximately 680,800 sq. yards and would be located between Ferry Point and Calves Island, upstream of the I–95/US RT 1 Baldwin Bridge. Special anchorage area B would be approximately 51,200 sq. yards and located just east of North Cove. Special anchorage area C would be approximately 185,400 sq. yards located in North Cove west of the navigable channel. Illustrations showing the locations of these proposed special anchorage areas are available in the docket.

Vessels less than 20 meters in length are not required to sound signals under Rule 35 of the Inland Navigation Rules (33 CFR 83.35) nor exhibit anchor lights or shapes under Rule 30 of the Inland Navigation Rules (33 CFR 83.30) when at anchor in a special anchorage area. Additionally, mariners using these anchorage areas are encouraged to contact local and state authorities, such as the local harbormaster, to ensure compliance with any additional applicable state and local laws. Such laws may involve, for example, compliance with direction from the local harbormaster when placing or using moorings within the anchorage.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and E.O.s related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and E.O.s, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

E.O.s 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. E.O. 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 E.O. 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

We expect minimal additional cost impacts on fishing, or recreational boats anchoring because this rule would not affect normal surface navigation. Although this proposed rulemaking may have some impact on the public, the potential impact would be minimized for the following reasons: (1) normal surface navigation will not be affected as these three areas in the Connecticut River in the vicinity of the eastern portion of Old Saybrook has been historically used as a mooring field by the town of Old Saybrook; (2) this proposed rule would simply permit eligible vessels in existing mooring areas to not use sound signals or exhibit anchor lights or shapes when at anchor there; (3) it encourages the use of existing mooring areas; and (4) the number of vessels using these special anchorage areas will be limited due to depth (less than or equal to 18 feet).

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 Connecticut River in Old Saybrook, CT may be small entities, for the reasons stated above in section IV.A, 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 (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** 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 E.O. 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 E.O. 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under E.O. 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 above.

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.lD, 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 the establishment of special anchorage grounds. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(f) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.lD. A preliminary environmental analysis checklist is 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. Documents mentioned in this notice of proposed rulemaking as being available in the docket, and all public comments, are 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.

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).

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 110.55b to subpart A to read as follows:

§ 110.55b Connecticut River, Old Saybrook, Connecticut.

(a) *Special anchorage area A.* All of the waters enclosed by a line beginning at latitude 41°19′54.75″ N, longitude 072°21′08.40″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′21.50″ N, longitude 072°20′49.65″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′17.80″ N, longitude 072°20′49.25″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′17.05″ N, longitude 72°20′59″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′25.40″ N, longitude 72°21′00.95″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′29.50″ N, longitude 72°21′17.60″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′35.40″ N, longitude 72°21′22.90″ W; thence to latitude 41°19′52.35″ N, longitude 72°21′26.10″ W; thence to the point of beginning.

(b) *Special anchorage area B.* All of the waters enclosed by a line beginning at latitude 41°17′26″ N, longitude 072°21′04″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′24.60″ N, longitude 072°21′16″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′20″ N, longitude 072°21′09″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′16″ N, longitude 072°21′05″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′16″ N, longitude 072°21′03″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′21.5″ N, longitude 072°21′04.5″ W; thence to the point of beginning.

(c) *Special anchorage area C.* All of the waters enclosed by a line beginning at latitude 41°17′27″ N, longitude 072°21′35″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′24″ N, longitude 072°22′01″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′16″ N, longitude 072°22′00″ W; thence to latitude 41°17′19″ N, longitude 072°21′33″ W; thence to the point of beginning.

Note to § 110.55b: All coordinates referenced use datum: NAD 83. All anchoring in the areas is under the supervision of the town of Old Saybrook Harbor Master or other such authority as may be designated by the authorities of the town of Old Saybrook, Connecticut. Mariners using these special anchorage areas are encouraged to contact local and state authorities, such as the local harbormaster, to ensure compliance with any additional applicable state and local laws.

This area is principally for use by recreational craft. Temporary floats or buoys for marking anchors or moorings in place are allowed in this area. Fixed mooring piles or stakes are not allowed. All moorings or anchors shall be placed well within the anchorage areas so that no portion of the hull or rigging will at any time extend outside of the anchorage.

Dated: November 4, 2015.

K.C. Kiefer,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2015–30011 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[Docket Number USCG–2015–0038]

RIN 1625–AA01

Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard proposes to disestablish 13 anchorage grounds and 1 special anchorage area that are now obsolete in Newark Bay, the East River, Western Long Island Sound, Raritan Bay, and Lower New York Bay. It also proposes to reduce the size of three anchorage grounds in Raritan, Sandy Hook, and Lower New York Bays. This proposed rulemaking is necessary due to the increased size and draft of current commercial vessels operating in the Captain of the Port New York zone, as the existing anchorages have insufficient water depths to accommodate these vessels; the exposure of these anchorages to winds, tides, and currents; and changes in recreational vessel usage patterns in Newark Bay. This proposed rulemaking would provide a higher degree of vessel and environmental safety by reducing the risk of vessels grounding in shallow water, and accurately reflect the anchorages currently in use.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2015–0038 using the following 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 on this notice of proposed rulemaking, contact Mr. Craig Lapiejko, Waterways Management at Coast Guard First District, telephone 617–223–8351, email *craig.d.lapiejko@uscg.mil* or Mr. Jeff Yunker, Coast Guard Sector New York Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 718–354–4195, email *jeff.m.yunker@uscg.mil*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR **Federal Register**
SAA Special Anchorage Area
USACE United States Army Corps of Engineers
USCP United States Coast Pilot
WAMS Waterways Analysis and Management System

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

Anchorage grounds were originally established by the (USACE) on April 25, 1907, pursuant to an Act of Congress approved May 16, 1888. This information was published in the 1909 (USCP) Atlantic Coast, Part IV, From Point Judith to New York, Fifth Edition. Anchorage regulation duties and powers were transferred to the Coast Guard in 1967 (32 FR 17726, Dec. 12, 1967)

The special anchorage areas (SAAs) were originally established by the USACE and first published in the USCP in 1960. The USCP is a series of nine nautical books published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) that encompasses a wide variety of information important to navigators of U.S. waters. The USCP is intended to be used as a supplement to NOAA nautical charts. Topics covered include anchorage grounds, SAAs, and specific anchoring regulations governing their usage.

The legal basis for this rule is: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to define anchorage grounds and special anchorage areas.

The specific reasons for this rulemaking are to disestablish 13 anchorage grounds and 1 SAA that are now obsolete and reduce the size of three anchorage grounds that are no longer used by commercial or recreational mariners. The intended purpose of this rulemaking is to reduce the risk of vessels grounding in shallow water and accurately reflect the anchorages currently in use. The USACE New York District was consulted on this regulation and had no objections.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed rule would disestablish five obsolete anchorage grounds in Newark Bay described in 33 CFR 110.155(h)(1) and (h)(3) through (6). During our 2012 WAMS review of Newark Bay, we announced in First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners that we were considering disestablishing anchorage ground numbers 34, 36, 37, 38, and 39. We received one comment that these anchorage grounds should be retained and dredged to a depth of not less than 12 feet at mean low water so vessels could anchor within their boundaries. These anchorage grounds are not a federal project under the jurisdiction of the USACE and thus will not be dredged to a depth that is usable by most commercial vessels.

During this 2012 WAMS we also sought comment on the proposed disestablishment of the Newark Bay Southeast and Newark Bay Southwest SAAs described in 33 CFR 110.60(d)(1) and (2). We received no comments that these SAAs are used or that they should be retained. These proposed revisions were advertised to the public in the First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners number 50 in 2011 (dated December 14, 2011) through number 24 in 2012 (dated June 13, 2012). During a 2014 site visit to the Robbins Reef Yacht Club in Bayonne, NJ, the Coast Guard was notified by a club member that the Newark Bay Southeast SAA is still in use. Based on those comments we are no longer considering disestablishing the Newark Bay Southeast SAA. We are, however, proposing to disestablish the Newark Bay Southwest SAA, § 110.60(d)(2).

This proposed rule would disestablish seven obsolete anchorage grounds in Western Long Island Sound and the East River described in 33 CFR 110.155(a)(2) through (7), and (b)(2). During our 2013 WAMS review of New Rochelle Harbor, Manhasset and Little Neck Bays we announced in the First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners that we were considering disestablishing anchorage ground numbers 1–A, 1–B, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7. We received no comments that these anchorage grounds are being used or that they should be retained. These proposed revisions were advertised to the public in the First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners number 48 in 2012 (dated November 28, 2012) through number 25 in 2013 (dated June 19, 2013).

This proposed rule would also disestablish obsolete anchorage ground number 46 in Raritan Bay described in 33 CFR 110.155(j)(4). Additionally, this proposed rule would reduce the size of anchorage ground number 28 described in 33 CFR 110.155(f)(3) and anchorage ground number 47 described in 33 CFR 110.155(j)(5) in Raritan and Lower New York Bays. Portions of these two reduced anchorage grounds would be incorporated into revised anchorage grounds, number 26, which would also be reduced in size, described in 33 CFR 110.155(f)(1), and revised anchorage ground, number 28, in Raritan and Lower New York Bays described in 33 CFR 110.155(f)(3). The existing anchorage ground numbers 26, 28, 46, and 47 cover approximately 59.307 square nautical miles. The proposed revised anchorage ground numbers 26 and 28 would cover approximately 7.877 square nautical miles. In addition, this proposed rule would update the coordinates to 1983 datum for Anchorage Ground number 27 in the Atlantic Ocean described in 33 CFR 110.155(f)(2).

This rulemaking would also remove regulations regarding navigation and mooring in the vicinity of the Naval Ammunition Depot Pier at Leonardo, NJ, in existing 33 CFR 110.155(f)(1)(i) and (ii) because these requirements are already codified at 33 CFR 165.130. During our 2014 WAMS review of Raritan Bay, we announced in the First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners we considering disestablishing anchorage ground numbers 46 and 47. We received no comments that these anchorage grounds are being used or that they should be retained in their current configurations. These proposed revisions were advertised to the public in the First Coast Guard District Local Notice to Mariners number 07 in 2014 (dated February 19, 2014) through number 26 in 2014 (dated July 2, 2014).

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 or executive orders.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. We do not expect this proposed rule to have a significant impact because it is administrative in nature and would not alter current navigational practices on the affected waterways.

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 would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: the owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor within these portions of Newark Bay; the East River near Little Bay; Western Long Island Sound between Throgs Neck, Sands Point, and Larchmont Harbor; and Raritan and Lower New York Bays.

This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: this rule would only codify current navigation practices on the affected waterways. Neither the proposed disestablishment of anchorage grounds nor the size reductions would affect vessels' schedules or their abilities to freely transit near these areas within the Captain of the Port New York zone. The water available in the anchorage grounds to be disestablished is too shallow for most commercial vessels to anchor within and the anchorage grounds in western Long Island Sound and East River are currently unusable as they are exposed to weather, tides, and currents that do not provide a safe anchorage.

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 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 E.O. 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 E.O. 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under E.O. 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 above.

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.lD, which guide 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 that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule involves disestablishing 13 obsolete anchorage grounds and 1 obsolete SAA, and reducing the size of two anchorage grounds and combining them into one smaller anchorage ground. This rule may be categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(f) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. 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. Documents mentioned in this document, and all public comments, are 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.

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 110

Anchorage grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 110 as follows:

PART 110—ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 110 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2071; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

§ 110.60 [Amended]

■ 2. In § 110.60:
■ a. Remove paragraph (d)(2) and redesignate paragraphs (d)(3) through (10) as paragraphs (d)(2) through (9), respectively.
■ b. Amend the note to newly redesignated paragraph (d)(2) by removing ''paragraph (d)(3)'' and adding ''paragraph (d)(2)'' in its place.
■ 3. In § 110.155:
■ a. Remove and reserve paragraph (a)(2) and remove paragraphs (a)(3) through (7);
■ b. Remove and reserve paragraph (b)(2);
■ c. Revise paragraph (f);
■ d. Remove and reserve paragraph (h);
■ e. Revise paragraph (j)(2); and
■ f. Remove paragraphs (j)(3) through (5).

The revisions read as follows:

§ 110.155 Port of New York.

* * * * *

(f) Lower Bay, Raritan Bay, Sandy Hook Bay, and Atlantic Ocean—(1) *Anchorage No. 26.* In Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays all waters bound by the following points: 40°30′06.74″ N., 074°10′04.96″ W.; thence to 40°28′59.44″ N., 074°05′00.00″ W.; thence to 40°28′44.94″ N., 074°05′00.00″ W.; thence to 40°29′05.02″ N., 074°07′30.56″ W.; thence to 40°29′17.49″ N., 074°10′16.50″ W.; thence to the point of origin (NAD 83).

(2) *Anchorage No. 27.* In the Atlantic Ocean all waters bound by the following points: 40°28′49.27″ N., 074°00′12.13″ W.; thence to 40°28′52.12″ N., 074°00′00.56″ W.; thence to 40°28′40.88″ N., 073°58′51.95″ W.; thence to 40°25′57.91″ N., 073°54′55.56″ W.; thence to 40°23′45.55″ N., 073°54′54.89″ W.; thence to 40°23′45.38″ N., 073°58′32.10″ W.; thence along the shoreline to the point of origin (NAD 83).

(3) *Anchorage No. 28.* In Lower Bay all waters bound by the following points: 40°30′02.30″ N., 074°08′52.69″ W.; thence to 40°29′10.10″ N., 074°04′59.65″ W.; thence to 40°29′09.99″ N., 074°02′57.75″ W.; thence to 40°31′52.89″ N., 074°02′39.89″ W.; thence to 40°31′59.72″ N., 074°03′25.13″ W.; thence to 40°31′28.57″ N., 074°03′40.70″ W.; thence to 40°30′26.24″ N., 074°05′11.46″ W.; thence to 40°30′19.01″ N., 074°06′21.37″ W.; thence to 40°30′21.53″ N., 074°08′46.19″ W.; thence to the point of origin (NAD 83).

* * * * *

(j) * * *

(2) *Anchorage No. 45.* West of the Raritan Bay Channel leading into Arthur Kill; north of the Raritan River Channel leading into Raritan River; and east of the Cutoff Channel between Raritan River and Arthur Kill, except that part of the said area occupied by Anchorage No. 44.

(i) Vessels must not anchor in the channel to Keyport Harbor west of lines ranging from Keyport Channel Buoy 1 to Keyport Channel Buoy 9, thence through Keyport Channel Buoys 11 and 13 to the northeast corner of the easterly steamboat wharf; and east of a line extending from a point 400 yards west of Keyport Channel Buoy 1 tangent to the west shore at the mouth of Matawan Creek.

(ii) [Reserved]

* * * * *

Dated: October 14, 2015.

K.C. Keifer,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Commander First Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2015–30056 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0032; FRL–9937–14]

Receipt of Several Pesticide Petitions Filed for Residues of Pesticide Chemicals in or on Various Commodities

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of filing of petitions and request for comment.

SUMMARY: This document announces the Agency's receipt of several initial filings of pesticide petitions requesting the establishment or modification of regulations for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on various commodities.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number and the pesticide petition number (PP) of interest as shown in the body of this document, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute.
- *Mail:* OPP Docket, Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC), (28221T), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001.
- *Hand Delivery:* To make special arrangements for hand delivery or delivery of boxed information, please follow the instructions at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/contacts.html.*

Additional instructions on commenting or visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert McNally, Director, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (BPPD) (7511P), main telephone number: (703) 305–7090, email address: *BPPDFRNotices@epa.gov;* or Susan Lewis, Director, Registration Division (RD) (7505P), main telephone number: (703) 305–7090, email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.* The mailing address for each contact person is: Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001. As part of the mailing address, include the contact person's name, division, and mail code. The division to contact is listed at the end of each pesticide petition summary.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for the division listed at the end of the pesticide petition summary of interest.

B. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through regulations.gov or email. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD–ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD–ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD–ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for preparing your comments.* When preparing and submitting your comments, see the commenting tips at *http://www.epa.gov/dockets/comments.html.*

3. *Environmental justice.* EPA seeks to achieve environmental justice, the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of any group, including minority and/or low-income populations, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. To help address potential environmental justice issues, the Agency seeks information on any groups or segments of the population who, as a result of their location, cultural practices, or other factors, may have atypical or disproportionately high and adverse human health impacts or environmental effects from exposure to the pesticides discussed in this document, compared to the general population.

II. What action is the agency taking?

EPA is announcing its receipt of several pesticide petitions filed under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a, requesting the establishment or modification of regulations in 40 CFR part 180 for residues of pesticide chemicals in or on various food commodities. The Agency is taking public comment on the requests before responding to the petitioners. EPA is not proposing any particular action at this time. EPA has determined that the pesticide petitions described in this document contain the data or information prescribed in FFDCA section 408(d)(2), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data support granting of the pesticide petitions. After considering the public comments, EPA intends to evaluate whether and what action may be warranted. Additional data may be needed before EPA can make a final determination on these pesticide petitions.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 180.7(f), a summary of each of the petitions that are the subject of this document, prepared by the petitioner, is included in a docket EPA has created for each rulemaking. The docket for each of the petitions is available at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

As specified in FFDCA section 408(d)(3), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(3), EPA is publishing notice of the petition so that the public has an opportunity to comment on this request for the establishment or modification of regulations for residues of pesticides in or on food commodities. Further information on the petition may be obtained through the petition summary referenced in this unit.

New Tolerances

1. *PP 4F8249.* (EPA–HQ–OPP–2014–0314). This notice is a revision to the notice published in the **Federal Register** of August 1, 2014 (79 FR 44729) (FRL–9911–67). Dow AgroSciences, LLC, 9330 Zionsville Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268–1054, requests to establish a tolerance in 40 CFR part 180 for

residues of the herbicide, triclopyr [(3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinyl)oxy] acetic acid in or on the raw agricultural commodity milk, fat at 0.7 parts per million (ppm); and to increase the tolerance in or on milk from 0.01 ppm to 0.6 ppm. The petitioner also requests to amend 40 CFR part 180.417 by establishing tolerances for residues of triclopyr [(3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinyl)oxy] acetic acid and its metabolite 3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol (TCP), calculated as the stoichiometric equivalent of triclopyr, in or on the raw agricultural commodities of cattle, goat, hog, horse, and sheep meat byproducts at 0.7 ppm; by increasing tolerances in cattle, goat, hog, horse, and sheep fat from 0.05 ppm to 0.09 ppm; and by increasing tolerances in cattle, goat, hog, horse, and sheep meat from 0.05 ppm to 0.08 ppm. An analytical method using electron capture gas chromatography is used to measure and evaluate the chemical triclopyr. Contact: RD.

2. *PP 5E8402.* (EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0712). Interregional Research No. 4 (IR–4), Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 500 College Road East, Suite 201–W, Princeton, NJ 08540, requests to establish a tolerance in 40 CFR part 180 for residues of the herbicide, clomazone 2-(2-chlorophenyl)methyl-4,4-dimethyl-3-isoxazolidinone in or on asparagus at 0.05 parts per million (ppm); and vegetable soybean (edamame) at 0.05 ppm. The analytical method consisting of an acid reflux, a C18 solid phase extraction (SPE), a Florisil SPE clean-up followed by gas chromatography (GC)-mass selective detection (MSD) is used to measure and evaluate the chemical clomazone. Contact: RD.

3. PP 5F8381. (EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0722). Bayer CropScience, P.O. Box 12014, 2 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, requests to establish a tolerance in 40 CFR part 180.626 for residues of the fungicide, prothioconazole in or on cotton, undelinted seed (crop subgroup 20C at 0.4 parts per million (ppm). The liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS) is used to measure and evaluate the chemical prothioconazole. Contact: RD.

4. PP 5F8381. (EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0722). Bayer CropScience, P.O. Box 12014, 2 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, requests to amend the tolerance in 40 CFR 180.626 for residues of the fungicide, prothioconazole in or on sugar beet, roots at 0.3 parts per million (ppm). The LC/MS/MS is used to measure and evaluate the chemical prothioconazole. Contact: RD.

5. PP 5F8361. (EPA–HQ–OPP–2015–0488). MacIntosh and Associates, Inc., 1203 Hartford Ave., St. Paul, MN 55116–1622 (on behalf of AgBiTech Pty Ltd, 8 Rocla Ct., Glenvale, Queensland 4350, Australia), requests to establish an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance in 40 CFR part 180 for residues of the microbial insecticide *Spodoptera frugiperda* Multiple Nucleopolyhedrovirus—3AP2 in or on food crops. The petitioner believes no analytical method is needed because the petitioner is requesting an exemption from tolerance. Contact: BPPD.

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a.

Dated: November 16, 2015.

Susan Lewis,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 2015–29893 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 90

[PS Docket 12–94, PS Docket 06–229, WT Docket No. 06–150, DA 15–1253]

Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Seeks Comment on FirstNet's Incumbent Relocation Proposal

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document seeks comment on the ex parte proposal made by the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) to facilitate the relocation of incumbent public safety communications systems operating in the 758–769/788–799 MHz spectrum band (Band 14) in advance of the deployment and operation of FirstNet's nationwide broadband public safety network (NPSBN).

DATES: Comments are due on or before December 9, 2015.

ADDRESSES: See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Marenco, Policy and Licensing Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, (202) 418–0838.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's document, DA 15–1253, released on November 5, 2015. The document is available for download at *http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/.* The complete text of this document also available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (tty).

1. On October 20, 2015, FirstNet filed an ex parte letter stating that its Board recently approved a Spectrum Relocation Grant Program designed to facilitate the relocation of Band 14 incumbents, and that it expects a Federal Funding Opportunity for the grant program to be released in early 2016. FirstNet further requests ''that the continuation of Commission licenses or other authorizations under Band 14 by any incumbent be conditioned upon the requirement that no operation on Band 14 be permitted without the express consent of FirstNet after July 31, 2017.'' FirstNet also requests that ''[i]n addition or in the alternative, . . . the Commission consider conditioning any continued operation on Band 14 on the cessation of all operations on Band 14 within 90 days written notice to the Band 14 incumbent(s) from FirstNet that deployment of the NPSBN is to begin in its State.''

2. In its 2013 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in these dockets, the Commission sought comment ''on the appropriate mechanism to transition incumbent narrowband operators out of [Band 14] and on the timeframe by which such a transition should be accomplished,'' 78 FR 24138, April 24, 2013. Specifically, the Commission asked whether it could require FirstNet to manage this transition process, or to provide funds for the process, and whether the Commission should establish a hard deadline by which relocation should be accomplished. While the Commission has already received comments on these issues, it believes that seeking expedited comment on FirstNet's more specific request will help ensure a complete and comprehensive record, and is consistent with FirstNet's expectation of release of a Federal Funding Opportunity for its related grant program in early 2016. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comment on FirstNet's request in light of the 2013 Notice and the associated record.

3. Interested parties may file comments until fourteen days after the publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. All pleadings are to reference PS Docket 12–94, PS Docket 06–229 and WT Docket No. 06–150. This proceeding is a ''permit-but-disclose'' proceeding in accordance with the Commission's ex parte rules.

Persons making ex parte presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral ex parte presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the ex parte presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter's written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during ex parte meetings are deemed to be written ex parte presentations and must be filed consistent with § 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by § 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written ex parte presentations and memoranda summarizing oral ex parte presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (*e.g.,* .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission's ex parte rules.

4. Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS). See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings, 63 FR 24121 (1998).

- Electronic Filers: Comments may be filed electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: *http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs2/.*
- Paper Filers: Parties that choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.

5. Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission's Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- All hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission's Secretary must be delivered to FCC Headquarters at 445 12th St. SW., Room TW–A325, Washington, DC 20554. The filing hours are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.
- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743.
- U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to 445 12th Street SW., Washington DC 20554.

6. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202–418–0530 (voice), 202–418–0432 (tty).

7. For further information, contact: Roberto Mussenden, Policy Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, at (202) 418–1428 or *Roberto.Mussenden@fcc.gov.*

Federal Communications Commission.

David L. Furth,

Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2015–30111 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 227
Wednesday, November 25, 2015

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[Docket No. 151028999–5999–01]

Privacy Act of 1974; Amended System of Records

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Amendment to Privacy Act System of Records: COMMERCE/NOAA–1, Applicants for the NOAA Corps.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the Department of Commerce's (Department) proposal to amend the system of records entitled ''COMMERCE/NOAA–1, Applicants for the NOAA Corps,'' under the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Commissioned Officer Corps (NOAA Corps) is the uniformed service of NOAA, a bureau of the Department of Commerce. The NOAA Corps provides a cadre of professionals trained in engineering, earth sciences, oceanography, meteorology, fisheries science, and other related disciplines who serve their country by supporting NOAA's mission of surveying the Earth's oceans, coasts, and atmosphere to ensure the economic and physical well-being of the Nation. This record system is necessary in order to identify both minimum eligibility and level of qualification of applicants for the NOAA Corps.

DATES: To be considered, written comments must be submitted on or before December 28, 2015. Unless comments are received, the amended system of records will become effective as proposed on the date of publication of a subsequent notice in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Director, NOAA Corps, 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 500, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Persons wishing to be considered for a NOAA Corps Commission must submit a complete application package, including NOAA Form 56–42, at least three letters of recommendation, NOAA Form 56–42A, and official transcripts. A personal interview must also be conducted. All persons shall meet the eligibility requirements prior to their appointments into the NOAA Corps. The requirements must include a bachelor's degree and at least 48 credit hours of science, engineering, or other disciplines related to NOAA's missions (including either calculus or physics), have satisfactorily passed the prescribed mental and physical evaluations in accordance with 33 U.S.C. 3021(a)(2)(A), 3021(a)(3); 10 U.S.C. 532(a)(4), and ability to complete 20 years of active duty commissioned service prior to their 62nd birthday.

COMMERCE/NOAA–1

SYSTEM NAME:

COMMERCE/NOAA–1, Applicants for the NOAA Corps.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:

Moderate.

SYSTEM LOCATION:

Office of Marine and Aviation Operations, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 500, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:

Applicants for appointment in the NOAA Corps and persons providing references.

CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

Name, date of birth, place of birth, country of citizenship (if U.S., how citizenship acquired), mailing address, physical address, telephone numbers, email addresses, social security number, selective service registration, educational information (names and locations of schools, graduation dates, areas of study, years attended, degrees) GPAs for undergraduate and graduate programs, courses (and credit hours) in progress or proposed prior to graduation, college transcripts, credit hours in applicable fields of study, work experience (name and location of company, position title, supervisor contact information, description of work, hours, salary and reason for leaving, whether employment is/was at a professional level), letters of reference, physical examinations, statements of prior military service (rejections, conscientious objector status, type of discharge, current obligations), recruiting officer's interview evaluation form, personal resumes, special qualifications and skills, and names of references.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM:

The statutory authorities for this system of records are 33 U.S.C. Chapter 43, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps and PL 112–166 Section 2. (gg)(1), Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act of 2011.

PURPOSES:

The NOAA Corps provides a cadre of professionals trained in engineering, earth sciences, oceanography, meteorology, fisheries science, and other related disciplines who support NOAA's mission of surveying the Earth's oceans, coasts, and atmosphere to ensure the economic and physical well-being of the Nation. This record system is necessary in order to identify both minimum eligibility and level of qualification of applicants for the NOAA Corps. The system is designed as follows: Application and reference information may be submitted on a year-round basis, but the primary periods of collection are typically immediately preceding summer and winter college graduations. Completed applications are examined by the NOAA Officer Personnel Board in order to rate and/or assess the level of qualification, suitability, and availability of candidates for appointment. NOAA Form 56–42 and NOAA Form 56–42A are now fully electronic, the result of efforts to reduce paperwork, clarify the collection process and improve the quality of applicant responses.

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

In addition to those disclosures generally permitted under 5 U.S.C. 552a(b) of the Privacy Act, these records or information contained therein may specifically be disclosed outside the Department of Commerce (Department).

The records or information contained therein may specifically be disclosed as a routine use as stated below. The Department will, when so authorized, make the determination as to the relevancy of a record prior to its decision to disclose a document.

1. In the event that a system of records maintained by the Department to carry out its functions indicates a violation or potential violation of law or contract, whether civil, criminal or regulatory in nature and whether arising by general statute or particular program statute or contract, rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto, or the necessity to protect an interest of the Department, the relevant records in the system of records, may be referred to the appropriate agency, whether Federal, State, local, or foreign, charged with the responsibility of investigating or prosecuting such violation or charged with enforcing or implementing the statute or contract, rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto, or protecting the interest of the Department.

2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, hearing officer or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations, administrative appeals and hearings.

3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.

4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice in connection with determining whether the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) requires disclosure thereof.

5. A record in this system of records may be disclosed to a contractor of the Department having need for the information in the performance of the contract but not operating a system of records within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).

6. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, state or local agency maintaining civil, criminal or other relevant enforcement information or other pertinent information, such as current licenses, if necessary to obtain information relevant to a Department decision concerning the assignment, hiring or retention of an individual, the issuance of a security clearance, the letting of a contract, or the issuance of a license, grant or other benefit.

7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, state, local, or international agency, in response to its request, in connection with the assignment, hiring or retention of an individual, the issuance of a security clearance, the reporting of an investigation of an individual, the letting of a contract, or the issuance of a license, grant, or other benefit by the requesting agency, to the extent that the information is relevant and necessary to the requesting agency's decision on the matter.

8. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Office of Management and Budget in connection with the review of private relief legislation as set forth in OMB Circular No. A–19 at any stage of the legislative coordination and clearance process as set forth in that Circular.

9. A record in this system may be transferred, as a routine use, to the Office of Personnel Management: For personnel research purposes; as a data source for management information; for the production of summary descriptive statistics and analytical studies in support of the function for which the records are collected and maintained; or for related manpower studies.

10. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services Administration (GSA), or his designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.* GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.

11. A record in this system of records may be disclosed to appropriate agencies, entities and persons when: (1) It is suspected or determined that the security or confidentiality of information in the system of records has been compromised; (2) the Department has determined that as a result of the suspected or confirmed compromise there is a risk of harm to economic or property interests, identity theft or fraud, or harm to the security or integrity of this system or other systems or programs (whether maintained by the Department or another agency or entity) that rely upon the compromised information; and (3) the disclosure made to such agencies, entities, and persons is reasonably necessary to assist in connection with the Department's efforts to respond to the suspected or confirmed compromise and to prevent, minimize, or remedy such harm.

DISCLOSURE TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES:

Disclosure to consumer reporting agencies pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(12) may be made from this system to ''consumer reporting agencies'' as defined in the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(f)) and the Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966 (31 U.S.C. 3701(a)(3)).

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

STORAGE:

Computerized data base; paper records in file folders in locked metal cabinets and/or locked rooms. Electronic records containing Privacy Act information are protected by a user identification/password. The database user identification/password is issued to individuals by authorized personnel.

RETRIEVABILITY:

Records are organized and retrieved by the individual's name.

SAFEGUARDS:

The system of records is stored in a building with doors that are locked during and after business hours. Visitors to the facility must register and must be accompanied by Federal personnel at all times. Only those that have the need to know, to carry out the official duties of their job, have access to the information. Paper records are maintained in secured file cabinets in areas that are accessible only to authorized personnel of the Data Collection Agent. Electronic records containing Privacy Act information are protected by a user identification/password. The user identification/password is issued to individuals by authorized personnel. OMAO staff and contractors, to whom access to this information is granted in accordance with this system of records routine uses provision, are instructed on the confidential nature of this information.

All electronic information disseminated by NOAA adheres to the standards set out in Appendix III, Security of Automated Information Resources, OMB Circular A–130; the Computer Security Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–23 and 278g–4); and the Government Information Security Reform Act, Public Law 106–398, and follows NIST SP 800–18, Guide for Developing Security Plans for Federal Information Systems; NIST SP 800–26, Security Self-Assessment Guide for Information

Technology Systems; and NIST SP 800–53, Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Records are destroyed after three years, if rejected, unless applicant indicates a desire for reconsideration. If selected and appointed to the NOAA Corps, the application becomes a permanent part of the officer's Official Personnel Folder.

SYSTEM MANAGER AND ADDRESS:

Director, NOAA Corps, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 500 Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

See NOAA Corps Directive, Chapter 6, Part 16107, Requests for Information.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

See NOAA Corps Directive, Chapter 6, Part 16107, Requests for Information.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

The Department's rules for access, for contesting contents, and appealing initial determinations by the individual concerned appear in 15 CFR part 4b. Use above address.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Subject individuals, personal references, the NOAA Corps officer who recruited the individual, and those authorized by the individual to furnish information.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5) this system of records is exempted from the notice, access, and contest requirements (under 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (d), (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I), and (f)) of the agency regulations in order to fulfill commitments made to protect the confidentiality of sources, and to maintain access to sources of information which are necessary to determine an applicant's suitability for employment in the NOAA Corps.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Michael J. Toland,

Department of Commerce, Freedom of Information and Privacy Act Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–29987 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Order No. 1984]

Grant of Authority; Establishment of a Foreign-Trade Zone Under the Alternative Site Framework Western Kentucky

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Foreign-Trade Zones Act provides for '' . . . the establishment . . . of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,'' and authorizes the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs and Border Protection ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board adopted the alternative site framework (ASF) (15 CFR 400.2(c)) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of zones;

Whereas, the Paducah McCracken County Riverport Authority (the Grantee), has made application to the Board (B–21–2015, docketed April 10, 2015, requesting the establishment of a foreign-trade zone under the ASF with a service area comprised of portions of McCracken and Livingston Counties, Kentucky, adjacent to the Evansville, Indiana Customs and Border Protection port of entry, and proposed Site 1 would be categorized as a magnet site;

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 20469, April 16, 2015) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations are satisfied;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby grants to the Grantee the privilege of establishing a foreign-trade zone, designated on the records of the Board as Foreign-Trade Zone No. 294, as described in the application, and subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.13, to the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit, and to an ASF sunset provision for magnet sites that would terminate authority for Site 1 if not activated within five years from the month of approval.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of November 2015.

Penny Pritzker,

Secretary of Commerce, Chairman and Executive Officer, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–30067 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–80–2015]

Foreign-Trade Zone 38—Spartanburg County, South Carolina; Application for Reorganization (Expansion of Service Area) Under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of FTZ 38, requesting authority to expand its service area under the alternative site framework (ASF) adopted by the Board (15 CFR Sec. 400.2(c)). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new subzones or ''usage-driven'' FTZ sites for operators/users located within a grantee's ''service area'' in the context of the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a zone. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally docketed on November 18, 2015.

FTZ 38 was approved by the Board on May 4, 1987 (Board Order 131, 43 FR 20526, May 12, 1978) and reorganized under the ASF on October 7, 2010 (Board Order 1710, 75 FR 65304, October 22, 2010). The zone currently has a service area that includes the Counties of Greenville, Spartanburg, Cherokee, Oconee, Union, Anderson and Laurens, South Carolina.

The applicant is requesting authority to expand the service area of the zone to include Pickens, Greenwood and Abbeville Counties, as described in the application. If approved, the grantee would be able to serve sites throughout the expanded service area based on companies' needs for FTZ designation. The application indicates that the proposed expanded service area is adjacent to the Greenville/Spartanburg Customs and Border Protection port of entry.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Kathleen Boyce of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is January 25, 2016. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to February 8, 2016.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the ''Reading Room'' section of the Board's Web site, which is accessible via *www.trade.gov/ftz.* For further information, contact Kathleen Boyce at *Kathleen.Boyce@trade.gov* or (202) 482–1346.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29996 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–78–2013]

Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 141—Rochester, New York, Termination of Review of Notification of Proposed Production Activity American Tactical Imports (Deconstruction of Firearms), Rochester, New York

Upon request by the County of Monroe, grantee of FTZ 141, the FTZ Board staff has terminated review of a notification of proposed production activity on behalf of American Tactical Imports within a now-expired site of FTZ 141 in Rochester, New York. The notification was received on July 29, 2013 (78 FR 50375–50376, 8/19/2013). The termination is the result of changed circumstances, and the case has been closed without prejudice.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–30066 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–977]

High Pressure Steel Cylinders From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is rescinding the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on high pressure steel cylinders (''steel cylinders'') from the People's Republic of China (''the PRC'') for the period of review June 1, 2014, through May 31, 2015.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Devine or Susan Pulongbarit, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0238 or (202) 482–4031, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 15, 2015, Norris Cylinder Company (''Petitioner'') submitted a request for administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel cylinders from the PRC for a single company, Beijing Tianhai Industry Co., Ltd. (''BTIC'').[1] On June 30, BTIC also submitted a request for administrative review of the order.[2] On August 3, 2015, the Department published the notice of initiation of an administrative review of the order for the period of review June 1, 2014, through May 31, 2015.[3] On September 9, 2015, Petitioner and BTIC both withdrew their requests for review.[4]

[1] *See* Letter to the Secretary from Petitioner, ''High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China Request for Administrative Review and Entry of Appearance,'' June 15, 2015.

[2] *See* Letter to the Secretary from BTIC, ''Request for the Third Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China, A–570–977 (POR: 06/01/14–05/31/15),'' June 30, 2015.

[3] *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews,* 80 FR 45947 (August 3, 2015) (''*Initiation Notice''*).

[4] *See* Letter to the Secretary from Petitioner, ''Withdrawal of Request for an Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China,'' (September 9, 2015); Letter to the Secretary from BTIC, ''Withdrawal of Review Request in the Third Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on High Pressure Steel Cylinders from the People's Republic of China,'' (September 9, 2015).

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the party or parties that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the publication date of the notice of initiation of the requested review. As noted above, all parties withdrew their requests for administrative reviews within 90 days of the publication date of the notice of initiation. No other parties requested an administrative review of the order. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we are rescinding this review in its entirety.

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (''CBP'') to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of steel cylinders from the PRC. Antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of this notice of rescission of administrative review.

Notifications

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under an APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: November 16, 2015.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2015–29944 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–602–809, A–351–845, A–588–874, A–580–883, A–421–813, A–489–826, A–412–825]

Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products From Australia, Brazil, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, the Republic of Turkey, and the United Kingdom: Postponement of Preliminary Determinations of Antidumping Duty Investigations

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective date:* November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Veith at (202) 482–4295 (Australia); Yang Jin Chun at (202) 482–5760 (Brazil); Jack Zhao at (202) 482–1396 (Japan); Matthew Renkey at (202) 482–2312 (the Republic of Korea (''Korea'')); Dmitry Vladimirov at (202) 482–0665, (the Netherlands); Jack Zhao at (202) 482–1396 (the Republic of Turkey (''Turkey'')); and Catherine Cartsos at (202) 482–1757 (the United Kingdom), AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 31, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') initiated antidumping duty (''AD'') investigations of imports of certain hot-rolled steel flat products (''hot-rolled steel'') from Australia, Brazil, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.[1] The notice of initiation stated that, in accordance with section 733(b)(l)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the ''Act''), and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), we would issue our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of initiation, unless postponed. Currently, the preliminary determinations in these investigations are due no later than January 19, 2016.[2]

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

Sections 733(c)(1)(B)(i) and (ii) of the Act permit the Department to postpone the time limit for the preliminary determination if it concludes that the parties concerned are cooperating and determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated by reason of the number and complexity of the transactions to be investigated or adjustments to be considered, the novelty of the issues presented, or the number of firms whose activities must be investigated, and additional time is necessary to make the preliminary determination. Under this section of the Act, the Department may postpone the preliminary determination until no later than 190 days after the date on which the Department initiated the investigation.

The Department determines that the parties involved in these hot-rolled steel AD investigations are cooperating, and that the investigations are extraordinarily complicated. Additional time is required to analyze the questionnaire responses and issue appropriate requests for clarification and additional information.

Therefore, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1), the Department is postponing the time period for the preliminary determinations of these investigations by 50 days, to March 8, 2016. Pursuant to section 735(a)(l) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(1), the deadline for the final determinations will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determinations, unless postponed at a later date.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1).

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–29936 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] *See Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Australia, Brazil, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, the Republic of Turkey, and the United Kingdom: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair Value Investigations,* 80 FR 54261(September 9, 2015).

[2] The deadline for the preliminary determinations is normally 140 days after we initiated these investigations, or January 18, 2016, which is a Federal holiday. Department practice dictates that where a deadline falls on a weekend or Federal holiday, the appropriate deadline is the next business day (in this instance, January 19, 2016). *See Notice of Clarification: Application of ''Next Business Day'' Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, As Amended,* 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Interim Procedures for Considering Requests and Comments From the Public for Textile and Apparel Safeguard Actions on Imports From Korea

AGENCY: International Trade Administration.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJessup@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Maria D'Andrea, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, Tel. (202) 482–1550, *Maria.D'Andrea@trade.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Article 4.1 of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (the ''Agreement'') provides for a textile and apparel safeguard mechanism. This safeguard mechanism applies when, as a result of the reduction or elimination of a customs duty under the Agreement, a Korean textile or apparel article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, in absolute terms or relative to the domestic market for that article, and under such conditions as to cause serious damage or actual threat thereof to a U.S. industry producing a like or directly competitive article. In these circumstances, Article 4.1 permits the United States to (a) suspend any further reduction in the rate of duty provided for under Annex 2–B of the Agreement in the duty imposed on the article; or (b) increase duties on the imported article from Korea to a level that does not exceed the lesser of the prevailing U.S. normal trade relations (''NTR'')/most-favored-

nation (''MFN'') duty rate for the article or the U.S. NTR/MFN duty rate in effect on the day before the Agreement enters into force.

The Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (the ''Act'') provides that the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA) will issue procedures for requesting such safeguard measures, for making its determinations under section 332(a) of the Act, and for providing relief under section 332(b) of the Act.

In Proclamation No. 8783 (77 FR 14265, March 9, 2012), the President delegated to CITA his authority under Subtitle C of Title III of the Act with respect to textile and apparel safeguard measures.

The textile and apparel safeguard mechanism will be of considerable benefit to firms manufacturing textile and apparel goods in the United States in the event that an industry finds itself to be adversely impacted by preferential duty or duty-free imports of textiles and apparel from Korea.

CITA must collect information in order to determine whether a domestic textile or apparel industry is being adversely impacted by imports of these products from Korea, thereby allowing CITA to take corrective action to protect the viability of the domestic textile and apparel industry, subject to section 332(b) of the Act.

An interested party in the U.S. domestic textile and apparel industry may file a request for a textile and apparel safeguard action with CITA. Consistent with longstanding CITA practice in considering textile and apparel safeguard actions, CITA will consider an interested party to be an entity (which may be a trade association, firm, certified or recognized union, or group of workers) that is representative of either: (A) A domestic producer or producers of an article that is like or directly competitive with the subject Korean textile or apparel article; or (B) a domestic producer or producers of a component used in the production of an article that is like or directly competitive with the subject Korean textile or apparel article.

In order for a request to be considered, the requestor must provide the following information in support of a claim that a textile or apparel article from Korea is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, in absolute terms or relative to the domestic market for that article, and under such conditions as to cause serious damage or actual threat thereof, to a U.S. industry producing an article that is like, or directly competitive with, the imported article: (1) Name and description of the imported article concerned; (2) import data demonstrating that imports of a Korea origin textile or apparel article that are like or directly competitive with the articles produced by the domestic industry concerned are increasing in absolute terms or relative to the domestic market for that article; (3) U.S. domestic production of the like or directly competitive articles of U.S. origin indicating the nature and extent of the serious damage or actual threat thereof, along with an affirmation that to the best of the requester's knowledge, the data represent substantially all of the domestic production of the like or directly competitive article(s) of U.S. origin; (4) imports from Korea as a percentage of the domestic market of the like or directly competitive article; and (5) all data available to the requester showing changes in productivity, utilization of capacity, inventories, exports, wages, employment, domestic prices, profits, and investment, and any other information, relating to the existence of serious damage or actual threat thereof caused by imports from Korea to the industry producing the like or directly competitive article that is the subject of the request. To the extent that such information is not available, the requester should provide best estimates and the basis therefore.

If CITA determines that the request provides the information necessary for it to be considered, CITA will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking public comments regarding the request. The comment period shall be 30 calendar days. The notice will include a summary of the request. Any interested party may submit information to rebut, clarify, or correct public comments submitted by any interested party.

CITA will make a determination on any request it considers within 60 calendar days of the close of the comment period. If CITA is unable to make a determination within 60 calendar days, it will publish a notice in the **Federal Register**, including the date it will make a determination.

If a determination under section 322(b) of the Act is affirmative, CITA may provide tariff relief to a U.S. industry to the extent necessary to remedy or prevent serious damage or actual threat thereof and to facilitate adjustment by the domestic industry to import competition. The import tariff relief is effective beginning on the date that CITA's affirmative determination is published in the **Federal Register**.

Entities submitting requests, responses or rebuttals to CITA may submit both a public and confidential version of their submissions. If the request is accepted, the public version will be posted on the dedicated Korea Free Trade Agreement textile safeguards section of the Office of Textile and Apparel (OTEXA) Web site. The confidential version of the request, responses or rebuttals will not be shared with the public as it may contain business confidential information. Entities submitting responses or rebuttals may use the public version of the request as a basis for responses.

II. Method of Collection

When an interested party files a request for a textile and apparel safeguard action with CITA, ten copies of any such request must be provided in a paper format. If business confidential information is provided, two copies of a non-confidential version must also be provided. If CITA determines that the request provides the necessary information to be considered, it publishes a **Federal Register** notice seeking public comments on the request. To the extent business confidential information is provided, a non-confidential version must also be provided. Any interested party may submit information to rebut, clarify, or correct public comments submitted by any interested party.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0625–0269.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Individuals or Business.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 14 (4 for Request; 10 for Comments).

Estimated Time per Response: 4 hours (for each Request) 4 hours (for each Comment).

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 56 hours (16 hours for Requests; 40 hours for Comments).

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $2,800.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information

on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–29932 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–535–904]

Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe From Pakistan: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kaitlin Wojnar at (202) 482–3857, Office VII, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On October 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of circular welded carbon-quality steel pipe (circular welded pipe) from Pakistan, filed in proper form on behalf of Bull Moose Tube Company, EXLTUBE, Wheatland Tube Company, and Western Tube and Conduit (collectively, Petitioners).[1] The CVD petition was accompanied by an antidumping duty (AD) petition concerning imports of circular welded pipe from Pakistan.[2] Petitioners are domestic producers of circular welded pipe.[3]

On November 2, 2015, the Department requested supplemental information pertaining to certain areas of the Petition.[4] Petitioners filed responses to these requests on November 4, 2015.[5] Petitioners submitted additional supplemental information on November 9, 2015,[6] and November 10, 2015.[7]

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Petitioners allege that the Government of Pakistan (GOP) is providing countervailable subsidies, within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act, to imports of circular welded pipe from Pakistan and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, for those alleged programs in Pakistan on which we have initiated a CVD investigation, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioners supporting their allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioners are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The Department also finds that Petitioners demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the CVD investigation that Petitioners are requesting.[8]

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation is January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014.[9]

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is circular welded carbon-quality steel pipe from Pakistan. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, *see* Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, the Department issued questions to and received responses from Petitioners pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[10] As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations,[11] we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.*, scope). The Department will consider all comments received from interested parties and, if necessary, will consult with the interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information,[12] all such factual information should be limited to public information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaire, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Monday, December 7, 2015, which is 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Thursday, December 17, 2015, which is 10 calendar days after the initial comments deadline.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider

[1] *See* Letter from Petitioners, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam,'' October 28, 2015 (the Petition), Volumes I and IV.

[2] *Id.,* Volume II. Petitioners also filed AD petitions regarding the Sultanate of Oman, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

[3] *Id.,* Volume I at 2.

[4] *See* Letter from the Department, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Pipe from Pakistan: Supplemental Questions,'' November 2, 2015 (General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire); Letter from the Department, ''Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Pipe from Pakistan: Supplemental Questions,'' November 2, 2015.

[5] *See* Letter from Petitioners, ''Response to Supplemental Questions Regarding Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan,'' November 4, 2015 (General Issues Supplement); *see also* Letter from Petitioners, ''*Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan:* Response to the Department's November 2, 2015 Questionnaire Regarding Volume IV of the Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,'' November 4, 2015.

[6] *See* Letter from Petitioners, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality-Steel Pipe from Pakistan: Response to Issues Identified in the November 6, 2015 Phone Call,'' November 9, 2015 (Second General Issues Supplement).

[7] *See* Letter from Petitioners, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon Quality-Steel Pipe from Pakistan: Second Response to Issues Identified in the November 6, 2015 Phone Call,'' November 10, 2015 (Third General Issues Supplement).

[8] *See* ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petition'' section, below.

[9] *See* 19 CFR 351.204(b)(2).

[10] *See* General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire; *see also* General Issues Supplement; Second General Issues Supplement.

[11] *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule,* 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997).

[12] *See* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21).

relevant to the scope of the investigation be submitted during this time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigation may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must be filed on the record of the concurrent AD investigation, as well as the AD investigations of circular welded pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).[13] An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.*, in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act, the Department notified representatives of the GOP of the receipt of the Petition. Also, in accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department provided representatives of the GOP the opportunity for consultations with respect to the CVD allegations.[14] Such consultations were held at the Department's main building on November 9, 2015.[15]

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A), or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[16] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[17]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petitions).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioners do not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that circular welded pipe constitutes a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[18]

In determining whether Petitioners have standing under section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigation,'' at Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioners provided their shipments of the domestic like product in 2014, then compared their shipments to the estimated total shipments domestic like product for the entire domestic industry.[19] Because total industry production data for the domestic like product for 2014 is not reasonably available and Petitioners have established that shipments are a reasonable proxy for production data,[20] we have relied upon the shipment data provided by Petitioners for purposes of measuring industry support.[21]

Our review of the data provided in the Petition, General Issues Supplement, Second General Issues Supplement, Third General Issues Supplement, and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioners have established industry support.[22] First, the Petition establishes support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total shipments [23] of the

[13] *See* 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements); *see also Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011), for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx*, and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filling%20Procedures.pdf*.

[14] *See* Letter from the Department, ''Petitions for Countervailing Duties on Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan,'' October 28, 2015.

[15] *See* Department Memorandum, ''Countervailing Duty Petition on Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan: Consultations with the Government of Pakistan,'' November 9, 2015.

[16] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[17] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States*, 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[18] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan (Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II—Analysis of Industry Support (Attachment II). This checklist is dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the Department's main building.

[19] *See* General Issues Supplement at 3–6, Exhibit I–13, and Exhibit I–14; *see also* Second General Issues Supplement at 1, Exhibits I–17 through I–19; Third General Issues Supplement at Exhibit I–21.

[20] *See* Petition, Volume I at 3 and Exhibit I–2; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 3–4, Exhibits I–13, and Exhibit I–14.

[21] For further discussion, *see* Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

[22] *Id.*

[23] As mentioned above, Petitioners have established that shipments are a reasonable proxy

Continued

domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.*, polling).[24] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total shipments of the domestic like product.[25] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the shipments of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition.[26] Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the CVD investigation that they are requesting the Department initiate.[27]

Injury Test

Because Pakistan is a ''Subsidies Agreement Country,'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, section 701(a)(2) of the Act applies to this investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Pakistan materially injures, or threatens material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioners allege that imports of the subject merchandise are benefitting from countervailable subsidies and that such imports are causing, or threaten to cause, material injury to the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. Petitioners allege that subject imports from Pakistan exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under the Act.[28] In CVD investigations, section 771(24)(B) of the Act provides that imports of subject merchandise must exceed a negligibility threshold of three percent. Section 771(24)(B) of the Act, however, provides that imports of subject merchandise from developing and least-developed countries must exceed a negligibility threshold of four percent.[29] Petitioners demonstrate that subject imports from Pakistan, which has been designated as a least-developed country under section 771(36)(B) of the Act, exceed the four percent negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(B) of the Act.[30]

Petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by reduced market share, underselling and price suppression or depression, lost sales and revenues, reduced shipments and a plant closure leading to job losses, increased inventories and inventory overhang in the U.S. market, and decline in profitability.[31] We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[32]

Initiation of CVD Investigation

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a CVD investigation whenever an interested party files a CVD petition on behalf of an industry that (1) alleges the elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a) of the Act and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioners supporting the allegations.

Petitioners allege that producers/exporters of circular welded pipe in Pakistan benefit from countervailable subsidies bestowed by the GOP. The Department examined the Petition and finds that it complies with the requirements of section 702(b)(1) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether manufacturers, producers, and/or exporters of circular welded pipe from Pakistan receive countervailable subsidies from the GOP.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.[33] The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.[34] The amendments to sections 776 and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to this CVD investigation.[35]

Based on our review of the petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on all of the 14 alleged programs in Pakistan. For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate on each program, *see* the CVD Initiation Checklist. A public version of the initiation checklist for this investigation is available on ACCESS.

In accordance with section 703(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

Respondent Selection

Petitioners named six companies as producers/exporters of circular welded pipe in Pakistan.[36] Following standard practice in CVD investigations, the Department will, where appropriate, select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports of circular welded pipe during the POI under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States numbers: 7306.30.1000, 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.30.5040, 7306.30.5055, 7306.30.5085, and 7306.30.5090. We intend to release CBP data under Administrative Protective Order (APO) to all parties with access to information protected by APO within five business days of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. Comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection should be submitted seven calendar days after the placement of the CBP data

for production data. Section 351.203(e)(1) of the Department's regulations states ''production levels may be established by reference to alternative data that the Secretary determines to be indicative of production levels.''

[24] *See* section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act; *see also* Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

[25] *See* Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment II.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.*

[28] *See* Petition, Volume I at 17–18, Exhibit I–7, and Exhibit I–8; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 8–10 and Exhibit I–11.

[29] *See* Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment III.

[30] *Id.*

[31] *See* Petition, Volume I at 15–23, Exhibits I–6 through I–9; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 6–10, Exhibit I–11, Exhibit I–13, and Exhibit I–15.

[32] *See* Pakistan CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment III.

[33] *See* Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Public Law 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

[34] *See Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015,* 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*). The 2015 amendments may be found at *https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl.*

[35] *See Applicability Notice,* 80 FR at 46794–95.

[36] *See* Petition, Volume I at Exhibit I–4.

on the record of this investigation. Parties wishing to submit rebuttal comments should submit those comments five calendar days after the deadline for initial comments.

Comments must be filed electronically using ACCESS. An electronically-filed document must be received successfully, in its entirety, by ACCESS no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on the date noted above. We intend to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 20 days of publication of this notice. Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(b). Instructions for filing such applications may be found on the Department's Web site at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/apo.*

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petition has been provided to the GOP *via* ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each known exporter (as named in the Petition), consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petition was filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of circular welded pipe from Pakistan are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.[37] A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated.[38] Otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). 19 CFR 351.301(b) requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Extension of Time Limits Regulation

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301 expires. For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Under certain circumstances, we may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. Review *Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule,* 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at *http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm,* prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[39] Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule.*[40] The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable revised certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures,* 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Parties wishing to participate in this investigation should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (*e.g.,* the filing of letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 702 and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I—Scope of the Investigation

This investigation covers welded carbon-quality steel pipes and tube, of circular cross-section, with an outside diameter (O.D.) not more than nominal 16 inches (406.4 mm), regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (*e.g.,* black, galvanized, or painted), end finish (plain-end, beveled-end, grooved, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or industry specification (*e.g.,* American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTM), proprietary, or other), generally known as standard pipe, fence pipe and tube, sprinkler pipe, and structural pipe (although subject product may also be referred to as mechanical tubing). Specifically, the term ''carbon-quality'' includes products in which:

(a) iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements;
(b) the carbon content is 2 percent or less, by weight; and
(c) none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity, by weight, as indicated:

(i) 1.80 percent of manganese;
(ii) 2.25 percent of silicon;
(iii) 1.00 percent of copper;
(iv) 0.50 percent of aluminum;
(v) 1.25 percent of chromium;
(vi) 0.30 percent of cobalt;
(vii) 0.40 percent of lead;
(viii) 1.25 percent of nickel;
(ix) 0.30 percent of tungsten;

[37] *See* section 703(a)(2) of the Act.

[38] *See* section 703(a)(1) of the Act.

[39] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[40] *See Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (''*Final Rule*''); *see also* frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule,* available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.*

(x) 0.15 percent of molybdenum;
(xi) 0.10 percent of niobium;
(xii) 0.41 percent of titanium;
(xiii) 0.15 percent of vanadium; or
(xiv) 0.15 percent of zirconium.

Covered products are generally made to standard O.D. and wall thickness combinations. Pipe multi-stenciled to a standard and/or structural specification and to other specifications, such as American Petroleum Institute (API) API–5L, is also covered by the scope of this investigation when it meets the physical description set forth above. Covered products may also possess one or more of the following characteristics: is 32 feet in length or less; is less than 2.0 inches (50 mm) in nominal O.D.; has a galvanized and/or painted (*e.g.,* polyester coated) surface finish; or has a threaded and/or coupled end finish.

Standard pipe is ordinarily made to ASTM specifications A53, A135, and A795, but can also be made to other specifications. Structural pipe is made primarily to ASTM specifications A252 and A500. Standard and structural pipe may also be produced to proprietary specifications rather than to industry specifications.

Sprinkler pipe is designed for sprinkler fire suppression systems and may be made to industry specifications such as ASTM A53 or to proprietary specifications.

Fence tubing is included in the scope regardless of certification to a specification listed in the exclusions below, and can also be made to the ASTM A513 specification. Products that meet the physical description set forth above but are made to the following nominal outside diameter and wall thickness combinations, which are recognized by the industry as typical for fence tubing, are included despite being certified to ASTM mechanical tubing specifications:

O.D. in inches (nominal)	Wall thickness in inches (nominal)	Gage
1.315	0.035	20
1.315	0.047	18
1.315	0.055	17
1.315	0.065	16
1.315	0.072	15
1.315	0.083	14
1.315	0.095	13
1.660	0.055	17
1.660	0.065	16
1.660	0.083	14
1.660	0.095	13
1.660	0.109	12
1.900	0.047	18
1.900	0.055	17
1.900	0.065	16
1.900	0.072	15
1.900	0.095	13
1.900	0.109	12
2.375	0.047	18
2.375	0.055	17
2.375	0.065	16
2.375	0.072	15
2.375	0.095	13
2.375	0.109	12
2.375	0.120	11
2.875	0.109	12
2.875	0.165	8
3.500	0.109	12
3.500	0.165	8
4.000	0.148	9
4.000	0.165	8
4.500	0.203	7

The scope of this investigation does not include:

(a) pipe suitable for use in boilers, superheaters, heat exchangers, refining furnaces and feedwater heaters, whether or not cold drawn, which are defined by standards such as ASTM A178 or ASTM A192;
(b) finished electrical conduit, *i.e.,* Electrical Rigid Steel Conduit (also known as Electrical Rigid Metal Conduit and Electrical Rigid Metal Steel Conduit), Finished Electrical Metallic Tubing, and Electrical Intermediate Metal Conduit, which are defined by specifications such as American National Standard (ANSI) C80.1–2005, ANSI C80.3–2005, or ANSI C80.6–2005, and Underwriters Laboratories Inc. (UL) UL–6, UL–797, or UL–1242;
(c) finished scaffolding, *i.e.,* component parts of final, finished scaffolding that enter the United States unassembled as a ''kit.'' A kit is understood to mean a packaged combination of component parts that contains, at the time of importation, all of the necessary component parts to fully assemble final, finished scaffolding;
(d) tube and pipe hollows for redrawing;
(e) oil country tubular goods produced to API specifications;
(f) line pipe produced to only API specifications, such as API 5L, and not multi-stenciled; and
(g) mechanical tubing, whether or not cold-drawn, other than what is included in the above paragraphs.

The products subject to this investigation are currently classifiable in Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) statistical reporting numbers 7306.19.1010, 7306.19.1050, 7306.19.5110, 7306.19.5150, 7306.30.1000, 7306.30.5015, 7306.30.5020, 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.50.5030, 7306.30.5040, 7306.30.5055, 7306.30.5085, 7306.30.5090, 7306.50.1000, 7306.50.5050, and 7306.50.5070. However, the product description, and not the HTSUS classification, is dispositive of whether the merchandise imported into the United States falls within the scope.

[FR Doc. 2015–29946 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–523–812, A–535–903, A–565–803, A–520–807, A–552–820]

Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe From the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kate Johnson at (202) 482–4929 (the Sultanate of Oman (Oman) and the United Arab Emirates (UAE)); David Lindgren at (202) 482–3870 (Pakistan and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Vietnam)); or Dennis McClure at (202) 482–5973 (the Philippines), AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petitions

On October 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received antidumping duty (AD) petitions concerning imports of circular welded carbon-quality steel pipe (circular welded pipe) from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam, filed in proper form on behalf of Bull Moose Tube Company; EXLTUBE; Wheatland Tube, a division of JMC Steel Group; and Western Tube and Conduit (Petitioners).[1] The AD petitions were accompanied by a countervailing duty (CVD) petition on imports from Pakistan. Petitioners are domestic producers of circular welded pipe.[2]

On November 2 and 6, 2015, the Department requested additional information and clarification of certain areas of the Petitions.[3] Petitioners filed

[1] *See* Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, dated October 28, 2015 (the Petitions).

[2] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 2.

[3] *See* Letter from the Department to Petitioners entitled ''Re: Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan: Supplemental Questions,'' dated November 2, 2015 (General Issues

responses to these requests on November 4, 5, 9 and 10, 2015.[4]

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Petitioners allege that imports of circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the Petitions are accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioners supporting their allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed these Petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioners are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The Department also finds that Petitioners demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the AD investigations that Petitioners are requesting.[5]

Periods of Investigation

Because the Petitions were filed on October 28, 2015, the period of investigation (POI) is, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1), as follows: October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015, for Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, and the UAE, and April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, for Vietnam.

Scope of the Investigations

The product covered by these investigations is circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam. For a full description of the scope of these investigations, *see* the ''Scope of the Investigations,'' in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigations

During our review of the Petitions, the Department discussed with Petitioners the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petitions would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[6]

As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations, we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (scope). The Department will consider all comments received from parties and, if necessary, will consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information (*see* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), all such factual information should be limited to public information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaires, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Monday, December 7, 2015, which is 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice.[7] Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Friday, December 17, 2015, which is 10 calendar days after the deadline for initial comments.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider relevant to the scope of the investigations be submitted during this time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigations may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must be filed on the records of each of the concurrent AD and CVD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).[8] An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date when it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.,* in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Comments on Product Characteristics for AD Questionnaires

The Department will be giving interested parties an opportunity to provide comments on the appropriate physical characteristics of circular welded pipe to be reported in response to the Department's AD questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the subject merchandise in order to report the relevant factors and costs of production accurately as well as to develop appropriate product-comparison criteria.

Subsequent to the publication of this notice, the Department will be releasing a proposed list of physical characteristics and product-comparison criteria, and interested parties will have the opportunity to provide any information or comments that they feel are relevant to the development of an accurate list of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: (1) General product characteristics and (2) product-comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product-comparison criteria. We base product-comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, although there may be some physical product characteristics used by manufacturers to describe circular welded pipe, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the order in which the physical characteristics should be used in matching products. Generally, the Department attempts to list the most

Supplemental Questionnaire); Letter from the Department to Petitioners entitled ''Re: Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from (country): Supplemental Questions'' on each of the country-specific records, dated November 2, 2015; Letter from the Department to Petitioners entitled ''Re: Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Philippines: Supplemental Questions,'' dated November 6, 2015; and Memorandum from Whitney Schablik to the File, dated November 6, 2015.

[4] *See* ''Response to the Department's November 2, 2015 Questionnaire Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,'' dated November 4, 2015 (General Issues Supplement); *see also* the responses to the Department's November 2, 2015 questionnaires regarding the remaining antidumping volumes of the Petition for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duties, dated November 4–5, 2015; response to the Department's November 6, 2015, second supplemental questionnaire regarding the Philippines, dated November 9, 2015; Second General Issues Supplement to the Petition, dated November 9, 2015 (Second General Issues Supplement); and Third General Issues Supplement to the Petition, dated November 10, 2015 (Third General Issues Supplement).

[5] *See* the ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions'' section below.

[6] *See* Memorandum from Whitney Schablik to The File, dated November 6, 2015; *see also* Second General Issues Supplement, at Exhibit I–16.

[7] *See* 19 CFR 351.303(b).

[8] *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011); *see also Enforcement and Compliance; Change of Electronic Filing System Name,* 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014) for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx* and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filling%20Procedures.pdf.*

important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

All comments and submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using ACCESS, as explained above, on the records of the Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam less-than-fair-value investigations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[9] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[10]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.,* the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petitions).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioners do not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we determined that circular welded pipe constitutes a single domestic like product and we analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[11]

In determining whether Petitioners have standing under section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petitions with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigations,'' in Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioners provided their shipments of the domestic like product in 2014, and compared their shipments to the estimated total shipments of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry.[12] Because total industry production data for the domestic like product for 2014 is not reasonably available and Petitioners established that shipments are a reasonable proxy for production data,[13] we relied upon the shipment data provided by Petitioners for purposes of measuring industry support.[14]

Our review of the data provided in the Petitions, General Issues Supplement, Second General Issues Supplement, Third General Issues Supplement, and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioners established industry support.[15] First, the Petitions established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total shipments [16] of the domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.,* polling).[17] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for at least 25 percent of the total shipments of the domestic like product.[18] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for more than 50 percent of the shipments of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petitions.[19] Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petitions were filed on behalf of the

[9] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[10] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States,* 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[11] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman (Oman AD Checklist), at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Attachment II); Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from Pakistan (Pakistan AD Checklist), at Attachment II; Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Republic of the Philippines (Philippines AD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II; Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the United Arab Emirates (UAE AD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II; and Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II. These checklists are dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

[12] *See* General Issues Supplement, at 3–6 and Exhibits I–13 and I–14; *see also* Second General Issues Supplement, at 1 and Exhibits I–17 through I–19; and Third General Issues Supplement, at Exhibit I–21.

[13] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 3 and Exhibit I–2; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 3–4 and Exhibits I–13 and I–14.

[14] For further discussion, *see* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, UAE AD Initiation Checklist, and Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[15] *Id.*

[16] As mentioned above, Petitioners established that shipments are a reasonable proxy for production data. Section 351.203(e)(1) of the Department's regulations states ''production levels may be established by reference to alternative data that the Secretary determines to be indicative of production levels.''

[17] *See* section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act; *see also* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, UAE AD Initiation Checklist, and Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[18] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, UAE AD Initiation Checklist, and Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[19] *Id.*

domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

The Department finds that Petitioners filed the Petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and they demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the AD investigations that they are requesting the Department to initiate.[20]

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioners allege that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than fair value. In addition, Petitioners allege that subject imports from Oman, Pakistan, the UAE, and Vietnam exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.[21]

With regard to the Philippines, while the allegedly dumped imports from the Philippines do not exceed the statutory requirements for negligibility, Petitioners allege and provide supporting evidence that these imports will imminently exceed the negligibility threshold.[22] Petitioners' arguments are consistent with the statutory criteria for ''negligibility in threat analysis'' under section 771(24)(A)(iv) of the Act, which provides that imports shall not be treated as negligible if there is a potential that subject imports from a country will imminently exceed the statutory requirements for negligibility.

Petitioners contend that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by reduced market share; underselling and price suppression or depression; lost sales and revenues; reduced shipments and a plant closure leading to job losses; increased inventories and inventory overhang in the U.S. market; and decline in profitability.[23] We assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[24]

Allegations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at less than fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate AD investigations of imports of circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. price and normal value (NV) are discussed in greater detail in the country-specific initiation checklists.

Export Price

For Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam, Petitioners based export price (EP) U.S. prices on average unit values (AUVs) of U.S. imports from those countries.[25] Where applicable, Petitioners made deductions from U.S. price for movement expenses consistent with the delivery terms.[26]

Normal Value

For Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, and the UAE, Petitioners provided home market price information obtained through market research for circular welded pipe produced, and offered for sale, in each of these countries.[27] For all four of these countries, Petitioners provided an affidavit or declaration from a market researcher for the price information.[28] Petitioners made no adjustments to the offer prices to calculate NV for Oman, Pakistan, or UAE, as no adjustments were warranted by the terms associated with the offers.[29] With regard to the Philippines, Petitioners made deductions for value added taxes and other expenses, consistent with the terms of sale.[30]

For Oman, the Philippines, and the UAE, Petitioners provided information that sales of circular welded pipe in the respective home markets were made at prices below the cost of production (COP). For these countries, Petitioners calculated NV based on constructed value (CV).[31] For further discussion of COP and NV based on CV, see below.

With respect to Vietnam, Petitioners stated that the Department has found Vietnam to be a non-market economy (NME) country in every previous less-than-fair-value investigation.[32] In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, the presumption of NME status remains in effect until revoked by the Department. The presumption of NME status for Vietnam has not been revoked by the Department and, therefore, remains in effect for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. Accordingly, the NV of the product is appropriately based on factors of production (FOPs) valued in a surrogate market economy country, in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. In the course of this investigation, all parties, and the public, will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issues of Vietnam's NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters.

Petitioners claim that India is an appropriate surrogate country because it is a market economy that is at a level of economic development comparable to that of Vietnam, it is a significant producer of the merchandise under consideration, and the data for valuing FOPs, factory overhead, selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit are both available and reliable.[33]

Based on the information provided by Petitioners, we believe it is appropriate to use India as a surrogate country for initiation purposes. Interested parties will have the opportunity to submit comments regarding surrogate country selection and, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(i), will be provided an opportunity to submit publicly available information to value FOPs within 30 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination.

Factors of Production

Petitioners based the FOPs for materials, labor, and energy on a petitioning U.S. producer's consumption rates for producing circular welded pipe, as they did not

[20] *Id.*

[21] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 17–18 and Exhibits I–7 and I–8; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 8–9.

[22] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 17–18 and Exhibits I–7 and I–8; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 9–10.

[23] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 12–23 and Exhibit I–6 through I–9; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 6–10 and Exhibits I–11, I–13 and I–15.

[24] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, UAE AD Initiation Checklist, and Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Circular Welded Carbon-Quality Steel Pipe from the Sultanate of Oman, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Arab Emirates, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

[25] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, UAE AD Initiation Checklist, and Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist.

[26] *See* Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist and Philippines AD Initiation Checklist.

[27] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, and UAE AD Initiation Checklist.

[28] *Id.; see also* Memorandum to the File, ''Telephone Call to Foreign Market Researcher,'' on each of the country-specific records, dated November 6, 2015 (Oman), November 5, 2015 (Pakistan), November 6, 2015 (the Philippines), and November 6, 2015 (the UAE).

[29] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist, and UAE AD Initiation Checklist.

[30] *See* Philippines AD Initiation Checklist.

[31] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, and UAE AD Initiation Checklist.

[32] *See* Volume III of the Petitions, at 1–2.

[33] *Id.,* at 2–3.

have access to the consumption rates of Vietnamese producers of the subject merchandise.[34] Petitioners valued the estimated factors of production using surrogate values from India.[35]

Valuation of Raw Materials

Petitioners valued the FOPs for raw materials (*i.e.,* steel, steel scrap offset) using reasonably available, public import data for India from the Global Trade Atlas (GTA) for the most recent six-month period for which data is available.[36] Petitioners excluded all import values from countries previously determined by the Department to maintain broadly-available, non-industry-specific export subsidies and from countries previously determined by the Department to be NME countries. In addition, in accordance with the Department's practice, the average import values exclude imports that were labeled as originating from an unidentified country. The Department made adjustments to Petitioners' calculation of these surrogate values.[37]

Valuation of Labor

Petitioners valued labor using India labor data published by the International Labor Organization (ILO).[38] Specifically, Petitioners relied on industry-specific wage rate data from Chapter 6A of the ILO's ''Yearbook of Labor Statistics'' publication.[39] As the Indian wage data are daily wages from 2005 and reported in Indian Rupees, Petitioners converted the wage rates to hourly rates, adjusted them for inflation, and converted them to U.S. Dollars using the average exchange rate during the POI.[40] Petitioners then applied that resulting labor rate to the labor hours expended by the U.S. producer of circular welded pipe.[41] The Department made adjustments to Petitioners' calculation of the inflator and labor rate.[42]

Valuation of Energy

Petitioners used public information, as reported by the Central Electric Authority (CEA) of India (the Government of India's electricity authority), to value electricity.[43] This 2008 CEA price information was converted from Indian Rupees to U.S. Dollars in order to be compared to the U.S producer factor usage rates.[44] The cost of natural gas in India was derived from an International Energy Agency working paper entitled ''Natural Gas in India,'' and the value was reported in U.S. Dollars and million British thermal units (mmBTU).[45] Using universal conversion factors, Petitioners converted that cost into a per metric ton price to ensure the proper comparison.[46]

Valuation of Factory Overhead, Selling, General and Administrative Expenses, and Profit

Petitioners calculated surrogate financial ratios (*i.e.*, manufacturing overhead, SG&A expenses, and profit) using the 2014–2015 audited financial statement of Ratnamani Metals and Tubes, Ltd., an Indian producer of circular welded pipe.[47]

Normal Value Based on Constructed Value

Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the cost of manufacturing (COM), SG&A expenses, financial expenses, and packing expenses. For Oman, the Philippines and the UAE, Petitioners calculated COM based on Petitioners' experience adjusted for known differences between their industry in the United States and the industry of the respective country during the proposed POI.[48] Using publicly-available data to account for price differences, Petitioners multiplied their usage quantities by the submitted value of the inputs used to manufacture circular welded pipe steel in each country.[49] Labor rates were derived from publicly-available sources, and multiplied by the product-specific usage rates.[50] To determine factory overhead, SG&A, and financial expense rates, Petitioners relied on financial statements of producers of comparable merchandise operating in the respective foreign country or their own experience.[51] For Oman and the UAE, we made an adjustment to these rates.[52]

Because certain home market prices fell below COP, pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b), and 773(e) of the Act, as noted above, Petitioners calculated NVs for Oman, the Philippines and the UAE based on CV.[53] Pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, CV consists of the COM, SG&A, financial expenses, packing expenses, and profit. Petitioners calculated CV using the same average COM, SG&A, and financial expenses, to calculate COP.[54] Petitioners relied on the financial statements of the same producer that they used for calculating manufacturing overhead, SG&A, and financial expenses to calculate the profit rate for Oman.[55] For the Philippines and the UAE, Petitioners conservatively did not include profit in their CV calculations. We continued to apply the same adjustments to Petitioners' calculations of factory overhead, SG&A, and financial expense rates as we made for the calculation of COP for Oman and the UAE.[56]

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by Petitioners, there is reason to believe that imports of circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Based on comparisons of EP to NV in accordance with sections 772 and 773 of the Act, the estimated dumping margins for circular welded pipe are as follows: (1) Oman ranges from 98.87 to 105.58 percent; [57] (2) Pakistan is 11.80 percent; [58] (3) the Philippines is 21.86 percent; [59] and (4) the UAE ranges from 47.06 to 54.27 percent.[60]

Based on comparisons of EP to NV, in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, the estimated dumping margin for circular welded pipe from Vietnam is 113.18 percent.[61]

Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

Based upon the examination of the AD Petitions on circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam, we find that the Petitions meet the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating AD investigations to determine whether imports of circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the

[34] *Id.,* at 3.

[35] *Id.,* at 4–10 and Exhibit III–C; *see also,* generally, Vietnam AD Supplemental Questionnaire Response.

[36] *See* Volume III of the Petitions, at 4–6 and Exhibit III–C–2; *see also,* Vietnam AD Supplemental Questionnaire Response at Exhibit III–S–5.

[37] *See* Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist.

[38] *See* Volume III of the Petitions, at 8–9 and Exhibit III–C–6; *see also,* Vietnam AD Supplemental Questionnaire Response at Exhibit III–S–6.

[39] *Id.*

[40] *Id.*

[41] *Id.*

[42] *See* Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist.

[43] *Id.* at 7, 11 and Exhibit III–C–4.

[44] *Id.*

[45] *Id.* at 8, 11 and Exhibit III–C–5.

[46] *Id.*

[47] *Id.* at 9–10, 11 and Exhibit III–C–7.

[48] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist, Philippines AD Initiation Checklist, and UAE AD Initiation Checklist.

[49] *Id.*

[50] *Id.*

[51] *Id.*

[52] *Id.*

[53] *Id.*

[54] *Id.*

[55] *Id.*

[56] *Id.*

[57] *See* Oman AD Initiation Checklist.

[58] *See* Pakistan AD Initiation Checklist.

[59] *See* Philippines AD Initiation Checklist.

[60] *See* UAE AD Initiation Checklist.

[61] *See* Vietnam AD Initiation Checklist.

Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.[62] The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.[63] The amendments to sections 771(15), 773, 776, and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to these AD investigations.[64]

Respondent Selection

Petitioners named six companies in Pakistan,[65] two companies in the Philippines,[66] and eight companies in the UAE,[67] as producers/exporters of circular welded pipe. Following standard practice in AD investigations involving market economy countries, in the event the Department determines that the number of companies is large and cannot individually examine each company based upon the Department's resources, the Department intends to select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports under the appropriate Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States numbers listed with the scope in Appendix I, below. We also intend to place the CBP data on the record within five business days of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. Comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection should be submitted seven calendar days after the placement of the CBP data on the record of these investigations. Parties wishing to submit rebuttal comments should submit those comments five calendar days after the deadline for the initial comments.

Although the Department normally relies on the number of producers/exporters identified in the petition and/or import data from CBP to determine whether to select a limited number of producers/exporters for individual examination in AD investigations, Petitioners identified only one company as a producer/exporter of circular welded pipe in Oman: Al Jazeera Tube Steel Company.[68] We currently know of no additional producers/exporters of subject merchandise from Oman. Accordingly, the Department intends to examine all known producers/exporters in this investigation (*i.e.*, the company cited above).

Comments must be filed electronically using ACCESS. An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the Department's electronic records system, ACCESS, by 5:00 p.m. ET by the date noted above. We intend to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 20 days of publication of this notice.

With respect to Vietnam, Petitioners named three companies as producers/exporters of circular welded pipe.[69] In accordance with our standard practice for respondent selection in cases involving NME countries, we intend to issue quantity-and-value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent and base respondent selection on the responses received. In addition, the Department will post the Q&V questionnaire along with filing instructions on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at *http://www.trade.gov/enforcement/news.asp.*

Exporters/producers of circular welded pipe from Vietnam that do not receive Q&V questionnaires by mail may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy from the Enforcement and Compliance Web site. The Q&V response must be submitted by all Vietnam exporters/producers no later than December 1, 2015, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS.

Separate Rates

In order to obtain separate-rate status in an NME investigation, exporters and producers must submit a separate-rate application.[70] The specific requirements for submitting a separate-rate application in the Vietnam investigation are outlined in detail in the application itself, which is available on the Department's Web site at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/nme/nme-sep-rate.html.* The separate-rate application will be due 30 days after publication of this initiation notice.[71] Exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate application and are selected as mandatory respondents will be eligible for consideration for separate-rate status only if they respond to all parts of the Department's AD questionnaire as mandatory respondents. The Department requires that respondents from Vietnam submit a response to both the Q&V questionnaire and the separate-rate application by their respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status.

Use of Combination Rates

The Department will calculate combination rates for certain respondents that are eligible for a separate rate in an NME investigation. The Separate Rates and Combination Rates Bulletin states:

> {w}hile continuing the practice of assigning separate rates only to exporters, all separate rates that the Department will now assign in its NME Investigation will be specific to those producers that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation. Note, however, that one rate is calculated for the exporter and all of the producers which supplied subject merchandise to it during the period of investigation. This practice applies both to mandatory respondents receiving an individually calculated separate rate as well as the pool of non-investigated firms receiving the weighted-average of the individually calculated rates. This practice is referred to as the application of ''combination rates'' because such rates apply to specific combinations of exporters and one or more producers. The cash-deposit rate assigned to an exporter will apply only to merchandise both exported by the firm in question *and* produced by a firm that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation.[72]

Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), copies of the public version of the Petitions have been provided to the governments of Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and Vietnam via

[62] *See* Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Public Law 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

[63] *See Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015*, 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*).

[64] *Id.* at 46794–95. The 2015 amendments may be found at *https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl.*

[65] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at Exhibit I–3.

[66] *Id.*

[67] *Id.*

[68] *Id.*

[69] *Id.*

[70] *See* Policy Bulletin 05.1: Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigation involving Non-Market Economy Countries (April 5, 2005), available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/policy/bull05-1.pdf* (Policy Bulletin 05.1).

[71] Although in past investigations this deadline was 60 days, consistent with 19 CFR 351.301(a), which states that ''the Secretary may request any person to submit factual information at any time during a proceeding,'' this deadline is now 30 days.

[72] *See* Policy Bulletin 05.1 at 6 (emphasis added).

ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petitions to each exporter named in the Petitions, as provided under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petitions were filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of circular welded pipe from Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the UAE, and/or Vietnam are materially injuring or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry.[73] A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country;[74] otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). Any party, when submitting factual information, must specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted [75] and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct.[76] Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Please review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.

Extensions of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351. For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. ET on the due date. Under certain circumstances, we may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. *Review Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule*, 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at *http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm*, prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[77] Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.[78] The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures*, 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Parties wishing to participate in these investigations should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (*e.g.*, the filing of letters of appearance as discussed in 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I—Scope of the Investigations

These investigations cover welded carbon-quality steel pipes and tube, of circular cross-section, with an outside diameter (O.D.) not more than nominal 16 inches (406.4 mm), regardless of wall thickness, surface finish (*e.g.*, black, galvanized, or painted), end finish (plain end, beveled end, grooved, threaded, or threaded and coupled), or industry specification (*e.g.*, American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTM), proprietary, or other), generally known as standard pipe, fence pipe and tube, sprinkler pipe, and structural pipe (although subject product may also be referred to as mechanical tubing). Specifically, the term ''carbon quality'' includes products in which:

(a) iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements;
(b) the carbon content is 2 percent or less, by weight; and
(c) none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity, by weight, as indicated:

(i) 1.80 percent of manganese;
(ii) 2.25 percent of silicon;
(iii) 1.00 percent of copper;
(iv) 0.50 percent of aluminum;
(v) 1.25 percent of chromium;
(vi) 0.30 percent of cobalt;
(vii) 0.40 percent of lead;
(viii) 1.25 percent of nickel;
(ix) 0.30 percent of tungsten;
(x) 0.15 percent of molybdenum;
(xi) 0.10 percent of niobium;
(xii) 0.41 percent of titanium;
(xiii) 0.15 percent of vanadium; or
(xiv) 0.15 percent of zirconium.

Covered products are generally made to standard O.D. and wall thickness combinations. Pipe multi-stenciled to a standard and/or structural specification and to other specifications, such as American Petroleum Institute (API) API–5L, is also covered by the scope of these investigations when it meets the physical description set forth above. Covered products may also possess one or more of the following characteristics: Is 32 feet in length or less; is less than 2.0 inches (50mm) in nominal O.D.; has a galvanized and/or painted (*e.g.*, polyester coated) surface finish; or has a threaded and/or coupled end finish.

Standard pipe is ordinarily made to ASTM specifications A53, A135, and A795, but can also be made to other specifications. Structural pipe is made primarily to ASTM specifications A252 and A500. Standard and structural pipe may also be produced to proprietary specifications rather than to industry specifications.

[73] *See* section 733(a) of the Act.

[74] *Id.*

[75] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b).

[76] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b)(2).

[77] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[78] *See Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration during Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*); *see also* frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.*

Sprinkler pipe is designed for sprinkler fire suppression systems and may be made to industry specifications such as ASTM A53 or to proprietary specifications.

Fence tubing is included in the scope regardless of certification to a specification listed in the exclusions below, and can also be made to the ASTM A513 specification. Products that meet the physical description set forth above but are made to the following nominal outside diameter and wall thickness combinations, which are recognized by the industry as typical for fence tubing, are included despite being certified to ASTM mechanical tubing specifications:

O.D. in inches (nominal)	Wall thickness in inches (nominal)	Gage
1.315	0.035	20
1.315	0.047	18
1.315	0.055	17
1.315	0.065	16
1.315	0.072	15
1.315	0.083	14
1.315	0.095	13
1.660	0.055	17
1.660	0.065	16
1.660	0.083	14
1.660	0.095	13
1.660	0.109	12
1.900	0.047	18
1.900	0.055	17
1.900	0.065	16
1.900	0.072	15
1.900	0.095	13
1.900	0.109	12
2.375	0.047	18
2.375	0.055	17
2.375	0.065	16
2.375	0.072	15
2.375	0.095	13
2.375	0.109	12
2.375	0.120	11
2.875	0.109	12
2.875	0.165	8
3.500	0.109	12
3.500	0.165	8
4.000	0.148	9
4.000	0.165	8
4.500	0.203	7

The scope of these investigations does not include:

(a) Pipe suitable for use in boilers, superheaters, heat exchangers, refining furnaces and feedwater heaters, whether or not cold drawn, which are defined by standards such as ASTM A178 or ASTM A192;

(b) finished electrical conduit, *i.e.*, Electrical Rigid Steel Conduit (aka Electrical Rigid Metal Conduit and Electrical Rigid Metal Steel Conduit), Finished Electrical Metallic Tubing, and Electrical Intermediate Metal Conduit, which are defined by specifications such as American National Standard (ANSI) C80.1–2005, ANSI C80.3–2005, or ANSI C80.6–2005, and Underwriters Laboratories Inc. (UL) UL–6, UL–797, or UL–1242;

(c) finished scaffolding, *i.e.*, component parts of final, finished scaffolding that enter the United States unassembled as a ''kit.'' A kit is understood to mean a packaged combination of component parts that contains, at the time of importation, all of the necessary component parts to fully assemble final, finished scaffolding;

(d) tube and pipe hollows for redrawing;

(e) oil country tubular goods produced to API specifications;

(f) line pipe produced to only API specifications, such as API 5L, and not multi-stenciled; and

(g) mechanical tubing, whether or not cold-drawn, other than what is included in the above paragraphs.

The products subject to these investigations are currently classifiable in Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) statistical reporting numbers 7306.19.1010, 7306.19.1050, 7306.19.5110, 7306.19.5150, 7306.30.1000, 7306.30.5015, 7306.30.5020, 7306.30.5025, 7306.30.5032, 7306.50.5030, 7306.30.5040, 7306.30.5055, 7306.30.5085, 7306.30.5090, 7306.50.1000, 7306.50.5050, and 7306.50.5070. However, the product description, and not the HTSUS classification, is dispositive of whether the merchandise imported into the United States falls within the scope.

[FR Doc. 2015–29988 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Foreign-Trade Zone Applications

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJesup@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Christopher J. Kemp, Department of Commerce, Office of Foreign-Trade Zones, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482–0862, or *Christopher.Kemp@trade.gov*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The Foreign-Trade Zone Application is the vehicle by which individual firms or organizations apply for foreign-trade zone (FTZ) status, for subzone status, production authority, modifications of existing zones, or for waivers. The FTZ Act and Regulations (19 U.S.C. 81b and 81f; 15 CFR 400.21–25, 43(f)) set forth the requirements for applications and other requests to the FTZ Board. The Act and Regulations require that applications for new or modified zones contain information on facilities, financing, operational plans, proposed production operations, need for FTZ authority, and economic impact, where applicable. Any request involving production authority requires specific information on the foreign status components and finished products involved. Applications for production activity can involve issues related to domestic industry and trade policy impact. Such applications must include specific information on the customs-tariff related savings that result from zone procedures and the economic consequences of permitting such savings. The FTZ Board needs complete and accurate information on the proposed operation and its economic effects because the Act and Regulations authorize the Board to restrict or prohibit operations that are detrimental to the public interest. The Regulations (15 CFR 400.43(f)) also require specific information for applications requesting waivers by parties impacted by 400.43(d). This information is necessary to assess the likelihood of the proposed activity resulting in a violation of the the uniform treatment provisions of the FTZ Act and Regulations.

II. Method of Collection

U.S. firms or organizations submit applications in paper format along with an electronic copy to the Office of Foreign-Trade Zones.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0625–0139.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: State, local, or tribal governments or not-for-profit institutions applying for foreign-trade zone status, for subzone status, modification of existing zones, production authority or for waivers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 248.

Estimated Time Per Response: 9 to 131 hours (depending on type of application).

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,128.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $141,388.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–29915 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–856, A–570–032]

Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and The People's Republic of China: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Bailey at (202) 482–0193 (Canada) and Maisha Cryor at (202) 482–5831 (the People's Republic of China (PRC)), AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petitions

On October 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received antidumping duty (AD) petitions concerning imports of certain iron mechanical transfer drive components (iron transfer drive components) from Canada and the PRC, filed in proper form on behalf of TB Wood's Incorporated (TB Woods) (Petitioner).[1] The AD petitions were accompanied by one countervailing duty (CVD) petition for the PRC.[2] Petitioner is a domestic producer of iron transfer drive components.[3]

On November 3, 2015, the Department requested additional information and clarification of certain areas of the Petitions.[4] Petitioner filed responses to these requests on November 5, 6 and 10, 2015.[5]

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Petitioner alleges that imports of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less-than-fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the Petitions are accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed these Petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The Department also finds that Petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the AD investigations that Petitioner is requesting.[6]

Periods of Investigation

Because the Petitions were filed on October 28, 2015, the period of investigation (POI) is, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1), October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015, for Canada and April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, for the PRC.

Scope of the Investigations

The product covered by these investigations is iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC. For a full description of the scope of these investigations, *see* the ''Scope of the Investigations,'' in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigations

During our review of the Petitions, the Department issued questions to, and received responses from, Petitioner pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petitions would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[7]

As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations,[8] we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (scope). The Department will consider all comments received from parties and, if necessary, will consult with parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information (*see* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), all such factual information should be limited to public information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaires, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Monday, December 7, 2015, which is 20 calendar

[1] *See* the Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the PRC, dated October 28, 2015 (the Petitions).

[2] *See* the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components the PRC, dated October 28, 2015.

[3] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 2.

[4] *See* Letters from the Department to Petitioner entitled ''Re: Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada: Supplemental Questions'' dated November 3, 2015; ''Re: Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China: Supplemental Questions'' dated November 3, 2015; and ''Re: Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China and Antidumping Duties on Imports from Canada: Supplemental Questions'' dated November 3, 2015 (General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire).

[5] *See* ''Re: Response to the Department's November 3, 2015 Questionnaire Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,'' dated November 6, 2015 (General Issues Supplement); ''Re: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China: Response to the Department's November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume II of the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties,'' dated November 6, 2015 (Canada Supplemental Response); and ''Re: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China: Response to the Department's November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume III of the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties,'' dated November 6, 2015 (Canada Supplemental Response); and ''Re: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China: Response to the Department's November 6, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties'' (PRC Supplemental Response) dated November 10, 2015.

[6] *See* the ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions'' section below.

[7] *See* General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire and General Issues Supplement.

[8] *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties,* 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997).

days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Thursday, December 17, 2015, which is 10 calendar days after the initial comments deadline.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider relevant to the scope of the investigations be submitted during this time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigations may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must be filed on the records of each of the concurrent AD and CVD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).[9] An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date when it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.,* in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Comments on Product Characteristics for AD Questionnaires

The Department requests comments from interested parties regarding the appropriate physical characteristics of iron transfer drive components to be reported in response to the Department's AD questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the subject merchandise in order to report the relevant factors and costs of production accurately as well as to develop appropriate product-comparison criteria.

Interested parties may provide any information or comments that they feel are relevant to the development of an accurate list of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: (1) General product characteristics and (2) product-comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product-comparison criteria. We base product-comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, although there may be some physical product characteristics utilized by manufacturers to describe iron transfer drive components, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the order in which the physical characteristics should be used in matching products. Generally, the Department attempts to list the most important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

In order to consider the suggestions of interested parties in developing and issuing the AD questionnaires, all comments must be filed by 5:00 p.m. EDT on December 7, 2015, which is twenty calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments must be filed by 5:00 p.m. EDT on December 14, 2015. All comments and submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using ACCESS, as explained above, on the records of both the Canada and the PRC less-than-fair-value investigations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[10] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[11]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.,* the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petitions).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioner does not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that iron transfer drive components constitute a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[12]

[9] *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011); *see also Enforcement and Compliance; Change of Electronic Filing System Name,* 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014) for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx* and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filling%20Procedures.pdf.*

[10] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[11] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States,* 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[12] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada (Canada AD Checklist), at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China (Attachment II); Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's

Continued

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petitions with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigations,'' in Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its production of the domestic like product in 2014, as well as estimated total production of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry.[13] We relied on data Petitioner provided for purposes of measuring industry support.[14]

On November 12, 2015, we received comments on industry support from Baldor Electric Company (Baldor) [15] and Caterpillar, Inc. (Caterpillar).[16] Baldor also indicated that it opposes the Petitions.[17] Petitioner responded to the letters from Baldor and Caterpillar on November 16, 2015.[18] Baldor filed two additional submissions regarding industry support on November 16, 2015.[19] Petitioner provided additional responses to Baldor's arguments on November 17, 2015.[20] For further discussion of these comments, *see* the Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

Our review of the data provided in the Petitions; General Issues Supplement; letters from Baldor, Caterpillar, and Petitioner; and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioner has established industry support.[21] First, the Petitions established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.,* polling).[22] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product.[23] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petitions.[24] Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petitions were filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the AD investigations that it is requesting the Department initiate.[25]

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than normal value (NV). In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.[26]

Petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by eroded domestic output and shipments; underselling and price suppression or depression; declining financial performance; negative impacts to employment; and lost sales and revenues.[27] We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[28]

Allegations of Sales at Less-Than-Fair Value

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at less-than-fair value upon which the Department based its decision to initiate investigations of imports of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. price and NV are discussed in greater detail in the country-specific initiation checklists.

Export Price

For Canada, Petitioner based U.S. prices on price quotes to customers in the United States for iron transfer drive components produced in, and exported from, Canada.[29] Where applicable, Petitioner made deductions from U.S. price for movement expenses consistent with the delivery terms.[30] Petitioner also deducted from U.S. price brokerage and handling expenses.[31]

For the PRC, Petitioner based U.S. prices on purchases of iron transfer drive components produced in and exported from the PRC by two different producers and sold or offered for sale to customers in the United States. Petitioner made deductions from U.S. price for movement expenses consistent with the delivery terms.

Normal Value

For Canada, Petitioner provided home market price information based on price quotes for iron transfer drive components produced in and offered for sale in Canada.[32] Petitioner made deductions for inland freight charges (where applicable) and local taxes from the price quotes.[33]

Petitioner provided information that sales of iron transfer drive components in Canada were made at prices below the cost of production (COP) and calculated NV based on constructed

Republic of China (PRC AD Initiation Checklist), at Attachment II. These checklists are dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

[13] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 3–4 and Exhibits I–4 through I–7.

[14] *Id.* For further discussion, *see* Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[15] *See* Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015.

[16] *See* Letter from Caterpillar, Inc., filed on November 12, 2015. We note that this letter is dated November 11, 2015, but was received by the Department on November 12, 2015.

[17] *See* Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015, at 15.

[18] *See* Letter from Petitioner, dated November 16, 2015.

[19] *See* Letters from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 16, 2015.

[20] *See* Letter from Petitioner, dated November 17, 2015.

[21] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[22] *See* section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act; *see also* Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[23] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[24] *Id.*

[25] *Id.*

[26] *See* General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

[27] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at 16–17, 22–44 and Exhibits I–4, I–10 through I–13, and I–15 through I–23; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

[28] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist and PRC AD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China.

[29] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist; *see also* Canada Supplemental Response at Exhibit II–S1.

[30] *Id.*

[31] *Id.*

[32] *Id.*

[33] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist. Note that home market prices were not used as the basis for NV for Canada, but for calculation of net price for comparison to COP.

value (CV).[34] For further discussion of COP and NV based on CV, see below.[35]

With respect to the PRC, Petitioner stated that the Department has found the PRC to be a non-market economy (NME) country in every administrative proceeding in which the PRC has been involved.[36] In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, the presumption of NME status remains in effect until revoked by the Department. The presumption of NME status for the PRC has not been revoked by the Department and, therefore, remains in effect for purposes of the initiation of this investigation. Accordingly, the NV of the product is appropriately based on factors of production (FOPs) valued in a surrogate market economy country, in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act. In the course of this investigation, all parties, and the public, will have the opportunity to provide relevant information related to the issues of the PRC's NME status and the granting of separate rates to individual exporters.

Petitioner claims that Thailand is an appropriate surrogate country because it is a market economy that is at a level of economic development comparable to that of the PRC and it is a significant producer of the merchandise under consideration.[37]

Based on the information provided by Petitioner, we believe it is appropriate to use Thailand as a surrogate country for initiation purposes. Interested parties will have the opportunity to submit comments regarding surrogate country selection and, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(i), will be provided an opportunity to submit publicly available information to value FOPs within 30 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination.

Factors of Production

Petitioner based the FOPs for materials, labor, and energy on U.S. producers consumption rates for producing iron transfer drive components as it did not have access to the consumption rates of PRC producers of the subject merchandise.[38] Petitioner notes that the selected U.S. producers were chosen because the facilities are similar to and representative of facilities operated by companies manufacturing iron transfer drive components in the PRC.[39] Petitioner valued the estimated factors of production using surrogate values from Thailand.[40]

Valuation of Raw Materials

Petitioner valued the FOPs for raw materials (*e.g.,* pig iron, carbon, acid, etc.) using reasonably available, public import data for Thailand from the Global Trade Atlas (GTA) for the period of investigation.[41] Petitioner excluded all import values from countries previously determined by the Department to maintain broadly available, non-industry-specific export subsidies and from countries previously determined by the Department to be NME countries. In addition, in accordance with the Department's practice, the average import value excludes imports that were labeled as originating from an unidentified country. The Department determines that the surrogate values used by Petitioner are reasonably available and, thus, are acceptable for purposes of initiation.

Valuation of Labor

Petitioner valued labor using quarterly Thai labor data published by Thailand's National Statistics Office (NSO).[42] Specifically, Petitioner relied on data pertaining to wages and benefits earned by Thai workers engaged in the manufacturing sector of the Thai economy.[43]

Petitioner converted the wage rates to hourly and converted to U.S. Dollars using the average exchange rate during the POI.[44]

Valuation of Packing Materials

Petitioner valued the packing materials used by PRC producers based on Thai import data for the POI obtained from GTA.[45]

Valuation of Energy

Petitioner used public information, as compiled by the Thai Board of Investment (TBI) to value electricity.[46] This TBI price information was reported in U.S. Dollars/kilowatt hours and multiplied by the U.S. producer factor usage rates.[47] The cost of natural gas in Thailand was calculated from the average unit value of imports of liquefied natural gas into Thailand, as reported by GTA.[48]

Valuation of Factory Overhead, Selling, General and Administrative Expenses (SG&A), and Profit

Petitioner calculated surrogate financial ratios (*i.e.,* factory overhead, SG&A expenses, and profit) using the 2014 audited financial statement of Tyrolit Thai Diamond Company Limited, a Thai producer of comparable merchandise (*i.e.,* industrial equipment including metal sawblades).[49]

Normal Value Based on Constructed Value

Pursuant to section 773(b)(3) of the Act, COP consists of the cost of manufacturing (COM); SG&A expenses; financial expenses; and packing expenses. Petitioner calculated COM based on a U.S. producer's experience adjusted for known differences between the industry in the United States and the industry in Canada during the proposed POI.[50] Using publicly available data to account for price differences, Petitioner multiplied the U.S. producer's usage quantities by the submitted value of the inputs used to manufacture iron transfer drive components in Canada.[51] Labor and energy rates were derived from publicly available sources multiplied by the product-specific usage rates.[52] We made adjustments for mathematical and transcription errors that were identified in Petitioner's materials, labor, and energy cost calculations. To determine fixed overhead, SG&A, and financial expense rates, Petitioner relied on the financial statements of Essar Algoma Steel (Algoma), a producer of comparable merchandise (finished steel mill goods including steel coil, steel sheet, and steel plate) operating in Canada, although we made adjustments to Petitioner's calculations of these rates.[53]

Because certain home market prices fell below COP, pursuant to sections 773(a)(4), 773(b), and 773(e) of the Act, as noted above, Petitioner calculated NVs based on CV.[54] Pursuant to section

[34] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist.

[35] In accordance with section 505(a) of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, amending section 773(b)(2) of the Act, for the Canada investigation, the Department will request information necessary to calculate the CV and COP to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the COP of the product. The Department no longer requires a COP allegation to conduct this analysis.

[36] *See* Volume III of the Petitions, at 9.

[37] *Id.* at 9.

[38] *See* Volume III of the Petitions, at 11 and Exhibit III–13.

[39] *Id.,* at Exhibit III–13.

[40] *Id.,* at 15 and Exhibits III–15 and III–16.

[41] *Id.,* at Exhibit III–16 and III–17.

[42] *Id.,* at 16 and Exhibit III–21.

[43] *Id.*

[44] *Id.,* at Exhibit III–16.

[45] *See* Volume III of the Petition, at Exhibits III–15 and 16.

[46] *Id.,* at Exhibit III–18.

[47] *Id.,* at Exhibits III–16 and III–18.

[48] *Id.,* at 15 and Exhibit III–19.

[49] *Id.,* at Exhibits III–22 and III–23.

[50] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist; *see* also Canada Supplemental Response at Exhibit II–S8.

[51] *Id.*

[52] *Id.*

[53] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist.

[54] *Id.; see* also Canada Supplemental Response at Exhibit II–S10.

773(e) of the Act, CV consists of the COM, SG&A, financial expenses, packing expenses, and profit. Petitioner calculated CV using the same average COM, SG&A, and financial expenses, used to calculate COP.[55] Petitioner included an amount for packing material expenses using Canadian import statistics to value the material inputs used in packing iron transfer drive components. Algoma reported a net loss on their financial statements in 2014; therefore, Petitioner did not include an amount for profit.[56] We continued to apply the same adjustments to Petitioner's calculations of the factory overhead, SG&A, and financial expense rates as we made for the calculation of COP.[57]

Fair Value Comparisons

Based on the data provided by Petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less-than-fair value. Based on comparisons of export price (EP) to NV in accordance with sections 772 and 773 of the Act, the estimated dumping margin(s) for iron transfer drive components for Canada ranges from 9.60 to 191.34 percent.[58]

Based on comparisons of EP to NV, in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act, the estimated dumping margin for iron transfer drive components from the PRC range from 67.82 to 401.68 percent.[59]

Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

Based upon the examination of the AD Petitions on iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC, we find that the Petitions meet the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating AD investigations to determine whether imports of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less-than-fair value. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.[60] The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.[61] The amendments to sections 771(15), 773, 776, and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to these AD investigations.[62]

Respondent Selection

Petitioner named eight companies from Canada[63] as producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components. Following standard practice in AD investigations involving market economy countries, the Department would normally select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports under the appropriate HTSUS numbers listed in the scope in Appendix I, below. However, CBP data have been reported in mixed units of quantity and, thus, it is problematic for the Department use this data for respondent selection purposes. Accordingly, we intend to issue quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent and base respondent selection on the responses received. In addition, the Department will post the Q&V questionnaire along with filing instructions on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at *http://www.trade.gov/enforcement/news.asp.*

With respect to the PRC, Petitioner named 36 companies as producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components.[64] In accordance with our standard practice for respondent selection in cases involving NME countries, we intend to issue Q&V questionnaires to each potential respondent and base respondent selection on the responses received. In addition, the Department will post the Q&V questionnaire along with filing instructions on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at *http://www.trade.gov/enforcement/news.asp.*

Exporters/producers of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC that do not receive Q&V questionnaires by mail may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy from the Enforcement and Compliance Web site. The Q&V response must be submitted by all Canada and PRC exporters/producers no later than December 1, 2015, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS.

Separate Rates

In order to obtain separate-rate status in an NME investigation, exporters and producers must submit a separate-rate application.[65] The specific requirements for submitting a separate-rate application in the PRC investigation are outlined in detail in the application itself, which is available on the Department's Web site at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/nme/nme-sep-rate.html.* The separate-rate application will be due 30 days after publication of this initiation notice.[66] Exporters and producers who submit a separate-rate application and have been selected as mandatory respondents will be eligible for consideration for separate-rate status only if they respond to all parts of the Department's AD questionnaire as mandatory respondents. The Department requires that respondents from the PRC submit a response to both the Q&V questionnaire and the separate-rate application by their respective deadlines in order to receive consideration for separate-rate status.

Use of Combination Rates

The Department will calculate combination rates for certain respondents that are eligible for a separate rate in an NME investigation. The Separate Rates and Combination Rates Bulletin states:

{w}hile continuing the practice of assigning separate rates only to exporters, all separate rates that the Department will now assign in its NME Investigation will be specific to those producers that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation. Note, however, that one rate is calculated for the exporter and all of the producers which supplied subject merchandise to it during the

[55] *Id.* at Exhibit II–S8.

[56] *Id.*

[57] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist.

[58] *See* Canada AD Initiation Checklist.

[59] *See* PRC AD Initiation Checklist.

[60] *See* Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Public Law 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

[61] *See Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015,* 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*).

[62] *Id.* at 46794–95. The 2015 amendments may be found at *https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl.*

[63] *See* Volume I of the Petitions, at Exhibit I–7.

[64] *Id.*

[65] *See* Policy Bulletin 05.1: Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigation involving Non-Market Economy Countries (April 5, 2005), available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/policy/bull05-1.pdf* (Policy Bulletin 05.1).

[66] Although in past investigations this deadline was 60 days, consistent with 19 CFR 351.301(a), which states that ''the Secretary may request any person to submit factual information at any time during a proceeding,'' this deadline is now 30 days.

period of investigation. This practice applies both to mandatory respondents receiving an individually calculated separate rate as well as the pool of non-investigated firms receiving the weighted-average of the individually calculated rates. This practice is referred to as the application of ''combination rates'' because such rates apply to specific combinations of exporters and one or more producers. The cash-deposit rate assigned to an exporter will apply only to merchandise both exported by the firm in question *and* produced by a firm that supplied the exporter during the period of investigation.[67]

Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), copies of the public version of the Petitions have been provided to the governments of Canada and the PRC via ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petitions to each exporter named in the Petitions, as provided under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petitions were filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of iron transfer drive components from Canada and the PRC are materially injuring or threatening material injury to a U.S. industry.[68] A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country;[69] otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) Evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). Any party, when submitting factual information, must specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted[70] and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct.[71] Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Please review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.

Extensions of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351 expires. For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. ET on the due date. Under certain circumstances, we may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. Review *Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule,* 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at *http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm*, prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[72] Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.[73] The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order (APO) in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures,* 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Parties wishing to participate in these investigations should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (*e.g.,* the filing of letters of appearance as discussed in 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I

Scope of the Investigations

The products covered by these investigations are iron mechanical transfer drive components, whether finished or unfinished (*i.e.,* blanks or castings). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are in the form of wheels or cylinders with a center bore hole that may have one or more grooves or teeth in their outer circumference that guide or mesh with a flat or ribbed belt or like device and are often referred to as sheaves, pulleys, flywheels, flat pulleys, idlers, conveyer pulleys, synchronous sheaves, and timing pulleys. The products covered by these investigations also include bushings, which are iron mechanical transfer drive components in the form of a cylinder and which fit into the bore holes of other mechanical transfer drive components to lock them into drive shafts by means of elements such as teeth, bolts, or screws.

Iron mechanical transfer drive components subject to these investigations are those not less than 4.00 inches (101 mm) in the maximum nominal outer diameter.

Unfinished iron mechanical transfer drive components (*i.e.,* blanks or castings) possess the approximate shape of the finished iron mechanical transfer drive component and have not yet been machined to final specification after the initial casting, forging or like operations. These machining processes may include cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering.

[67] *See* Policy Bulletin 05.1 at 6 (emphasis added).

[68] *See* section 733(a) of the Act.

[69] *Id.*

[70] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b).

[71] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b)(2).

[72] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[73] *See Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration during Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*); *see also* frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule,* available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.*

Subject merchandise includes iron mechanical transfer drive components as defined above that have been finished or machined in a third country, including but not limited to finishing/machining processes such as cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering, or any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigations if performed in the country of manufacture of the iron mechanical transfer drive components.

Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigations regardless of width, design, or iron type (*e.g.,* gray, white, or ductile iron). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigations regardless of whether they have non-iron attachments or parts and regardless of whether they are entered with other mechanical transfer drive components or as part of a mechanical transfer drive assembly (which typically includes one or more of the iron mechanical transfer drive components identified above, and which may also include other parts such as a belt, coupling and/or shaft). When entered as a mechanical transfer drive assembly, only the iron components that meet the physical description of covered merchandise are covered merchandise, not the other components in the mechanical transfer drive assembly (*e.g.,* belt, coupling, shaft).

For purposes of these investigations, a covered product is of ''iron'' where the article has a carbon content of 1.7 percent by weight or above, regardless of the presence and amount of additional alloying elements.

The merchandise covered by these investigations is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') subheadings 8483.30.8090, 8483.50.6000, 8483.50.9040, 8483.50.9080, 8483.90.3000, 8483.90.8080. Covered merchandise may also enter under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7325.10.0080, 7325.99.1000, 7326.19.0010, 7326.19.0080, 8431.31.0040, 8431.31.0060, 8431.39.0010, 8431.39.0050, 8431.39.0070, 8431.39.0080, and 8483.50.4000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the investigations is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2015–29985 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–031]

Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Trisha Tran or Robert Galantucci at (202) 482–4852 or (202) 482–2923, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Petition

On October 28, 2015, the Department of Commerce (Department) received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning certain iron mechanical transfer drive components (iron transfer drive components) from the People's Republic of China (the PRC), filed in proper form on behalf of TB Wood's Incorporated (Petitioner). The CVD petition was accompanied by an antidumping duty (AD) petition concerning imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC and Canada.[1] Petitioner is a domestic producer of iron transfer drive components.[2]

On November 3, 2015 and November 6, 2015, the Department requested information and clarification for certain areas of the Petition.[3] Petitioner filed responses to these requests on November 5, 2015 and November 10, 2015.[4]

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Petitioner alleges that the Government of China (GOC) is providing countervailable subsidies (within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act) to imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, for those alleged programs in the PRC on which we have initiated a CVD investigation, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegation.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The Department also finds that Petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the CVD investigation that Petitioner is requesting.[5]

Period of Investigation

The period of the investigation is January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014.[6]

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is iron transfer drive components from the PRC. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, *see* the ''Scope of the Investigation'' in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, the Department issued questions to, and received responses from, Petitioner pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition would be an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[7]

As discussed in the preamble to the Department's regulations,[8] we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.,* scope). The Department will consider all comments received from interested parties, and if necessary, will consult with interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determination. If scope comments include factual information (*see* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21)), all such factual information should be limited to public

[1] *See* ''Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China,'' dated October 28, 2015 (Petition).

[2] *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 2, and Exhibits I–3 and I–4.

[3] *See* Letter from the Department, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China: Supplemental Questions,'' dated November 3, 2015 (General Issues Questionnaire); *see also* Letter from the Department, ''Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China: Supplemental Questions,'' dated November 3, 2015; *see also* Letter from the Department, ''Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties on Imports of Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China: Supplemental Questionnaire,'' dated November 6, 2015.

[4] *See* Letter from Petitioner, ''Response to the Department's November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,'' dated November 5, 2015, covering volume I (General Issues Supplement); *see also* ''Response to the Department's November 3, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume IV of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,'' dated November 5, 2015, covering volume IV of the Petition (CVD Supplement); ''Response to the Department's November 6, 2015 Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition for the Imposition of Countervailing Duties,'' dated November 10, 2015, covering volume IV of the Petition (General Issues Second Supplement).

[5] *See* the ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petition'' section below.

[6] *See* 19 CFR 351.204(b)(2).

[7] *See* General Issues Questionnaire; *see also* General Issues Supplement.

[8] *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule,* 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997).

information. In order to facilitate preparation of its questionnaire, the Department requests all interested parties to submit such comments by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, which is the first business day after 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice. Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on Friday, December 18, 2015, which is 10 calendar days after the initial comments deadline.

The Department requests that any factual information the parties consider relevant to the scope of the investigation be submitted during this time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigation may be relevant, the party may contact the Department and request permission to submit the additional information. All such comments must be filed on the record of the concurrent AD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to the Department must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).[9] An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due. Documents excepted from the electronic submission requirements must be filed manually (*i.e.,* in paper form) with Enforcement and Compliance's APO/Dockets Unit, Room 18022, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, and stamped with the date and time of receipt by the applicable deadlines.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act, the Department notified representatives of the GOC of the receipt of the Petition. Also, in accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department provided representatives of the GOC the opportunity for consultations with respect to the CVD petition. As the GOC did not request consultations prior to the initiation of this investigation, the Department and the GOC did not hold consultations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, the Department shall: (i) Poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[10] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[11]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.,* the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, Petitioner does not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation. Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that iron transfer drive components constitute a single domestic like product and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[12]

In determining whether Petitioner has standing under section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigation,'' in Appendix I of this notice. To establish industry support, Petitioner provided its production of the domestic like product in 2014, as well as estimated total production of the domestic like product for the entire domestic industry.[13] We relied on data Petitioner provided for purposes of measuring industry support.[14]

On November 12, 2015, we received comments on industry support from Baldor Electric Company (Baldor) [15] and Caterpillar, Inc. (Caterpillar).[16] Baldor also indicated that it opposes the Petition.[17] Petitioner responded to the letters from Baldor and Caterpillar on November 16, 2015.[18] Baldor filed two additional submissions regarding industry support on November 16,

[9] *See* 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements); *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011), for details of the Department's electronic filing requirements, which went into effect on August 5, 2011. Information on help using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx* and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook%20on%20Electronic%20Filling%20Procedures.pdf.*

[10] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[11] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States,* 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[12] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis in this case, *see* Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from the People's Republic of China (PRC CVD Checklist) at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China (Attachment II). This checklist is dated concurrently with this notice and on file electronically via ACCESS. Access to documents filed via ACCESS is also available in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

[13] *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 3–4 and Exhibits I–4 through I–7.

[14] *Id.* For further discussion, *see* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[15] *See* Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015.

[16] *See* Letter from Caterpillar, Inc., filed on November 12, 2015. We note that this letter is dated November 11, 2015, but was received by the Department on November 12, 2015.

[17] *See* Letter from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 12, 2015, at 15.

[18] *See* Letter from Petitioner, dated November 16, 2015.

2015.[19] Petitioner provided additional responses to Baldor's arguments on November 17, 2015.[20] For further discussion of these comments, *see* the PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

Our review of the data provided in the Petition; General Issues Supplement; letters from Baldor, Caterpillar, and Petitioner; and other information readily available to the Department indicates that Petitioner has established industry support.[21] First, the Petition established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, the Department is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.,* polling).[22] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product.[23] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition.[24] Accordingly, the Department determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because it is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act and it has demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the CVD investigation that it is requesting the Department initiate.[25]

Injury Test

Because the PRC is a ''Subsidies Agreement Country'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, section 701(a)(2) of the Act applies to this investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from the PRC materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

Petitioner alleges that imports of the subject merchandise are benefitting from countervailable subsidies and that such imports are causing, or threaten to cause, material injury to the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. In addition, Petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.[26]

Petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by eroded domestic output and shipments; underselling and price suppression or depression; declining financial performance; negative impacts to employment; and lost sales and revenues.[27] We have assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, and causation, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[28]

Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires the Department to initiate a CVD investigation whenever an interested party filed a CVD petition on behalf of an industry that: (1) Alleges elements necessary for an imposition of a duty under section 701(a) of the Act; and (2) is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting the allegations.

Petitioner alleges that producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components in the PRC benefit from countervailable subsidies bestowed by the GOC. The Department examined the Petition and finds that it complies with the requirements of section 702(b)(1) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of iron transfer drive components from the PRC receive countervailable subsidies from the GOC.

On June 29, 2015, the President of the United States signed into law the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, which made numerous amendments to the AD and CVD law.[29] The 2015 law does not specify dates of application for those amendments. On August 6, 2015, the Department published an interpretative rule, in which it announced the applicability dates for each amendment to the Act, except for amendments contained in section 771(7) of the Act, which relate to determinations of material injury by the ITC.[30] The amendments to sections 776 and 782 of the Act are applicable to all determinations made on or after August 6, 2015, and, therefore, apply to this CVD investigation.[31]

Based on our review of the petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on 39 of the 40 alleged programs in the PRC.[32] For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate or not initiate on each program, *see* the PRC CVD Initiation Checklist. A public version of the initiation checklist for this investigation is available on ACCESS.

In accordance with section 703(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

Respondent Selection

Petitioner named 36 companies as producers/exporters of iron transfer drive components from the PRC.[33] Following standard practice in CVD investigations, the Department would normally select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports of iron transfer drive components during the period of investigation under the appropriate HTSUS numbers listed in the scope in Appendix I, below. However, CBP data has been reported in

[19] *See* Letters from Baldor Electric Company, dated November 16, 2015.

[20] *See* Letter from Petitioner, dated November 17, 2015.

[21] *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[22] *See* section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act; *see also* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[23] *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment II.

[24] *Id.*

[25] *Id.*

[26] *See* General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

[27] *See* Volume I of the Petition, at 16–17, 22–44 and Exhibits I–4, I–10 through I–13, and I–15 through I–23; *see also* General Issues Supplement, at 12–13 and Exhibit I–S3.

[28] *See* PRC CVD Initiation Checklist, at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Iron Mechanical Transfer Drive Components from Canada and the People's Republic of China.

[29] *See* Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114–27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

[30] *See Dates of Application of Amendments to the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws Made by the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015,* 80 FR 46793 (August 6, 2015) (*Applicability Notice*). The 2015 amendments may be found at *https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1295/text/pl.*

[31] *Id.* at 46794–95.

[32] Petitioner initially alleged 39 subsidy programs. *See* Volume IV of the Petition, at 7–92. In response to a Department questionnaire, the final number of programs alleged increased to 40. *See* CVD Supplement at 9–12.

[33] *See* General Issues Second Supplement, at Exhibit 1; *see also* Volume I of the Petition, at Exhibit I–11.

mixed units of quantity and, thus, it is problematic for the Department use this data for respondent selection purposes. Accordingly, we intend to issue quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent and base respondent selection on the responses received. In addition, the Department will post the Q&V questionnaire along with filing instructions on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at *http://www.trade.gov/enforcement/news.asp.*

Exporters and producers of iron transfer drive components from the PRC that do not receive Q&V questionnaires by mail may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy from the Enforcement and Compliance Web site. The Q&V response must be submitted by all PRC exporters/producers no later than December 1, 2015, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS. An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by ACCESS, by 5 p.m. ET by the date noted above.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petition has been provided to the GOC *via* ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each known exporter (as named in the Petition), consistent with 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

We will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petition was filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of iron transfer drive components from the PRC are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.[34] A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated;[35] otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) Evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by the Department; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). The regulation requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Extension of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301 expires. For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Under certain circumstances, we may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. Review *Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule,* 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013), available at *http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm,* prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[36] Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials, as well as their representatives. Investigations initiated on the basis of petitions filed on or after August 16, 2013, and other segments of any AD or CVD proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule.*[37] The Department intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable revised certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. On January 22, 2008, the Department published *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Documents Submission Procedures; APO Procedures,* 73 FR 3634 (January 22, 2008). Parties wishing to participate in this investigation should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (*e.g.,* the filing of letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 702 and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I

Scope of the Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are iron mechanical transfer drive components, whether finished or unfinished (*i.e.,* blanks or castings). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are in the form of wheels or cylinders with a center bore hole that may have one or more grooves or teeth in their outer circumference that guide or mesh with a flat or ribbed belt or like device and are often referred to as sheaves, pulleys, flywheels, flat pulleys, idlers, conveyer pulleys, synchronous sheaves, and timing pulleys. The products covered by this investigation also include bushings, which are iron mechanical transfer drive components in the form of a cylinder and which fit into the bore holes of other mechanical transfer drive components to lock them into drive shafts by means of elements such as teeth, bolts, or screws.

[34] *See* section 703(a)(2) of the Act.

[35] *See* section 703(a)(1) of the Act.

[36] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[37] *See Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (''*Final Rule*''); *see also* frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule,* available at *http://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.*

Iron mechanical transfer drive components subject to this investigation are those not less than 4.00 inches (101 mm) in the maximum nominal outer diameter.

Unfinished iron mechanical transfer drive components (*i.e.,* blanks or castings) possess the approximate shape of the finished iron mechanical transfer drive component and have not yet been machined to final specification after the initial casting, forging or like operations. These machining processes may include cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering.

Subject merchandise includes iron mechanical transfer drive components as defined above that have been finished or machined in a third country, including but not limited to finishing/machining processes such as cutting, punching, notching, boring, threading, mitering, or chamfering, or any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigation if performed in the country of manufacture of the iron mechanical transfer drive components.

Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigation regardless of width, design, or iron type (*e.g.,* gray, white, or ductile iron). Subject iron mechanical transfer drive components are covered by the scope of the investigation regardless of whether they have non-iron attachments or parts and regardless of whether they are entered with other mechanical transfer drive components or as part of a mechanical transfer drive assembly (which typically includes one or more of the iron mechanical transfer drive components identified above, and which may also include other parts such as a belt, coupling and/or shaft). When entered as a mechanical transfer drive assembly, only the iron components that meet the physical description of covered merchandise are covered merchandise, not the other components in the mechanical transfer drive assembly (*e.g.,* belt, coupling, shaft).

For purposes of this investigation, a covered product is of ''iron'' where the article has a carbon content of 1.7 percent by weight or above, regardless of the presence and amount of additional alloying elements.

The merchandise covered by this investigation is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') subheadings 8483.30.8090, 8483.50.6000, 8483.50.9040, 8483.50.9080, 8483.90.3000, 8483.90.8080. Covered merchandise may also enter under the following HTSUS subheadings: 7325.10.0080, 7325.99.1000, 7326.19.0010, 7326.19.0080, 8431.31.0040, 8431.31.0060, 8431.39.0010, 8431.39.0050, 8431.39.0070, 8431.39.0080, and 8483.50.4000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the investigation is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2015–29945 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free Trade Agreement, Article 1904; NAFTA Panel Reviews; First Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On November 18, 2015, Irving Paper Limited filed a First Request for Panel Review with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Also, on November 18, 2015, additional Requests for Panel Review were filed on behalf of Resolute FP Canada Inc., Port Hawkesbury Paper LP, the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces of British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Québec. Panel Review was requested of the U.S. Department of Commerce's final affirmative countervailing duty determination regarding Supercalendered Paper from Canada. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 63535), on October 20, 2015. The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA–CDA–2015–1904–01 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Morris, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, (202)–482–5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (''Agreement'') established a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms to the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada, and the Government of Mexico established *Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* (''Rules''). These Rules were published in the **Federal Register** on February 23, 1994 (59 FR 8685) and subsequently amended on April 10, 2008 (73 FR 19458).

A first Request for Panel Review was filed with the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat, pursuant to Article 1904 of the Agreement, on November 18, 2015, requesting a panel review of the determination and order described above.

The Rules provide that:

(a) A Party or interested person may challenge the final determination in whole or in part by filing a Complaint in accordance with Rule 39 within 30 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Complaint is December 18, 2015);

(b) a Party, investigating authority or interested person that does not file a Complaint but that intends to appear in support of any reviewable portion of the final determination may participate in the panel review by filing a Notice of Appearance in accordance with Rule 40 within 45 days after the filing of the first Request for Panel Review (the deadline for filing a Notice of Appearance is January 4, 2016); and

(c) the panel review shall be limited to the allegations of error of fact or law, including the jurisdiction of the investigating authority, that are set out in the Complaints filed in panel review and the procedural and substantive defenses raised in the panel review.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Paul Morris,

United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2015–29959 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–549–822]

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by Thai Union Group Public Co., Ltd. (Thai Union Group), a producer/exporter of certain frozen warmwater shrimp (shrimp) from Thailand, and pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), 19 CFR 351.216, and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances review (CCR) of the antidumping duty (AD) order on shrimp from Thailand with regard to Thai

Union Group. Based on the information received, we preliminarily determine that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen Products Public Co., Ltd. (Thai Union Frozen) for purposes of determining AD liability. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis McClure or Elizabeth Eastwood, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5973 or (202) 482–3874, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 1, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** an AD order on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Thailand.[1] On September 17, 2015, Thai Union Group, a producer/exporter of Thai shrimp covered by this order, changed its name from Thai Union Frozen to Thai Union Group. On October 5, 2015, Thai Union Group requested that the Department conduct an expedited changed circumstances review under section 751(b) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.216(c), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii).[2] In this request, Thai Union Group asked the Department to determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen and, accordingly, to assign it the cash deposit rate of the Thai Union group of companies, of which Thai Union Frozen is a part.[3] [4] On October 8, 2015, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to Thai Union Group, to which the company responded on October 21, 2015.[5]

[1] *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand,* 70 FR 5145 (February 1, 2005).

[2] *See* Letter from Thai Union Group, Re: ''Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand: Request for Expedited Changed Circumstances Review,'' dated October 5, 2015 (Thai Union CCR Request).

[3] *Id.*

[4] This group consists of Thai Union Frozen, Thai Union Seafood Co., Ltd., Pakfood Public Company Limited, Okeanos Co. Ltd., Okeanos Food Co., Ltd, Asia Pacific (Thailand) Co., Ltd., Chaophraya Cold Storage Co. Ltd., and Takzin Samut Co. Ltd. (collectively, ''Thai Union'').

[5] *See* Letter from Thai Union Group, Re: ''Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand: Changed Circumstances Review Supplemental Questionnaire Response,'' dated October 21, 2015 (CCR Supplemental Questionnaire Response).

Scope of the Order

The scope of this order includes certain frozen warmwater shrimp and prawns, whether wild-caught (ocean harvested) or farm-raised (produced by aquaculture), head-on or head-off, shell-on or peeled, tail-on or tail-off,[6] deveined or not deveined, cooked or raw, or otherwise processed in frozen form.

The frozen warmwater shrimp and prawn products included in the scope of this order, regardless of definitions in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), are products which are processed from warmwater shrimp and prawns through freezing and which are sold in any count size.

The products described above may be processed from any species of warmwater shrimp and prawns. Warmwater shrimp and prawns are generally classified in, but are not limited to, the Penaeidae family. Some examples of the farmed and wild-caught warmwater species include, but are not limited to, whiteleg shrimp (Penaeus vannemei), banana prawn (Penaeus merguiensis), fleshy prawn (Penaeus chinensis), giant river prawn (Macrobrachium rosenbergii), giant tiger prawn (Penaeus monodon), redspotted shrimp (Penaeus brasiliensis), southern brown shrimp (Penaeus subtilis), southern pink shrimp (Penaeus notialis), southern rough shrimp (Trachypenaeus curvirostris), southern white shrimp (Penaeus schmitti), blue shrimp (Penaeus stylirostris), western white shrimp (Penaeus occidentalis), and Indian white prawn (Penaeus indicus).

Frozen shrimp and prawns that are packed with marinade, spices or sauce are included in the scope of this order. In addition, food preparations, which are not ''prepared meals,'' that contain more than 20 percent by weight of shrimp or prawn are also included in the scope of this order.

Excluded from the scope are: (1) Breaded shrimp and prawns (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.10.20); (2) shrimp and prawns generally classified in the Pandalidae family and commonly referred to as coldwater shrimp, in any state of processing; (3) fresh shrimp and prawns whether shell-on or peeled (HTSUS subheadings 0306.23.00.20 and 0306.23.00.40); (4) shrimp and prawns in prepared meals (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.05.10); (5) dried shrimp and prawns; (6) canned warmwater shrimp and prawns (HTSUS subheading 1605.20.10.40); (7) certain battered shrimp. Battered shrimp is a shrimp-based product: (1) That is produced from fresh (or thawed-from-frozen) and peeled shrimp; (2) to which a ''dusting'' layer of rice or wheat flour of at least 95 percent purity has been applied; (3) with the entire surface of the shrimp flesh thoroughly and evenly coated with the flour; (4) with the non-shrimp content of the end product constituting between four and ten percent of the product's total weight after being dusted, but prior to being frozen; and (5) that is subjected to IQF freezing immediately after application of the dusting layer. When dusted in accordance with the definition of dusting above, the battered shrimp product is also coated with a wet viscous layer containing egg and/or milk, and par-fried.

The products covered by this order are currently classified under the following HTSUS subheadings: 0306.17.00.03, 0306.17.00.06, 0306.17.00.09, 0306.17.00.12, 0306.17.00.15, 0306.17.00.18, 0306.17.00.21, 0306.17.00.24, 0306.17.00.27, 0306.17.00.40, 1605.21.10.30, and 1605.29.10.10. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only and are not dispositive, but rather the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.[7]

[6] ''Tails'' in this context means the tail fan, which includes the telson and the uropods.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216(d), the Department will conduct a CCR upon receipt of a request from an interested party for a review of an AD order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. The information submitted by Thai Union Group supporting its claim that it is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen demonstrates changed circumstances sufficient to warrant such a review.[8]

In accordance with the above-referenced regulation, the Department is

[7] On April 26, 2011, the Department amended the antidumping duty order to include dusted shrimp, pursuant to the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) decision in *Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee* v. *United States,* 703 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (CIT 2010) and the U.S. International Trade Commission determination, which found the domestic like product to include dusted shrimp. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, India, the People's Republic of China, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Amended Antidumping Duty Orders in Accordance with Final Court Decision,* 76 FR 23277 (April 26, 2011); *see also Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee* v. *United States,* 703 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (CIT 2010) and *Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, China, India, Thailand, and Vietnam* (Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1063, 1064, 1066–1068 (Review), USITC Publication 4221, March 2011).

[8] *See* 19 CFR 351.216(d).

initiating a CCR to determine whether Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen. When it concludes that expedited action is warranted, the Department may publish the notice of initiation and preliminary results for a CCR concurrently.[9] We determined that expediting this CCR is warranted because we have the information necessary to make a preliminary finding already on the record, in accordance with our practice.[10]

In determining whether one company is the successor-in-interest to another, the Department examines a number of factors including, but not limited to, changes in management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer base.[11] While no single factor or combination of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of a successor-in-interest relationship, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if the new company's resulting operation is not materially dissimilar to that of its predecessor.[12] Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the prior company, the Department will assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor.[13]

In its October 5 and October 21, 2015, submissions, Thai Union Group provided information to demonstrate that it is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen. Thai Union Group states that the company's management, production facilities and customer/supplier relationships have not changed as a result of the corporate name change. To support its claims, Thai Union Group submitted the following documents: (1) Resolutions passed at a board of directors' meeting for the company as well as shareholder meeting minutes, demonstrating approval of the name change; [14] (2) a letter announcing the company's name change to its customers and suppliers; [15] (3) two affidavits, both dated September 2015, from the Thai Ministry of Commerce's Department of Business Development, certifying that the directors and other business information appearing in the Thai company register for Thai Union Group and Thai Union Frozen are identical; [16] (4) a list showing the management of Thai Union Frozen before, and Thai Union Group after, the name change; [17] (5) a list showing the Board of Directors of Thai Union Frozen before, and Thai Union Group after, the name change; [18] (6) Thai Union Frozen's 2014 audited financial statements; [19] (7) a list of the suppliers of Thai Union Frozen before, and Thai Union Group after, the name change; [20] and (8) a list of the customers of Thai Union Frozen before, and Thai Union Group after, the name change.[21]

Based on the evidence on the record, we preliminarily find that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen. We find that Thai Union Group operates as the same business entity as Thai Union Frozen and that its Board of Directors, management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customers have not changed as a result of its name change. Thus, we preliminarily find that Thai Union Group should receive the same antidumping duty cash-deposit rate with respect to the subject merchandise as Thai Union Frozen, its predecessor company.[22]

Should our final results remain the same as these preliminary results, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend entries of subject merchandise produced or exported by Thai Union Group at Thai Union Frozen's cash deposit rate, effective on the publication date of our final results.

Public Comment

Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments not later than 14 days after the publication of this notice.[23] Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed not later than five days after the deadline for filing case briefs.[24] Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this changed circumstance review are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities. Interested parties who wish to comment on the preliminary results must file briefs electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at *http://access.trade.gov.* An electronically-filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the Department's electronic records system, ACCESS, by 5 p.m. Eastern Time on the date the document is due.

Interested parties that wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, filed electronically via ACCESS, within 14 days of publication of this notice.[25] Parties will be notified of the time and date of any hearing, if requested.[26]

Consistent with 19 CFR 351.216(e), we intend to issue the final results of this changed circumstance review no later than 270 days after the date on which this review was initiated, or

[9] *See* 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii); *see also Certain Pasta From Italy: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 80 FR 33480, 33480–41 (June 12, 2015) (*Pasta From Italy Preliminary Results*) (unchanged in *Certain Pasta From Italy: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review,* 80 FR 48807) (August 14, 2015) (*Pasta From Italy Final Results*).

[10] *See, e.g., Pasta From Italy Preliminary Results,* 80 FR at 33480–41 (unchanged in *Pasta From Italy Final Results,* 80 FR at 48807).

[11] *See, e.g., Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand,* 75 FR 61702, 61703 (October 6, 2010) (*Shrimp From Thailand Preliminary Results*) (unchanged in *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand,* 75 FR 74684 (December 1, 2010) (*Shrimp From Thailand Final Results*)); and *Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 59 FR 6944, 6946 (February 14, 1994).

[12] *See Shrimp From Thailand Preliminary Results,* 75 FR at 61703 (unchanged in *Shrimp From Thailand Final Results,* 75 FR at 74684).

[13] *Id.; see also Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan,* 67 FR 58, 59 (January 2, 2002); and *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France: Final Results of Changed-Circumstances Review,* 75 FR 34688, 34689 (June 18, 2010).

[14] *See* Thai Union CCR Request, at Exhibit 1.

[15] *Id.,* at Exhibit 2.

[16] *Id.,* at Exhibit 5; and CCR Supplemental Questionnaire Response, at Exhibit 2.

[17] *See* Thai Union CCR Request, at Exhibit 3.

[18] *Id.,* at Exhibits 4 and 5.

[19] *See* CCR Supplemental Questionnaire Response, at Exhibit 3.

[20] *See* Thai Union CCR Request, at Exhibit 7.

[21] *Id.*

[22] Thai Union Frozen received a 1.10 percent dumping margin as part of Thai Union in the 2012–2013 administrative review of the AD order on shrimp from Thailand. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Final Determination of No Shipments, and Partial Rescission of Review; 2012–2013,* 79 FR 51306 (August 28, 2014) (corrected by *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Notice of Correction to the Final Results of the 2012–2013 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 79 FR 62099 (October 16, 2014)). We note that Thai Union Frozen is also a respondent in the current 2014–2015 administrative review of this antidumping duty order. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From India and Thailand: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 80 FR 16634 (March 30, 2015). At the conclusion of this CCR, if we determine that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen, we will assign Thai Union Group an updated cash deposit rate based on the final results of that review.

[23] *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii).

[24] *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d).

[25] *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c); *see also* 19 CFR 351.303 for general filing requirements.

[26] *See* 19 CFR 351.310.

within 45 days of publication of these preliminary results if all parties agree to our preliminary finding.

We are issuing and publishing this finding and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3)(ii).

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–29984 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Interim Procedures for Considering Requests and Comments from the Public Under the Commercial Availability Provision of the United States—Korea Free Trade Agreement

AGENCY: International Trade Administration

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at *JJessup@doc.gov*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Maria D'Andrea, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, Tel. (202) 482–1550, *Maria.D'Andrea@trade.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The United States and Korea negotiated the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (the ''Agreement'') which was implemented into U.S. law pursuant to the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (''the Act''). Under the provisions of the Act, textile and apparel goods must contain fibers, yarns, and fabrics produced in Korea or the United States to receive duty-free tariff treatment. The Agreement also provides for the establishment of a list of specific fibers, yarns, and fabrics that are not available in commercial quantities in a timely manner from producers in the United States. Articles containing these commercially unavailable fibers, yarns, and fabrics are also entitled to duty-free or preferential duty treatment despite not being produced in the United States.

The list of commercially unavailable fabrics, yarns, and fibers may be changed pursuant to the commercial availability provision of the Agreement and the Act. Under Section 202(o) of the Act (''the commercial availability provision''), interested entities from Korea or the United States have the right to request that a specific fiber, yarn, or fabric be added to, or removed from, the list of commercially unavailable fibers, yarns, and fabrics. This right becomes effective when the Agreement enters into force.

Section 202(o)(3)(F) of the Act requires that the President establish procedures for parties to follow when exercising the right to make these requests. The President delegated the responsibility for publishing the procedures and administering commercial availability requests to the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA), which issues procedures and acts on requests through the Office of Textiles and Apparel (''OTEXA'').

The intent of these procedures is to foster the trade in U.S. and Korean textile and apparel articles by allowing non-originating fibers, yarns, and fabrics to be placed on or removed from a list of items not available in commercial quantities, on a timely basis, and in a manner that is consistent with normal business practice. To this end, these procedures are intended to facilitate the transmission, on a timely basis, of requests for commercial availability determinations and offers to supply the products that are the subject of the requests; have the market indicate the availability of the supply of the subject products; make available promptly, to interested entities and parties, information received regarding the requests for products and offers to supply; ensure wide participation by interested entities and parties; provide careful scrutiny of information provided to substantiate order requests and responses of offers to supply; and provide timely public dissemination of information used by CITA in making commercial availability determinations.

For a fiber, yarn or fabric to be added to Appendix 4–B–1, an interested entity must submit to CITA a Request for a Commercial Availability Determination (''Request'') which states that the subject product is not commercially available in the United States within a commercially reasonable timeframe (*i.e.,* timely). In support of its claim, the requestor must provide information to CITA regarding its attempts to source the subject product in the United States, and why it determined that the product is not available in a timely manner. Potential suppliers from the United States may submit a Response with an Offer to Supply (''Response''), asserting their capability and capacity to supply the subject product. These Responses must include information supporting the capability and capacity assertion. If the requestor disputes a responder's assertions, the requestor may submit a Rebuttal comment offering its contention, along with supporting information and documentation.

The information collected by CITA from Requests, Responses and Rebuttals will be used to determine whether the subject product is available in commercial quantities in a timely manner in the United States under the commercial availability provision of the Act. Requests, Responses, and Rebuttals must identify confidential information. Entities submitting confidential information in their Requests, Responses, or Rebuttals to CITA must submit both a public and a confidential version of their submissions. If the submissions are accepted, the public submissions or public versions of submissions will be posted on the dedicated commercial availability section of the Office of Textiles and Apparel (OTEXA)'s Web site. Business confidential information will not be shared with the public. Requestors and potential suppliers of the product named in the Request may use the public version as a basis for Responses and Rebuttals.

Each submission containing factual information for CITA's consideration must be accompanied by the appropriate certification regarding the accuracy of the factual information. With each electronic and original signed submission that contains factual information, an interested entity must file a certification of due diligence, attesting to the accuracy and authenticity of the submission. If the interested entity has legal counsel or other representative, the legal counsel or other representative must also file a certification of due diligence with each electronic and original signed submissions that contains factual

information. Accurate representations of material facts submitted to CITA for the Commercial Availability Proceeding are vital to the integrity of this process and are necessary for CITA's effective administration of the statutory scheme. Each submission containing factual information for CITA's consideration must be accompanied by the appropriate certification regarding the accuracy of the factual information. Any submission that lacks the applicable certifications will be considered an incomplete submission that CITA will reject and return to the submitter. CITA may verify any factual information submitted by interested entities in a Commercial Availability Proceeding.

II. Method of Collection

All submissions for a commercial availability proceeding pursuant to these procedures (*e.g.,* Commercial Availability Request, Response, Rebuttal, and Request to Remove) must be in English. If any attachments are in a language other than English, a complete translation must be provided. Each submission must be submitted to the Chairman of CITA, in care of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Office of Textiles and Apparel (''OTEXA'') in two forms: email and an original signed submission. An email version of the submission must be either in PDF or Word format, must contain an adequate public summary of any business confidential information and the due diligence certification, and should be sent to *OTEXA.KOREA@trade.gov*. The email version of the submission will be posted for public review on KOREA FTA Commercial Availability Web site. No business confidential information should be submitted in the email version of any document.

Brackets must be placed around all business confidential information contained in submissions. Documents containing business confidential information must have a bolded heading stating ''Confidential Version.'' Attachments considered business confidential information must have a heading stating ''Business Confidential Information.'' Documents, including those submitted via email, provided for public release must have a bolded heading stating ''Public Version'' and all the business confidential information must be deleted from public versions, and substituted with an adequate public summary.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0625–0270.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Individuals or Business.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 16.

Estimated Time per Response: 8 hours for Request for Commercial Availability Determination; 2 hours for Response to a Request; and 1 hour for Rebuttal.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 89.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: $3,440.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Glenna Mickelson,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–29933 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–BC69

Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the Elliot Bay Seawall Project in Seattle, Washington

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of issuance of a Letter of Authorization.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), as amended, and implementing regulations, notification is hereby given that a Letter of Authorization (LOA) has been issued to the City of Seattle's Department of Transportation (SDOT) for the take of eight species of marine mammals incidental to pile driving activities associated with the Elliot Bay Seawall Project (EBSP).

DATES: Effective from October 22, 2015, through August 31, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The LOA and supporting documentation are available for review on the Internet at: *www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm.* Documents cited in this notice may also be viewed, by appointment, during regular business hours at the Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910–3225, by telephoning the contact listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zach Hughes, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 301–427–8401.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Sections 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) directs the Secretary of Commerce to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region if certain findings are made and either regulations are issues or, if the taking is limited to harassment, notice of a proposed authorization is provided to the public for review. Under the MMPA, the term ''take'' means to harass, hunt, capture, or kill marine mammals. Authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the identified species or stock(s), will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses (where relevant), and if the permissible methods of taking and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring, and reporting of such takings are set forth in the regulations. NMFS has defined ''negligible impact'' in 50 CFR 216.103 as ''. . . an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival.'' Regulations governing the taking of harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina richardii*), California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*), Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus monteriensis*), harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*

vomerina), Dall's porpoise (*Phocoenoides dalli dalli*), southern resident and transient killer whales (*Orcinus orca*), gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*), and humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), by harassment, incidental to pile driving activities in Elliot Bay for the EBSP, were issued on October 21, 2013 (78 FR 63396, October 24, 2013), and remain in effect until October 21, 2018. For detailed information on this action, please refer to that document. The regulations include mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements for the incidental take of marine mammals during pile driving activities associated with the EBSP. Pursuant to those regulations, NMFS first issued an LOA, effective from October 22, 2013, through October 21, 2014, and a second LOA, effective from October 22, 2014, through October 21, 2015. SDOT conducted activities as described, implemented the required mitigation methods, and conducted the required monitoring.

Monitoring Reports

The total number of potentially harassed marine mammals was well below the authorized limits, with the exception of the California sea lion. The reported take for California sea lion for the 2014–2015 Letter of Authorization, by Level B harassment only, exceeded the annually authorized level. Please see the monitoring report at *http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental/construction.htm* for more detail. This resulted in part because of an error in our assumptions relating to the proposed take estimates in the original rule, *i.e.,* the number of California sea lions regularly hauling out on buoys in Elliot Bay. Based on our review of monitoring to date we plan to revise future take estimates by assuming an estimated daily exposure of up to 7 California sea lions (as compared with 5 assumed in regulations).

Because this revision of the estimated number of California sea lions constitutes less than 0.1 percent of the population for California sea lions, and is the same kind of take anticipated in the regulations, it remains consistent with the determinations of negligible impact and small numbers, and our subsistence findings for the specified activity and remaining years of the issued regulations for the EBSP.

Authorization

NMFS has issued an LOA to SDOT authorizing the Level B harassment of marine mammals incidental to pile driving activities associated with the EBSP at Seattle, WA. Take of marine mammals will be minimized through implementation of the following mitigation measures: (1) Limited impact pile driving; (2) containment of impact pile driving; (3) additional sound attenuation measures; (4) ramp-up of pile-related activities; (5) marine mammal exclusion zones; and (6) shutdown and delay procedures. SDOT will also conduct visual monitoring and underwater acoustic monitoring for mitigation and research purposes. Reports will be submitted to NMFS at the time of request for a renewal of the LOA, and a final comprehensive report, which will summarize all previous reports and assess cumulative impacts, will be submitted before the rule expires.

Issuance of this LOA is based on the results of the monitoring reports that verified that the total number of potentially harassed marine mammals was below the authorized limits, with the exception of the California sea lion (as discussed above). Based on these findings and the information discussed in the preamble to the final rule, the activities described under the LOA will have a negligible impact on the marine mammal stocks and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the affected marine mammal stocks for subsistence uses. No injury, serious injury, or mortality of the affected species is anticipated.

Dated: October 28, 2015.

Perry F. Gayaldo,

Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–29979 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Notice of Intent To Renew Collection Numbers 3038–0068, 3038–0083, and 3038–0088, Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (''CFTC'' or ''Commission'') is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed renewal of three collections of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (''PRA''), Federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment. This notice solicits comments on the collections of information mandated by §§ 23.500 to 23.505 of the Commission regulations (Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by ''Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants'','' and Collection Numbers 3038–0068, 3038–0083, and 3038–0088 by any of the following methods:

- *The Agency's Web site, at http://comments.cftc.gov/.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Web site.
- *Mail:* Christopher Kirkpatrick, Secretary of the Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Same as Mail above.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov/.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Portal. Please submit your comments using only one method.

All comments must be submitted in English, or if not, accompanied by an English translation. Comments will be posted as received to *www.cftc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory Scopino, Special Counsel, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, (202) 418–5496; email: *gscopino@cftc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA, Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. ''Collection of Information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3 and includes agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), requires Federal agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information,

including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, the CFTC is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information listed below.

Title: Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants (OMB Control Nos. 3038–0068, 3038–0083, 3038–0088). This is a request for an extension of currently approved information collections.

Abstract: On September 11, 2012 the Commission adopted Commission regulations 23.500–23.505 (Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, Portfolio Compression, and Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants) [1] under sections 4s(f), (g) and (i) [2] of the Commodity Exchange Act (''CEA''). Commission regulations 23.500–23.505 require, among other things, that swap dealers (''SD'') [3] and major swap participants (''MSP'') [4] develop and retain written swap trading relationship documentation. The regulations also establish requirements for SDs and MSPs regarding swap confirmation, portfolio reconciliation, and portfolio compression. Under the regulations, swap dealers and major swap participants are obligated to maintain records of the policies and procedures required by the rules.[5] Confirmation, portfolio reconciliation, and portfolio compression are important post-trade processing mechanisms for reducing risk and improving operational efficiency. The information collection obligations imposed by the regulations are necessary to ensure that each swap dealer and major swap participant maintains the required records of their business activities and an audit trail sufficient to conduct comprehensive and accurate trade reconstruction. The information collections contained in the regulations are essential to ensuring that swap dealers and major swap participants document their swaps, reconcile their swap portfolios to resolve discrepancies and disputes, and wholly or partially terminate some or all of their outstanding swaps through regular portfolio compression exercises. The collections of information are mandatory. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

With respect to the collection of information, the CFTC invites comments on:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information will have a practical use;
- The accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

All comments must be submitted in English, or if not, accompanied by an English translation. Comments will be posted as received to *http://www.cftc.gov.* You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. If you wish the Commission to consider information that you believe is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, a petition for confidential treatment of the exempt information may be submitted according to the procedures established in § 145.9 of the Commission's regulations.[6]

The Commission reserves the right, but shall have no obligation, to review, pre-screen, filter, redact, refuse or remove any or all of your submission from *http://www.cftc.gov* that it may deem to be inappropriate for publication, such as obscene language. All submissions that have been redacted or removed that contain comments on the merits of the information collection request will be retained in the public comment file and will be considered as required under the Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws, and may be accessible under the Freedom of Information Act.

Burden Statement: The Commission is revising its estimate of the burden for this collection to reflect the current number of respondents and estimated burden hours. The respondent burden for this collection is estimated to be as follows:

- OMB Control No. 3038–0068 (Confirmation, Portfolio Reconciliation, and Portfolio Compression Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants).

Number of Registrants: 106.

Estimated Average Burden Hours per Registrant: 1,282.5.

Estimated Aggregate Burden Hours: 135,945.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: As applicable.

- OMB Control No. 3038–0083 (Orderly Liquidation Termination Provision in Swap Trading Relationship Documentation for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants).

Number of Registrants: 106.

Estimated Average Burden Hours per Registrant: 270.

Estimated Aggregate Burden Hours: 28,620.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: As applicable.

- OMB Control No. 3038–0088 (Swap Trading Relationship Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants).

Number of Registrants: 106.

Estimated Average Burden Hours per Registrant: 6284.

Estimated Aggregate Burden Hours: 135,945.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: As applicable.

There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection.

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*)

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Robert N. Sidman,

Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–30048 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

[1] 17 CFR 23.500–23.505.

[2] 7 U.S.C. 6s(f),(g) & (i).

[3] For the definition of SD, *see* section 1a(49) of the CEA and Commission regulation 1.3(ggg). 7 U.S.C. 1a(49) and 17 CFR 1.3(ggg).

[4] For the definitions of MSP, *see* section 1a(33) of the CEA and Commission regulation 1.3(hhh). 7 U.S.C. 1a(33) and 17 CFR 1.3(hhh).

[5] SDs and MSPs are required to maintain all records of policies and procedures in accordance with Commission regulation 1.31, including policies, procedures and models used for eligible master netting agreements and custody agreements that prohibit custodian of margin from re-hypothecating, repledging, reusing, or otherwise transferring the funds held by the custodian.

[6] 17 CFR 145.9.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Notice of Intent To Renew Collection Number 3038–0078, Conflicts of Interest Policies and Procedures by Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (''CFTC'' or ''Commission'') is announcing an opportunity for public comment on the proposed renewal of a collection of certain information by the agency. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (''PRA''), Federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, and to allow 60 days for public comment. This notice solicits comments on the collections of information mandated by Commission regulation 1.71 (Conflicts of interest policies and procedures by futures commission merchants and introducing brokers).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by ''Conflicts of Interest Policies and Procedures by Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers,'' and Collection Number 3038–0078 by any of the following methods:

- *The Agency's Web site, at http://comments.cftc.gov/.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Web site.
- *Mail:* Christopher Kirkpatrick, Secretary of the Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Same as Mail above.
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov/.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments through the Portal.

Please submit your comments using only one method.

All comments must be submitted in English, or if not, accompanied by an English translation. Comments will be posted as received to *http://www.cftc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jacob Chachkin, Special Counsel, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, (202) 418–5496, email: *jchachkin@cftc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the PRA,[1] Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. ''Collection of Information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3 and includes agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), requires Federal agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, the CFTC is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information listed below.

Title: Conflicts of Interest Policies and Procedures by Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers (OMB Control No. 3038–0078). This is a request for an extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: On April 3, 2012, the Commission adopted Commission regulation 1.71 (Conflicts of interest policies and procedures by futures commission merchants and introducing brokers)[2] pursuant to section 4d(c)[3] of the Commodity Exchange Act (''CEA''). Commission regulation 1.71 requires generally that, among other things, futures commission merchants (''FCM'')[4] and introducing brokers (''IB'')[5] develop conflicts of interest procedures and disclosures, adopt and implement written policies and procedures reasonably designed to ensure compliance with their conflicts of interest and disclosure obligations, and maintain specified records related to those requirements.[6] The Commission believes that the information collection obligations imposed by Commission regulation 1.71 are essential (i) to ensuring that FCMs and IBs develop and maintain the conflicts of interest systems, procedures and disclosures required by the CEA, and Commission regulations, and (ii) to the effective evaluation of these registrants' actual compliance with the CEA and Commission regulations. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

With respect to the collection of information, the CFTC invites comments on:

- Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information will have a practical use;
- The accuracy of the Commission's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. If you wish the Commission to consider information that you believe is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, a petition for confidential treatment of the exempt information may be submitted according to the procedures established in § 145.9 of the Commission's regulations.[7]

The Commission reserves the right, but shall have no obligation, to review, pre-screen, filter, redact, refuse or remove any or all of your submission from *http://www.cftc.gov* that it may deem to be inappropriate for publication, such as obscene language. All submissions that have been redacted or removed that contain comments on the merits of the information collection request will be retained in the public comment file and will be considered as required under the Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws, and may be accessible under the Freedom of Information Act.

Burden Statement: The Commission is revising its estimate of the burden for this collection to reflect the current number of registered FCMs and IBs. Accordingly, the respondent burden for this collection is estimated to be as follows:

Number of Registrants: 1,381.

Estimated Average Burden Hours per Registrant: 44.5.

Estimated Aggregate Burden Hours: 61,454.5.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: As applicable.

(Authority:

44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*)

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Robert N. Sidman,

Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–30047 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

[1] 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

[2] 17 CFR 1.71.

[3] 7 U.S.C. 6d(c).

[4] For the definition of FCM, *see* section 1a(28) of the CEA and Commission regulation 1.3(p). 7 U.S.C. 1a(28) and 17 CFR 1.3(p).

[5] For the definition of IB, *see* section 1a(31) of the CEA and Commission regulation 1.3(mm). 7 U.S.C. 1a(31) and 17 CFR 1.3(mm).

[6] *See* 17 CFR 1.71.

[7] 17 CFR 145.9.

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

[Docket No. CFPB–2015–0053]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) is requesting to renew the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for an existing information collection titled, ''High-Cost Mortgage and Homeownership Counseling Amendments to the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z).''

DATES: Written comments are encouraged and must be received on or before December 28, 2015 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the title of the information collection, OMB Control Number (see below), and docket number (see above), by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *OMB:* Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503 or fax to (202) 395–5806. Mailed or faxed comments to OMB should be to the attention of the OMB Desk Officer for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection. Please note that comments submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. In general, all comments received will become public records, including any personal information provided. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or social security numbers, should not be included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Documentation prepared in support of this information collection request is available at *www.reginfo.gov* (this link active on the day following publication of this notice). Select ''Information Collection Review,'' under ''Currently under review, use the dropdown menu ''Select Agency'' and select ''Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'' (recent submissions to OMB will be at the top of the list). The same documentation is also available at *http://www.regulations.gov.* Requests for additional information should be directed to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 435–9575, or email: *PRA@cfpb.gov.* Please do not submit comments to this email box.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: High-Cost Mortgage and Homeownership Counseling Amendments to the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z).

OMB Control Number: 3170–0023.

Type of Review: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Private Sector (Businesses and other for- and non-profit institutions).

Estimated Number of Respondents: 55.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 12.

Abstract: The Truth in Lending Act (TILA), 15 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.,* was enacted to foster comparison credit shopping and informed credit decision making by requiring accurate disclosure of the costs and terms of credit to consumers. Creditors are subject to disclosure and other requirements that apply to open-end credit (*e.g.,* revolving credit or credit lines) and closed-end credit (*e.g.,* installment financing). TILA imposes disclosure requirements on all types of creditors in connection with consumer credit, including mortgage companies, finance companies, retailers, and credit card issuers, to ensure that consumers are fully apprised of the terms of financing prior to consummation of the transaction and, in some instances, during the loan term. It also imposes advertising disclosure requirements on advertisers of consumer credit. TILA also establishes billing error resolution procedures for open-end credit and limits consumer liability for the unauthorized use of credit cards.

An amendment to TILA, the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act (HOEPA), imposes, among other things, various disclosure and other requirements on certain creditors offering high-cost mortgages to consumers. The Bureau promulgated its Regulation Z to implement TILA, as required by the statute. The Bureau enforces TILA as to certain creditors and advertisers. TILA also contains a private right of action for consumers and provides enhanced remedies to consumers in high-cost mortgages for violations of HOEPA.

Request for Comments: The Bureau issued a 60-day **Federal Register** notice on September 14, 2015 (80 FR 55100). Comments were solicited and continue to be invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Darrin A. King,

Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2015–30042 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AM–P

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

[Docket No: CFPB–2015–0049]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Bureau) is requesting to renew the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for an existing information collection titled, ''Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B) 12 CFR 1002.''

DATES: Written comments are encouraged and must be received on or before January 25, 2016 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by the title of the information collection, OMB Control Number (see below), and docket number (see above), by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552.
- *Hand Delivery/Courier:* Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Attention: PRA Office), 1275 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20002.

Please note that comments submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. In general, all comments received will become public records, including any personal information provided. Sensitive personal information, such as account numbers or social security numbers, should not be included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Documentation prepared in support of this information collection request is available at *www.regulations.gov.* Requests for additional information should be directed to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, (Attention: PRA Office), 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 435–9575, or email: *PRA@cfpb.gov. Please do not submit comments to this mailbox.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B) 12 CFR 1002.

OMB Control Number: 3170–0013.

Type of Review: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Private sector.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 514,000.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,450,250.

Abstract: The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (''ECOA'') was enacted to ensure that credit is made available to all creditworthy applicants without discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, race, color, religion, national origin, age, or other prohibited bases under the ECOA. The ECOA allows for creditors to collect information for self-testing against these criteria, while not allowing creditors to use this information in making credit decisions of applicants. For certain mortgage applications, the ECOA requires creditors to ask for some of the prohibited information for monitoring purposes. In addition, for certain mortgage applications, creditors are required to send a copy of any appraisal or written valuation used in the application process to the applicant in a timely fashion.

The ECOA also prescribes creditors to inform applicants of decisions made on credit applications. In particular, where creditors make adverse actions on credit applications or existing accounts, creditors must inform consumers as to why the adverse action was taken, such that credit applicants can challenge errors on their accounts or learn how to become more creditworthy. Creditors must retain all application information for 25 months, including notices sent and any information related to adverse actions.

Finally, the ECOA requires creditors who furnish applicant information to a consumer credit bureau to reflect participation of the applicant's spouse, if the spouse if permitted to use or contractually liable on the account.

Request for Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Darrin A. King,

Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2015–29910 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AM–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2012–0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Safety Standard for Walk-Behind Power Lawn Mowers

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'' or ''Commission'') requests comments on a proposed extension of approval of a collection of information relating to testing and recordkeeping requirements in the Safety Standard for Walk-Behind Power Lawn Mowers (16 CFR part 1205), approved previously under OMB Control No. 3041–0091. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice before requesting an extension of this collection of information from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'').

DATES: Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2012–0058, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through *www.regulations.gov.* The Commission encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Written Submissions: Submit written submissions by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If furnished at all, such information should be submitted in writing.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: *http://www.regulations.gov,* and insert the docket number CPSC–2012–0058, into the ''Search'' box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: *rsquibb@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CPSC seeks to renew the following currently approved collection of information:

Title: Safety Standard for Walk-Behind Power Lawn Mowers.

OMB Number: 3041–0091.

Type of Review: Renewal of collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Manufacturers and importers of walk-behind power lawn mowers.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 25 manufacturers and importers of walk-

behind power lawn mowers have been identified.

Estimated Time per Response: Walk-behind power lawn mowers are manufactured seasonally to meet demand. They are manufactured during an estimated 130 days out of the year. When they are manufactured, firms are required to test and maintain records of those tests. Three hours daily is estimated for testing and recordkeeping per firm totaling 390 hours per firm (3 hours x 130 days). In addition, to produce labels and apply labels on the newly manufactured lawn mowers, one hour daily is estimated for each firm during the production cycle for a total of 130 hours per firm (1 hour x 130 days).

Total Estimated Annual Burden: 9,750 hours on testing and recordkeeping (25 firms x 390 hours) and 3,250 hours for labeling (25 firms x 130 hours) for a total annual burden of 13,000 hours per year.

General Description of Collection: In 1979, the Commission issued the Safety Standard for Walk-Behind Power Lawn Mowers (16 CFR part 1205) to address blade contact injuries. Subpart B of the standard sets forth regulations prescribing requirements for a reasonable testing program to support certificates of compliance with the standard for walk-behind power lawn mowers. 16 CFR part 1205, subpart B.

In addition, section 14(a) of the CPSA (15 U.S.C. 2063(a)) requires manufacturers, importers, and private labelers of a consumer product subject to a consumer product safety standard to issue a certificate stating that the product complies with all applicable consumer product safety standards. Section 14(a) of the CPSA also requires that the certificate of compliance must be based on a test of each product or upon a reasonable testing program. The information collection is necessary because these regulations require manufacturers and importers to establish and maintain records to demonstrate compliance with the requirements for testing and labeling to support the certification of compliance.

Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

—Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;

—Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;

—Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and

—Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29978 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2012–0056]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Safety Standard for Omnidirectional Citizens Band Base Station Antennas

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'' or ''Commission'') requests comments on a proposed extension of approval of a collection of information associated with the Commission's Safety Standard for Omnidirectional Citizens Band Base Station Antennas (16 CFR part 1204), approved previously under OMB Control No. 3041–0006. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice before requesting an extension of this collection of information from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'').

DATES: Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2012–0056, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through *www.regulations.gov.* The Commission encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Written Submissions: Submit written submissions by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If furnished at all, such information should be submitted in writing.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: *http://www.regulations.gov,* and insert the docket number CPSC–2012–0056, into the ''Search'' box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: *rsquibb@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CPSC seeks to renew the following currently approved collection of information:

Title: Safety Standard for Omnidirectional Citizens Band Base Station Antennas.

OMB Number: 3041–0006.

Type of Review: Renewal of collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Manufacturers, importers, and private labelers of omnidirectional citizens band base station antennas.

Estimated Number of Respondents: We have identified five firms that supply omnidirectional citizen band base station antennas.

Estimated Time per Response: Based on the information compiled by manufacturers, importers, and private labelers of antennas to test and maintain records for certificates of compliance, we estimate an average of 220 hours per firm for annual testing and recordkeeping.

Total Estimated Annual Burden: 1,100 hours (5 firms × 220 hours).

General Description of Collection: The Safety Standard for Omnidirectional Citizens Band Base Station Antennas

(16 CFR part 1204) establishes performance requirements for omnidirectional citizens band base station antennas to reduce unreasonable risks of death and injury that may result if an antenna contacts overhead power lines while being erected or removed from its site. The regulations implementing the standard (16 CFR part 1204, subpart B) require manufacturers, importers, and private labelers of antennas subject to the standard to test the antennas for compliance with the standard and to maintain records of that testing.

Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

—Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;
—Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;
—Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
—Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29976 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2012–0055]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Flammability Standards for Children's Sleepwear

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'' or ''Commission'') requests comments on a proposed extension of approval of a collection of information associated with the Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 0 Through 6X (16 CFR part 1615); and the Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 7 Through 14 (16 CFR part 1616), approved previously under OMB Control No. 3041–0027. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice before requesting an extension of this collection of information from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'').

DATES: Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2012–0055, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through *www.regulations.gov.* The Commission encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Written Submissions: Submit written submissions by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If furnished at all, such information should be submitted in writing.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: *http://www.regulations.gov,* and insert the docket number CPSC–2012–0055, into the ''Search'' box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: *rsquibb@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CPSC seeks to renew the following currently approved collection of information:

Title: Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 0 Through 6X; and the Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 7 Through 14.

OMB Number: 3041–0027.

Type of Review: Renewal of collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Manufacturers and importers of children's sleepwear.

Estimated Number of Respondents: Based on a review of past firm inspections, and published industry information, approximately 50 large domestic companies manufacture most of the children's sleepwear produced in the United States. In addition, there may be up to 1,000 small domestic producers of children's sleepwear. Accordingly, there may be as many as 1,050 firms that manufacture children's sleepwear in the United States. There are also approximately 4,500 importers (which may include some of the domestic manufacturers) that supply children's sleepwear to the United States market.

Estimated Time per Response: The 50 large domestic manufacturers and the 100 largest importers may each introduce an average of 100 new children's sleepwear items annually. Testing and recordkeeping of each item is approximately 3 hours. The annual burden for the 50 large domestic manufacturers and the 100 largest importers is estimated at 45,000 hours for testing and recordkeeping (150 firms × 100 items × 3 hours). The remaining 1,000 manufacturers and 4,400 importers have on the average 10 new children's sleepwear items annually, for a testing and recordkeeping burden of 162,000 hours (5,400 firms × 10 items × 3 hours.)

Total Estimated Annual Burden: The total estimated potential annual burden imposed by the flammability standards on all manufacturers and importers of children's sleepwear is approximately 207,000 hours (45,000 hours + 162,000 hours).

Description of Collection: The Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 0 through 6X (16 CFR part 1615) and the Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 7 through 14 (16 CFR part 1616) address the fire hazard associated with small-flame ignition sources for children's sleepwear manufactured for sale in or imported into the United States. The standards also require manufacturers and importers of children's sleepwear to collect information resulting from

product testing, and maintenance of the testing records. 16 CFR part 1615, subpart B; 16 CFR part 1616; subpart B.

Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

—Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;

—Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;

—Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and

—Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29975 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CPSC–2012–0057]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Requirements for Electrically Operated Toys and Children's Articles

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'' or ''Commission'') requests comments on a proposed extension of approval of a collection of information required in the Requirements for Electrically Operated Toys or Other Electrically Operated Articles Intended for Use by Children (16 CFR part 1505), approved previously under OMB Control No. 3041–0035. The Commission will consider all comments received in response to this notice before requesting an extension of this collection of information from the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'').

DATES: Submit written or electronic comments on the collection of information by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. CPSC–2012–0057, by any of the following methods:

Electronic Submissions: Submit electronic comments to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. The Commission does not accept comments submitted by electronic mail (email), except through *www.regulations.gov.* The Commission encourages you to submit electronic comments by using the Federal eRulemaking Portal, as described above.

Written Submissions: Submit written submissions by mail/hand delivery/courier to: Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Room 820, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. All comments received may be posted without change, including any personal identifiers, contact information, or other personal information provided, to: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Do not submit confidential business information, trade secret information, or other sensitive or protected information that you do not want to be available to the public. If furnished at all, such information should be submitted in writing.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to: *http://www.regulations.gov,* and insert the docket number CPSC–2012–0057, into the ''Search'' box, and follow the prompts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert H. Squibb, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; (301) 504–7815, or by email to: *rsquibb@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CPSC seeks to renew the following currently approved collection of information:

Title: Requirements for Electrically Operated Toys.

OMB Number: 3041–0035.

Type of Review: Renewal of collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Affected Public: Manufacturers and importers of electrically operated toys and other electrically operated articles.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 40 firms that manufacture or import electrically operated toys and other electrically operated articles have been identified; based on manufacturer and importer records for sales and distribution of inventory, there are approximately 10 models each year per firm for which testing and recordkeeping is required resulting in 400 records (40 firms x 10 models) per year.

Estimated Time per Response: Based on discussion with a trade association for the toy industry, we estimate that the tests required by the regulations can be performed on one model in 16 hours and that four hours of recordkeeping is required per model. In addition, each firm may spend 30 minutes or less per model on labeling requirements.

Total Estimated Annual Burden: 6400 hours for testing burden (16 hours x 400 records); 1600 hours for recordkeeping (4 hours x 400 records); 200 hours for labeling (40 firms x ½ hour x 10 models) for a total annual burden of 8200 hours per year.

General Description of Collection: The regulations in 16 CFR part 1505 establish performance and labeling requirements for electrically operated toys and children's articles to reduce unreasonable risks of injury to children from electric shock, electrical burns, and thermal burns associated with those products. Manufacturers and importers of electrically operated toys and children's articles are required to maintain records for three years on: (1) Material and production specifications; (2) the quality assurance program used; (3) results of all tests and inspections conducted; and (4) sales and distribution of electrically operated toys and children's articles.

Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

—Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;

—Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;

—Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and

—Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29977 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Judicial Proceedings Since Fiscal Year 2012 Amendments Panel (Judicial Proceedings Panel); Notice of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing this notice to announce the following Federal Advisory Committee meeting of the Judicial Proceedings since Fiscal Year 2012 Amendments Panel (''the Judicial Proceedings Panel'' or ''the Panel''). The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: A meeting of the Judicial Proceedings Panel will be held on Friday, December 11, 2015. The Public Session will begin at 9:00 a.m. and end at 4:45 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The Holiday Inn Arlington at Ballston, 4610 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Julie Carson, Judicial Proceedings Panel, One Liberty Center, 875 N. Randolph Street, Suite 150, Arlington, VA 22203. Email: *whs.pentagon.em.mbx.judicial-panel@mail.mil* Phone: (703) 693–3849. Web site: *http://jpp.whs.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This public meeting is being held under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102–3.150.

Purpose of the Meeting: In Section 576(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Pub. L. 112–239), as amended, Congress tasked the Judicial Proceedings Panel to conduct an independent review and assessment of judicial proceedings conducted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) involving adult sexual assault and related offenses since the amendments made to the UCMJ by section 541 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1404), for the purpose of developing recommendations for improvements to such proceedings. At this meeting, the Panel will continue deliberations on issues relating to retaliation against individuals who report incidents of sexual assault within the military and deliberations on the draft report on restitution and compensation for victims of sexual assault in the military. The Panel will receive a presentation by the JPP Subcommittee on its analysis, conclusions and recommendations regarding Article 120 of the UCMJ, followed by a discussion with members of the JPP Subcommittee on the issues and recommendations presented. The Panel is interested in written and oral comments from the public, including non-governmental organizations, relevant to these issues or any of the Panel's tasks.

Agenda

9:00—10:00 Deliberations: Retaliation Against Victims of Sexual Assault Crimes *(Public meeting begins)*
10:00—10:45 Deliberations: Review of the Restitution and Compensation Draft Report
10:45—11:00 Break
11:00—12:00 JPP Subcommittee Presentation: Overview of Art. 120 Analysis, Conclusions, and Recommendations
12:00—1:00 Lunch
1:00—3:00 JPP Members Discussion with JPP Subcommittee Members to Review Art. 120 Recommendations on Issues 1 through 11 (Terms and Definitions in Art. 120)
3:00–4:30 JPP Members Discussion with JPP Subcommittee Members to Review Art. 120 Recommendations on Issues 12 through 17 (Coercive and Abuse of Authority Sexual Offenses)
4:30—4:45 Public Comment

Availability of Materials for the Meeting: A copy of the December 11, 2015 public meeting agenda or any updates or changes to the agenda, to include individual speakers not identified at the time of this notice, as well as other materials provided to Panel members for use at the public meeting, may be obtained at the meeting or from the Panel's Web site at *http://jpp.whs.mil.*

Public's Accessibility to the Meeting: Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b and 41 CFR 102–3.140 through 102–3.165, and the availability of space, this meeting is open to the public. Seating is limited and is on a first-come basis.

Special Accommodations: Individuals requiring special accommodations to access the public meeting should contact the Judicial Proceedings Panel at *whs.pentagon.em.mbx.judicial-panel@mail.mil* at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Procedures for Providing Public Comments: Pursuant to 41 CFR 102–3.140 and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, the public or interested organizations may submit written comments to the Panel about its mission and topics pertaining to this public session. Written comments must be received by the JPP at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting date so that they may be made available to the Judicial Proceedings Panel for their consideration prior to the meeting. Written comments should be submitted via email to the Judicial Proceedings Panel at *whs.pentagon.em.mbx.judicial-panel@mail.mil* in the following formats: Adobe Acrobat or Microsoft Word. Please note that since the Judicial Proceedings Panel operates under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, all written comments will be treated as public documents and will be made available for public inspection. If members of the public are interested in making an oral statement, a written statement must be submitted along with a request to provide an oral statement. Oral presentations by members of the public will be permitted from 4:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m. on December 11, 2015 in front of the Panel members. The number of oral presentations to be made will depend on the number of requests received from members of the public on a first-come basis. After reviewing the requests for oral presentation, the Chairperson and the Designated Federal Officer will, if they determine the statement to be relevant to the Panel's mission, allot five minutes to persons desiring to make an oral presentation.

Committee's Designated Federal Officer: The Panel's Designated Federal Officer is Ms. Maria Fried, Department of Defense, Office of the General Counsel, 1600 Defense Pentagon, Room 3B747, Washington, DC 20301–1600.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2015–29983 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DoD–2015–HA–0132]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,* the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Department of Defense, Office of the Deputy Chief Management Officer, Directorate of Oversight and Compliance, Regulatory and Audit Matters Office, 9010 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–9010.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

Any associated form(s) for this collection may be located within this same electronic docket and downloaded for review/testing. Follow the instructions at *http://www.regulations.gov* for submitting comments. Please submit comments on any given form identified by docket number, form number, and title.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the Defense Health Agency, TRICARE Policy and Benefits Office, 16401 E. Centretech Parkway, Aurora Co, 80011–9066, ATTN: Mr. Doug McBroom, or call 303–676–3533.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: DD Form 2876, TRICARE Prime Enrollment, Disenrollment, and Primary Care Manager (PCM) Change Form, OMB No. 0720–0008.

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary to obtain the TRICARE beneficiary's personal information needed to: (1) Complete his/her enrollment into TRICARE Prime health plan, (2) change the beneficiary's enrollment (new Primary Care Manager, enrolled region, add/drop a dependent, etc.), or (3) dis-enroll the beneficiary. All TRICARE beneficiaries have the option of enrolling, changing their enrollment or dis-enrolling using the DD Form 2876, the Beneficiary Web Enrollment (BWE) portal, or by calling their regional Managed Care Support Contractor (MCSC). Although the telephonic enrollment/change is the preferred method by the large majority of beneficiaries, many beneficiaries prefer using the form to document their enrollment date and preferences.

Affected Public: Individuals and households.

Annual Burden Hours: 74,017.

Number of Respondents: 148,033.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Average Burden per Response: 30 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondents are TRICARE beneficiaries choosing to enroll in TRICARE Prime for the first time, change their current enrollment, or dis-enroll using the DD Form 2876, instead of using the BWE web portal or calling their Managed Care Support Contractor. The completed form is used by the TRICARE Managed Care Support Contractors to formally update the enrollment, enrollment change or dis-enrollment. The beneficiary is notified via email or postcard, which refers them to the MilConnect Web site to confirm the enrollment/change. A beneficiary can also call their Managed Care Support Contractor to confirm the change.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2015–29997 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 15–69]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated July 21, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah A. Ragan or Heather N. Harwell, DSCA/LMO, (703) 604–1546/(703) 607–5339.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 15–69 with attached Policy Justification and Sensitivity of Technology.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD **Federal Register** *Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY
201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

The Honorable Paul D. Ryan
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

NOV 0 3 2015

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 15-69, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of France for defense articles and services estimated to cost $30 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J. W. Rixey
Vice Admiral, USN
Director

Enclosures:
1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification
3. Sensitivity of Technology

Transmittal No. 15–69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) *Prospective Purchaser:* The Government of France

(ii) *Total Estimated Value:*

Major Defense Equipment*	$ 25 million
Other	$ 5 million
TOTAL	$ 30 million

(iii) *Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services Under Consideration for Purchase:*

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two-hundred (200) AGM–114K1A Hellfire Missiles

Non-MDE items included in this request are: Hellfire Missile conversion kits; blast fragmentation sleeves and installation kits; containers; and transportation.

(iv) *Military Department:* Army (FR–B–WAA, Amendment 8)

(v) *Prior Related Cases, if any:* FR–B–WAA-$42.2M–09 JAN 08

(vi) *Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:* None

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:* See Attached Annex

(viii) *Date Report Delivered to Congress:* 03 NOV 2015

* as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

The Government of France—Hellfire Missiles

The Government of France has requested a possible sale of two-hundred (200) AGM–114K1A Hellfire Missiles; Hellfire Missile conversion kits; blast fragmentation sleeves and installation kits; containers; and transportation. The estimated cost of MDE is $25 million. The total estimated cost is $30 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the capability of a NATO ally. France is a major political and economic power in Europe and a key democratic partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability around the world. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist France to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The additional missiles will meet France's operational requirements for a precision guided tactical missile for its Tigre Attack Helicopter. The purchase will directly support French forces actively engaged in operations in Mali and Northern Africa, providing them the capability to successfully engage targets with minimal collateral damage. France will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

There is no principal contractor for this sale as the missiles are coming from U.S. Army stock. There are no known offset agreements in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives in France.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

Transmittal No. 15–69

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex

Item No. vii

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology:*

1. AGM–114K1A: The highest level for release of the K1A semi active laser is SECRET, based upon the software. Software documentation (*e.g.,* Data Processing, Software Requirements, Algorithms) are not authorized for disclosure. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is up to and including SECRET. The highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is up to and including SECRET. Reverse engineering could reveal SECRET information. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL. Detailed information to include discussions, reports and studies of system capabilities, vulnerabilities and limitations that leads to conclusions on specific tactics or other counter countermeasures (CCM) are not authorized for disclosure.

2. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

[FR Doc. 2015–30046 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 0O–15]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated July 21, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah A. Ragan or Heather N. Harwell, DSCA/LMO, (703) 604–1546/(703) 607–5339.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives,Transmittal 0O–15 with attached Policy Justification.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY
201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

The Honorable Paul D. Ryan
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

NOV 0 3 2015

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), we are forwarding Transmittal No. 0O-15, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Morocco for defense articles and services. These additions will result in an increase in Major Defense Equipment (MDE) of $117.5 million, for a total estimated MDE value of $221.9 million, and the total overall value will remain $1.015 billion. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 12-28 of 18 June 2012.

Sincerely,

J. W. Rixey
Vice Admiral, USN
Director

Enclosures:
1. Transmittal
2. Regional Balance (Classified Document Provided Under Separate Cover)

Transmittal No. 0O–15

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(B)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) *Purchaser:* Government of the Kingdom of Morocco.

(ii) *Sec. 36(b)(l), AECA Transmittal No.:* 12–28.

Date: 18 June 2012.

Military Department: Army.

(iii) *Description:* On 18 Jun 2012, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 12–28, of the enhancement and refurbishment of 200 M1A1 Abrams tanks, provided as part of a grant Excess Defense Article (EDA) transfer notified to Congress on 27 April 2011, to the M1A1 Situational Awareness (SA) configuration. The proposed sale also includes 150 AN/VRC–87E and 50 AN/VRC–89E Exportable Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS), 200 M2 Chrysler Mount Machine Guns, 400 7.62MM M240 Machine Guns, 12,049,842 Ammunition Rounds (including 1400 C785 SABOT, 1800 CA31 HEAT, and 5400 AA38 SLAP–T), 200 M250 Smoke Grenade Launchers, support equipment, spare and repair parts, personnel training and training equipment, publications and technical data, communication support, U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance, and other related logistics support. The estimated Major Defense Equipment (MDE) was $104.4 million, with a total estimated cost of $1.015 billion.

This transmittal reports that 28 fewer of the EDA M1A1 tanks will be refurbished than were reported in the previous transmittal. It also reports the potential sale of 50 M1A1 tanks from

Long Supply. These 50 tanks from Long Supply will be enhanced and refurbished to the M1Al SA configuration. The proposed sale also includes 50 AGT 1500 engines (variant of the SLE and TIGER), electronic communication support systems consisting of an additional 22 each Export Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS), 22 each M2 Chrysler Mount Machine Guns, 44 each 7.62MM M240 Machine Guns, and Ammunition consisting of 820 M865 SABOT Rounds, 2,640 M831Al Rounds, 133,200 .50 caliber Rounds, 366,400 7.62MM Rounds and other various types of ammunition to support the M1A1 Tanks. This report also includes Support Equipment, Government-Furnished Equipment, Repair Parts, Communication Support Equipment, Tool and Test Equipment, Training, U.S. Government Technical Support and Logistical Support, Contractor Technical Support. These additions will result in an increase in MDE of $117.5 million, for a total estimated MDE value of $221.9 million, and the total overall value will remain $1.015 billion.

(iv) *Significance:* This notification is being provided for the additional 50 M1A1 Abrams tanks from Long Supply, with their associated equipment, that were not enumerated as Major Defense Equipment in the original notification. Their inclusion represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. This equipment provides the Kingdom of Morocco Army the ability to modernize its tank fleet, enhancing its ability to meet current and future threats. These tanks will contribute to Morocco's goal of updating its military capability while further enhancing interoperability with the U.S. and other allies.

(v) *Justification:* This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major Non-NATO ally that continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Africa. This package of M1A1 tank enhancements will contribute to the modernization of Morocco's tank fleet, enhancing its ability to meet current and future threats. These tanks will contribute to Morocco's goal of updating its military capability while further enhancing interoperability with the U.S. and other allies.

(vi) *Date Report Delivered to Congress:* 03 NOV 2015

[FR Doc. 2015–30052 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 15–59]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b)(1) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated July 21, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah A. Ragan or Heather N. Harwell, DSCA/LMO, (703) 604–1546/(703) 607–5339.

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 15–59 with attached Policy Justification.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY
201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

The Honorable Paul D. Ryan
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

NOV 0 3 2015

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 15-59, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Italy for defense articles and services estimated to cost $129.6 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

for J. W. Rixey
Vice Admiral, USN
Director

Enclosures:
1. Transmittal
2. Policy Justification
3. Sensitivity of Technology

Transmittal No. 15–59

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) *Prospective Purchaser:* Government of Italy

(ii) *Total Estimated Value:*

Major Defense Equipment *	$ 18.3 million
Other	$ 111.3 million
TOTAL	$ 129.6 million

(iii) *Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:*

Major Defense Equipment (MDE) included:

One hundred and fifty-six (156) AGM–114R2 HELLFIRE II Missiles
Eight (8) HELLFIRE II, M36–E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs)
Thirty (30) GBU–12 Laser Guided Bombs
One hundred and twenty (120) FMU–152A/B Joint Programmable Fuzes

Also included with this request are the following non-MDE items: thirty (30) GBU–38 Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs); five (5) Hellfire M34 Dummy Missiles; thirty (30) GBU–49 Enhanced Laser Guided Bombs; thirty (30) GBU–54 Laser JDAMS; twenty-six (26) BRU–71A Bomb Racks; thirteen (13) M–299 launchers; six (6) MQ–9 weaponization kits and installation; and two (2) AN/AWM–103 test suites. Additionally, this transmittal includes personnel weapons training/equipment; spare parts; support equipment; publications and technical data; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance; and other related

elements of program and logistics support.

(iv) *Military Department:* Air Force (QAV)

(v) *Prior Related Cases, if any:* FMS Case IT–D–SAG–$182M–02 Dec 08

(vi) *Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid:* None

(vii) *Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold:* See Attached Annex

(viii) *Date Report Delivered to Congress:* 03 NOV 2015

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Italy—Weaponization of MQ–9s

The Government of Italy requested a possible sale of Major Defense Equipment (MDE) items including one hundred and fifty-six (156) AGM–114R2 HELLFIRE II Missiles; eight (8) HELLFIRE II, M36–E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs); and thirty (30) GBU–12 Laser Guided Bombs. Non-MDE items requested include thirty (30) GBU–38 Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs); five (5) HELLFIRE M34 Dummy Missiles; thirty (30) GBU–49 Enhanced Laser Guided Bombs; thirty (30) GBU–54 Laser JDAMs; twenty-six (26) Bomb Racks; six (6) MQ–9 weaponization kits and installation; thirteen (13) M–299 launchers; two (2) AN/AWM–103 test suites; personnel weapons training/equipment; spare parts; support equipment; publications and technical data; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance; and other related elements of program and logistics support. The estimated MDE value is $18 million. The estimated total value is $129.6 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the capability of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) ally that has been an integral member of every recent NATO and U.S.-led operation. It is in the U.S. strategic interest to support Italy's security contributions as a capable and interoperable ally. Italy is a major political and economic power in NATO and a key democratic partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability around the world.

Italy requests to arm its MQ–9 Reapers for three primary reasons: 1) to support and enhance burden sharing in NATO and coalition operations; 2) to increase operational flexibility; and 3) to increase the survivability of Italian deployed forces. Italy currently operates the MQ–9 system and will have no difficulty incorporating this added capability into its Air Force.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the General Atomics-Aeronautical Systems, Inc. of San Diego, California. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Italy.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale. All defense articles/services have been approved for release by our foreign disclosure office.

Transmittal No. 15–59

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex

Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. *Armed MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle System Upgrade:* Italy currently owns and operates an unarmed version of the MQ–9 system and has formally requested an armed capability.

No new Critical Program Information or Technology is involved in the weaponization process. The equipment proposed in this weaponization process for the Italian MQ–9 includes:

- BRU–7A Bomb Racks, M–299 launchers, MQ–9 weaponization kits to include pylons, AN/AWM–103 test suites, and associated operational flight programming (OFP).

2. *AGM–114R2 HELLFIRE II Semi-Active Laser Missile:* The AGM–114R2 HELLFIRE II is a rail-launched guided missile. The guidance system employs a Semi-Active Laser (SAL) seeker and an analogue autopilot. SAL missiles home on the laser energy reflected off a target that has been illuminated by a laser designator. The laser can be on either the launch platform or another platform that can be separated by several kilometers. The AGM–114R2 has a multi-purpose selectable warhead and inertial measurement unit (IMU)-Aided Trajectories. The highest level of classified information to be disclosed regarding the AGM–114R2 HELLFIRE II missile is SECRET, based upon the software. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is SECRET; the highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified up to SECRET.

3. The HELLFIRE II Captive Air Training Missile (CATM) consists of a functional guidance section coupled to an inert missile bus. The CATM is used for flight training and cannot be launched. The missile has an operational semi-active laser seeker that can search for and lock-on to laser-designated targets. The CATM functions like a tactical missile (without launch capability) during captive carry on the aircraft, making it suitable for training the aircrew in simulated HELLFIRE missile target acquisition and lock.

4. *GBU–12 (500 lb):* The GBU–12 is a general purpose bomb fitted with the MXU–650 airfoil and the MAU–169 L/B Computer Control Group (CCG) to convert them to Laser Guided Bombs (LGBs). The LGB is a maneuverable, free-fall weapon that guides to a spot of laser energy reflected off of the target. The LGB is delivered like a normal general purpose (GP) warhead and the semi-active guidance corrects for many of the normal errors inherent in any delivery system. The hardware is Unclassified.

Information revealing the probability of destroying common/unspecified targets, the number of simultaneous lasers the laser seeker head can discriminate, and data on the radar/infra-red frequency is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

5. *GBU–38 (500 lb) JDAM (Joint Direct Attack Munition):* The GBU–38 is a general purpose bomb with an FMU–152A/B fuse and a KMU–572 B/B guidance tail kit that converts unguided free-fall bombs into accurate, all weather, GPS guided ''smart'' munitions.

Information revealing target designation tactics and associated aircraft maneuvers, the probability of destroying specific/peculiar targets, vulnerabilities regarding countermeasures and the electromagnetic environment is classified SECRET.

Information revealing the probability of destroying common/unspecified targets is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

6. *GBU–49 (500 lb):* The GBU–49 is a 500 lb (MK–82 or BLU–111) Enhanced Paveway II, dual mode GPS/laser guided bomb with an airfoil group and the MAU–169L/B CCG. The laser sensor enhances standard GPS guidance by allowing rapid prosecution of moving targets or fixed targets with large initial target location errors (TLE).

Information revealing target designation tactics and associated aircraft maneuvers, the probability of destroying specific/peculiar targets, vulnerabilities regarding countermeasures and the

electromagnetic environment is classified SECRET.

Information revealing the probability of destroying common/unspecified targets, the number of simultaneous lasers the laser seeker head can discriminate, and data on the radar/infra-red frequency is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

7. *GBU–54 (500 lb):* This is the dual-mode laser JDAM variant of the GBU–38 JDAM. The nose fuze is replaced with the DSU–38, which gives the weapon both GPS and laser guidance capability. The laser sensor enhances standard JDAM's reactive target capability by allowing rapid prosecution of fixed targets with large initial target location errors (TLE). The addition of the laser sensor combined with additional cabling and mounting hardware turns a standard JDAM into a Laser JDAM.

Information revealing target designation tactics and associated aircraft maneuvers, the probability of destroying specific/peculiar targets, vulnerabilities regarding countermeasures and the electromagnetic environment is classified SECRET.

Information revealing the probability of destroying common/unspecified targets, the number of simultaneous lasers the laser seeker head can discriminate, and data on the radar/infra-red frequency is classified CONFIDENTIAL.

8. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

9. A determination has been made that the recipient country can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

10. Release of this technology has been approved via appropriate technology transfer and foreign disclosure processes.

[FR Doc. 2015–30025 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP16–9–000]

Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC, Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, LLC; Supplemental Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for and Requesting Comments on the Proposed Atlantic Bridge Project

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the Atlantic Bridge Project (Project), which would involve construction and operation of facilities by Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC (Algonquin) and Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, LLC (Maritimes), collectively referred to as the Applicants, in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. The Commission will use this EA in its decision-making process to determine whether the Project is in the public convenience and necessity.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) for this Project was issued by the FERC on April 27, 2015. Since that time, some additional stakeholders not previously identified have been added to the environmental mailing list. In addition, the Applicants are proposing to use additional available horsepower at a compressor station in New York that was not previously included during the pre-filing process. As a result, this notice announces a supplemental scoping period to gather input from the public and agencies on the Project.

You can make a difference by providing us [1] with your specific comments or concerns about the Project. Your comments should focus on the potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts. Your input will help the Commission staff determine what issues need to be evaluated in the EA. To ensure that your comments are timely and properly recorded, please send your comments so that the Commission receives them in Washington, DC on or before December 21, 2015; however, this will not be the last public input opportunity for the Project. Please refer to the Review Process flow chart in Appendix 1.[2]

If you sent comments on this Project to the Commission under Docket No. PF15–12–000, prior to the opening of the CP docket on October 22, 2015, you do not need to refile your comments under Docket No. CP16–9–000. We have received your comments and will use the information in the preparation of the EA.

If you are a landowner receiving this notice, a pipeline company representative may contact you about the acquisition of an easement to construct, operate, and maintain the planned facilities. The company would seek to negotiate a mutually acceptable agreement. However, if the Commission approves the Project, that approval conveys with it the right of eminent domain. Therefore, if easement negotiations fail to produce an agreement and the Project is approved, the pipeline company could initiate condemnation proceedings where compensation would be determined in accordance with state law.

A fact sheet prepared by the FERC entitled ''An Interstate Natural Gas Facility On My Land? What Do I Need To Know?'' is available for viewing on the FERC Web site (*www.ferc.gov*). This fact sheet addresses a number of typically-asked questions, including the use of eminent domain and how to participate in the Commission's proceedings.

Public Participation

For your convenience, there are three methods you can use to submit your comments to the Commission. The commission will provide equal consideration to all comments received. In all instances, please reference the Project docket number (CP16–9) with your submission. The Commission encourages electronic filing of comments and has expert staff available to assist you at (202) 502–8258 or *efiling@ferc.gov. Please carefully follow these instruction so that your comments are properly recorded.*

(1) You can file your comments electronically using the *eComment* feature on the Commission's Web site (*www.ferc.gov*) under the link to *Documents and Filings.* This is an easy method for submitting brief, text-only comments on a project;

(2) You can file your comments electronically using the *eFiling* feature on the Commission's Web site (*www.ferc.gov*) under the link to *Documents and Filings.* With eFiling,

[1] ''We,'' ''us,'' and ''our'' refer to the environmental staff of the Commission's Office of Energy Projects.

[2] The appendices referenced in this notice will not appear in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail and are available at *www.ferc.gov* using the link called ''eLibrary'' or from the Commission's Public Reference Room, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 502–8371. For instructions on connecting to eLibrary, refer to the last page of this notice.

you can provide comments in a variety of formats by attaching them as a file with your submission. New eFiling users must first create an account by clicking on ''*eRegister.''* If you are filing a comment on a particular project, please select ''Comment on a Filing'' as the filing type; or

(3) You can file a paper copy of your comments by mailing them to the following address: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426.

Summary of the Proposed Project

The Applicants plan to construct, install, own, operate, and maintain the proposed Atlantic Bridge Project, which (as described more fully below) would involve expansion of its existing pipeline and compressor station facilities located in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts.

The proposed Atlantic Bridge Project, which was reduced in scope after the issuance of the first NOI, includes replacing about 6.3 miles of existing 26-inch-diameter mainline pipeline with 42-inch-diameter pipeline. About 4.0 miles of the pipeline replacement would be in Westchester County, New York (Stony Point Discharge L&R). The remaining 2.3 miles of pipeline replacement would be in Fairfield County, Connecticut (Southeast Discharge L&R).

In addition to the pipeline facilities, the Applicants plan to modify/uprate three existing compressor stations, construct one new compressor station, modify five existing metering and regulating (M&R) stations and one regulator station, and construct one new M&R station to replace an existing station. The modifications and uprating to the existing compressor stations would occur in Rockland County, New York and New Haven and Windham Counties, Connecticut, and would add a total additional 18,800 horsepower to the Applicants' pipeline system. The new compressor station would be located in Norfolk County, Massachusetts and would include a new 7,700 horsepower gas-fired compressor unit. The modifications to the five existing Algonquin M&R stations and one regulator station would occur in New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Maine to accept the new gas flows associated with the Project. The new M&R station to replace an existing station would be constructed in New London County, Connecticut. The Applicants would also need to construct a number of pig[3] launcher and receiver facilities and four new mainline valves.

The proposed Atlantic Bridge Project has been modified since the issuance of the NOI to include uprating of existing horsepower at the Stony Point Compressor Station in Rockland County, New York. The proposed uprate would involve the removal of a software control and would not require any facility construction or ground disturbance.

The general locations of the Project facilities are shown in Appendix 2.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. This discovery process is referred to as ''scoping.'' The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this notice, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues to address in the EA. We will consider all filed comments during the preparation of the EA.

In the EA we will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation and maintenance of the planned Project under these general headings:

- Geology and soils;
- land use, including residential, commercial, and prime farmland uses;
- water resources, fisheries, and wetlands;
- cultural resources;
- vegetation and wildlife, including migratory birds;
- air quality and noise;
- endangered and threatened species;
- traffic and transportation;
- public safety; and
- cumulative impacts.

We will also evaluate reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project or portions of the Project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

The EA will present our independent analysis of the issues. The EA will be available in the public record through eLibrary and will be published and distributed to the public for an allotted comment period. We will consider all comments on the EA before making our recommendations to the Commission. To ensure we have the opportunity to consider and address your comments, please carefully follow the instructions in the Public Participation section of this notice, beginning on page 2.

Consultations Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's implementing regulations for section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are using this notice to update the project status in our ongoing consultation with applicable State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), and to solicit their views and those of other government agencies, interested Indian tribes, and the public on the Project's potential effects on historic properties.[4] We will define the Project-specific Area of Potential Effects (APE) in consultation with the SHPOs. On natural gas facility projects, the APE at a minimum encompasses all areas subject to ground disturbance (examples include construction right-of-way, contractor/pipe storage yards, compressor stations, and access roads). Our EA for this project will document our findings on the impacts on historic properties and summarize the status of consultations under section 106.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by the Applicants. This preliminary list of issues may change based on your comments and our analysis.

- *Geology*—Effects as a result of blasting to remove existing surface and bedrock during construction.
- *Biological Resources*—Effects on threatened and endangered species and sensitive habitats.
- *Water Resources*—Effects on waterbodies and wetlands.
- *Land Use*—Effects on residential and commercial areas as well as traffic and transportation corridors from construction.
- *Cultural Resources*—Effects on archaeological sites and historic resources.
- *Air Quality and Noise*—Effects on the local air quality and noise

[3] A ''pig'' is a tool that the pipeline company inserts into and pushed through the pipeline for cleaning the pipeline, conducting internal inspections, or other purposes.

[4] The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations are at Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800. Those regulations define historic properties as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

environment from construction and operation.

- *Socioeconomics*—Effects on Environmental Justice communities.
- *Reliability and Safety*—Hazards associated with natural gas pipelines and aboveground facilities.
- *Alternatives*—Evaluation of other locations for the new Weymouth Compressor Station.

Environmental Mailing List

The environmental mailing list includes: Federal, state, and local government representatives and agencies; elected officials; environmental and public interest groups; Native American Tribes; other interested parties; and local libraries and newspapers. We encourage government representatives who receive this notice to notify their constituents about this proposed Project and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern. This list also includes the affected landowners (as defined in the Commission's regulations) who are potential right-of-way grantors, whose property may be used temporarily for Project purposes, or who own homes within certain distances of aboveground facilities and proposed workspaces, and anyone who submits comments on the Project.

We will update the environmental mailing list as the analysis proceeds to ensure that we send the information related to this environmental review to individuals, organizations, and government entities interested in and/or potentially affected by the Project.

When we publish and distribute the EA, copies will be sent to the environmental mailing list for public review and comment. If you would prefer to receive a paper copy of the document instead of the CD version or would like to remove your name from the mailing list, please return the attached Information Request (Appendix 3).

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, now that the Applicants have filed their application with the Commission, you may want to become an ''intervenor,'' which is an official party to the Commission's proceeding. Intervenors play a more formal role in the process and are able to file briefs, appear at hearings, and be heard by the courts if they choose to appeal the Commission's final ruling. An intervenor formally participates in the proceeding by filing a request to intervene. Instructions for becoming an intervenor are in the User's Guide under the ''e-filing'' link on the Commission's Web site. As indicated in the Notice of Application for the Project issued on November 5, 2015, the deadline for motions to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10) close on November 27, 2015. However, those individuals who were not previously noticed in this proceeding may request to intervene out of time, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214(d).

Additional Information

Additional information about the Project is available from the Commission's Office of External Affairs, at (866) 208–FERC, or on the FERC Web site (*www.ferc.gov*) using the eLibrary link. Click on the eLibrary link, click on ''General Search'' and enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the Docket Number field (*i.e.,* CP16–9). Be sure you have selected an appropriate date range. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll free at (866) 208–3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The eLibrary link also provides access to the texts of formal documents issued by the Commission, such as orders, notices, and rulemakings.

In addition, the Commission offers a free service called eSubscription that allows you to keep track of all formal issuances and submittals in specific dockets. This can reduce the amount of time you spend researching proceedings by automatically providing you with notification of these filings, document summaries, and direct links to the documents. Go to *www.ferc.gov/esubscribenow.htm.*

Any public meetings or site visits that are conducted by our staff will be posted on the Commission's calendar located at *www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventsList.aspx* along with other related information.

November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29965 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #3

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER13–77–008.
Applicants: Tucson Electric Power Company.
Description: Compliance filing: OATT Order No. 1000 Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5186.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–78–008.
Applicants: UNS Electric, Inc.
Description: Compliance filing: OATT Order No. 1000 Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5207.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–96–007.
Applicants: Black Hills Power, Inc.
Description: Compliance filing: Order No. 1000 OATT Regional Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5203.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–97–007.
Applicants: Black Hills/Colorado Electric Utility Co.
Description: Compliance filing: Order No. 1000 OATT Regional Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5204.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–120–007.
Applicants: Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power Company.
Description: Compliance filing: Order No. 1000 OATT Regional Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5205.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–358–000.
Applicants: Nevada Power Company.
Description: Compliance filing: OATT Order No. 1000 Revision to Attachment K to be effective 1/1/2015.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5193.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–359–000.
Applicants: Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amendment to the NCPA Interconnection Agreement (SA 292) to be effective 1/19/2016.
Filed Date: 11/19/15.
Accession Number: 20151119–5212.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings

must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29963 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CD16–3–000]

Susan Raymond; Notice of Preliminary Determination of a Qualifying Conduit Hydropower Facility and Soliciting Comments and Motions To Intervene

On November 12, 2015, Susan Raymond filed a notice of intent to construct a qualifying conduit hydropower facility, pursuant to section 30 of the Federal Power Act (FPA), as amended by section 4 of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2013 (HREA). The proposed Powell Mesa Micro-Hydropower Project would have an installed capacity of 7.6 kilowatts (kW), and would be located at the end of an existing 12-inch pipeline used to control overflow from Susan Raymond's irrigation system. The project would be located near the Town of Hotchkiss, in Delta County, Colorado.

Applicant Contact: Susan Raymond, 34670 Powell Mesa Road, Hotchkiss, CO 81419, Phone No. (970) 250–3714.

FERC Contact: Christopher Chaney, Phone No. (202) 502–6778, email: *christopher.chaney@ferc.gov.*

Qualifying Conduit Hydropower Facility Description: The proposed project would consist of: (1) A proposed powerhouse, approximately 8 feet by 10 feet, at the end of the existing 12-inch overflow pipeline; (2) two short penstocks teeing off the existing 12-inch-diameter overflow pipeline; (3) two Turgo turbine/generator units with a total installed capacity of 7.6 kW; (4) an approximately 4 feet by 8 feet underground tailrace, discharging to a short, 8-inch-diameter pipeline that discharges to the same pond as the existing 12-inch overflow pipeline; and (5) appurtenant facilities.

The proposed project would have a total installed capacity of 7.6 kW.

A qualifying conduit hydropower facility is one that is determined or deemed to meet all of the criteria shown in the table below.

TABLE 1—CRITERIA FOR QUALIFYING CONDUIT HYDROPOWER FACILITY

Statutory provision	Description	Satisfies (Y/N)
FPA 30(a)(3)(A), as amended by HREA ...	The conduit the facility uses is a tunnel, canal, pipeline, aqueduct, flume, ditch, or similar manmade water conveyance that is operated for the distribution of water for agricultural, municipal, or industrial consumption and not primarily for the generation of electricity.	Y
FPA 30(a)(3)(C)(i), as amended by HREA	The facility is constructed, operated, or maintained for the generation of electric power and uses for such generation only the hydroelectric potential of a non-federally owned conduit.	Y
FPA 30(a)(3)(C)(ii), as amended by HREA	The facility has an installed capacity that does not exceed 5 megawatts	Y
FPA 30(a)(3)(C)(iii), as amended by HREA.	On or before August 9, 2013, the facility is not licensed, or exempted from the licensing requirements of Part I of the FPA.	Y

Preliminary Determination: The primary purpose of the overflow pipeline is to assist the operation of Susan Raymond's irrigation system, not for the generation of electricity. Therefore, based upon the above criteria, Commission staff preliminarily determines that the proposal satisfies the requirements for a qualifying conduit hydropower facility, which is not required to be licensed or exempted from licensing.

Comments and Motions to Intervene: Deadline for filing comments contesting whether the facility meets the qualifying criteria is 45 days from the issuance date of this notice.

Deadline for filing motions to intervene is 30 days from the issuance date of this notice.

Anyone may submit comments or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210 and 385.214. Any motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified deadline date for the particular proceeding.

Filing and Service of Responsive Documents: All filings must (1) bear in all capital letters the ''COMMENTS CONTESTING QUALIFICATION FOR A CONDUIT HYDROPOWER FACILITY'' or ''MOTION TO INTERVENE,'' as applicable; (2) state in the heading the name of the applicant and the project number of the application to which the filing responds; (3) state the name, address, and telephone number of the person filing; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of sections 385.2001 through 385.2005 of the Commission's regulations.[1] All comments contesting Commission staff's preliminary determination that the facility meets the qualifying criteria must set forth their evidentiary basis.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file motions to intervene and comments using the Commission's eFiling system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp.* Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/ecomment.asp.* You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov,* (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). In lieu of electronic filing, please send a paper copy to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. A copy of all other filings in reference to this application must be accompanied

[1] 18 CFR 385.2001–2005 (2015).

by proof of service on all persons listed in the service list prepared by the Commission in this proceeding, in accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b) and 385.2010.

Locations of Notice of Intent: Copies of the notice of intent can be obtained directly from the applicant or such copies can be viewed and reproduced at the Commission in its Public Reference Room, Room 2A, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. The filing may also be viewed on the web at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp* using the ''eLibrary'' link. Enter the docket number (*i.e.,* CD16–3) in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, call toll-free 1–866–208–3676 or email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov.* For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29960 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings

Take notice that the Commission has received the following Natural Gas Pipeline Rate and Refund Report filings:

Filings Instituting Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP16–199–000.

Applicants: Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: City of Sullivan to be effective 12/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5119.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Docket Numbers: RP16–200–000.

Applicants: Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: Village of Bethany to be effective 12/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5131.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Docket Numbers: RP16–201–000.

Applicants: Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: City of Pickneyville to be effective 12/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5140.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Docket Numbers: RP16–202–000.

Applicants: Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company.

Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: Non-Conforming Agreement—Bayonne Delivery Lateral—NEC to be effective 4/1/2014.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5144.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR § 385.211 and § 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

Filings in Existing Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP15–23–009.

Applicants: Transwestern Pipeline Company, LLC.

Description: Compliance filing RP15–23 Settlement Compliance Filing to be effective 12/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5029.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Any person desiring to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR § 385.211) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29964 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 8396–021]

Great Bear Hydropower, Inc.; Notice of Application Accepted for Filing, Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

a. *Type of Application:* Surrender of License.

b. *Project No.:* 8396–021.

c. *Date Filed:* October 26, 2015.

d. *Applicant:* Great Bear Hydropower, Inc.

e. *Name of Project:* Columbia Dam Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location:* On the Paulins Kill, in Knowlton Township, Warren County, New Jersey.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791a–825r.

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Terry McDonnell, President, Great Bear Hydropower, Inc., 15 Brigham Hill Rd., Norwich, Vermont 05055, Phone: (802) 345–5616, Email: *t.p.mcd@comcast.net.*

i. *FERC Contact:* Mr. Ashish Desai, (202) 502–8370, *Ashish.Desai@ferc.gov.*

j. Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene and protests, is 30 days from the issuance date of this notice. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file motions to intervene, protests, comments, and recommendations, using the Commission's eFiling system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp.* Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/ecomment.asp.* You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov*, (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). In lieu of electronic filing, please send a paper copy to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. The first page of any filing should include docket number P–8396–021.

k. *Description of Request:* The applicant proposes to surrender the license and remove all project works inside the powerhouse and disconnect the electrical connection to the utility company. There would be no work involving ground disturbance and the equipment required to control the level of the lake would remain in place, along with all public safety features. The applicant has consulted with the relevant stakeholders and federal, state, and local agencies, all of which support the decommissioning of the project.

l. *Locations of the Application:* A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 502–8371. This filing may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp.* Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the

docket number field to access the document. You may also register online at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp* to be notified via email of new filings and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, call 1–866–208–3676 or email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov*, for TTY, call (202) 502–8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item (h) above.

m. Individuals desiring to be included on the Commission's mailing list should so indicate by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

n. *Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene:* Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

o. *Filing and Service of Responsive Documents:* Any filing must (1) bear in all capital letters the title ''COMMENTS'', ''PROTEST'', or ''MOTION TO INTERVENE'' as applicable; (2) set forth in the heading the name of the applicant and the project number of the application to which the filing responds; (3) furnish the name, address, and telephone number of the person protesting or intervening; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 385.2001 through 385.2005. All comments, motions to intervene, or protests must set forth their evidentiary basis and otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 4.34(b). All comments, motions to intervene, or protests should relate to project works which are the subject of the license surrender. Agencies may obtain copies of the application directly from the applicant. A copy of any protest or motion to intervene must be served upon each representative of the applicant specified in the particular application. If an intervener files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency. A copy of all other filings in reference to this application must be accompanied by proof of service on all persons listed in the service list prepared by the Commission in this proceeding, in accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b) and 385.2010.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29969 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. ER15–1344–001, ER15–1344–002, ER15–1387–001]

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.; PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.; Potomac Electric Power Company; Notice Inviting Post-Technical Conference Comments

On November 12, 2015, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) staff conducted a technical conference to understand PJM Interconnection, L.L.C's (PJM) application of its Order No. 1000-compliant [1] transmission planning process to local transmission facilities in PJM's Regional Transmission Expansion Plan (RTEP). All interested persons are invited to file post-technical conference comments on the topics discussed during the technical conference, including:

- The process for planning for individual Transmission Owner FERC-filed planning criteria in Form No. 715; [2]
- the process and method PJM uses to track criteria [3] violations that drive each transmission project identified in the Subregional Local Plans and RTEP;
- the difference, if any, between local transmission maintenance and local transmission planning;
- which categories of transmission projects included in the RTEP are considered to be selected in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation;
- the process for reclassifying Supplemental Projects as Regional Projects or Subregional Projects selected in the RTEP for purposes of cost allocation, including requirements to open proposal windows for these projects;
- whether, pursuant to section 1.5.8 of its Operating Agreement, PJM should have opened a proposal window for baseline project b2582 under its current tariff and whether other factors justify the manner in which the project was planned; and
- how the transmission planning process used by each PJM transmission owner for Supplemental Projects complies with Order No. 890,[4] specifically with respect to the coordination, openness, transparency, information exchange, comparability, and dispute resolution transmission planning principles as described by the Commission and where these processes are set forth in FERC-filed documents.

Commenters need not address every question and may provide comments on relevant issues other than those listed above. These comments are due no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST) on Thursday, December 10, 2015. Reply comments are due on or before 5:00 p.m. EST January 7, 2016. The written comments will be included in the formal record of the proceeding, which, together with the record developed to date, will form the basis for further Commission action.

For more information about this Notice, please contact:

Nicole Buell, Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–6846, *nicole.buell@ferc.gov*.

Katherine Scott, Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–6495, *katherine.scott@ferc.gov*.

Ron LeComte, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8405, *ron.lecomte@ferc.gov*.

[1] *Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities*, Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 (2011), order on reh'g, Order No. 1000–A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132, order on reh'g, Order No. 1000–B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2012), *aff'd sub nom. S.C. Pub. Serv. Auth.* v. *FERC*, 762 F.3d 41 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

[2] *See* PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, Operating Agreement, Schedule 6 § 1.2 (e) (Conformity with NERC Reliability Standards and Other Applicable Reliability Criteria).

[3] The criteria PJM uses in its regional transmission planning process include PJM planning procedures, North American Electric Reliability Corporation Reliability Standards, Regional Entity reliability principles and standards, and the individual Transmission Owner planning criteria as filed in FERC Form No. 715, and as posted on the PJM Web site. *See* PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, § 1.2(e).

[4] *Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service,* Order No. 890, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,241, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 890–A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,261 (2007), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 890–B, 123 FERC ¶ 61,299 (2008), *order on reh'g,* Order No. 890–C, 126 FERC ¶ 61,228 (2009), *order on clarification,* Order No. 890–D, 129 FERC ¶ 61,126 (2009).

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29966 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #2

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric corporate filings:

Docket Numbers: EC16–35–000.

Applicants: Solar Star Colorado III, LLC.

Description: Application for Authorization Pursuant to FPA Section 203(a)(1)(A) and Requests for Expedited Action and Waivers of Certain Filing Requirements of Solar Star Colorado III, LLC.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5079.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER12–162–014; ER11–3876–017; ER11–2044–017; ER15–2211–004; ER10–2611–015.

Applicants: Bishop Hill Energy II LLC, Cordova Energy Company LLC, MidAmerican Energy Company, MidAmerican Energy Services, LLC, Saranac Power Partners, L.P.

Description: Notice of Change in Status of the Berkshire Hathaway Eastern Parties.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5074.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–75–010.

Applicants: Public Service Company of Colorado.

Description: Compliance filing: 2015–11–19_PSCo Order 1000 Comp filing to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5073.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–79–008.

Applicants: Public Service Company of New Mexico.

Description: Compliance filing: Order No. 1000 OATT Fifth Regional Compliance Filing to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5067.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–82–008.

Applicants: Arizona Public Service Company.

Description: Compliance filing: Order No. 1000 Compliance to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5088.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER13–91–007.

Applicants: El Paso Electric Company.

Description: Compliance filing: OATT Order No. 1000 Compliance Filing to Comply with October 20, 2015 Order to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5055.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER15–411–004.

Applicants: Arizona Public Service Company.

Description: Compliance filing: Rate Schedule No. 274—Planning Participation Agreement to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5124.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–91–000.

Applicants: Blythe Solar 110, LLC.

Description: Amendment to October 15, 2015 Blythe Solar 110, LLC tariff filing.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5200.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–354–000.

Applicants: Southern California Edison Company.

Description: Tariff Cancellation: Notices of Cancellation GIA and Distribution Service Agmt Chester Adams to be effective 10/21/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5002.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–355–000.

Applicants: Colonial Eagle Solar, LLC.

Description: Baseline eTariff Filing: MBR Application and Tariff to be effective 11/20/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5035.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–356–000.

Applicants: The Connecticut Light and Power Company.

Description: Tariff Cancellation: Cancellation of CPV Towantic LLC Engineering Design Permitting Siting Agreement to be effective 4/13/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5045.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–357–000.

Applicants: Public Service Company of New Hampshire.

Description: Tariff Cancellation: Cancellation of Design and Engineering Agreement for New Hampshire Electric Coop to be effective 6/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/19/15.

Accession Number: 20151119–5054.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/10/15.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29962 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER11–2159–005; ER10–2609–011; ER10–2606–011;ER10–2602–012.

Applicants: Verso Maine Energy LLC, NewPage Energy Services LLC, Escanaba Paper Company, Consolidated Water Power Company.

Description: Supplement to June 30, 2015 Updated Market Power Analysis for the Central Region of Verso MBR Entities.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5169.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/27/15.

Docket Numbers: ER14–1153–002; ER11–2159–004; ER10–2609–010; ER10–2606–010; ER10–2604–008; ER10–2602–011; ER10–2543–003.

Applicants: Verso Androscoggin LLC, Verso Androscoggin Power LLC, Verso Maine Energy LLC, Luke Paper Company, New Page Energy Services, Inc., Consolidated Water Power Company, Escanaba Paper Company.

Description: Second Supplement to February 6, 2015 Notice of Non-Material

Change in Status of the Verso MBR and NewPage MBR Entities.

Filed Date: 11/17/15.

Accession Number: 20151117–5170.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/27/15.

Docket Numbers: ER14–1656–006.

Applicants: CSOLAR IV WEST, LLC.

Description: Notification of Change in Status of CSOLAR IV WEST, LLC.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5194.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER14–2762–002.

Applicants: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

Description: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. submits tariff filing per 35.19a(b): Refund Report to be effective N/A.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5099.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER15–765–002.

Applicants: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

Description: Compliance filing: 2015–11–16_SA 6509 White Pine 2 SSR Agreement (Settlement) to be effective 1/1/2015.

Filed Date: 11/16/15.

Accession Number: 20151116–5105.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/7/15.

Docket Numbers: ER15–2477–000.

Applicants: Golden Hills Wind, LLC.

Description: Amendment to August 18, 2015, September 29, 2015 and October 16, 2015 Golden Hills Wind, LLC tariff filing.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5199.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 11/30/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–342–000.

Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Service Agreement No. 4295; Queue No. Y3–033 to be effective 10/19/2015.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5046.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–348–000.

Applicants: ISO New England Inc., Eversource Energy Service Company.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: The Conn. Light & Power Co., Public Service Co. of NH & Western Mass Electric Co to be effective 1/18/2016.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5140.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–349–000.

Applicants: Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: E&P Agreement for RE Tranquillity 8 LLC to be effective 11/19/2015.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5155.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–350–000.

Applicants: California Independent System Operator Corporation.

Description: Compliance filing: 2015–11–18 Tariff Record Overlap Compliance Filing to be effective 9/10/2010.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5156.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–351–000.

Applicants: KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Rate Schedule 137 to be effective 1/17/2016.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5157.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–352–000.

Applicants: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: 2015–11–18_SA 2870 Minnesota Power Zemple Substation TIA to be effective 11/13/2015.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5170.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Docket Numbers: ER16–353–000.

Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Original Service Agreement No. 4301; Queue #Z2–088/AA1–050 to be effective 10/19/2015.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5175.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

Take notice that the Commission received the following public utility holding company filings:

Docket Numbers: PH16–1–000.

Applicants: Energy Transfer Equity, L.P.

Description: Energy Transfer Equity, L.P. submits FERC 65–A Exemption Notification.

Filed Date: 11/18/15.

Accession Number: 20151118–5195.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 12/9/15.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR § 385.211 and § 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29961 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 8546–022]

Howard and Mildred Carter, Allen Rae Carter; Notice of Application for Transfer of License and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

On October 26, 2015, Karl Knuchel, attorney for the estate of Mildred Carter, (Howard Carter preceded Mildred Carter in death) (transferor) and Allen Rae Carter (transferee) filed an application for the transfer of the license of the Pine Creek Hydroelectric Project No. 8546 to Allen Rae Carter. Mildred Carter, now deceased, was the surviving licensee on the project. Pursuant to Mildred Carter's will, her estate seeks to transfer the project to her son, Allen Rae Carter. The project is located on Pine Creek in Park County, Montana.

Applicant Contact: For *Applicants:* Mr. Allen Rae Carter, 33 Eastep Lane, Livingston, MT 59047 and Mr. Karl Knuchel, P.C., 101 North E Street, P.O. Box 953, Livingston, MT 59047, Phone: 46–222–0135, email: *karl@knuchelpc.com.*

FERC Contact: Patricia W. Gillis, (202) 502–8735.

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, and protests: 30 days from the date that the Commission issues this notice. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file motions to intervene, comments, and protests using the Commission's eFiling system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp.* Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/ecomment.asp.* You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov,* (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). In lieu of electronic filing, please

send a paper copy to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. The first page of any filing should include docket number P–8546–022.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29970 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP15–1026–000]

Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, L.L.C.; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

Take notice that an informal settlement conference will be convened in this proceeding commencing at 9:00 a.m. EST on December 2, 2015 at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission), 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, for the purpose of exploring settlement of the above-referenced docket.

Any party, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(c), or any participant as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(b), is invited to attend. Persons wishing to become a party must move to intervene and receive intervenor status pursuant to the Commission's regulations under 18 CFR 385.214.

FERC conferences are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations please send an email to *accessibility@ferc.gov* or call toll free (866) 208–3372 (voice) or 202–502–8659 (TTY), or send a fax to 202–208–2106 with the required accommodations.

For additional information, please contact John Perkins (202–502–6591) or Frank Kelly (202–502–8185).

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29973 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–9939–30–Region 2]

Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (PSD) Final Determinations in New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final actions.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to announce that between April 16, 2014 and Oct 1, 2015, the Region 2 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), issued one final agency action and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) issued three final agency actions pursuant to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality (PSD) regulations codified at 40 CFR 52.21.

DATES: The effective dates for the above determinations are delineated in the chart in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Frank Jon, Environmental Engineer of the Permitting Section, Air Programs Branch, Clean Air and Sustainability Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 Office, 290 Broadway, 25th Floor, New York, NY 10007–1866, at (212) 637–4085.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the PSD regulations, the Region 2 Office of the USEPA, and the NJDEP have made final PSD determinations relative to the facilities listed below:

Name	Location	Project	Agency	Final action	Date
West Deptford Energy, LLC.	West Deptford Township, New Jersey.	A new project (Phase II) at an existing electric generating facility. It is a 427 Mw Siemens combined-cycle combustion turbine unit with duct burners, a 40 MM Btu/hr auxiliary boiler, an emergency generator, a fire water pump, and a multi-cell cooling tower.	NJDEP	New PSD Permit	June 2, 2014.
RC Cape May Holdings, LLC.	Beesley's Point, New Jersey.	BL England Repowering Project—18-month extension for commencing construction of the project.	NJDEP	PSD Permit Extension Granted.	October 2, 2014.
West Deptford Energy, LLC.	West Deptford Township, New Jersey.	Extension of the 18-month deadline for commencing construction of the Phase II project listed above.	NJDEP	PSD Permit Extension Granted.	September 29, 2015.
Energy Answers, LLC.	Arecibo, Puerto Rico	Extension of the 18-month deadline for commencing construction of the Arecibo Puerto Rico Renewable Energy Project which consists of two 1,050 tons per day (each) refuse-derived fuel municipal waste combustors, a 77 megawatt steam turbine electrical-generator, and other ancillary equipment.	EPA	PSD Permit Extension Granted.	October 1, 2015 (effective date of the PSD permit extended until April 10, 2017).

This notice lists only the facilities that have received final PSD determinations. Anyone who wishes to review these determinations and related materials should contact the following offices:

EPA Actions

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 Office, Air Programs Branch—25th Floor, 290 Broadway, New York, New York 10007–1866, (212) 637–4085.

NJDEP Actions

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Permitting Element, Bureau of Preconstruction Permits, 401 East State Street, Trenton, New Jersey 08625, (609) 777–0286.

With respect to the final PSD permit for West Deptford Energy, LLC, pursuant to 40 CFR 124.19(l), a prerequisite to seeking judicial review of the determination under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (the Act), 42 U.S.C. 7607(b)(1), is that parties must have previously filed a petition with the

EPA Environmental Appeals Board under 40 CFR 124.19(a). If the prerequisite has been met, review may be sought only by the filing of a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date on which the determination is published in the **Federal Register**. With respect to the PSD permit extensions, pursuant to section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, judicial review of this extension decision may be sought by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date on which these determinations are published in the **Federal Register**. Under section 307(b)(2) of the Act, the determinations in this Notice shall not be subject to later judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

Dated: November 6, 2015.

Judith A. Enck,

Regional Administrator, Region 2.

[FR Doc. 2015–30098 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–ORD–2015–0765; FRL–9939–36–ORD]

Board of Scientific Counselors Executive Committee; Notification of Public Meeting and Public Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notification of public meeting and public comment.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) hereby provides notice that the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) Executive Committee will host a public meeting convening on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, and adjourning Thursday, December 10, 2015. The primary discussion will focus on the draft reports from the BOSC subcommittee meetings which addressed the research and future direction for the Office of Research and Development's (ORD) National Research Programs: Air, Climate and Energy, Chemical Safety for Sustainability, Homeland Security, Human Health Risk Assessment, Safe and Sustainable Water Resources, Sustainable and Healthy Communities. The Committee will also deliberate on two ORD Cross-Cutting Research Roadmaps: Environmental Justice and Climate Change. There will be a public comment period from 10:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. Eastern Time on December 8, 2015.

For information about registering to attend the meeting or to provide public comment, please see the *Registration* and **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** sections below. Due to a limited number of telephone lines, attendance will be on a first-come, first-served basis. Pre-registration is required. Registration for participating via teleconference closes Friday, December 4, 2015. Registration to participate in person closes Monday, November 30, 2015. The deadline to sign up to speak during the public comment period or to submit written public comment is Friday, December 4, 2015.

DATES: The BOSC Executive Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, December 9, 2015, from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and Thursday, December 10, 2015, from 8:30 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. All times noted are Eastern Time and are approximate.

Registration: In order to participate either via teleconference or in person, you must register at the following site: *https://www.eventbrite.com/e/us-epa-bosc-executive-committee-public-meeting-registration-19431552296.* Once you have completed the online registration you will be contacted and provided with call-in or in-person instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions or correspondence concerning the meeting should be directed to Tom Tracy, Designated Federal Officer, Environmental Protection Agency, by mail at 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., (MC 8104 R), Washington, DC 20460, by telephone at 202–564–6518, fax at 202–565–2911or via email at *tracy.tom@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Charter of the BOSC states that the advisory committee shall provide independent advice to the Administrator on technical and management aspects of the ORD's research program. Additional information about the BOSC is available at: *http://www2.epa.gov/bosc.*

Oral Statements: Members of the public who wish to provide oral comment during the meeting must pre-register. Individuals or groups making remarks during the public comment period will be limited to five (5) minutes. To accommodate the number of people who want to address the BOSC Executive Committee, only one representative of a particular community, organization, or group will be allowed to speak.

Written Statements: Written comments for the public meeting must be received by Friday, December 4, 2015, and will be included in the materials distributed to the BOSC Executive Committee prior to the meeting. Written comments should be sent to Tom Tracy, Environmental Protection Agency, via email at *tracy.tom@epa.gov* or by mail to 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., (MC 8104 R), Washington, DC 20460, or submitted through regulations.gov, Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–ORD–2015–0765. Members of the public should be aware that their personal contact information, if included in any written comments, may be posted online at regulations.gov.

Information about Services for Individuals with Disabilities: For information about access or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Tom Tracy, at 202–564–6518 or via email at *tracy.tom@epa.gov.* To request special accommodations for a disability, please contact Tom Tracy no later than Friday, December 4, 2015, to give the Environmental Protection Agency sufficient time to process your request. All requests should be sent to the address, email, or phone number listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section above.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Fred S. Hauchman,

Director, Office of Science Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–30102 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 9939–27–OA]

Announcement of the Board of Directors for the National Environmental Education Foundation

AGENCY: Office of External Affairs and Environmental Education, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Environmental Education and Training Foundation (doing business as The National Environmental Education Foundation or NEEF) was created by Section 10 of Public Law 101–619, the National Environmental Education Act of 1990. It is a private 501(c)(3) non-profit organization established to promote and support education and training as necessary tools to further environmental protection and sustainable,

environmentally sound development. It provides the common ground upon which leaders from business and industry, all levels of government, public interest groups, and others can work cooperatively to expand the reach of environmental education and training programs beyond the traditional classroom. The Foundation promotes innovative environmental education and training programs such as environmental education for medical healthcare providers and broadcast meteorologists; it also develops partnerships with government and other organizations to administer projects that promote the development of an environmentally literal public. The Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as required by the terms of the Act, announces the following appointment to the National Environmental Education Foundation Board of Directors. The appointee is Mr. Robert Garcia, is a civil rights advocate who engages, educates, and empowers communities for equal access to public resources.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding this Notice of Appointment, please contact Mr. Micah Ragland, Associate Administrator for Office of Public Engagement and Environmental Education, U.S. EPA 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460. General information concerning NEEF can be found on their Web site at: *http://www.neefusa.org.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Additional Considerations: Great care has been taken to assure that this new appointee not only has the highest degree of expertise and commitment, but also brings to the Board diverse points of view relating to environmental education. This appointment is a four-year term which may be renewed once for an additional four years pending successful re-election by the NEEF nominating committee.

This appointee will join the current Board members which include:

- Decker Anstrom (NEEF Chairman), Former U.S. Ambassador, Retired Chairman, The Weather Channel Companies
- Diane Wood (NEEF Secretary) President, National Environmental Education Foundation
- Carlos Alcazar, Founder and Chairman, Culture ONE World
- Megan Reilly Cayten, Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Catrinka, LLC
- David M. Kiser (NEEF Treasurer), Vice President, Environment, Health, Safety and Sustainability, International Paper
- Wonya Lucas, President and CEO, Public Broadcasting Atlanta
- Shannon Schuyler, Principal, Corporate Responsibility Leader, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC)
- Jacqueline M. Thomas, Vice President of Corporate Responsibility, Toyota Motor Sales USA Inc.
- Raul Perea-Henze, MD, MPH, Managing Director, HORUS Advisors, Washington, DC
- George Basile, Ph.D., Professor, School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
- Jennifer Harper-Taylor, Siemens Foundation (in process)

Background: Section 10 (a) of the National Environmental Education Act of 1990 mandates a National Environmental Education Foundation. The Foundation is established in order to extend the contribution of environmental education and training to meeting critical environmental protection needs, both in this country and internationally; to facilitate the cooperation, coordination, and contribution of public and private resources to create an environmentally advanced educational system; and to foster an open and effective partnership among Federal, State, and local government, business, industry, academic institutions, community based environmental groups, and international organizations.

The Foundation is a charitable and nonprofit corporation whose income is exempt from tax, and donations to which are tax deductible to the same extent as those organizations listed pursuant to section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. The Foundation is not an agency or establishment of the United States. The purposes of the Foundation are—

(A) subject to the limitation contained in the final sentence of subsection (d) herein, to encourage, accept, leverage, and administer private gifts for the benefit of, or in connection with, the environmental education and training activities and services of the United States Environmental Protection Agency;

(B) to conduct such other environmental education activities as will further the development of an environmentally conscious and responsible public, a well-trained and environmentally literate workforce, and an environmentally advanced educational system;

(C) to participate with foreign entities and individuals in the conduct and coordination of activities that will further opportunities for environmental education and training to address environmental issues and problems involving the United States and Canada or Mexico.

The Foundation develops, supports, and/or operates programs and projects to educate and train educational and environmental professionals, and to assist them in the development and delivery of environmental education and training programs and studies.

The Foundation has a governing Board of Directors (hereafter referred to in this section as 'the Board'), which consists of 13 directors, each of whom shall be knowledgeable or experienced in the environment, education and/or training. The Board oversees the activities of the Foundation and assures that the activities of the Foundation are consistent with the environmental and education goals and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency and with the intents and purposes of the Act. The membership of the Board, to the extent practicable, represents diverse points of view relating to environmental education and training. Members of the Board are appointed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Within 90 days of the date of the enactment of the National Environmental Education Act, and as appropriate thereafter, the Administrator will publish in the **Federal Register** an announcement of appointments of Directors of the Board. Such appointments become final and effective 90 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. The directors are appointed for terms of 4 years. The Administrator shall appoint an individual to serve as a director in the event of a vacancy on the Board within 60 days of said vacancy in the manner in which the original appointment was made. No individual may serve more than 2 consecutive terms as a director.

Dated: November 10, 2015.

Gina McCarthy,

Administrator.

Mr. Robert Garcia

Mr. Robert Garcia, is the Founding Director and Counsel of The City Project, a non-profit legal and policy advocacy team in Los Angeles, California. The City Project works with diverse allies on equal access to (1) healthy green land use through community planning; (2) climate justice; (3) quality education including physical education; (4) health equity; and (5) economic vitality for all, including creating jobs and avoiding displacement. He received the President's Award from the American

Public Health Association. PODER Magazine named him one of the Top 100 Latino Green Leaders. Hispanic Business Magazine has recognized him as one of the 100 most influential Latinos in the United States. Green 2.0 celebrates his work as an accomplished leader of color in the environmental field. Robert graduated from Stanford University and Stanford Law School, where he served on the Board of Editors of the Stanford Law Review. He is an Assistant Professor at Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science.

President Barack Obama and federal agencies are catapulting The City Project's work on green access to the national level. As the President recognized in dedicating the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument, ''Too many children . . . especially children of color, don't have access to parks where they can run free, breathe fresh air, experience nature, and learn about their environment. This is an issue of social justice.'' Conservation isn't about locking away our natural treasures. ''It's about working with communities to open up our glorious heritage to everybody—young and old, black, white, Latino, Asian, Native American—to make sure everybody can experience these incredible gifts.''

The National Park Service and the US Army Corps of Engineers agree. Their studies on green access and the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Gabriel Mountains, and the Los Angeles River rely on The City Project's analyses to document that there are disparities in access to green space for people of color and low-income people in Los Angeles, that these disparities contribute to health disparities, and that environmental justice requires agencies to address these disparities. The City Project worked with Ranking Member Raul Grijalva and the House Natural Resources Committee to organize the historic forum on environmental justice, climate, and health. The forum included seven Members of Congress and community advocates at the L.A. River Center in 2015.

He has extensive experience in public policy, legal advocacy, mediation, and litigation involving complex social justice, civil rights, human health, environmental, education, and criminal justice matters. He has influenced the investment of over $43 billion in underserved communities, working at the intersection of equal justice, public health, and the built environment. He served as chairman of the Citizens' School Bond Oversight Committee for five years, helping raise over $27 billion to build new, and modernize existing, public schools as centers of their communities in Los Angeles. He has helped communities create and preserve great urban parks and preserve access to beaches and trails. He has helped diversify support for and access to state resource bonds, with unprecedented levels of support among communities of color and low-income communities, and billions of dollars for urban parks. He served on the Development Team for the National Park Service Healthy Parks, Healthy People Community Engagement eGuide. He served on Cardinal Roger Mahony's Justice and Peace Committee for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

He served as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and an attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund. He received the President's Award from the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice for helping release Geronimo Pratt, the former Black Panther leader, from prison after 27 years for a crime he did not commit. He represented people on Death Row in Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi. Stanford Law School called him a ''civil rights giant'' and Stanford Magazine ''an inspiration.'' He is an immigrant who came to the U.S. from Guatemala at age four.

He has lectured widely on the vision for healthy parks, schools, and communities. Recent keynote speeches include conferences at the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency New Partners for Smart Growth, and Smithsonian Anacostia Community Museum. Other presentations include Stanford, Yale, Duke, Harvard Law School, Howard, UCLA, USC, Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia, Canada, FLAC in Dublin, Ireland, Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and National Council of La Raza (NCLR). The City Project [is] working to broaden access to parks and open space for inner-city residents and . . . to fight childhood obesity by guaranteeing that . . . students get enough physical education.''—New York Times.

[FR Doc. 2015–29918 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–9939–26–OA]

Notification of a Public Teleconference of the Farm, Ranch, and Rural Community Federal Advisory Committee (FRRCC)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gives notice of a teleconference of the Farm, Ranch, and Rural Communities Committee (FRRCC). This teleconference is open to the public. Members of the public are encouraged to provide comments relevant to the specific issues being considered by the FRRCC.

DATES: A public teleconference will be held on December 11, 2015, from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Eastern Standard Time.

Location: The teleconference will be conducted by telephone only.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donna Perla, Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Administrator (MC1101A), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460; via email at *perla.donna@epa.gov*, or via telephone at 202–564–0184. General information concerning the EPA FRRCC can be found at *http://www2.epa.gov/faca/frrcc.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: EPA established the Farm, Ranch, and Rural Communities Committee (FRRCC) in 2008 to provide independent policy advice, information, and recommendations to the Administrator on a range of environmental issues and policies that are of importance to agriculture and rural communities.

The purpose of this teleconference is to discuss progress and next steps for actions that were identified as a result of the October 22, 2015 FRRCC meeting, open to the public, in Denver, CO, (see **Federal Register** Notice). Discussion will include progress of the Soil Health and the Outreach and Engagement Working Groups, and identification of additional topics that members want to advise the Administrator on.

Procedures for Providing Public Input: The meeting is open to the public. Members of the public wishing to participate or to make oral comments in the teleconference should contact

Donna Perla at *perla.donna@epa.gov* or (202) 564–0184 by December 4, 2015.

Accessibility: For information on access to this teleconference or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Donna Perla at 202–564–0184 or *perla.donna@epa.gov.* To request special accommodations, please contact Donna Perla, preferably at least four working days prior to the teleconference, to allow sufficient time to process your request.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Donna Perla,

Designated Federal Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–30096 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreements Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreements under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreements to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within twelve days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the agreements are available through the Commission's Web site (*www.fmc.gov*) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202)-523–5793 or *tradeanalysis@fmc.gov.*

Agreement No.: 012323–001.

Title: Hoegh/Hyundai Glovis Transatlantic Vessel Sharing Agreement.

Parties: Hoegh Autoliners AS and Hyundai Glovis Co. Ltd.

Filing Party: Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1200 Nineteenth St. NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The amendment adds Spain, Morocco, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Venezuela and Colombia to the geographic scope of the agreement, and corrects the address of Hyundai Glovis.

Agreement No.: 012327–002.

Title: ''K'' Line/WHL/WHS/PIL Space Charter and Sailing Agreement.

Parties: Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.; Wan Hai Lines (Singapore) PTE Ltd.; Wan Hai Lines Ltd.; Pacific International Lines (PTE) Ltd.

Filing Party: Eric. C. Jeffrey, Esq.; Nixon Peabody LLP; 799 9th Street NW., Suite 500; Washington, DC 20001.

Synopsis: The amendment updates language in the agreement concerning operational coordination with third parties using slots provided by a party under this agreement.

Agreement No.: 012361–001.

Title: ELJSA/CMA CGM North West European Continent—U.S. East Coast Service Slot Charter Agreement.

Parties: Evergreen Line Joint Service Agreement and CMA CGM S.A.

Filing Party: Paul M. Keane, Esq.; Cichanowicz, Callan, Keane, Vengrow & Textor, LLP; 61 Broadway, Suite 3000; New York, NY 10006–2802.

Synopsis: The amendment adds Article 5.9 to the agreement allowing CMA CGM to communicate directly with members of the CKYHE Agreement (FMC Agreement No. 012300) who are providing the vessel space which Evergreen is chartering to CMA CGM.

Agreement No.: 012373.

Title: NMCC/Hoegh Autoliners Space Charter Agreement.

Parties: Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd; Nissan Motor Car Carrier Co., Ltd.; World Logistics Service, (U.S.A.), Inc.; and Hoegh Autoliners AS.

Filing Party: Eric. C. Jeffrey, Esq.; Nixon Peabody LLP; 799 9th Street NW., Suite 500; Washington, DC 20001.

Synopsis: The agreement authorizes the parties to charter space to one another for the carriage of vehicles and other Ro-Ro cargo in the trades between the United States and countries in the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, Northern Europe (including the United Kingdom and Ireland) and the Middle East and Mediterranean, excluding the trades from the United States East and Gulf Coasts to Bahrain and Oman.

Agreement No.: 012373–001.

Title: NMCC/Hoegh Autoliners Space Charter Agreement.

Parties: Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd; Nissan Motor Car Carrier Co., Ltd.; World Logistics Service, (U.S.A.), Inc.; and Hoegh Autoliners AS.

Filing Party: Eric. C. Jeffrey, Esq.; Nixon Peabody LLP; 799 9th Street NW., Suite 500; Washington, DC 20001.

Synopsis: The amendment would expand the geographic scope of the agreement to include the trades from the United States East and Gulf Coasts to Bahrain and Oman, and change the name of the agreement.

Agreement No.: 012374.

Title: Seaboard/Crowley Space Charter Agreement.

Parties: Crowley Caribbean Services, LLC and Seaboard Marine, Ltd.

Filing Party: Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Connor; 1200 19th Street NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The agreement would authorize Crowley to charter space to Seaboard in the trade from Port Everglades, FL to Jamaica.

Agreement No.: 012375.

Title: Hanjin/Zim Slot Exchange Agreement.

Parties: ZIM Integrated Shipping Services, Ltd. and Hanjin Shipping Co., Ltd.

Filing Party: Mark E. Newcomb; ZIM American Integrated Shipping Services Co., LLC; 5801 Lake Wright Dr.; Norfolk, VA 23508.

Synopsis: The agreement would authorize the parties to exchange slots on their respective services in the trade between ports in Asia and ports on the U.S. East Coast.

Agreement No.: 201161–001.

Title: AMPT/Maher Cooperative Working Agreement.

Parties: APM Terminals North America, Inc.; Maher Terminals, Inc.; and Millennium Marine Rail LLC.

Filing Party: Wayne R. Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O'Conner; 1200 19th Street NW.; Washington, DC 20036.

Synopsis: The amendment would reflect the fact that Maher has restructured itself as an LLC, and that APMT has placed its terminal operations in a wholly-owned subsidiary. It would also correct the addresses of the parties to the agreement.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Rachel E. Dickon,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–30036 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6731–AA–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of a Bank or Bank Holding Company

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire shares of a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than December 11, 2015.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (Dennis Denney, Assistant Vice President) 1 Memorial Drive, Kansas City, Missouri 64198–0001:

1. *William H. Croak, Sherri L. Croak, John R. Croak, Heather M. Croak, Shelly Croak Yocham, and Tobin N. Yocham, all of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, either individually and/or as Co-Trustees of the Croak Family Holdings Trust under agreement dated effective July 1, 2015, of Midwest City, Oklahoma, and the John R. and Heather M. Croak Family Trust dated June 30, 2005, the William H. and Sherri L. Croak Family Trust dated June 30, 2005, and the Tobin N. & Shelly Croak Yocham Family Trust dated October 1, 2015,* all of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, all as members of the Croak family control group acting in concert; to acquire voting shares of First Midwest Acquisition Corporation, and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of FNB Community Bank, both in Midwest City, Oklahoma, and FinancePoint, Inc., Del City, Oklahoma.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, November 20, 2015.

Michael J. Lewandowski,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2015–29999 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Proposed Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SUMMARY: On June 15, 1984, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) delegated to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) its approval authority under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), to approve of and assign OMB numbers to collection of information requests and requirements conducted or sponsored by the Board. Board-approved collections of information are incorporated into the official OMB inventory of currently approved collections of information. Copies of the PRA Submission, supporting statements and approved collection of information instruments are placed into OMB's public docket files. The Federal Reserve may not conduct or sponsor, and the respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection that has been extended, revised, or implemented on or after October 1, 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB number.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by *FR 3066a, b, c, and d,* by any of the following methods:

- *Agency Web site: http://www.federalreserve.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/foia/proposedregs.aspx.*
- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Email: regs.comments@federalreserve.gov.* Include OMB number in the subject line of the message.
- *FAX:* (202) 452–3819 or (202) 452–3102.
- *Mail:* Robert deV. Frierson, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20551.

All public comments are available from the Board's Web site at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/foia/proposedregs.aspx* as submitted, unless modified for technical reasons. Accordingly, your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information. Public comments may also be viewed electronically or in paper form in Room 3515, 1801 K Street (between 18th and 19th Streets NW.). Washington, DC 20006 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

Additionally, commenters may send a copy of their comments to the OMB Desk Officer—Shagufta Ahmed—Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–6974.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the PRA OMB submission, including the proposed reporting form and instructions, supporting statement, and other documentation will be placed into OMB's public docket files, once approved. These documents will also be made available on the Federal Reserve Board's public Web site at: *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/reportforms/review.aspx* or may be requested from the agency clearance officer, whose name appears below.

Federal Reserve Board Clearance Officer—Nuha Elmaghrabi—Office of the Chief Data Officer, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551 (202) 452–3829. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) users may contact (202) 263–4869, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comment on Information Collection Proposal

The following information collection, which is being handled under this delegated authority, has received initial Board approval and is hereby published for comment. At the end of the comment period, the proposed information collection, along with an analysis of comments and recommendations received, will be submitted to the Board for final approval under OMB delegated authority. Comments are invited on the following:

a. Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the Federal Reserve's functions; including whether the information has practical utility;

b. The accuracy of the Federal Reserve's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

c. Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

d. Ways to minimize the burden of information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and

e. Estimates of capital or start up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Proposal To Approve Under OMB Delegated Authority the Extension for Three Years, With Revision, of the Following Report

1. *Report title:* Federal Reserve Payments Study.

Agency form number: FR 3066a, b, c, and d.

OMB control number: 7100–0351.

Frequency: FR 3066a, b: triennial with shorter annual versions to a subset of respondents, FR 3066c: triennial, and FR 3066d: annual and on occasion.

Reporters: Depository and financial institutions, payment networks, payment processors, and payment instrument issuers.

Estimated annual reporting hours: FR 3066a triennial: 43,200 hours; FR 3066a annual: 1,700 hours; FR 3066b triennial: 1,000 hours; FR 3066b annual: 150 hours; FR 3066c: 450 hours: FR 3066d: 600 hours.

Estimated average hours per response: FR 3066a triennial: 32 hours; FR 3066a annual: 10 hours; FR 3066b triennial: 8 hours; FR 3066b annual: 5 hours; FR 3066c: 3 hours: FR 3066d: 12 hours.

Number of respondents: FR 3066a triennial: 1,350 respondents; FR 3066a annual: 85 respondents; FR 3066b triennial: 125 respondents; FR 3066b annual: 15 respondents; FR 3066c: 150 respondents: FR 3066d: 50 respondents.

General description of report: This information collection is broadly authorized under sections 2A and 12A

of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 225a and 12 U.S.C. 263) and is voluntary. The information is given confidential treatment (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4))).

Abstract: The FR 3066a, FR 3066b, and FR 3066c are triennial surveys. The FR 3066d is conducted up to one time per year. These surveys are designed to collect information needed to support the Federal Reserve System's (FRS) role in the retail payments system.[1]

The FR 3066a, FR 3066b, FR 3066c, and FR 3066d are the latest iteration of the Federal Reserve Payments Study (FRPS), which has been conducted since 2000. The FRPS originated from a system-wide effort to improve the measurement and public availability of information on volumes and trends in checks and other noncash payments. Despite the retail payments system's critical importance in supporting everyday commerce, there was a significant gap in quantitative information on U.S. retail payments before 2000. The FRPS filled this gap by providing a reliable and transparent non-mandatory survey-based approach to collecting payments industry data on retail payment volumes and trends.

A U.S. payments system that is safe, efficient, and broadly accessible is vital to the U.S. economy, and the Federal Reserve plays an important role in promoting these qualities as a leader, catalyst for change, and provider of payment services to financial institutions and the U.S. Treasury. In 2012, Federal Reserve Financial Services (FRFS), managed by the Reserve Banks, refreshed its strategic direction to focus on meeting the evolving needs of payment system users for end-to-end payment speed, efficiency and security, while remaining true to its longstanding financial services mission to foster the integrity, efficiency and accessibility of the U.S. payment system.[2] FRFS identified gaps in available data on payments fraud and payment security threats. In support of these efforts, the Federal Reserve proposes to leverage the FR 3066 surveys, where appropriate, to collect and improve the availability of aggregate payments fraud and security information.

The FRPS helps to support FRFS goals by producing information on aggregate volumes and trends in the payments system and sharing that information with the financial services and payments industry and the public. The aggregate survey results are widely cited in academic working papers and journal articles, industry publications, reported in the media, and used by the public, industry, and the Federal Reserve as the quantitative aggregate benchmark on payments activity in the United States. Questions in the surveys consist primarily of quantitative payment transaction volume data in the form of number-value pairs, and require knowledgeable personnel at participating organizations to reference their confidential commercial and financial records. The surveys also contain a smaller amount of categorical questions (*e.g.,* Yes/No/Don't Know) to help clarify the meaning and content of the responses to volume questions. Because of the confidential nature of the information, individual response data are only used to produce aggregate estimates and are not disclosed.

The Retail Payments Risk Forum (RPRF) and the Retail Payments Office (RPO) play key roles within the Federal Reserve's strategic framework. The mission of the RPRF is to identify, detect, and encourage mitigation of risk in retail payments through research, and through collaboration with industry stakeholders. RPRF will provide leadership and assistance with the surveys, in recognition of the importance of payments security to the FRS and the increasing focus on payments fraud and security of the FRPS. The RPO provides leadership in payments services, operates check and Automated Clearing House (ACH) clearance services, and will continue to support study planning, contractor procurement, contracting, and survey execution.

As the noncash payments system has continued to grow larger and more complex and as policymakers, the industry, and the public face more choices related to the payments system, the Federal Reserve believe that the data collected under the FR 3066 surveys play a crucial role in objectively maintaining and updating quantitative information on the U.S. retail payments system and should be continued in 2016 through 2018. The FRS's role as a trusted leader in payments processing, its essential role in policymaking, and the successful record of the data collected under the FRPS uniquely positions the Federal Reserve to collect these data.

The FR 3066a currently collects information on the national volume (number and value) of major categories and subcategories of established and emerging methods of payment from a nationally representative stratified random sample of depository institutions.[3] Most questions in the surveys consist of payment and related transactions organized as number-value pairs. The FR 3066b currently comprises 15 different surveys, each specific to a particular payment instrument and/or respondent type (respondents only answer surveys that apply to their organizations). It collects information from a census of payment networks, processors, and issuers. The FR 3066c currently collects data from samples of individual checks obtained from a set of depository institutions. The FR 3066d is an ad-hoc supplement to the other FR 3066 surveys.

The Federal Reserve currently use data collected from the FR 3066a and FR 3066b to estimate aggregate totals and trends in (1) the number and value of various types of payment and withdrawal transactions processed by financial institutions that hold transaction deposit, prepaid card program, or credit card accounts domiciled in the United States; (2) the number and value of various types of payments that are facilitated by payment networks, payment processors, and payment instrument issuers within the United States; (3) inter- and intra-bank volumes; (4) the usage of different types of prepaid cards; (5) transaction volumes of emerging payment methods; and (6) relevant non-transactional volumes, such as the number of accounts, number of payment cards outstanding, volumes of returned checks, and volumes of third-party payment fraud. Data from these two surveys is also used to estimate volumes and trends in cash usage, which are connected to noncash payment trends, the cash issuance responsibilities of the Federal Reserve, and the cash distribution responsibilities of the Reserve Banks. The information about checks collected from the FR 3066c is currently used to estimate the distribution of checks among broad categories of payers, payees, and purposes. These data help identify what

[1] The Federal Reserve plays a vital role in the U.S. payments system, fostering its safety and efficiency, and providing a variety of financial services to depository institutions. The Federal Reserve is involved with both retail and wholesale payments. Retail payments are generally for relatively small-dollar amounts and often involve a depository institution's retail clients—individuals, businesses, and governments. The Reserve Banks' retail services include distributing currency and coin, collecting checks, and electronically transferring funds through the automated clearinghouse system. By contrast, wholesale payments are generally for large dollar amounts, and often involve a depository institution's large corporate customers or counterparties, including other financial institutions.

[2] See the FedPayments Improvement Web site for more information (*https://fedpaymentsimprovement.org/*).

[3] To obtain comprehensive coverage of total national volumes the survey may also include non-depository financial institutions.

types of check payments are declining as well as remaining opportunities for the replacement of checks with other payment instruments.

Current Actions: The Federal Reserve proposes the following revisions to the FR 3066 surveys, which would be effective for the surveys administered in 2016.

The FR 3066a and FR 3066b were designed to support a triennial data collection. The Federal Reserve proposes to continue the triennial data collection for 2015 data and to add shorter, annual surveys to update high-priority items from a relatively small set of participants for 2016 data and for 2017 data.

The Federal Reserve proposes to revise the FR 3066a to collect data for the full calendar year 2015 instead of a single month, as was the case in the 2013 survey. This will improve the quality of aggregate estimates by removing the need to annualize monthly data, making the estimates less sensitive to annual seasonality, and providing closer comparability with data collected in FR 3066b. The change from a month to a year does not affect the number of reported items. Because of greater availability and automation of data reporting systems at many depository institutions, this revision is not expected to significantly affect the reporting burden.[4]

The Federal Reserve proposes to revise the data collection processes for the FR 3066a and FR 3066b to more effectively employ adaptive survey methods, supplemented by the use and collection of survey paradata.[5] For example, to adapt to relatively low past response probabilities and incomplete responses, particularly in some smaller-institution survey strata, some participants may receive shorter survey forms with selected questions or entire sections removed. The survey paradata would provide information to assess the influence of differential treatment and to possibly adjust for any bias that might otherwise be introduced into the estimation process.

In 2013, the FRPS began collecting information on payments fraud from depository institutions responding to FR 3066a, and established baseline aggregate estimates for unauthorized third-party fraud payments by payment type. The Federal Reserve would use new information collected on payments fraud to update totals for 2015 and to estimate trends in unauthorized third-party payments fraud.

The Federal Reserve proposes revisions to the survey questions based on the need to further expand the collection of payments-related fraud and security information, respond to new developments in technology and choices in the payments marketplace, and adjust for lessons learned from the 2013 data collection. Most of the proposed expanded fraud questions would be in the 3066b surveys sent to payment networks, issuers, and processors. The expanded questions on fraud and payments security are based on an attempt to align the questions with the way that various participating organizations have said they already track and compile such information.

In addition, more detailed fraud baseline information would be collected through follow-on studies, including the FR 3066d, or possibly in questions included in another triennial study approved in a future clearance process.

The Federal Reserve proposes revising the FR 3066c data collection process to include check images processed via the Reserve Banks' check service. The additional data are expected to improve the variety and quality of data used to estimate the proportion of checks by categories such as payers, payees, and purposes.

FR 3066a. The Federal Reserve proposes changing the survey reference period. Flows such as payment volumes would be reported for the entire year. Stocks, such as the number or value of accounts would be reported as the average of end-of-month totals for the calendar year. The current survey collects the flows for the month of March and stocks for March 31.

In general, proposed questions have been added requesting the total payment transactions of each major payment type to be allocated to consumer and business categories. The current survey includes such questions for cards only.

Most proposed changes are specific to the section or type of payment as described below.

1. Institution Profile: In the current version, respondents verify which affiliates are associated with their survey responses and provide corrections. The Federal Reserve proposes to remove the verification step, reducing the amount of up-front analysis required of the respondent. Some relatively simple qualitative questions would be included that are expected to help tailor the survey to the institution, reducing overall response time.

The Federal Reserve proposes to change the language describing customer deposit accounts to better reflect the types of accounts from which payments are made. The Federal Reserve also proposes adding questions on sweep balances that would be reported separately to aid in understanding related payment volumes.

The proposed revision would reduce the number of verifications required which is proportional to the complexity of the participating institution.

2. Checks:

a. Check Payments: The proposed check payments section would include 8 questions compared with 5 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 3 questions.

b. Check Deposits: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions regarding ATM imaging of paper check deposits both at the institution's own ATMs and at ''foreign'' institution ATMs through deposit-sharing agreements. Respondents would report remotely created checks they collect, including those created by the bank of first deposit and by client customers. The proposed check deposits section would include 23 questions compared with 11 in the current survey, for a net increase of 12 questions.

c. Outgoing and On-Us Check Returns: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions to obtain detail about the reasons for returned checks, particularly unauthorized fraud-related returns. The proposed section would include 12 questions compared with 5 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 7 questions.

3. ACH Credits and ACH Debits: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions that sum network and in-house on-us volume of payments.[6] Credits and debits would continue to be reported separately. Directly exchanged ACH entries are reported separately in the current survey and the Federal Reserve proposes they be consolidated with network ACH entries. The Federal Reserve proposes to add questions on ACH payments settled same-day and otherwise. The proposed section

[4] Evidence of this is based on data collected in other surveys conducted by the Federal Reserve, and a recent survey conducted by the 3066a contractor. Support for this view was also expressed by various depository institution participants and other survey researchers.

[5] Adaptive methods include Survey paradata is administrative information generated during the conduct of the survey describing the survey process, including differential treatments and records of any communication such as telephone conversations and Web site interactions.

[6] In-house on-us is a term of art meant to cover only those on-us payments (where the account transfer takes place between two accounts at the same depository institution) that are processed in-house (meaning not sent over an ACH network). This distinction is unique to ACH because some depository institutions send on-us ACH payments to network operators, and the distinction is necessary to properly measure the activity.

includes 28 questions compared with 14 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 14 questions.

4. ACH returns: The Federal Reserve proposes adding this section. Respondents would report the number and value of returned ACH transactions drawn on customer accounts, which are outgoing for ACH debit transactions and incoming for returned ACH credit transactions. Respondents would report reasons for returned ACH transactions, particularly unauthorized fraud-related reasons. The proposed new section includes 10 new questions.

5. Wire transfer originations: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions regarding wire originations allocated to interbank (over a network or directly exchanged) and book transfers. The proposed section includes 13 questions compared with 10 questions in the current survey, a net increase of 3 questions.

6. Wire transfer receipts: The Federal Reserve proposes adding this new section with questions on wire transfers received by beneficiaries allocated to categories as with originations. Respondents would also report wire receipts allocated to interbank (over a network or directly exchanged) and book transfers. The proposed new section includes 13 new questions.

7. General-Purpose Debit and Prepaid Cards: The Federal Reserve proposes restructuring this section to better match developments in technology and established categories by which depository institutions track transactions. Proposed revisions include adding questions on the number of debit and prepaid cards provisioned to mobile devices and digital wallets, and questions to allocate volumes into person-present/merchant point-of-sale volumes and remote volumes. Person-present volumes would be further allocated into signature, PIN, or other/no signature required. Questions in the current survey allocating prepaid accounts and cards to those managed by the responding institution and those managed by a third-party are proposed to be replaced with allocations between reloadable and non-reloadable/gift accounts and cards. The proposed section includes 33 questions compared with 20 questions in the current survey, a net increase of 13 questions.

8. General-Purpose Credit Cards: The Federal Reserve proposes a restructuring of questions so that network transactions would be separated from non-network transactions. The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions to collect information on consumer accounts allocated by revolving balances and current balances. As with debit and prepaid cards, the Federal Reserve proposes restructuring this section to better match developments in technology and established categories by which depository institutions track transactions, and to add questions on the number of credit cards provisioned to mobile devices and digital wallets. The proposed section includes 29 questions compared with 16 in the current survey, for a net increase of 13 questions.

9. Cash Withdrawals and Deposits: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions on ATM cards in force, and additional clarifying questions on ATM terminals at branch locations. The proposed section includes 34 questions compared with 23 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 11 questions.

10. Alternative Payment Initiation Methods: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions on business-to-person and business-to-business payments, in parallel with questions on person-to-person payments in the current survey. The proposed section includes 12 questions compared with 7 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 5 questions.

11. Unauthorized Third-Party Payment Fraud: The Federal Reserve proposes restructuring the section for debit, prepaid, and credit cards as described above. The Federal Reserve also proposes to add questions on fraudulent wire transfers originated. The proposed section includes 23 questions compared with 12 questions in the current survey, for a net increase of 11 questions.

FR 3066b. Proposed changes include the introduction of four new surveys and broad changes to the existing surveys to account for the greater need for payments fraud-prevention, and security information, new developments in payment technology, and adjustments that reflect lessons learned from the previous information collection.

The Federal Reserve proposes to add new surveys to cover ATM networks and ATM processors, in response to demand for richer information about developments in the ATM industry. In addition, the Federal Reserve added a new transit system operator survey that would be sent to such participants in place of the private-label prepaid card processor and issuer survey. This survey is designed to be easier to understand and more consistent with standard reports of organizations that operate transit systems. Similarly, the Federal Reserve added an electronic benefits transfer (EBT) processor survey which would be sent to organizations that contract with the government to administer such programs in place of the private-label prepaid card issuer and processor survey.

The Federal Reserve proposes including new questions in each of the new and existing surveys on the number and value of fraudulent transactions. The new questions would request fraud transactions by type of fraud using established issuer-reported categories, such as lost card, stolen card, counterfeit card, and stolen card data. Fraud transactions would also be allocated by card entry mode and card verification methods in parallel to the allocations requested for transactions. Where appropriate, the Federal Reserve proposes to request information on issued cards and payment device acceptance terminals associated with reported payment volumes.

Transaction value distributions in the current surveys contained only one value category above $50, overlooking a significant portion of transactions in some cases. The Federal Reserve proposes to revise distributions in the surveys to include breakouts above $50 to better reflect higher-value transactions. For the credit card surveys, the new higher-value transaction categories would include two new categories to obtain $50-$99.99, $100-$499.99, and $500 and above. Transaction value distributions in other surveys would be tailored to what is known from previously collected value-distribution information. For example, the bill payment surveys, which have much smaller proportions of lower-value transactions, would involve the introduction of a richer set of higher-value categories and the removal of lower-value categories.

The Federal Reserve also proposes that various stock variables, such as the number of cards, be reported as the average of monthly totals over the calendar year, replacing the reporting of stocks as of December 31 as requested in the current surveys.

Additional proposed revisions to the surveys contained in the FR 3066b are as follows:

1. General-Purpose Card Network Surveys, (credit card, debit card, and prepaid card): The Federal Reserve proposes restructuring all the card network surveys to better match established categories by which card networks track transactions. In particular, person-present card transactions will be tracked by entry mode (*e.g.* whether a contact or contactless chip card, card with no chip, or a mobile device was used) and card verification method categories (*e.g.* signature, PIN, or remote authentication

method). Remote transactions would be allocated into several categories, including mail-order/telephone-order purchase (MOTO), internet purchase, recurring, installment, and other categories. Internet purchase transactions would be further allocated into ''authenticated (two-factor authentication via 3–D Secure)'' and ''other'' categories. Card transactions by payee location would include an additional category of transactions made to U.S. payees with foreign cards. Respondents would also be asked to report the number of cards provisioned to a mobile wallet or token vault. The proposed credit card survey would include 118 questions compared with 54 in the current survey for a net increase of 64 questions. The proposed debit card survey would include 117 questions compared with 43 in the current survey for a net increase of 74 questions. The proposed prepaid card survey would include 117 questions compared with 40 in the current survey for a net increase of 77 questions.

2. Private-Label Credit Card Merchant Issuer Survey, Private-Label Credit Card Processor Survey, General-Purpose Prepaid Card Processor Survey, and Private-Label Prepaid Card Issuer and Processor Survey: Similar to card network surveys, the Federal Reserve proposes restructuring the transaction entry mode and card verification method categories to better reflect standard industry reports, but in less detail compared with the general purpose card networks. Proposed questions on fraud allocations would be similar, but simpler, as well. The proposed private-label credit card merchant issuer survey includes 69 questions compared with 36 in the current survey for a net increase of 33 questions. The proposed private-label credit card processor survey includes 69 questions compared with 35 in the current survey for a net increase of 34 questions. The proposed general-purpose prepaid card processor survey includes 94 questions compared with 59 in the current survey for a net increase of 35 questions. The proposed private-label prepaid card issuer and processor survey includes 76 questions compared with 48 in the current survey for a net increase of 28 questions.

3. Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) Card Processor Survey: EBT processors reported their volumes in the current private-label prepaid card issuer and processor survey. Transaction types in the proposed EBT survey would be broken down into the main types of EBT card programs and questions about types of credits and loads would not be included, making the reporting form more relevant for this group of processors. The proposed EBT card processor survey includes 74 questions compared with 48 in the current private-label prepaid card issuer and processor survey for a net increase of 26 questions.

4. Automated Teller Machine (ATM) Network and ATM Processor Surveys: The Federal Reserve proposes adding surveys regarding ATM transaction volumes, including cash withdrawals by debit, prepaid, and credit cards, deposits of cash or checks, and other general types of ATM transactions. Respondents would report the number of active and total ATMs and allocate them between those that accept chip cards and those that do not. Chip card acceptance terminals would be allocated between those that use contact and contactless chip-acceptance technology.

a. Automated Teller Machine Card Network Survey: Respondents would consist of the domestic ATM networks in the United States. Most respondents also operate general-purpose debit card networks. The proposed number of questions would be 24.

b. Automated Teller Machine Card Processor: Respondents would consist of independent service operators and ATM transaction processors. The proposed number of questions would be 24.

5. Alternative Payment Initiation Method Processor Surveys: The Federal Reserve proposes adding questions regarding fraudulent transactions and, where relevant, doing so by transaction type.

a. Person-to-Person (P2P) and Money Transfer Payment Survey: The Federal Reserve proposes adding new questions on fraud broken down by origination channel. The proposed number of questions would be 33 compared with 22 in the current survey, for a net increase of 11 questions.

b. Online Bill Payment Processor Survey: The Federal Reserve proposes adding new questions on the bill payment funding method broken down by type. Fraudulent transactions would be broken down by origination channel. The proposed number of questions would be 27 compared with 20 in the current survey, for a net increase of 7 questions.

c. Walk-In Bill Payment Processor Survey: The proposed number of questions would be 20 compared with 20 in the current survey, for a net increase of 0 questions.

d. Deferred Payment Processor Survey: The proposed number of questions would be 20 compared with 19 in the current survey, for a net increase of 1 question.

e. Private-Label ACH Debit Card Processor Survey: The Federal Reserve proposes adding a new question regarding the number of active cards. The proposed number of questions would be 18 compared with 21 in the current survey, for a net decrease of 3 questions.

f. Far-field RFID Payment Processor Survey: The proposed number of questions would be 15 compared with 16 in the current survey, for a net decrease of 1 question.

g. Secure Online Payment Processor Survey: Processors would report secure online payment transactions in 2015, broken down into types. The proposed number of questions would be 16 compared with 13 in the current survey, for a net increase of 3 questions.

h. Mobile Wallet Processor Survey: The Federal Reserve proposes adding new questions regarding the number of active and total cards provisioned to the mobile wallet. The proposed number of questions would be 17 compared with 8 in the current survey, for a net increase of 9 questions.

Unlike the FR 3066a, the FR 3066b is designed as a census. The project team would work with a contractor to identify the final list of networks, processors, and issuers from which to collect data. Estimation of national aggregate payment volumes from the survey is based on developing a complete population frame of all relevant organizations and requesting data from each. The survey would be broken up into parts and respondents would only provide information in the sections of the survey applicable to their organizations. In cases where a response is not returned, the missing items would need to be imputed using publically available information and analysis of data from similar organizations that did provide data.

FR 3066c. The FR 3066c would conduct a survey that in past FRPS surveys was referred to as the Check Sample Study (CSS). Versions of the CSS were conducted in four out of five FRPS, including the first and last. The survey instrument design could be modified slightly, but is expected to be very similar to the instrument used in 2013. More importantly, the data collection method may be revised based on proposals received through a competitive bidding process. As noted above, check samples from Reserve Bank processing may be included. The Federal Reserve has developed a low-cost random sampling process. The Federal Reserve proposes that the decision on what approach to use for this survey would be based on an evaluation of the proposals received.

FR *3066d.* The Federal Reserve may conduct the ad-hoc Retail Payments Survey Supplement up to one time per year to collect information on specific issues that affect its decision making. The survey topics discussed with the respondents are often time sensitive and the questions of interest may vary with the focus of the survey. Because the relevant questions change with each survey, there is no fixed reporting form. For each survey, the Federal Reserve prepares questions of specific topical interest and then determines the relevant target group to contact. The principal value of the FR 3066d is the flexibility it provides the Federal Reserve to respond quickly to the need for data as new developments occur in the retail payment area. One area of interest pertains to new methods of collecting and aggregating fraud data that help to identify important trends as they emerge. Other topics covered by the FR 3066d may include payments security, speed, efficiency, and other topics that help to explain payment trends and support the Federal Reserve's role in the payments system.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, November 20, 2015.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2015–30016 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Proposed Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SUMMARY: On June 15, 1984, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) delegated to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) its approval authority under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), to approve of and assign OMB numbers to collection of information requests and requirements conducted or sponsored by the Board. Board-approved collections of information are incorporated into the official OMB inventory of currently approved collections of information. Copies of the PRA Submission, supporting statements and approved collection of information instruments are placed into OMB's public docket files. The Federal Reserve may not conduct or sponsor, and the respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection that has been extended, revised, or implemented on or after October 1, 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB number.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by *CAC Application* by any of the following methods:

- Agency Web site: *http://www.federalreserve.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/foia/proposedregs.aspx.*
- Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- Email: *regs.comments@federalreserve.gov.* Include OMB number in the subject line of the message.
- FAX: (202) 452–3819 or (202) 452–3102.
- Mail: Robert deV. Frierson, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20551.

All public comments are available from the Board's Web site at *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/foia/proposedregs.aspx* as submitted, unless modified for technical reasons. Accordingly, your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information. Public comments may also be viewed electronically or in paper form in Room 3515, 1801 K Street (between 18th and 19th Streets NW.) Washington, DC 20006 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

Additionally, commenters may send a copy of their comments to the OMB Desk Officer—Shagufta Ahmed—Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–6974.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the PRA OMB submission, including the proposed reporting form and instructions, supporting statement, and other documentation will be placed into OMB's public docket files, once approved. These documents will also be made available on the Federal Reserve Board's public Web site at: *http://www.federalreserve.gov/apps/reportforms/review.aspx* or may be requested from the agency clearance officer, whose name appears below.

Federal Reserve Board Clearance Officer—Nuha Elmaghrabi—Office of the Chief Data Officer, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551 (202) 452–3829. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) users may contact (202) 263–4869, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comment on Information Collection Proposal

The following information collection, which is being handled under this delegated authority, has received initial Board approval and is hereby published for comment. At the end of the comment period, the proposed information collection, along with an analysis of comments and recommendations received, will be submitted to the Board for final approval under OMB delegated authority. Comments are invited on the following:

a. Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the Federal Reserve's functions, including whether the information has practical utility;

b. The accuracy of the Federal Reserve's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

c. Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;

d. Ways to minimize the burden of information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and

e. Estimates of capital or start up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

Proposal to approve under OMB delegated authority the implementation of the following collection:

Collection title: Application for Membership for the Community Advisory Council.

Agency form number: FR 1401.

OMB control number: 7100-to be assigned.

Frequency: Annual.

Reporters: Persons seeking to be considered for Community Advisory Council (CAC) membership.

Estimated annual reporting hours: 1,100 hours.

Estimated average hours per response: 1 hour.

Estimated number of respondents: 1,100.

General description of information collection: The CAC Application is required to obtain a benefit and is authorized pursuant to the Federal Reserve's general authority to establish the CAC, which is derived from sections 2A and 12A of the Federal Reserve Act which generally authorize the Board to collect information to facilitate these statutory mandates, as well as various consumer protection laws that the Board is authorized to implement and enforce, including the following:

- Community Reinvestment Act, (12 U.S.C. 2905);
- Competitive Equality Banking Act, (12 U.S.C. 3806);
- Expedited Funds Availability Act, (12 U.S.C. 4008);
- Truth in Lending Act, (15 U.S.C. 1604);
- Fair Credit Reporting Act, (15 U.S.C. 1681s(e));
- Equal Credit Opportunity Act, (15 U.S.C. 1691b);
- Electronic Funds Transfer Act, (15 U.S.C. 1693b & 1693o-2);
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)); and
- Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 4012a).

Abstract: The CAC was established to provide information, advice, and recommendations to the Board on policy matters and issues affecting consumers and communities. The Application would be used to obtain information about the experience and qualification of persons seeking to be considered for CAC membership. The proposed Application for Membership would collect a candidate's contact information, current employment, areas of expertise, a resume, which typically includes information about employment history, education, and training, and a statement explaining why they are interested in serving on the CAC and what they believe are their primary qualifications. Candidates could voluntarily elect to provide additional information to support their application, such as copies of publications or letters of recommendation.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, November 19, 2015.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2015–29917 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Government in the Sunshine Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TIME AND DATE: 8:30 a.m. on Monday, November 30, 2015.

PLACE: Marriner S. Eccles Federal Reserve Board Building, 20th Street entrance between Constitution Avenue and C Streets NW., Washington, DC 20551.

STATUS: Open.

On the day of the meeting, you will be able to view the meeting via webcast from a link available on the Board's public Web site. *You do not need to register to view the webcast of the meeting.* A link to the meeting documentation will also be available approximately 20 minutes before the start of the meeting. Both links may be accessed from the Board's public Web site at *www.federalreserve.gov.*

If you plan to attend the open meeting in person, we ask that you notify us in advance and provide your name, date of birth, and social security number (SSN) or passport number. You may provide this information by calling 202–452–2474 or you may *register online.* You may pre-register until close of business on Friday, November 27, 2015. You also will be asked to provide identifying information, including a photo ID, before being admitted to the Board meeting. The Public Affairs Office must approve the use of cameras; please call 202–452–2955 for further information. If you need an accommodation for a disability, please contact Penelope Beattie on 202–452–3982. For the hearing impaired only, please use the Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD) on 202–263–4869.

Privacy Act Notice: The information you provide will be used to assist us in prescreening you to ensure the security of the Board's premises and personnel. In order to do this, we may disclose your information consistent with the routine uses listed in the Privacy Act Notice for BGFRS–32, including to appropriate federal, state, local, or foreign agencies where disclosure is reasonably necessary to determine whether you pose a security risk or where the security or confidentiality of your information has been compromised. We are authorized to collect your information by 12 U.S.C §§ 243 and 248, and Executive Order 9397. In accordance with Executive Order 9397, we collect your SSN so that we can keep accurate records, because other people may have the same name and birth date. In addition, we use your SSN when we make requests for information about you from law enforcement and other regulatory agency databases. Furnishing the information requested is voluntary; however, your failure to provide any of the information requested may result in disapproval of your request for access to the Board's premises. You may be subject to a fine or imprisonment under 18 U.S.C § 1001 for any false statements you make in your request to enter the Board's premises.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Discussion Agenda

1. Implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act amendments to the emergency lending authority under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act.

Notes: 1. The staff memo to the Board will be made available to attendees on the day of the meeting in paper and the background material will be made available on a compact disc (CD). If you require a paper copy of the entire document, please call Penelope Beattie on 202–452–3982. The documentation will not be available until about 20 minutes before the start of the meeting.

2. This meeting will be recorded for the benefit of those unable to attend. The webcast recording and a transcript of the meeting will be available after the meeting on the Board's public Web site *http://www.federalreserve.gov/aboutthefed/boardmeetings/* or if you prefer, a CD recording of the meeting will be available for listening in the Board's Freedom of Information Office, and copies can be ordered for $4 per disc by calling 202–452–3684 or by writing to: Freedom of Information Office, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT: Michelle Smith, Director, or Dave Skidmore, Assistant to the Board, Office of Board Members at 202–452–2955.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: You may access the Board's public Web site at *www.federalreserve.gov* for an electronic announcement. (The Web site also includes procedural and other information about the open meeting.)

Dated: November 23, 2015.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2015–30167 Filed 11–23–15; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority

Part C (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) of the Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegations of Authority of the Department of Health and Human Services (45 FR 67772–76, dated October 14, 1980, and corrected at 45 FR 69296, October 20, 1980, as amended most recently at 80 FR 5874–58485, dated September 29, 2015) is amended to reflect the reorganization of the Division of Global Health Protection, Center for Global Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Section C–B, Organization and Functions, is hereby amended as follows:

Delete in its entirety the title and the mission and function statements for the *Division of Global Health Protection (CWL)* and insert the following:

Division of Global Health Protection (CWL). The Division of Global Health Protection (DGHP) protects the health and well-being of Americans and populations around the world. DGHP builds public health capacity in countries and international settings to prevent disease, disability, and death from communicable and noncommunicable diseases (NCDs). DGHP helps to ensure global health protection and security through supporting the implementation of the International Health Regulations (IHR); developing and supporting in-country programs including Global Health Security (GHS) programs, Global Disease Detection (GDD) Centers, Field Epidemiology Training Programs (FETPs), and National Public Health Institutes (NPHIs); detecting emerging health threats; advancing NCD prevention and control; and by preparing for and responding to public health emergencies. DGHP works with partners to build strong, transparent, sustained public health systems through training, consultation, capacity building, and technical assistance in applied epidemiology, public health surveillance, policy development, informatics and health information systems, evaluation, operational and implementation research, and laboratory systems. Specifically, it: (1) Provides country-based and international coordination for disease detection, IHR implementation and public health emergency response; (2) leads the agency's global efforts to address the public health emergency continuum from prevention to detection to response through post-emergency health systems recovery; (3) provides epidemic intelligence and response capacity for early warning about international disease threats, and coordinates with partners throughout the U.S. government (USG) as well as international partners to provide rapid response; (4) provides resources and assists in developing country-level epidemiology, laboratory and other capacity to ensure country emergency preparedness and response to outbreaks and incidents of local and international importance; (5) in coordination and communication with other CDC Centers, Institute, or Offices (CIOs), leads CDC activities on global NCDs; and (6) collaborates with other divisions in CDC, Federal agencies, international agencies, partner countries and non-governmental organizations assisting Ministries of Health (MoHs) to build public health capacity for addressing communicable diseases and NCDs.

Office of the Director (CWL1). The DGHP Office of the Director (OD) provides leadership, management, and oversight for all division activities. Specifically, it: (1) Develops the division's overall strategy and division policies on planning, evaluation, management and operations; (2) provides coordination of budgeting and liaison with the Center for Global Health (CGH) and the Office of Financial Resources (OFR) on budget development and execution; (3) ensures that CGH strategies are executed by the division and aligned with overall CDC goals; (4) ensures division activities in the field are well coordinated with the CDC Country Office and supports a ''one-CDC'' approach at the country level; (5) ensures scientific quality, ethics and regulatory compliance; (6) evaluates strategies, focus, and prioritization of branch research, program and budget activities; (7) coordinates division policy and communication activities; (8) develops and promotes partnerships with both national and international organizations, including other USG agencies, in support of division activities; (9) ensures coordination of the division's overall activities within the division as well as with subject matter experts across CDC; (10) fosters an integrated and collaborative approach to research, program, and policy activities; (11) provides scientific leadership within the division on the evaluation of high impact global health protection strategies and the dissemination of data on these strategies; (12) facilitates CDC headquarters and international human resources activities including recruitment, hiring, orienting, deploying, and assisting with relocation of qualified staff; (13) provides workforce management and career development services for headquarters and international staff; (14) serves as CDC's lead for supporting and facilitating CDC's response to international outbreaks; (15) develops and implements in coordination with other CDC CIOs and USG partners, information technology solutions for emergency preparedness information management, surveillance, and executive decision support to enhance the effectiveness of public health emergency detection and response around the globe; (16) coordinates international aspects of CDC's public health preparedness and emergency response activities in collaboration with the Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response (OPHPR) and other CDC organizational units involved in chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear hazard preparedness and emergency response activities; and (17) provides early warning on disease threats via CDC's event based surveillance and other epidemic intelligence activities conducted in partnership with USG agencies, WHO, MoHs, and other international and public health and security partners to assure IHR compliance.

Emergency Response and Recovery Branch (CWLB). The Emergency Response and Recovery Branch applies public health and epidemiologic science to mitigate the impact of disasters, complex humanitarian emergencies, and other emergencies on populations and to support the recovery of health systems in these settings. Specifically, it: (1) Coordinates, supervises, and monitors CDC's work in international emergency settings and in refugee or displaced populations in collaboration with other USG agencies (*e.g.,* Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance and Department of State), United Nations agencies, and non-governmental organizations; (2) provides direct technical assistance to refugees, internally displaced persons, and emergency-affected populations in the field, focusing on rapid health and nutrition assessments, public health surveillance, assessment of public health threats and prioritization of public health interventions, epidemic investigations, communicable disease prevention and control, program implementation, and program evaluation; (3) develops and implements operational research projects aimed at developing the most effective public health interventions for populations in emergency settings; (4) plans, implements, and evaluates training courses and workshops to help strengthen CDC technical capacity in emergency and post-emergency public health, as well as that of other USG agencies, international, non-governmental and other organizations, and schools of public health; (5) develops technical guidelines on public health issues associated with international complex humanitarian emergencies; (6) serves as the CDC liaison to maintain strong working relationships with other international, bilateral, and non-governmental relief organizations involved with humanitarian emergencies; (7) aids in health systems recovery after acute or

protracted emergencies; (8) maintains a Global Rapid Response Team to enhance CDC's emergency response capacity and strengthen the global emergency workforce; (9) leads CGH's global water, sanitation and hygiene programs; and (10) coordinates and serves as the lead for emergency preparedness activities related to development of emergency operations centers with subject matter expertise from OPHPR.

Workforce and Institute Development Branch (CWLC). The Workforce and Institute Development Branch collaborates with MoHs and other partners to strengthen public health systems through human and institutional capacity development. Specifically, it: (1) Leads the agency in working with MoHs to determine institutional and manpower needs for capacity in field epidemiology, surveillance, public health management, and other essential public health functions, operations and services; (2) designs, implements, and evaluates long-term career development programs in field epidemiology, public health management, and related disciplines for district, regional, and national health agencies; (3) plans, implements, coordinates, supports, and evaluates the FETP and Improving Public Health Management for Actions (IMPACT) program in partnership with MoHs and CDC Country Offices; (4) plans, supports, implements and coordinates the training and capacity building needs for specific programs such as high-impact diseases (HIV, TB, malaria), NCDs, one health, and laboratory capacity building; (5) sustains international, regional, and global networks of FETP and IMPACT programs and graduates; (6) provides CDC leadership on the establishment and strengthening of NPHIs worldwide; (7) engages subject matter experts to provide technical assistance targeted to NPHI priorities; and (8) develops tools to measure NPHI needs and assess progress in NPHI development.

Epidemiology, Informatics, Surveillance and Lab Branch (CWLD). The Epidemiology, Informatics, Surveillance, and Lab Branch provides scientific leadership in epidemiology, informatics, surveillance, and laboratory capacity. Specifically, it: (1) Provides leadership, guidance, and technical assistance support and resources for global infectious disease surveillance, applied epidemiology, informatics, and laboratory research; (2) provides resources and assists in developing country-level epidemiologic, informatics, surveillance, laboratory, and other capacity to ensure country emergency preparedness and response to outbreaks and incidents of local and international interest; (3) provides program support, resources, and technical assistance to GDD Centers and other programs; (4) coordinates and supports research and other scientific projects to estimate disease burden and assess disease prevention interventions; (5) in collaboration and coordination with CIO partners, supports and facilitates emerging infectious disease detection and response, pandemic influenza preparedness, zoonotic disease investigation, laboratory system strengthening and biosafety, and other global health protection activities; (6) in collaboration with subject matter experts and with public and private sector laboratory organizations, provides technical assistance, consultation and training to CDC country offices and other international partners to develop and maintain international public health laboratories; (7) in collaboration with other divisions and CIOs, defines and promotes public health laboratory quality standards and practices; (8) develops and conducts training to facilitate timely transfer of newly emerging laboratory, informatics and other technology; (9) coordinates CDC's support to WHO's Integrated Disease Surveillance and Response strategy; (10) conducts surveillance activities in overseas sites to serve as early warning detection platforms for disease outbreaks; and (11) serves as a principal point of coordination for USG interagency partners involved in international disease surveillance and situational awareness activities.

Country Strategy and Implementation Branch (CWLE). The Country Strategy and Implementation Branch drives progress on country planning and DGHP program implementation in collaboration with CDC in-country offices. Specifically, it: (1) Serves as DGHP's principal country experts and drives DGHP strategy for each country; (2) facilitates regional and country level program and budget planning; (3) serves as a resource for country point-of-contacts for questions regarding in-country activities and dynamics and management of budgets and cooperative agreements; (4) serves as the WHO Collaborating Center for Implementation of National IHR Surveillance and Response Capacities; (5) provides leadership and coordination of CDC's relationships with WHO for IHR international capacity development activities; (6) in the context of IHR, assesses, coordinates, implements, and measures the effectiveness of international public health preparedness activities in partnership with WHO, MoHs, and USG security, development, and disaster response agencies; (7) manages the implementation of CDC's GHS program and ensures that CDC's activities align with interagency goals and partner country priorities; (8) leads development of integrated country plans and budgets in collaboration with all DGHP branches and programs, such as GDD and FETP, and CDC-wide experts; (9) provides operations support to facilitate effective delivery of DGHP programs; (10) serves as a key linkage between DGHP headquarters and DGHP country offices coordinating calls and liaising with interagency and intra-agency partners; (11) manages CDC's relationships and develops partnerships with USG security (*e.g.,* National Security Council, Department of Defense, Department of State) and development agencies (*e.g.,* USAID) engaged in GHS activities; (12) develops strategies to improve the technical skills and problem-solving abilities of country program managers and locally employed staff who work in the management and operations area; (13) provides short term and long-term consultation and technical assistance for management and operations issues to DGHP country offices; and (14) provides long-term management and operations support for smaller countries.

Global Noncommunicable Disease Branch (CWLG). The Global Noncommunicable Disease Branch collaborates with partners to provide vision and direction to prevent premature deaths and disabilities due to NCDs, injuries, and environmental health hazards. Specifically, it: (1) Strengthens surveillance, monitoring, evaluation, and information systems to prevent and control global NCDs, injuries, and environmental health hazards; (2) expands the evidence base, and develops and disseminates technical packages, about effective prevention and control interventions; (3) enhances workforce capacity for integrated, systematic training and technical exchange on global NCDs, injuries, and environmental health hazards; (4) leverages external partnerships and resources; (5) liaises and coordinates with other CDC CIOs engaged in global NCD activities and supports CDC's technical expertise to advance global NCD priorities; and (6) increases NCD awareness and support through strategic communication outreach.

Overseas Business Operations Branch (CWLH). The Overseas Business Operations Branch oversees management and operations activities in

support of DGHP country offices. Specifically, it: (1) Coordinates all DGHP procurement and extramural activities in compliance with federal appropriations law, congressional intent, and global health policies; (2) facilitates and manages the development, clearance, and award of all new and ongoing DGHP field grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts; (3) provides technical assistance and guidance to country offices and DGHP branches on budget and extramural issues including assisting programs in determining the appropriate funding mechanism to support DGHP activities; (4) provides training and tools to DGHP country programs to improve budget and cooperative agreement management; (5) manages DGHP country budgets including conducting budget planning exercises, spend plan development and reporting, annual close-out processes, and analyses to inform country planning; (6) provides funding and budgetary data for regular reports including HHS and OMB reports, GAO and IG audits, country program reviews, and other requests for data; (7) liaises and collaborates with CDC financial and procurement-related units and offices including OFR and the Information Technology Services Office; (8) collaborates with other DGHP branches, other CDC and HHS programs and offices, other USG agencies, and other national and international organizations on overseas management and operations priorities; (9) develops strategies to improve the technical skills and problem-solving abilities of country program managers and locally employed staff who work in the budget and finance area; (10) provides short-term and long-term consultation and technical assistance for management and operations issues to DGHP country offices; (11) facilitates overseas purchasing and property management activities; (12) monitors risk management of country operations and extramural awards; (13) oversees property, facilities, motor pool, and records management; and (14) coordinates other logistics needs for DGHP overseas operations.

James Seligman,

Acting Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2015–29914 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[30Day–16–15AUJ]

Agency Forms Undergoing Paperwork Reduction Act Review

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The notice for the proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address any of the following: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses; and (e) Assess information collection costs.

To request additional information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the information collection plan and instruments, call (404) 639–7570 or send an email to *omb@cdc.gov.* Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice should be directed to the Attention: CDC Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 or by fax to (202) 395–5806. Written comments should be received within 30 days of this notice.

Proposed Project

Paul Coverdell National Acute Stroke Program (PCNASP)—New—National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (NCCDPHP), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Background and Brief Description

Stroke is the fifth leading cause of death in the United States and results in approximately 130,000 deaths per year. Stroke outcomes depend upon the rapid recognition of signs and symptoms of stroke, prompt transport to a treatment facility, and early rehabilitation. Improving outcomes requires a coordinated systems approach involving pre-hospital care, emergency department and hospital care, rehabilitation, prevention of complications, and ongoing secondary prevention.

Through the Paul Coverdell National Acute Stroke Program (PCNASP), CDC has been continuously working to measure and improve acute stroke care using well-known quality improvement strategies coupled with frequent evaluation of results. PCNASP awardees are state health departments who work with participating hospitals and EMS agencies in their jurisdictions to improve quality of care for stroke patients.

Nine awardees were funded under five-year cooperative agreements effective July 1, 2015. Awardees and their selected hospital partners will systematically collect and report data on stroke care data across the continuum of care which includes pre-hospital (EMS), in-hospital, and post-hospital phases of care. In addition, PCNASP awardees will also request information from hospitals that admit and treat stroke patients in awardees' jurisdictions. This information is needed to understand the capacity and infrastructure of the systems for acute stroke care.

Hospitals will transmit pre-hospital and post-hospital information to their awardee quarterly. The average burden per response is 15 minutes for pre-hospital and post-hospital information transmission. There is no burden for hospitals to transmit in-hospital data, because awardees use their own processes to extract in-hospital data from hospitals' electronic systems. Each hospital will collect and transmit hospital inventory information to its PCNASP awardee annually. This average burden per response is 30 minutes.

The average burden per response for awardees to transmit pre-hospital, in-hospital, and post-hospital data to CDC will vary between 30–90 minutes. The burden will be 30 minutes each for independent submission of information relating to the pre-hospital, in-hospital, and post-hospital phases of patient care. Alternatively, the burden will be 90 minutes for awardees who transmit pre-, in-, and post-hospital data as one

combined file. CDC accepts file transmissions as individual phases or combined. In addition, each PCNASP awardee will prepare an annual aggregate hospital inventory file for transmission to CDC. The average burden of reporting hospital inventory information for each PCNASP awardee is eight hours per response.

All patient, hospital, and EMS provider data that is submitted to CDC by PCNASP awardees will be de-identified and occur through secure data systems. Proposed data elements and quality indicators may be updated over time to include new or revised items based on evolving recommendations and standards in the field to improve the quality of stroke care.

OMB approval is requested for three years. Participation is voluntary and there are no costs to respondents other than their time. The total estimated annualized burden hours are 382.

ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Type of respondent	Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden per response (in hours)
PCNASP Hospital Partners	Pre-hospital quality of care data	78	4	15/60
	Post-hospital quality of care data	20	4	15/60
	Hospital inventory data	315	1	30/60
PCNASP Awardee	Pre-hospital quality of care data	9	4	30/60
	In-hospital quality of care data	9	4	30/60
	Post-hospital quality of care data	9	4	30/60
	Hospital inventory data	9	1	8

Leroy A. Richardson,

Chief, Information Collection Review Office, Office of Scientific Integrity, Office of the Associate Director for Science, Office of the Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2015–30061 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2015–P–1153]

Determination That TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (Acetaminophen With Codeine Phosphate) Oral Tablets, 325 Milligrams/7.5 Milligrams, 325 Milligrams/15 Milligrams, 325 Milligrams/30 Milligrams, and 325 Milligrams/60 Milligrams, Were Not Withdrawn From Sale for Reasons of Safety or Effectiveness

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) has determined that TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 milligrams (mg)/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, were not withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness. This determination will allow FDA to approve abbreviated new drug applications (ANDAs) for TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, if all other legal and regulatory requirements are met.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jane Baluss, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 51, Rm. 6278, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 301–796–3469.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1984, Congress enacted the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (Pub. L. 98–417) (the 1984 amendments), which authorized the approval of duplicate versions of drug products under an ANDA procedure. ANDA applicants must, with certain exceptions, show that the drug for which they are seeking approval contains the same active ingredient in the same strength and dosage form as the ''listed drug,'' which is a version of the drug that was previously approved. ANDA applicants do not have to repeat the extensive clinical testing otherwise necessary to gain approval of a new drug application (NDA).

The 1984 amendments include what is now section 505(j)(7) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)), which requires FDA to publish a list of all approved drugs. FDA publishes this list as part of the ''Approved Drug Products With Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations,'' which is known generally as the ''Orange Book.'' Under FDA regulations, drugs are removed from the list if the Agency withdraws or suspends approval of the drug's NDA or ANDA for reasons of safety or effectiveness or if FDA determines that the listed drug was withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness (21 CFR 314.162).

A person may petition the Agency to determine, or the Agency may determine on its own initiative, whether a listed drug was withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness. This determination may be made at any time after the drug has been withdrawn from sale, but must be made prior to approving an ANDA that refers to the listed drug (§ 314.161 (21 CFR 314.161)). FDA may not approve an ANDA that does not refer to a listed drug.

TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, are the subject of ANDA 85–056 held by McNeil Ortho Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and were initially approved July 9, 1976. TYLENOL WITH CODEINE is indicated for the relief of mild to moderately severe pain.

In a letter dated January 26, 1993, McNeil Ortho Pharmaceuticals, Inc. notified FDA that TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, were being discontinued, and FDA moved the drug product to the ''Discontinued Drug Product List'' section of the Orange Book.

Lachman Consultant Services, Inc. submitted a citizen petition dated April 7, 2015 (Docket No. FDA–2015–P–1153), under 21 CFR 10.30, requesting that the Agency determine whether TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, were withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness.

After considering the citizen petition and reviewing Agency records and based on the information we have at this time, FDA has determined under § 314.161 that TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, were not withdrawn for reasons of safety or effectiveness. The petitioner has identified no data or other information suggesting that TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, were withdrawn for reasons of safety or effectiveness. We have carefully reviewed our files for records concerning the withdrawal of TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, from sale. We have also independently evaluated relevant literature and data for possible postmarketing adverse events. We have reviewed the available evidence and determined that the product was not withdrawn from sale for reasons of safety or effectiveness.

Accordingly, the Agency will continue to list TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, in the ''Discontinued Drug Product List'' section of the Orange Book. The ''Discontinued Drug Product List'' delineates, among other items, drug products that have been discontinued from marketing for reasons other than safety or effectiveness. ANDAs that refer to TYLENOL WITH CODEINE (acetaminophen with codeine phosphate) oral tablets, 325 mg/7.5 mg, 325 mg/15 mg, 325 mg/30 mg, and 325 mg/60 mg, may be approved by the Agency as long as they meet all other legal and regulatory requirements for the approval of ANDAs. If FDA determines that labeling for this drug product should be revised to meet current standards, the Agency will advise ANDA applicants to submit such labeling.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–30051 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2012–D–1197]

Certification Process for Designated Medical Gases; Revised Draft Guidance for Industry; Availability

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) is announcing the availability of a revised draft guidance for industry entitled ''Certification Process for Designated Medical Gases.'' The original version of this draft guidance was published by FDA on December 18, 2012. The revised draft guidance, like the original version, describes the certification process created by the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA) for certain medical gases and explains how FDA plans to implement that process. In response to comments received, we have revised the draft guidance and are reissuing it in draft form to enable the public to review and comment before it is finalized.

DATES: Although you can comment on any guidance at any time (see 21 CFR 10.115(g)(5)), to ensure that the Agency considers your comment on this draft guidance before it begins work on the final version of the guidance, submit either electronic or written comments on the draft guidance by January 25, 2016. Submit either electronic or written comments concerning the collection of information proposed in the draft guidance and attached Form 3864 by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*
- If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

- Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions): Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.
- For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2012–D–1197 for ''Certification Process for Designated Medical Gases; Revised Draft Guidance for Industry; Availability.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.'' The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any

information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

Submit written requests for single copies of this revised draft guidance to the Division of Drug Information, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10001 New Hampshire Ave., Hillandale Building, 4th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002; or the Communications Staff (HFV–12), Center for Veterinary Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, 7519 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855. Send one self-addressed adhesive label to assist that office in processing your requests. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for electronic access to the revised draft guidance document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Folkendt, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 301–796–1900; or Germaine Connolly, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–116), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 240–276–8331.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In the **Federal Register** of December 18, 2012 (77 FR 74852), FDA announced the availability of a draft guidance for industry entitled ''Certification Process for Designated Medical Gases.'' This guidance was intended to help persons or entities interested in requesting certification of a designated medical gas under the approval process for designated medical gases created by the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA) (Pub. L. 112–144).

Title XI, subtitle B, of FDASIA added sections 575 and 576 to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 360ddd and 360ddd-1), which created a certification process for designated medical gases. Specifically, section 575 of the FD&C Act provides that oxygen, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, carbon dioxide, helium, carbon monoxide, and medical air are designated medical gases. Section 576 of the FD&C Act permits any person, beginning on January 5, 2013, to request certification of a medical gas for certain indications and describes when FDA will grant or deny these requests. The December 2012 draft guidance explained how FDA planned to implement this new certification process. Specifically, the December 2012 draft guidance described the medical gases that are eligible for certification, who should submit a certification request, what information should be submitted, and how FDA will evaluate and act on the request. The December 2012 draft guidance also described how the new certification requirement will be enforced. Finally, the draft guidance included a draft certification request form (Form FDA 3864) and form instructions.

This notice announces the availability of a revised draft guidance. In response to comments received, we have revised the discussions of labeling for final use containers (see section II of the revised draft guidance) and documentation by a person or entity that markets a designated medical gas but is not the original manufacturer or marketer of the gas (see section VI of the revised draft guidance). The December 2012 draft guidance also contained a detailed implementation timeline, which has been removed in this revised version because the dates listed in the implementation timeline have all passed. FDA has also made small revisions to improve readability and address minor technical issues. We have not made any changes to the draft certification request form (Form FDA 3864) and form instructions that were attached to the 2012 draft guidance and are attached to this revised guidance. The revised guidance is being reissued in draft form to enable the public to review and comment before it is finalized.

This revised draft guidance is being issued consistent with FDA's good guidance practices regulation (21 CFR 10.115). This revised draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the current thinking of FDA on the certification process for designated medical gases. It does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations.

II. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520) (the PRA), Federal Agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. ''Collection of information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and includes Agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)) requires Federal Agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, FDA is publishing notice of the proposed collection of information set forth in this document.

With respect to the collection of information associated with this draft guidance, FDA invites comments on these topics: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of FDA's functions, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of FDA's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology.

Title: Certification Process for Designated Medical Gas.

Description of Respondents: Respondents to this collection of information are original manufacturers and/or marketers and downstream manufacturers and/or marketers of certain medical gas drug products.

Burden Estimate: Under section 576 of the FD&C Act and as explained in the revised draft guidance, the following information would be submitted to FDA by a person requesting certification of a designated medical gas product: A description of the medical gas for which certification is sought; the requestor's name, address, and other contact information; the name, address, and other contact information of the manufacturing facilities involved in the production of the gas; and certain affirmations that the gas meets applicable compendial standards and

that the product is manufactured in accordance with current good manufacturing practice. Requestors should make certification requests using Form FDA 3864 and include a cover letter explaining the nature of the submission (as explained in the Instructions page to the form). In certain circumstances, FDA may ask followup questions if additional information is needed from the requestor to determine whether a medical gas qualifies for certification as a designated medical gas.

If the original information submitted in connection with a certification request becomes incomplete or inaccurate at any time, including after the request has been granted, the requestor should resubmit its certification request, submitting both a complete new form and a cover letter clearly explaining the purpose of the resubmission and highlighting the updated or corrected information. All updates or corrections to the information originally submitted (other than adding a new manufacturing facility) should be submitted in this manner. If the update or change involves adding a new manufacturing facility, requestors should notify FDA of the change by submitting a ''changes being effected'' supplement under § 314.70(c) (21 CFR 314.70(c)) or § 514.8(b)(3) (21 CFR 514.8(b)(3)). The requestor should also update its registration and listing information as needed.

As explained in the revised draft guidance, section 576 of the FD&C Act permits any person to file a request for certification of a medical gas as a designated medical gas for certain indications. Based on our records, 31 requesters (''number of respondents'' in table 1, row 1) submitted 63 certification requests (''total responses'' in table 1, row 1) during 2013. Based on our familiarity with the medical gas certification process, we estimate that preparing and submitting each certification request to FDA (for original submissions and resubmissions) takes approximately 2 hours per requestor (''average burden per response'' in table 1). This estimate includes the time that some requestors may need to reply to any followup questions by FDA. For subsequent years, we expect to receive approximately five certification requests annually (including any resubmissions) (''total responses'' in table 1, row 2). All certification requests include Form FDA 3864 together with a cover letter explaining the nature of the submission.

As stated previously, requestors should notify FDA of a change that adds a new manufacturing facility by submitting a ''changes being effected'' supplement under § 314.70(c) or § 514.8(b)(3). Other manufacturing changes, *e.g.,* a change in ownership or closure of a particular manufacturing facility, should be made in accordance with § 314.70 or § 514.8 as appropriate. FDA has OMB approval under control number 0910–0001 for the submission of manufacturing supplements under § 314.70. FDA has OMB approval under control number 0910–0032 for the submission of supplements for new animal drug applications under § 514.8. As described in the revised draft guidance, requestors should also update their registration and listing information as appropriate. FDA has OMB approval under control number 0910–0045 for the submission of registration and listing information under 21 CFR part 207.

As described in the revised draft guidance, a person or entity that markets a medical gas but is neither the original manufacturer nor the original marketer should verify and document that the gas they receive is from a certified source. Documentation should include the name of the original manufacturer(s) or marketer(s) as well the applicable new drug application number or numbers associated with the gas, and the information should be verified by reference to the FDA database ''Drugs@FDA.gov.'' Each downstream customer should obtain documentation from their immediate supplier. Proper certification by a supplier or suppliers should be verified initially for existing suppliers and for new suppliers as part of a vendor qualification process. Once a new vendor or existing supplier has been qualified initially and the certification of the gas or gases confirmed, this documentation can consist of an annual letter from the immediate supplier attesting or certifying that the gas was originally manufactured at one or more firms with granted certifications. Based on our knowledge of the medical gas marketplace, we estimate that approximately 4,000 persons or entities that market a medical gas (but are neither the original manufacturer nor the original marketer) (''number of recordkeepers'' in table 2) will document and record that the gas they receive is from a certified source. We estimate that each recordkeeper will maintain approximately three records per year (''number of records per recordkeeper'' in table 2). We also estimate that it will take approximately 15 minutes per record to obtain and review the documentation (''average burden per recordkeeping'' in table 2).

Furthermore, we estimate that 3,500 persons or entities (''number of respondents'' in table 3) will provide documentation of certification. We estimate that each responder will provide approximately five disclosures per year (''frequency of disclosure'' in table 3). Lastly, we estimate that it will take approximately 15 minutes per disclosure (''hours per disclosure'' in table 3). This burden estimate includes the time required to update the disclosure annually and to provide a letter, as described in the revised draft guidance, certifying that the gas was originally manufactured at one or more firms with granted certifications.

As stated in the revised draft guidance, section 576(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the FD&C Act provides that the labeling requirements at sections 503(b)(4) and 502(f) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)(4) and 352(f), respectively) are deemed to have been met for a designated medical gas if the labeling on final use containers for the medical gas bears: (1) The information required by section 503(b)(4); (2) a warning statement concerning the use of the medical gas as determined by the Secretary by regulation; and (3) appropriate directions and warnings concerning storage and handling. The revised draft guidance states that with regard to the warning statement referred to at section 576(a)(3)(A)(ii)(II) of the FD&C Act, a warning statement applicable to carbon dioxide, helium, and nitrous oxide can be found at § 201.161(a) (21 CFR 201.161(a)). However, no regulation sets forth warning statements for the other designated medical gases or for combinations of designated medical gases. The revised draft guidance states that in the absence of a regulation, FDA recommends that the labeling for final use containers containing nitrogen, medical air, carbon monoxide, or any medically appropriate combination of designated medical gases bear the warning statement set forth at § 201.161(a). The revised draft guidance also states that FDA recommends that the labeling for oxygen final use containers should convey that uninterrupted use of high concentrations of oxygen over a long duration, without monitoring its effect on oxygen content of arterial blood, may be harmful, and that oxygen should not be used on patients who have stopped breathing unless used in conjunction with resuscitative equipment. FDA estimates that approximately 4,000 persons or entities (as described in the revised draft guidance) (''number of respondents'' in table 3) will need to include the labeling information described in the revised draft guidance

on approximately 10,250 gas containers (''frequency of disclosure'' in table 3), resulting in approximately 41,000,000 labels (''total disclosures'' in table 3). FDA expects that the labeling information currently used by industry is already consistent with the recommendations in the revised draft guidance. As a result, FDA estimates that it will take each person or entity approximately 0.1 hours (''hours per disclosure'' in table 3) to review the information to ensure that their labeling is consistent with the revised draft guidance.

FDA estimates the information collection resulting from the revised draft guidance as follows:

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED REPORTING BURDEN[1]

Form FDA 3864 and other requested information	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total responses	Average burden per response (in hours)	Total hours
Certification Requests During the First Year	31	2.03	63	2	126
Certification Requests Annually After the First Year	5	1	5	2	10
Total					136

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED RECORDKEEPING BURDEN[1]

	Number of recordkeepers	Number of records per recordkeeper	Total records	Average burden per recordkeeping (in hours)	Total hours
Verification and documentation of certified sources by persons or entities who market a medical gas but are neither the original manufacturer nor the original marketer	4,000	3	12,000	0.25 (15 minutes)	3,000

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

TABLE 3—ESTIMATED ANNUAL THIRD-PARTY DISCLOSURE BURDEN[1]

	Number of respondents	Frequency of disclosure	Total disclosures	Hours per disclosure	Total hours
Providing documentation of certification	3,500	5	17,500	0.25 (15 minutes)	4,375
Labeling required under section 576(a)(3)(A)(ii) of the FD&C Act	4,000	10,250	41,000,000	0.1 (6 minutes)	4,100,000
Total					4,104,375

[1] There are no capital costs or operating and maintenance costs associated with this collection of information.

III. Electronic Access

Persons with access to the Internet may obtain the draft guidance at either *http://www.fda.gov/RegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm* or *http://www.regulations.gov*.

Dated: *November 19, 2015.*

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29989 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

[Docket No. FDA–2015–N–4166]

Public Meeting on Patient-Focused Drug Development for Psoriasis

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing a public meeting and an opportunity for public comment on Patient-Focused Drug Development for Psoriasis. Patient-Focused Drug Development is part of FDA's performance commitments made as part of the fifth authorization of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA V). The public meeting is intended to allow FDA to obtain patient perspectives on the impact of psoriasis, including on daily life and patient views on treatment approaches. FDA is interested in patients' perspectives for the types of psoriasis with primarily skin symptoms (such plaque psoriasis, nail psoriasis, guttate psoriasis, etc.), patient views on treatment approaches, and decision factors taken into account when selecting a treatment.

DATES: The public meeting will be held on March 17, 2016, from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Registration to attend the meeting must be received by March 10, 2016 (see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for instructions). Submit electronic or written comments to the public docket by May 17, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments as follows:

Electronic Submissions

Submit electronic comments in the following way:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments. Comments submitted electronically, including attachments, to *http://www.regulations.gov* will be posted to the docket unchanged. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for ensuring that your comment does not include any confidential information that you or a third party may not wish to be posted, such as medical information, your or anyone else's Social Security number, or confidential business information, such as a manufacturing process. Please note that if you include your name, contact information, or other information that identifies you in the body of your comments, that information will be posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.*
- If you want to submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made available to the public, submit the comment as a written/paper submission and in the manner detailed (see ''Written/Paper Submissions'' and ''Instructions'').

Written/Paper Submissions

Submit written/paper submissions as follows:

- Mail/Hand delivery/Courier (for written/paper submissions): Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.
- For written/paper comments submitted to the Division of Dockets Management, FDA will post your comment, as well as any attachments, except for information submitted, marked and identified, as confidential, if submitted as detailed in ''Instructions.''

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket No. FDA–2013–N–0418 for ''An Evaluation of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act Workload Adjuster; Request for Comments.'' Received comments will be placed in the docket and, except for those submitted as ''Confidential Submissions,'' publicly viewable at *http://www.regulations.gov* or at the Division of Dockets Management between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- Confidential Submissions—To submit a comment with confidential information that you do not wish to be made publicly available, submit your comments only as a written/paper submission. You should submit two copies total. One copy will include the information you claim to be confidential with a heading or cover note that states ''THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION''. The Agency will review this copy, including the claimed confidential information, in its consideration of comments. The second copy, which will have the claimed confidential information redacted/blacked out, will be available for public viewing and posted on *http://www.regulations.gov.* Submit both copies to the Division of Dockets Management. If you do not wish your name and contact information to be made publicly available, you can provide this information on the cover sheet and not in the body of your comments and you must identify this information as ''confidential.'' Any information marked as ''confidential'' will not be disclosed except in accordance with 21 CFR 10.20 and other applicable disclosure law. For more information about FDA's posting of comments to public dockets, see 80 FR 56469, September 18, 2015, or access the information at: *http://www.fda.gov/regulatoryinformation/dockets/default.htm.*

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or the electronic and written/paper comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and insert the docket number, found in brackets in the heading of this document, into the ''Search'' box and follow the prompts and/or go to the Division of Dockets Management, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FDA will post the agenda approximately 5 days before the meeting at: *http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/UserFees/PrescriptionDrugUserFee/ucm470608.htm.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Meghana Chalasani, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 51, Rm. 1146, Silver Spring, MD 20993–0002, 240–402–6525, FAX: 301–847–8443, *Meghana.Chalasani@fda.hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on Patient-Focused Drug Development

FDA has selected psoriasis as the focus of a public meeting under Patient-Focused Drug Development, an initiative that involves obtaining a better understanding of patient perspectives on the severity of a disease and the available therapies for that condition. Patient-Focused Drug Development is being conducted to fulfill FDA performance commitments that are part of the reauthorization of the PDUFA under Title I of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA) (Pub. L. 112–144). The full set of performance commitments is available at *http://www.fda.gov/downloads/forindustry/userfees/prescriptiondruguserfee/ucm270412.pdf.*

FDA committed to obtain the patient perspective on at least 20 disease areas during the course of PDUFA V. For each disease area, the Agency is conducting a public meeting to discuss the disease and its impact on patients' daily lives, the types of treatment benefit that matter most to patients, and patients' perspectives on the adequacy of the available therapies. These meetings will include participation of FDA review divisions, the relevant patient communities, and other interested stakeholders.

On April 11, 2013, FDA published a notice in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 08441) announcing the disease areas for meetings in fiscal years (FYs) 2013–2015, the first 3 years of the 5-year PDUFA V time frame. The Agency used several criteria outlined in that notice to develop the list of disease areas. FDA obtained public comment on the Agency's proposed criteria and potential disease areas through a public docket and a public meeting that was convened on October 25, 2012. In selecting the set of disease areas, FDA carefully considered the public comments received and the perspectives of review divisions at FDA. FDA initiated a second public process for determining the disease areas for FY 2016–2017, and published a notice in the **Federal Register** on July 2, 2015, announcing the selection of eight disease areas. More information, including the list of disease areas and a general schedule of meetings, is posted at *http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/UserFees/PrescriptionDrugUserFee/ucm326192.htm.*

II. Public Meeting Information

A. Purpose and Scope of the Meeting

As part of Patient-Focused Drug Development, FDA will obtain patient and patient stakeholder input on the symptoms of psoriasis that matter most to patients and on current approaches to treating psoriasis. Psoriasis is a chronic, immune-mediated skin condition that is associated with both a physical and psychological burden. It is characterized by areas of red, thickened, scaling skin and may be accompanied by itching or soreness. While there is currently no cure, treatments for psoriasis include topical therapies such as corticosteroids

and vitamin D analogs, systemic drugs, biologic products, and phototherapy. FDA is interested in the perspectives of patients with psoriasis on (1) the impact of their skin disease, including the extent and location (*e.g.,* nail, palm, scalp, genital) of involvement, (2) treatment approaches, and (3) decision factors taken into account when selecting a treatment.

The questions that will be asked of patients and patient stakeholders at the meeting are listed in this section, organized by topic. For each topic, a brief initial patient panel discussion will begin the dialogue. This will be followed by a facilitated discussion inviting comments from other patient and patient stakeholder participants. In addition to input generated through this public meeting, FDA is interested in receiving patient input addressing these questions through written comments, which can be submitted to the public docket (see **ADDRESSES**).

Topic 1: Disease Symptoms and Daily Impacts That Matter Most to Patients

(1) Of all the symptoms that you experience because of your condition, which one to three symptoms have the most significant impact on your life? (Examples may include red, thickened, scaling skin, itching, burning, or soreness, etc.)

(2) Are there specific activities that are important to you but that you cannot do at all or as fully as you would like because of your condition? (Examples of activities may include sleeping through the night, daily hygiene, participation in sports or social activities, intimacy with a spouse or partner, etc.)

(3) How do your symptoms and their negative impacts affect your daily life on the best days? On the worst days?

(4) How have your condition and its symptoms changed over time?

(a) Would you define your condition today as being well managed?

(5) What worries you most about your condition?

Topic 2: Patients' Perspectives on Current Approaches to Treatment

(1) What are you currently doing to help treat your condition or its symptoms? (Examples may include prescription medicines, over-the-counter products, phototherapy, and other therapies including non-drug therapies such as diet modification.)

(a) How has your treatment regimen changed over time, and why?

(2) How well does your current treatment regimen control your condition?

(a) How well do your treatments address specific skin symptoms? Which symptoms are not addressed as well?

(b) How well have these treatments worked for you as your condition has changed over time?

(3) What are the most significant downsides to your current treatments, and how do they affect your daily life? (Examples of downsides may include going to the hospital or clinic for treatment, time devoted to treatment, etc.)

(4) Assuming there is no complete cure for your condition, what specific things would you look for in an ideal treatment for your condition?

(a) What would you consider to be a meaningful improvement (for example symptom improvements or functional improvements) in your condition that a treatment could provide?

(5) What factors do you take into account when making decisions about selecting a course of treatment?

(a) What information on the potential benefits of these treatments factors most into your decision?

(b) How do you weigh the potential benefits of these treatments versus the common side effects of the treatments? (Common side effects could include headache, nausea, injection site reactions.)

(c) How do you weigh potential benefits of these treatments versus the less common but serious risks associated with the treatments? (Examples of less common but serious risks are infections, cancer, liver damage, kidney damage, birth defects, blood disorders, etc.)

B. Meeting Attendance and Participation

If you wish to attend this meeting, visit *https://psoriasispfdd.eventbrite.com.* Please register by March 10, 2016. If you are unable to attend the meeting in person, you can register to view a live Webcast of the meeting. You will be asked to indicate in your registration if you plan to attend in person or via the Webcast. Seating will be limited, so early registration is recommended. Registration is free and will be on a first-come, first-served basis. However, FDA may limit the number of participants from each organization based on space limitations. Registrants will receive confirmation once they have been accepted. Onsite registration on the day of the meeting will be based on space availability. If you need special accommodations because of a disability, please contact Meghana Chalasani (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**) at least 7 days before the meeting.

Patients who are interested in presenting comments as part of the initial panel discussions will be asked to indicate in their registration which topic(s) they wish to address. These patients also must send to *PatientFocused@fda.hhs.gov* a brief summary of responses to the topic questions by February 29, 2016. Panelists will be notified of their selection approximately 7 days before the public meeting. We will try to accommodate all patients and patient stakeholders who wish to speak, either through the panel discussion or audience participation; however, the duration of comments may be limited by time constraints.

Docket Comments: Regardless of whether you attend the public meeting, you can submit electronic or written responses to the questions pertaining to Topics 1 and 2 to the public docket (see **ADDRESSES**) by May 17, 2016.

Transcripts: As soon as a transcript is available, FDA will post it at *http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/UserFees/PrescriptionDrugUserFee/ucm470608.htm.*

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Leslie Kux,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29992 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection: Public Comment Request

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirement for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects (Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995), the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) announces plans to submit an Information Collection Request (ICR), described below, to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Prior to submitting the ICR to OMB, HRSA seeks comments from the public regarding the burden estimate, below, or any other aspect of the ICR.

DATES: Comments on this Information Collection Request must be received no later than January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments to *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or mail the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Room 10–29, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and draft instruments, email *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or call the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer at (301) 443–1984.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: When submitting comments or requesting information, please include the information request collection title for reference.

Information Collection Request Title: HIV Quality Measures (HIVQM) Module OMB No. 0915–xxxx–New.

Abstract: The Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program (RWHAP) provides entities funded by the program with flexibility to respond effectively to the changing HIV epidemic, with an emphasis on providing life-saving and life-extending services for people living with HIV. Under the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Extension Act of 2009, RWHAP Parts A–D recipients are required to establish clinical quality management programs in order to assess their HIV services according to the most recent Department of Health and Human Services guidelines and to develop strategies to improve access to quality HIV services. The HIV Quality Measures (HIVQM) module will be the HIV/AIDS Bureau's (HAB) voluntary online reporting tool created to help facilitate recipients in meeting these requirements. Recipients and their providers will enter aggregate data in the HIVQM module on HAB performance measures and then will be able to generate reports to assess their performance and compare their results to results at the state, regional, and national levels. The HAB performance measures include the following priority performance measure categories: (1) Core (those measures that emphasize essential aspects of care and treatment, align with the milestones along the HIV care continuum, and are most feasible for data collection); (2) all ages; (3) adolescent/adult; (4) HIV-positive children; (5) HIV-exposed children; (6) medical case management; (7) oral health; (8) AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP); and (9) system level measures. The use of the HIVQM module will be voluntary for RWHAP recipients and services providers.

Need and Proposed Use of the Information: The HIVQM Module will be a voluntary online reporting tool that supports recipients in monitoring their performance in serving patients particularly in access to care and the provision of quality HIV services, and to reduce HIV-related morbidity and mortality among people living with HIV/AIDS. These data will help RWHAP recipients document their strengths, identify gaps in performance and areas for improvement, and plan how to enhance future delivery of quality care to their patients.

The HIVQM module will also assist RWHAP recipients in meeting the requirement to construct quality assurance structures in their provision of HIV care services. In addition, for recipients and service providers participating in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Incentive Programs, such as the Medicare and Medicaid Electronic Health Records Incentive Program and the Physician Quality Reporting System, the module will be consistent to qualify and comply with the requirements to receive incentives from these programs. Finally, the module will assist HAB in identifying recipients and service providers that are supporting the aims of the National HIV/AIDS Strategy in establishing a system that links HIV positive individuals to continuous and coordinated quality care.

The module will be available for data entry 3 times a year. The module will be accessible via the HRSA Electronic Handbook (EHB) Ryan White Services Report (RSR) portal, an existing online tool that RWHAP recipients already use for required data collection on their services. Recipients will choose which performance measures they want to monitor and enter data accordingly. Reports of performance measures can be generated and reviewed by the recipients or their service providers and can be compared to results at the state, regional, and national levels.

Likely Respondents: Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A, Part B, Part C, and Part D recipients and their service providers and the AIDS Drug Assistance Program recipients.

Burden Statement: Burden in this context means the time expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide the information requested. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information; to search data sources; to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information. The total annual burden hours estimated for this Information Collection Request are summarized in the table below.

Total Estimated Annualized burden hours:

Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total responses	Average burden per response (in hours)	Total burden hours
HIVQM module	1,100	3	3,300	4	13,200
Total	1,100	3	3,300	4	13,200

HRSA specifically requests comments on (1) the necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions, (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden, (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

Jackie Painter,

Director, Division of the Executive Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2015–29948 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4165–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection: Public Comment Request

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirement for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects (Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995), the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) announces plans to submit an Information Collection Request (ICR), described below, to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Prior to submitting the ICR to OMB, HRSA seeks comments from the public regarding the burden estimate, below, or any other aspect of the ICR.

DATES: Comments on this ICR should be received no later than January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments to *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or mail the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Room 10C–24, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and draft instruments, email *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or call the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer at (301) 443–1984.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: When submitting comments or requesting information, please include the information request collection title for reference.

Information Collection Request Title: Rural Health Care Coordination Network Partnership Program Performance Improvement Measurement System.

OMB No. 0915–xxxx—New.

Abstract: The Rural Health Care Coordination Network Partnership (Care Coordination) Program is authorized under Section 330A(f) of the Public Health Service (PHS) Act (42 U.S.C. 254(c)(f)), as amended, to support the development of formal, mature rural health networks that focus on care coordination activities for the following chronic conditions: Diabetes, congestive heart failure (CHF), and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). This authority permits the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy (FORHP) to support grants for eligible entities to promote, through planning and implementation, the development of integrated health care networks that have combined the functions of the entities participating in the networks in order to: (i) Achieve efficiencies; (ii) expand access to, coordinate, and improve the quality of essential health care services; and (iii) strengthen the rural health care system as a whole.

Need and Proposed Use of the Information: For this program, performance measures were drafted to provide data to the program and to enable HRSA to provide aggregate program data required by Congress under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993. These measures cover the principal topic areas of interest to the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy including: (a) Access to care; (b) population demographics; (c) staffing; (d) consortium/network; (e) sustainability; and (f) project specific domains. Several measures will be used for this program. All measures will speak to FORHP's progress toward meeting the goals set.

Likely Respondents: The respondents would be recipients of the Rural Health Care Coordination Network Partnership grant program funding.

Burden Statement: Burden in this context means the time expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide the information requested. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information; to search data sources; to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information. The total annual burden hours estimated for this Information Collection Request are summarized in the table below.

TOTAL ESTIMATED ANNUALIZED BURDEN HOURS

Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total responses	Average burden per response (in hours)	Total burden hours
Rural Health Care Coordination Network Partnership Grant Program Measures	8	1	8	3.5	28
Total	8	1	8	3.5	28

HRSA specifically requests comments on: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

Jackie Painter,

Director, Division of the Executive Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2015–29968 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4165–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection: Public Comment Request

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirement for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects (Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995), the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) announces plans to submit an Information Collection Request (ICR), described below, to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Prior to submitting the ICR to OMB, HRSA seeks comments from the public regarding the burden estimate, below, or any other aspect of the ICR.

DATES: Comments on this ICR should be received no later than January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments to *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or mail the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Room 10C–24, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on the proposed project or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and draft instruments, email *paperwork@hrsa.gov* or call the HRSA Information Collection Clearance Officer at (301) 443–1984.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: When submitting comments or requesting information, please include the information request collection title for reference. Information Collection Request Title: Rural Network Allied Health Training Program Performance Improvement Measurement System (PIMS). OMB No. 0915–xxxx—New.

Abstract: The Allied Health Training Program will support the development of formal, mature rural health networks that focus on activities that achieve efficiencies, expand access to, coordinate, and improve the quality of essential health care services, and strengthen the rural health care system as a whole. This purpose will be achieved through the recruitment, clinical training, and retention of allied health professionals. This program will further support integrated rural health networks that can partner with local community colleges and other accredited educational institutions (such as vocational and technical colleges) to develop formal clinical training programs.

Need and Proposed Use of the Information: For this program, performance measures were drafted to provide data to the program and to enable HRSA to provide aggregate program data required by Congress under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. These measures cover the principal topic areas of interest to the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy including: (a) Access to care; (b) population demographics; (c) staffing; (d) consortium/network; (e) sustainability; and (f) project specific domains. Several measures will be used for this program. All measures will speak to the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy's progress toward meeting the goals set.

Likely Respondents: The respondents are recipients of the Rural Network Allied Health Training Program grant funding.

Burden Statement: Burden in this context means the time expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide the information requested. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information; to search data sources; to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information. The total annual burden hours estimated for this Information Collection Request are summarized in the table below.

Total Estimated Annualized burden hours:

Form name	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total responses	Average burden per response (in hours)	Total burden hours
Rural Network Allied Health Training Program Performance Improvement Measurement System (PIMS)	10	1	10	3.33	30.33
Total	10	1	10	3.33	30.33

HRSA specifically requests comments on: (1) The necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

Jackie Painter,

Director, Division of the Executive Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2015–29967 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4165–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Federal Financial Participation in State Assistance Expenditures; Federal Matching Shares for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and Aid to Needy Aged, Blind, or Disabled Persons for October 1, 2016 Through September 30, 2017

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DHHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Medical Assistance Percentages (FMAP), Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentages (eFMAP), and disaster-recovery FMAP adjustments for Fiscal Year 2017 have been calculated pursuant to the Social Security Act (the Act). These percentages will be effective from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017. This notice announces the calculated FMAP rates, in accordance with sections 1101(a)(8) and 1905(b) of the Act, that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) will use in determining the amount of federal matching for state medical assistance (Medicaid), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Contingency Funds, Child Support Enforcement collections, Child Care Mandatory and Matching Funds of the Child Care and Development Fund, Foster Care Title IV–E Maintenance payments, and Adoption Assistance payments, and the eFMAP rates for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) expenditures. Table 1 gives figures for each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto

Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. This notice reminds states of available disaster-recovery FMAP adjustments for qualifying states, and adjustments available for states meeting requirements for negative growth in total state personal income. At this time, no states qualify for such adjustments.

This notice also contains the increased eFMAPs for CHIP as authorized under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Affordable Care Act) for fiscal years 2016 through 2019 (October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2019).

Programs under title XIX of the Act exist in each jurisdiction. Programs under titles I, X, and XIV operate only in Guam and the Virgin Islands. The percentages in this notice apply to state expenditures for most medical assistance and child health assistance, and assistance payments for certain social services. The Act provides separately for federal matching of administrative costs.

Sections 1905(b) and 1101(a)(8)(B) of the Social Security Act (the Act) require the Secretary of HHS to publish the FMAP rates each year. The Secretary calculates the percentages, using formulas in sections 1905(b) and 1101(a)(8), and calculations by the Department of Commerce of average income per person in each state and for the Nation as a whole. The percentages must fall within the upper and lower limits specified in section 1905(b) of the Act. The percentages for the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands are specified in statute, and thus are not based on the statutory formula that determines the percentages for the 50 states.

Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP)

Section 1905(b) of the Act specifies the formula for calculating FMAPs as follows:

''Federal medical assistance percentage for any state shall be 100 per centum less the state percentage; and the state percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 45 per centum as the square of the per capita income of such state bears to the square of the per capita income of the continental United States (including Alaska) and Hawaii; except that (1) the Federal medical assistance percentage shall in no case be less than 50 per centum or more than 83 per centum, (2) the Federal medical assistance percentage for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa shall be 55 percent . . .''.

Section 4725(b) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 amended section 1905(b) to provide that the FMAP for the District of Columbia for purposes of titles XIX and XXI shall be 70 percent. For the District of Columbia, we note under Table 1 that other rates may apply in certain other programs. In addition, we note the rate that applies for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in certain other programs pursuant to section 1118 of the Act. The rates for the States, District of Columbia and the territories are displayed in Table 1, Column 1.

Section 1905(y) of the Act, as added by section 2001 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (''Affordable Care Act''), provides for a significant increase in the FMAP for medical assistance expenditures for individuals determined eligible under the new adult group in the state and who will be considered to be ''newly eligible'' in 2014, as defined in section 1905(y)(2)(A) of the Act. This newly eligible FMAP is 100 percent for Calendar Years 2014, 2015, and 2016, gradually declining to 90 percent in 2020 where it remains indefinitely. In addition, section 1905(z) of the Act, as added by section 10201 of the Affordable Care Act, provides that states that had expanded substantial coverage to low-income parents and nonpregnant adults without children prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, referred to as ''expansion states,'' shall receive an enhanced FMAP that begins in 2014 for medical assistance expenditures for nonpregnant childless adults who may be required to enroll in benchmark coverage. . These provisions are discussed in more detail in the Medicaid Eligibility proposed rule published on August 17, 2011 (76 FR 51172) and the final rule published on March 23, 2012 (77 FR 17143). This notice is not intended to set forth the newly eligible or expansion state FMAP rates.

Other Adjustments to the FMAP

For purposes of Title XIX (Medicaid) of the Social Security Act, the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP), defined in section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act, for each state beginning with fiscal year 2006 is subject to an adjustment pursuant to section 614 of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (CHIPRA), Public Law 111–3. Section 614 of CHIPRA stipulates that a state's FMAP under Title XIX (Medicaid) must be adjusted in two situations.

In the first situation, if a state experiences positive growth in total personal income and an employer in that state has made a significantly disproportionate contribution to a pension or insurance fund, the state's FMAP must be adjusted. Employer pension and insurance fund contributions are significantly disproportionate if the increase in contributions exceeds 25 percent of the increase in total personal income in that state. A **Federal Register** Notice with comment period was issued on June 7, 2010 (75 FR 32182) announcing the methodology for calculating this adjustment; a final notice was issued on October 15, 2010 (75 FR 63480).

A second situation arises if a state experiences negative growth in total personal income. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2006, section 614(b)(3) of CHIPRA specifies that certain employer pension or insurance fund contributions shall be disregarded when computing the per capita income used to calculate the FMAP for states with negative growth in total personal income. In that instance, for the purposes of calculating the FMAP, for a calendar year in which a state's total personal income has declined, the portion of an employer pension and insurance fund contribution that exceeds 125 percent of the amount of the employer contribution in the previous calendar year shall be disregarded.

We request that states follow the same methodology to determine potential FMAP adjustments for negative growth in total personal income that HHS employs to make adjustments to the FMAP for states experiencing significantly disproportionate pension or insurance contributions. See also the information described in the January 21, 2014 **Federal Register** notice (79 FR 3385).

This notice does not contain an FY 2017 adjustment for a major statewide disaster for any state because no state's FMAP decreased by at least three percentage points from FY 2016 to FY 2017.

Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (eFMAP) for CHIP

Section 2105(b) of the Act specifies the formula for calculating the eFMAP rates as follows:

The ''enhanced FMAP'', for a state for a fiscal year, is equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in the first sentence of section 1905(b)) for the state increased by a number of percentage points equal to 30 percent of the number of percentage points by which (1) such Federal medical assistance percentage for the state, is less than (2) 100 percent; but in no case shall

the enhanced FMAP for a state exceed 85 percent.

In addition, Section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act, as amended by Section 2101 of the Affordable Care Act, increases the eFMAP for states by 23 percentage points:

. . . during the period that begins on October 1, 2015, and ends on September 30, 2019, the enhanced FMAP determined for a state for a fiscal year (or for any portion of a fiscal year occurring during such period) shall be increased by 23 percentage points, but in no case shall exceed 100 percent.

The eFMAP rates are used in the Children's Health Insurance Program under Title XXI, and in the Medicaid program for certain children for expenditures for medical assistance described in sections 1905(u)(2) and 1905(u)(3) of the Act. There is no specific requirement to publish the eFMAP rates. We include them in this notice for the convenience of the states, and display both the normal eFMAP rates (Table 1, Column 2) and the Affordable Care Act's increased eFMAP rates (Table 1, Column 3) for comparison.

DATES: *Effective Dates:* The percentages listed in Table 1 will be effective for each of the four quarter-year periods beginning October 1, 2016 and ending September 30, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Musco or Rose Chu, Office of Health Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Room 447D, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20201, (202) 690–6870.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.558: TANF Contingency Funds; 93.563: Child Support Enforcement; 93.596: Child Care Mandatory and Matching Funds of the Child Care and Development Fund; 93.658: Foster Care Title IV–E; 93.659: Adoption Assistance; 93.769: Ticket-to-Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act (TWWIIA) Demonstrations to Maintain Independence and Employment; 93.778: Medical Assistance Program; 93.767: Children's Health Insurance Program)

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Sylvia M. Burwell,

Secretary.

TABLE 1—FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGES AND ENHANCED FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGES, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2016–SEPTEMBER 30, 2017 (FISCAL YEAR 2017)

State	Federal Medical Assistance percentages	Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance percentages	Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance percentages with ACA 23 PT increase ***
Alabama	70.16	79.11	100.00
Alaska	50.00	65.00	88.00
American Samoa *	55.00	68.50	91.50
Arizona	69.24	78.47	100.00
Arkansas	69.69	78.78	100.00
California	50.00	65.00	88.00
Colorado	50.02	65.01	88.01
Connecticut	50.00	65.00	88.00
Delaware	54.20	67.94	90.94
District of Columbia **	70.00	79.00	100.00
Florida	61.10	72.77	95.77
Georgia	67.89	77.52	100.00
Guam *	55.00	68.50	91.50
Hawaii	54.93	68.45	91.45
Idaho	71.51	80.06	100.00
Illinois	51.30	65.91	88.91
Indiana	66.74	76.72	99.72
Iowa	56.74	69.72	92.72
Kansas	56.21	69.35	92.35
Kentucky	70.46	79.32	100.00
Louisiana	62.28	73.60	96.60
Maine	64.38	75.07	98.07
Maryland	50.00	65.00	88.00
Massachusetts	50.00	65.00	88.00
Michigan	65.15	75.61	98.61
Minnesota	50.00	65.00	88.00
Mississippi	74.63	82.24	100.00
Missouri	63.21	74.25	97.25
Montana	65.56	75.89	98.89
Nebraska	51.85	66.30	89.30
Nevada	64.67	75.27	98.27
New Hampshire	50.00	65.00	88.00
New Jersey	50.00	65.00	88.00
New Mexico	71.13	79.79	100.00
New York	50.00	65.00	88.00
North Carolina	66.88	76.82	99.82
North Dakota	50.00	65.00	88.00
Northern Mariana Islands *	55.00	68.50	91.50
Ohio	62.32	73.62	96.62
Oklahoma	59.94	71.96	94.96
Oregon	64.47	75.13	98.13
Pennsylvania	51.78	66.25	89.25
Puerto Rico *	55.00	68.50	91.50
Rhode Island	51.02	65.71	88.71

TABLE 1—FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGES AND ENHANCED FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGES, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 2016–SEPTEMBER 30, 2017 (FISCAL YEAR 2017)—Continued

State	Federal Medical Assistance percentages	Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance percentages	Enhanced Federal Medical Assistance percentages with ACA 23 PT increase ***
South Carolina	71.30	79.91	100.00
South Dakota	54.94	68.46	91.46
Tennessee	64.96	75.47	98.47
Texas	56.18	69.33	92.33
Utah	69.90	78.93	100.00
Vermont	54.46	68.12	91.12
Virgin Islands *	55.00	68.50	91.50
Virginia	50.00	65.00	88.00
Washington	50.00	65.00	88.00
West Virginia	71.80	80.26	100.00
Wisconsin	58.51	70.96	93.96
Wyoming	50.00	65.00	88.00

* For purposes of section 1118 of the Social Security Act, the percentage used under titles I, X, XIV, and XVI will be 75 per centum.

** The values for the District of Columbia in the table were set for the state plan under titles XIX and XXI and for capitation payments and DSH allotments under those titles. For other purposes, the percentage for DC is 50.00, unless otherwise specified by law.

*** Section 2101(a) of the Affordable Care Act amended Section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act to increase the enhanced FMAP for states by 23 percentage points, but not to exceed 100 percent, for the period that begins on October 1, 2015 and ends on September 30, 2019 (fiscal years 2016 through 2019).

[FR Doc. 2015–30050 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4150–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

[OMHA–1502–N]

Medicare Program; Administrative Law Judge Hearing Program for Medicare Claim and Entitlement Appeals; Quarterly Listing of Program Issuances—July Through September 2015

AGENCY: Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals (OMHA), HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This quarterly notice lists the OMHA Case Processing Manual (OCPM) manual instructions that were published from July through September 2015. This manual standardizes the day-to-day procedures for carrying out adjudicative functions, in accordance with applicable statutes, regulations and OMHA directives, and gives OMHA staff direction for processing appeals at the OMHA level of adjudication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amanda Axeen, by telephone at (571) 777–2705, or by email at *amanda.axeen@hhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals (OMHA), a staff division within the Office of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), administers the nationwide Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) hearing program for Medicare claim, organization and coverage determination, and entitlement appeals under sections 1869, 1155, 1876(c)(5)(B), 1852(g)(5), and 1860D–4(h) of the Social Security Act (the Act). OMHA ensures that Medicare beneficiaries and the providers and suppliers that furnish items or services to Medicare beneficiaries, as well as Medicare Advantage Organizations (MAOs) and Medicaid State Agencies, have a fair and impartial forum to address disagreements with Medicare coverage and payment determinations made by Medicare contractors, MAOs, or Part D Plan Sponsors (PDPSs), and determinations related to Medicare eligibility and entitlement, Part B late enrollment penalties, and income-related monthly adjustment amounts (IRMAA) made by the Social Security Administration (SSA).

The Medicare claim, organization and coverage determination appeals processes consist of four levels of administrative review, and a fifth level of review with the Federal district courts after administrative remedies under HHS regulations have been exhausted. The first two levels of review are administered by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and conducted by Medicare contractors for claim appeals, by MAOs and an independent review entity for Part C organization determination appeals, or by PDPSs and an independent review entity for Part D coverage determination appeals. The third level of review is administered by OMHA and conducted by Administrative Law Judges. The fourth level of review is administered by the HHS Departmental Appeals Board (DAB) and conducted by the Medicare Appeals Council. In addition, OMHA and the DAB administer the second and third levels of appeal, respectively, for Medicare eligibility, entitlement, Part B late enrollment penalty, and IRMAA reconsiderations made by SSA; a fourth level of review with the Federal district courts is available after administrative remedies within SSA and HHS have been exhausted.

Sections 1869, 1155, 1876(c)(5)(B), 1852(g)(5), and 1860D–4(h) of the Act are implemented through the regulations at 42 CFR part 405, subparts I and J; part 417, subpart Q; part 422, subpart M; part 423, subparts M and U; and part 478, subpart B. As noted above, OMHA administers the nationwide Administrative Law Judge hearing program in accordance with these statutes and applicable regulations. As part of that effort, OMHA has established the OMHA Case Processing Manual (OCPM). Through the OCPM, the OMHA Chief Administrative Law Judge establishes the day-to-day procedures for carrying out adjudicative functions, in accordance with applicable statutes, regulations and OMHA directives. The OCPM provides direction for processing appeals at the OMHA level of adjudication for Medicare Part A and B claims; Part C organization determinations; Part D coverage determinations; and SSA eligibility and entitlement, Part B late

enrollment penalty, and IRMAA determinations.

Section 1871(c) of the Act requires that we publish a list of all Medicare manual instructions, interpretive rules, statements of policy, and guidelines of general applicability not issued as regulations at least every 3 months in the **Federal Register**.

II. Format for the Quarterly Issuance Notices

This quarterly notice provides the specific updates to the OCPM that have occurred in the 3-month period. A hyperlink to the available chapters on the OMHA Web site is provided below. The OMHA Web site contains the most current, up-to-date chapters and revisions to chapters, and will be available earlier than we publish our quarterly notice. We believe the OMHA Web site list provides more timely access to the current OCPM chapters for those involved in the Medicare claim, organization and coverage determination and entitlement appeals processes. We also believe the Web site offers the public a more convenient tool for real time access to current OCPM provisions. In addition, OMHA has a listserv to which the public can subscribe to receive immediate notification of any updates to the OMHA Web site. This listserv avoids the need to check the OMHA Web site, as update notifications are sent to subscribers as they occur. If accessing the OMHA Web site proves to be difficult, the contact person listed above can provide the information.

III. How To Use the Notice

This notice lists the OCPM chapters and subjects published during the quarter covered by the notice so the reader may determine whether any are of particular interest. We expect this notice to be used in concert with the previously published notice. The OCPM can be accessed at *http://www.hhs.gov/omha/OMHA_Case_Processing_Manual/index.html.*

IV. OCPM Releases for July Through September 2015

The OCPM is used by OMHA adjudicators and staff to administer the OMHA program. It offers day-to-day operating instructions, policies, and procedures based on statutes and regulations, and OMHA directives.

The following is a list and description of new and revised OCPM provisions, and the subject matter, that have been released in the covered 3-month period. The full text of current OCPM provisions is available on our Web site at *http://www.hhs.gov/omha/OMHA_Case_Processing_Manual/index.html.*

OCPM Division I: General Matters

Chapter 4, Parties. This new chapter describes who qualify as parties to the ALJ hearing and review process under the applicable authorities to guide OMHA ALJs and support staff in ensuring those filing requests for hearing and requests for review with OMHA have standing to pursue appeals, and notices and other correspondence are sent to the appropriate individuals and entities in accordance with the authorities.

Chapter 5, Representatives. This new chapter describes the roles and responsibilities of party representatives in the ALJ hearing and review process, as well as the requirements to substantiate that an individual is authorized or appointed to act as a party representative under the applicable authorities.

Chapter 6, CMS and CMS Contractor Roles. This new chapter describes the roles and responsibilities of CMS and its contractors in the ALJ hearing and review process, including under what conditions and how CMS or a contractor may participate in the process, including at oral hearings before OMHA ALJs, in accordance with the applicable authorities.

OCPM Division II: Part A/B Claim Determinations

Chapter 3, Procedural Screening. This chapter has been updated to correct a typographical error. No substantive changes were made to the chapter.

Dated: _November 17, 2015.

Nancy J. Griswold,

Chief Administrative Law Judge, Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 2015–30044 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4152–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Mental Health; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Mental Health Special Emphasis Panel AIDS Research Centers on Mental Health and HIV/AIDS (P30).

Date: December 2, 2015.

Time: 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, Neuroscience Center, 6001 Executive Boulevard, Rockville, MD 20852, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: David W. Miller, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Division of Extramural Activities, National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, Neuroscience Center, 6001 Executive BLVD, Room 6140, MSC 9608, Bethesda, MD 20892–9608, 301–443–9734, *millerda@mail.nih.gov*.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.242, Mental Health Research Grants, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: *November 18, 2015.*

Carolyn A. Baum,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29942 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Pathogenesis of Rare Diseases.

Date: November 20, 2015–November 20, 2016.

Time: 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Richard Panniers, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 2212, MSC 7890, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1741, *pannierr@csr.nih.gov*.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Carolyn Baum,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29939 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences Special Emphasis Panel, Exposure to Water Disinfection Byproducts.

Date: December 9, 2015.

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: NIEHS/National Institutes of Health, Keystone Building, 530 Davis Drive, Room 3170B, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Janice B. Allen, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Scientific Review Branch, Division of Extramural Research and Training, Nat. Institute of Environmental Health Science, P.O. Box 12233, MD EC–30/Room 3170B, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, 919/541–7556.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.115, Biometry and Risk Estimation—Health Risks from Environmental Exposures; 93.142, NIEHS Hazardous Waste Worker Health and Safety Training; 93.143, NIEHS Superfund Hazardous Substances—Basic Research and Education; 93.894, Resources and Manpower Development in the Environmental Health Sciences; 93.113, Biological Response to Environmental Health Hazards; 93.114, Applied Toxicological Research and Testing, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Carolyn Baum,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29943 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Topics in Virology.

Date: December 8, 2015.

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Contact Person: Richard G. Kostriken, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3192, MSC 7808, Bethesda, MD 20892, 240–519–7808, *kostrikr@csr.nih.gov.*

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the timing limitations imposed by the review and funding cycle.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846– 93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Anna Snouffer,

Deputy Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–30015 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meeting.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Sleep, Psychopathology, Emotion, and Stress.

Date: December 15, 2015.

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Andrea B Kelly, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3182, MSC 7770, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 455–1761, *kellya2@csr.nih.gov*.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Anna Snouffer,

Deputy Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–30014 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Final Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Organ Policy Equity (HOPE) Act Safeguards and Research Criteria for Transplantation of Organs Infected With HIV

AGENCY: National Institutes of Health, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), through the National Institutes of Health (NIH), announces the publication of Final Safeguards and Research Criteria for transplantation of HIV-positive donor organs in HIV-positive recipients. All such transplants must occur under an institutional review board (IRB)-approved research protocol that is compliant with federal regulations governing human subjects' research. The goal of this research is to increase knowledge about the safety, efficacy, and effectiveness of solid organ transplantation (SOT) utilizing HIV-positive donors in HIV-positive recipients.

A summary of public comments on the previously published Draft Safeguards and Research Criteria and HHS' responses follow, as well as the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Jonah Odim, phone 240–627–3540, Email: *HOPEAct@mail.nih.gov,* Fax: 301–451–5671, 5601 Fishers Lane, Room 6B21, MSC 9827, Bethesda, MD 20892–9827.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: HHS initially published the *Draft Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Organ Policy Equity (HOPE) Act Safeguards and Research Criteria for Transplantation of Organs Infected with HIV, subsequently referred to as the ''Draft Safeguards and Research Criteria,''* in the **Federal Register** on June 18, 2015, for a 60-day public comment period ending August 17, 2015. In the months leading up to the draft publication, HHS presented the research criteria at national meetings of transplantation and HIV medicine professionals and received their input. Several teleconferences were hosted with transplantation community stakeholders from the private, nonprofit, and government sectors.

HHS received comments from a total of 13 individuals/entities on the Draft Safeguards and Research Criteria. Comments were submitted by transplant centers, Organ Procurement Organizations (OPOs), the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (OPTN), United Network of Organ Sharing (UNOS), HIV and transplantation professional societies, and a municipal agency. Overall, these comments were supportive of the HOPE Act and the Draft Safeguards and Research Criteria. Many commenters made useful suggestions that provided clarity and were incorporated into the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria. While the comments will not be addressed individually in this response document, questions, comments, and suggestions about specific aspects of the Draft Safeguards and Research Criteria are addressed by topic below.

HOPE Act: Scope

The HOPE Act permits HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation under IRB-approved research protocols conforming to the Final Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Organ Policy Equity (HOPE) Act Safeguards and Research Criteria for Transplantation of Organs Infected with HIV, which were developed as directed in the HOPE Act. Patients receiving HIV-positive kidneys from deceased HIV-positive donors in South Africa (Muller, 2015) had survival rates of 84 percent and 74 percent at 1 and 5 years, respectively; however, there is presently no evidence for the safety, efficacy, and effectiveness of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation in North America. The Final Safeguards and Research Criteria are meant to support the acquisition of new clinical knowledge and mechanistic insights about HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation in the United States. The results of this research will be evaluated by the Secretary of HHS and the OPTN to determine whether and how the OPTN standards for organ transplantation shall be revised to address HIV-positive organ donors.

One commenter raised concerns about the negative impact of adverse outcomes at transplant centers conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplants on transplant program-specific reports. This commenter proposed ''that transplants performed with HIV-positive donor to HIV-positive recipients are not included in the center specific reports. The risk of transplanting these patients is unknown, and there is no risk adjustment for it on the center specific reports. There will potentially be a strong disincentive for centers to do these patients leading to fewer patients receiving life-saving organ transplants.'' Clearly this is an important issue but one that is beyond the authorities delegated to the NIH to enable implementation of the HOPE Act (*i.e.,* to develop safeguards and research criteria).

Living Donors

Several commenters stated that HIV-infected living donors may be at long-term risk for renal and/or liver disease and therefore their centers would not use HIV-infected living donors. Another commenter felt it was premature to embark on living HIV-positive donors without prior experience with deceased HIV-positive donors and recommended a staged approach. The Hope Act (2013) does not include any language addressing the use of living HIV-infected donors.

The long-term risks of living organ donation to the donor might be greater for those infected with HIV than for those who are not. At the same time, the desire to donate an organ, (*e.g.,* to save or prolong a life) is strong, and evaluation of the risks and benefits of such a decision is personal and unique to a given donor/recipient pair. Evidence for the safety of organ donation by an HIV-infected individual will only be generated by clinical research. HHS has included living donors in these Safeguards and Research Criteria so that, if investigators choose to pursue this line of research, that research can be conducted with appropriate informed consent, safeguards, and rigor.

The decision to participate in HIV-positive to HIV-positive clinical research is made freely, based on informed consent in the absence of coercion. The health care team must provide a rigorous, transparent education and informed consent process that describes alternatives, risks, potential benefits, unknowns, and the need for long-term follow-up. These discussions must address how research-related injuries are managed and paid for, and must specifically include the present uncertainties about the outcomes for both HIV-positive living donors and the recipients of HIV-positive organs. Participation of knowledgeable, independent advocates for both the HIV-positive recipient and the HIV-positive donor is required by these Safeguards and Research Criteria.

Independent Advocates

Some commenters strongly supported the requirement for independent advocates for both HIV-positive recipients and prospective HIV-positive living donors. Others viewed this as unnecessary given the expertise of the principal investigator and study team and current OPTN standards. With

respect to informed consent, the role of the independent advocate complements that of the investigator and does not replace it. The investigator is assumed to have the expertise necessary to discuss risks, benefits, expectations, and alternatives. The advocate is an additional knowledgeable person who is neither a member of the research team nor the patient's health care provider, whose role is to provide information, answer questions, and provide assurance of equal access to health care regardless of the patient's decisions regarding research participation. For example, the advocate can assure that the transplant candidate is aware that he or she has the right to be offered and to accept an HIV-*negative* deceased donor organ should one become available, and can assure the prospective living donor of confidentiality and support should he or she determine that donation is not in his or her own best interest.

Transplant Hospital Experience

Several commenters from academic institutions, professional societies, and the OPTN indicated that the requirements for physicians' and surgeons' prior experience in HIV-negative to HIV-positive organ transplant were excessive and would result in few centers being able to participate in the research allowed under the HOPE Act. In response to the wide consensus on this issue, we have accepted the specific suggestion of the American Society of Transplant Surgeons (ASTS). Section 3 of the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria describe collective team experience, rather than individual experience.

Immunologic Criteria (CD4+ T-Cell Counts, HIV Viral Load)

Several commenters expressed concerns about the usefulness and relevance of requiring a minimum CD4+ T-cell count/percentage in the donor. They argued that the CD4+ T lymphocyte count will not predict allograft function, and that, among HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplants in South Africa, excellent outcomes were observed in recipients of kidneys from donors with CD4+ T-cell counts well below 200. These commenters urged flexibility and the elimination of this minimum immunologic criterion. In response to these comments, Section 1 of the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria was revised to indicate that, although collection of CD4+ T cell counts and percentages during the donor evaluation is required, no minimum criterion is imposed for organ acceptance. Some commenters preferred excluding any donors with detectable plasma viral load due to the risk of transmitted drug resistance. Unfortunately, it will not be possible in all cases to mitigate the risk of transmitting viral resistance by setting viral load limits and/or assessing antiretroviral resistance profiles in the time available for donor evaluation. It is expected that in many cases, potential donors will have adequate medical history available to inform the transplantation team's assessment and maximally reduce the risk of transmitting resistant virus. For these reasons, the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria do not stipulate a limit on the allowable viral load in a donor. The transplant team should only transplant the organ if the team is confident they can define a post-transplant antiretroviral regimen that will be safe, tolerable, and effective. Concerns about transmitted drug resistance must be included in the recipient informed consent process for the research study. In addition, at the time of an organ offer, the recipient informed consent must address the transplant team's assessment of risk specific to the characteristics of the offered organ.

Biospecimens

Several commenters emphasized the importance of a pre-transplant donor organ biopsy. The final updated research criteria include a requirement for performance of a pre-implantation ''back-table'' biopsy for post-transplantation patient management and future scientific and mechanistic studies. Although there are no further specimen requirements, we strongly encourage the inclusion of serial biospecimens (*e.g.,* allograft tissue, urine, serum, and cells) in the individual research protocols. These specimens will be a valuable resource to the community in studies relating to superinfection risks, for example. Failure to collect such specimens, particularly in organ donors, would be a regrettable lost opportunity.

Required Outcomes

Several commenters expressed concerns about data collection, quality, and reporting. The HOPE Act requires the Secretary of HHS to review the results of research conducted under the Act. One purpose of the criteria presented in the Final Safeguards and Research Criteria is to ensure that all investigators conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation collect similar data elements. This standardization will facilitate the subsequent review mandated in the HOPE Act.

Conclusion Regarding Comments Received

HHS appreciates the time and effort taken by commenters to respond to the Request for Comments. The comments represented the deliberative efforts of truly dedicated individuals and organizations in transplantation and HIV medicine. All the responses were helpful in revising the draft Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Organ Policy Equity (HOPE) Act Safeguards and Research Criteria for Transplantation of Organs Infected with HIV.

The Final Safeguards and Research Criteria for transplantation of HIV-positive (HIV+) donor organs in HIV-positive (HIV+) recipients are as follows:

ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome.
APOL1	Apolipoprotein 1.
ART	Antiretroviral Therapy.
CD4	Cluster of Differentiation 4.
CMS	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.
CNS	Central Nervous System.
dL	Deciliter.
FDA	U.S. Food and Drug Administration.
FIPSE	Spanish Foundation for AIDS Research.
GESIDA	Spanish AIDS Study Group.
HAART	Highly Active Antiretroviral Therapy.
HBV	Hepatitis B Virus.
HCT/Ps	Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products (HCT/Ps).
HCV	Hepatitis C Virus.

ABBREVIATIONS—Continued

HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus.
HOPE Act	HIV Organ Policy Equity Act.
INR	International Normalized Ratio.
IRB	Institutional Review Board.
mL	Milliliter.
NIH	National Institutes of Health.
NNRTI	Non-Nucleoside (or Non-Nucleotide) Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor.
NRTI	Nucleoside (or Nucleotide) Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor.
OI	Opportunistic Infection.
OPO	Organ Procurement Organization.
OPTN	Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network.
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction.
PML	Progressive Multifocal Leukoencephalopathy.
RNA	Ribonucleic Acid.
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures.
SOT	Solid Organ Transplantation.
SRTR	Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients.
UNOS	United Network for Organ Sharing.
μL	Microliter.

DEFINITIONS

ABO compatible	People who have one blood type (A, B, AB, or O) form proteins (antibodies) that cause their immune system to react against other blood types. This is important when a patient needs to receive blood (transfusion) or have an organ transplant. The blood types must be matched to avoid an ABO incompatibility reaction. ABO compatible is when the blood types are matched.
Antiretroviral therapy (ART) resistance.	When an HIV strain develops drug resistance and/or genetic mutations associated with drug resistance.
Types/classes of HIV/AIDS antiretroviral drugs (current at publication).	(1) Entry inhibitors. (2) Fusion inhibitors. (3) Nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs). (4) Non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs). (5) Integrase inhibitors. (6) Protease inhibitors. (7) Multi-class combination products.
HIV strain	Distinct genetic variants of the HIV retrovirus, conferring characteristics such as susceptibility or resistance to ART medications.
HIV-negative	Not testing positive for HIV by serology and/or nucleic acid testing using FDA-licensed, approved or cleared test devices.
HIV-positive	HIV-infected by serology and/or nucleic acid testing using FDA-licensed, approved, or cleared test devices.
HIV undetectable viral load	(The conventional definition at the time of the publication of this research criteria document, based on current clinical technology/practice): HIV ribonucleic acid (RNA) below 50 copies with current technology.
Opportunistic infection	Infections that are more frequent or more severe because of immunosuppression in HIV-infected persons (Kaplan, 1995a, 1995b; Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents, 2015).
Suppressed viral load	HIV RNA below 50 copies with current technology at time of publication of this research criteria document.
Viral detection threshold	HIV RNA below 50 copies with current technology at time of publication of this research criteria document.

Executive Summary

The HOPE Act requires the HHS Secretary (the Secretary) to develop and publish criteria for research involving transplantation of human immunodeficiency virus-infected donor organs in HIV-positive recipients. A summary of the criteria for conducting clinical research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation is included in the chart below, and the criteria are set forth in six broad categories (Donor Eligibility, Recipient Eligibility, Transplant Hospital Criteria, Organ Procurement Organization (OPO) Responsibilities, Prevention of Inadvertent Transmission of HIV, and Study Design/Required Outcome Measures). These criteria are in addition to current policies and regulations governing organ transplantation and human subjects' research. The goals of these criteria are, first, to ensure that research using organs from HIV-positive donors is conducted under conditions protecting the safety of research participants and the general public; and second, to ensure that the results of this research provide a basis for evaluating the safety of solid organ transplantation (SOT) from HIV-positive donors to HIV-positive recipients.

Category	Criteria
Donor Eligibility:	
All HIV-positive deceased donors.	No evidence of invasive opportunistic complications of HIV infection. Pre-implant donor organ biopsy. Viral load: no requirement.

Category	Criteria
Deceased donor with known history of HIV infection and prior antiretroviral therapy (ART).	The study team must describe the anticipated post-transplant antiretroviral regimen(s) to be prescribed for the recipient and justify its conclusion that the regimen will be safe, tolerable, and effective.
HIV-positive living donor	Well-controlled HIV infection defined as: • CD4+ T-cell count ≥500/μL for the 6-month period before donation. • HIV–1 RNA <50 copies/mL. • No evidence of invasive opportunistic complications of HIV infection. Pre-implant donor organ biopsy.
Recipient Eligibility	CD4+ T-cell count ≥200/μL (kidney). CD4+ T-cell count ≥100 μL (liver) within 16 weeks prior to transplant and no history of opportunistic infection (OI); or ≥200 μL if history of OI is present. HIV–1 RNA <50 copies/mL and on a stable antiretroviral regimen. No evidence of active opportunistic complications of HIV infection. No history of primary central nervous system (CNS) lymphoma or progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy (PML).
Transplant Hospital Criteria	Transplant hospital with established program for care of HIV-positive subjects. HIV program expertise on the transplant team. Experience with HIV-negative to HIV-positive organ transplantation. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) and training for the organ procurement, implanting/operative, and postoperative care teams for handling HIV-infected subjects, organs, and tissues. Institutional review board (IRB)-approved research protocol in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation. Institutional biohazard plan outlining measures to prevent and manage inadvertent exposure to and/or transmission of HIV. Provide each living HIV-positive donor and HIV-positive recipient with an ''independent advocate''. Policies and SOPs governing the necessary knowledge, experience, skills, and training for independent advocates.
OPO Responsibilities	SOPs and staff training procedures for working with deceased HIV-positive donors and their families in pertinent history taking; medical chart abstraction; the consent process; and handling blood, tissues, organs, and biospecimens. Biohazard plan to prevent and manage HIV exposure and/or transmission.
Prevention of Inadvertent Transmission of HIV.	Each participating Transplant Program and OPO shall develop an institutional biohazard plan for handling organs from HIV-positive donors that is designed to prevent and/or manage inadvertent transmission or exposure to HIV. Procedures must be in place to ensure that human cells, tissues, and cellular and tissue-based products (HCT/Ps) are not recovered from HIV-positive donors for implantation, transplantation, infusion, or transfer into a human recipient; however, HCT/Ps from a donor determined to be ineligible may be made available for nonclinical purposes.
Required Outcome Measures:	
Wait List Candidates	HIV status. CD4+ T-cell counts. Co-infection (hepatitis C virus [HCV], hepatitis B virus [HBV]). HIV viral load. ART resistance. Removal from wait list (death or other reason). Time on wait list.
Donors (all)	Type (Living or deceased). HIV status (HIV-infected [HIV-positive] new diagnosis, HIV-positive known diagnosis). CD4+ T-cell count. Co-infection (HCV, HBV). HIV viral load. ART resistance.
Living Donors	Progression to renal insufficiency in kidney donors. Progression to hepatic insufficiency in liver donors. Change in ART regimen as a result of organ dysfunction. Progression to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). Failure to suppress viral replication (persistent HIV viremia). Death.
Transplant Recipients	Rejection rate (annual up to 5 years). Progression to AIDS. New OI. Failure to suppress viral replication (persistent HIV viremia). HIV-associated organ failure. Malignancy. Graft failure. Mismatched ART resistance versus donor. Death.

The HOPE Act research criteria focus on liver and kidney transplantation, where there is substantial experience with HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplantation. The intent is not to exclude the possibility of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation of other organs; however, transplant organ-specific teams must gain experience

with HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplantation before embarking on the more complex and less well-defined issues with HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation. The minimum combined experience required of the transplant physician and HIV physician on the team is five organ-specific cases over 4 years.

The HOPE Act requires the Secretary and the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (OPTN) to review the results of the scientific research conducted under these criteria to determine whether the results warrant further revisions to the OPTN's standards of quality. Under the HOPE Act, the Secretary may in the future determine that participation in research under such criteria is no longer required for HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplants.

Background

Public Law 113–51, The HOPE Act, requires the HHS Secretary (the Secretary) to, among other things, ''develop and publish criteria for conduct of research relating to transplantation of organs from donors infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) into individuals who are infected with HIV before receiving such organs.'' (See Public Health Service Act section 377E(a) [codified at 42 U.S.C. 274f–5]). In addition, pursuant to section 377E(c) of the HOPE Act, the Secretary is required, in conjunction with the OPTN, to review the results of that research to determine whether revisions should be made to the standards of quality adopted under section 372(b)(2)(E) of the Public Health Service Act (OPTN standards for the acquisition and transportation of donated organs) and the regulations governing the operation of the OPTN (42 CFR 121.6).

The authority vested in the Secretary under section 377E(a) to develop and publish research criteria was delegated to the Director, National Institutes of Health (NIH), and these research criteria are the subject of this document. They are meant to ensure first, that research using organs from HIV-positive donors is conducted under conditions protecting the safety of research participants and the general public; and second, that the results of this research provide a basis for evaluating the safety of transplantation of organs from HIV-positive donors to HIV-positive recipients.

Process

This document was authored by representatives of the NIH and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Additional input from representatives of other federal agencies, including the Health Resources and Services Administration, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), was solicited. In addition, perspectives and input were solicited from community stakeholders.

Introduction

The advent of effective antiretroviral therapy (ART) in the mid-1990s for treatment of individuals infected with HIV transformed a rapidly fatal disease into a well-controlled chronic illness. Currently, the life expectancy of individuals infected with HIV and receiving ART early in the course of their disease approaches that of individuals without HIV infection (Wada, 2013, 2014). In this era of greater longevity, liver failure, end-stage renal disease, and cardiovascular disease have emerged as important causes of morbidity and mortality in patients with HIV infection (Neuhaus, 2010).

Organ transplantation prolongs survival and improves quality of life for individuals with end-stage organ disease (Matas, 2014; Kim, 2014). Until recently, however, organ transplantation was unavailable to those infected with HIV due to concerns that pharmacologic immunosuppression to prevent organ rejection would hasten the progression from HIV infection to AIDS, concerns about disease transmission, and reluctance to allocate organs to a population whose outcome was unpredictable (Blumberg, 2009, 2013a, 2013b; Mgbako, 2013; Taege, 2013). Nevertheless, a few transplant programs accepted HIV-positive patients on their transplant waiting lists and accumulated data showing kidney or liver transplantation could be done safely in these patients (Roland, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c; Blumberg, 2009; Stock, 2010; Yoon, 2011; Terrault, 2012). Subsequently, a prospective, multicenter clinical trial of kidney and liver transplantation in 275 patients demonstrated that, among HIV-positive kidney and liver transplant recipients, patient and graft survival rates were acceptable and within the range of outcomes currently achieved among non-infected transplant recipients. However, the rate of kidney rejection was unexpectedly high, demonstrating that the immune dysregulation resulting from HIV infection, HCV co-infection, and antirejection drugs is complex and incompletely understood. Some of the challenges encountered in that study remain relevant for clinical sites offering organ transplantation to HIV-positive individuals today (*e.g.,* management of drug interactions and toxicities when combining complex medical regimens, management of combined morbidities of two or more active diseases, and the need for ongoing collaboration among medical professionals from different specialties) (Frassetto, 2007, 2014; Locke, 2014). Despite the complexities, this study and others (Ragni, 1999; Frassetto, 2009; Huprikar, 2009; Stock, 2010; Touzot, 2010; Cooper, 2011; Duclos-Vallee, 2011; Reeves-Daniel, 2011; Fox, 2012; Terrault, 2012; Grossi, 2012; Gomez, 2013; Harbell, 2013) demonstrate that kidney and liver transplantation are appropriate in HIV-positive individuals with liver or kidney failure, although gaps in knowledge and many research questions remain. There is much less experience with heart (Calabrese, 2003; Bisleri, 2003; Pelletier, 2004; Uriel, 2009, 2014; Castel, 2011a, 2011b; Durante-Mangoni, 2011 and 2014) and lung (Mehta, 2000; Humbert, 2006; Petrosillo, 2006; Bertani, 2009; Kern, 2014a, 2014b) transplantation in HIV-positive recipients, or mechanical circulatory assistance (Brucato, 2004; Fieno, 2009; Mehmood, 2009; Sims, 2011) as a bridge to transplantation, although case reports and small case series suggest acceptable short-term outcomes are possible.

Prior to the passage of the HOPE Act, U.S. law required that all U.S. transplants for HIV-positive recipients utilize organs from HIV-uninfected donors. (See 42 U.S.C. 273(b)(3)(C), 274(b) and 18 U.S.C. 1122, all prior to amendment by the HOPE Act). The potential for increasing the pool of available organ donors for all recipients by allowing the use of organs from donors infected with HIV for transplantation into recipients infected with HIV (hereinafter referred to as ''HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation'') is recognized (Boyarsky, 2011, 2015; Mgbako, 2013; Mascolini, 2014; Kucirka, 2015; Richterman, 2015). It is estimated that an additional 500 organ donors per year might be available if HIV-positive individuals were accepted as organ donors for HIV-positive recipients (Boyarsky, 2011). The published experience with HIV-positive to HIV-positive SOT at this time comes from Muller et al from the University of Cape Town in South Africa. Initially, Muller et al (2010) reported 100 percent patient and graft survival in a four-patient pilot study. Subsequently, the same group reported an additional 10 HIV-positive to HIV-positive renal transplants (Muller, 2012). All patients were restarted on ART early postoperatively in the immunosuppressive setting of T-

cell-depleting induction therapy, tacrolimus, mycophenolate mofetil, and prednisone. One to 4 years after transplantation, outcomes remained excellent and all patients had undetectable viral loads (Muller, 2012). The cumulative University of Cape Town experience of 27 HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplant procedures was recently summarized in the New England Journal of Medicine (Muller, 2015). The 1- and 5-year death-censored graft survival was 93 and 84 percent, respectively, and 1- and 5-year patient survival was 83 and 74 percent, respectively. Of note, the South African HIV-positive deceased donors were ART-naïve, without history of opportunistic infection or proteinuria, and had normal pre-transplant renal biopsies. While renal function has remained normal in the recipients, three have had routine post-transplant renal biopsies demonstrating new changes typical of early HIV-associated nephropathy that were not present in baseline biopsy specimens. The long-term significance of these findings remains unknown and awaits longer follow-up. All patients had undetectable plasma HIV viral loads after transplantation. Graft rejection rates were 8 percent at 1 year and 22 percent at 3 years.

This document presents criteria for conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation in the United States. The criteria are grouped into six broad categories: Donor Eligibility, Recipient Eligibility, Transplant Hospital Criteria, OPO Responsibilities, Prevention of Inadvertent Transmission of HIV, and Study Design/Required Outcome Measures. These research criteria do not describe all of the necessary components of a research protocol for HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation, such as the specific medication regimens, pre-transplant induction (if any), maintenance immunosuppression after transplantation, or control of HIV infection. These protocol elements and others will be determined by an investigator's specific research questions and the expertise of those conducting the research. Rather, the criteria address the minimum safety and data requirements of clinical research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation. As mandated by the HOPE Act, the Secretary, together with the OPTN, is charged with reviewing the results of scientific research conducted under these criteria to determine whether the OPTN's standards of quality should be further modified and whether some HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplants should proceed outside the auspices of research conducted under such criteria.

This document focuses on liver and kidney transplantation, as it is only in liver and kidney transplantation that there is substantial experience with transplantation from HIV-negative donors to HIV-positive recipients (Sawinski, 2015; Locke, 2015a, 2015b; Miro, 2015). The intent is not to exclude the possibility of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation of other organs such as the heart or lung in the future; however, transplant teams must gain experience with HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplantation of a specific organ before taking on the more complex and less well-defined issues of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation of that organ. Centers developing research protocols for HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation of organs other than kidney or liver must have a study team with demonstrated experience in HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplants, as noted in Section 3.1(ii), for the organ transplant(s) proposed in the research protocol. Specific criteria for the transplantation of organs other than the liver and kidney have not been provided in this document because no evidence base exists to support such recommendations. The study team developing a research protocol for HIV-positive to HIV-positive non-renal, non-liver transplantation must develop and justify specific criteria for review and approval by their IRB, based on the relevant experiences of the study team and others.

These criteria are in addition to, not in place of, current policies and regulations governing organ transplantation and human subjects' research. Accordingly, to emphasize the specific requirements unique to the investigational transplantation of organs from HIV-positive donors into HIV-positive recipients, the research criteria set forth here do not address related requirements that exist in federal regulations or OPTN bylaws or policies including, but not limited to, obligations imposed on OPTN transplant hospitals and transplant programs concerning informed consent of transplant recipients and living donors, the equitable allocation of organs, and organ offers. The regulations governing the operation of OPTN are codified at 42 CFR part 121 and OPTN policies and bylaws can be found at *http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/ContentDocuments/OPTN_Policies.pdf.*

Under these research criteria, all HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation must occur under an IRB-approved research protocol and shall comply with any other existing laws, policies, and regulations governing the conduct of human subjects' research (see Public Law 113–51 and, *e.g.,* 45 CFR part 46, as applicable). In addition, a transplant program conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation under these research criteria must provide each living donor and recipient with an independent advocate.

Although the criteria set forth in this document outline the minimum safety requirements for research involving HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation, it is expected that investigators will develop more specific eligibility criteria based on their individual research questions and protocols. In addition, it is likely, that researchers will wish to collect research specimens (blood, urine, tissue) in addition to those specified in the Research Criteria.

1 Donor Eligibility

HIV-positive living donors and HIV-positive deceased donors of organs for transplantation into an HIV-positive recipient must fulfill applicable clinical criteria in place for HIV-uninfected organ donors.

There is substantial concern about the consequences of transplanting an organ from an HIV-positive donor to a recipient infected with a strain of HIV that differs from the donor's in terms of its responsiveness to antiretroviral therapy (ART). The likelihood and impact of HIV superinfection in this context are unknown. Adverse consequences could range from transient loss of viral suppression, necessitating a change in antiretroviral regimen to a worst-case scenario in which the new infecting strain of HIV is unresponsive to available antiretroviral treatment and the recipient progresses to AIDS (Redd, 2013). Information relevant to understanding the known or potential extent of antiretroviral resistance in the strain of HIV infecting the organ donor may be incomplete for many reasons:

- There may be inadequate virus in donor specimens for antiretroviral resistance testing;
- If the specimen is adequate, there may not be enough time within the decision-making evaluation window to fully assess antiretroviral resistance before the clinical deterioration of the donor, organ procurement, and implantation;
- The donor's history of antiretroviral treatment may be unknown or incomplete;

• Results from prior antiretroviral resistance testing may be unavailable.

These issues might be especially challenging when considering organ donation from deceased donors whose HIV infection is first identified during donor evaluation. As of 2011, an estimated 1 in 6 U.S. adults living with HIV infection were undiagnosed (Prevention, 2013) and an estimated 16 percent of newly diagnosed, untreated individuals were infected with virus resistant to at least one class of antiretroviral drug (Kim, 2013; Megens, 2013).

It is anticipated that the risk of transmission of resistant HIV strains may be lower from deceased donors with a well-documented history of antiretroviral treatment, undetectable virus at demise, and robust and persistent undetectable viral load for at least 1 year prior to death. However, to impose this as an eligibility criterion would limit the pool of suitable donors and severely limit the ability to study transplantation of HIV-positive organs under the HOPE Act. In addition, it will not be possible in all cases to obtain viral loads and/or antiretroviral resistance profiles in the time available for donor evaluation. Transplant teams evaluating a donor must review all available donor and recipient information and be able to propose an antiretroviral regimen that will be equally or more safe, tolerable, and effective for the recipient after transplantation as the regimen in place in the recipient before transplantation. For instance, a donor who only achieves viral suppression with a regimen known to be intolerable to the recipient must not be accepted. If there is doubt about the ability to suppress viral replication after transplantation, the transplant must not move forward.

Donors co-infected with hepatitis are not excluded from HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplant; however, careful consideration must be given when evaluating a donor co-infected with HBV and/or HCV (Terrault, 2012; Miro, 2012; Moreno, 2012; Sherman, 2014; Chen, 2014). Although HCV therapeutic strategies are rapidly evolving (Liang, 2013), it is possible that mixed genotype HCV infections may influence post-transplant treatment of HCV in the recipient. Prior antiretroviral treatment of the donor and/or recipient with agents active against HBV (*i.e.,* lamivudine, emtricitabine, adefovir, and tenofovir) has the potential for inducing or uncovering archived HBV drug resistance in the recipient (Dieterich, 2007; Soriano, 2009; Pais, 2010).

In the case of a living HIV-positive organ donor, the risk of future end-stage liver or kidney failure in the donor must be carefully assessed as it is in other at-risk populations currently eligible to donate an organ. For example, kidney disease in HIV-positive patients has been associated with the apolipoprotein 1 (APOL1) coding variants that confer a very high risk of susceptibility and are almost exclusively found in patients of African descent (Freedman, 2013; Genovese, 2010). Living donation of a kidney from a donor having such a variant may be associated with an unacceptable risk of subsequent kidney disease to both the donor and the recipient (Freedman, 2015; Reeves-Daniel, 2011; Parsa, 2013; Riella, 2015).

The consent process for an HIV-positive living organ donor must include and document provision to the donor of information regarding: (1) The possibility that the loss of organ function resulting from donation could preclude the use of certain antiretroviral drugs in the future; (2) the risk of kidney or liver failure in the future; (3) the possibility of transmission of occult opportunistic infections to the recipient; and (4) the absence of U.S. experience in HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation, and thus the unpredictable nature of donor and recipient outcomes (Mgbako, 2013).

HIV-positive transplant candidates who are listed for a transplant in the context of a research study of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation must have the same opportunity as other transplant candidates to receive an organ from an HIV-negative donor, should one become available for them.

1.1 HIV-Positive Donor Eligibility Criteria

The HIV-specific donor eligibility criteria for deceased donors and for living donors are listed (also refer to Table 1). Co-infection with HBV and/or HCV is not an exclusion criterion, although research that includes co-infected donors must address any additional eligibility criteria within their research protocol.

1.1.1 HIV-Positive Deceased Donors

When evaluating HIV-positive deceased donors, it is understood that limited medical history may be available and/or known at the time of the donor evaluation. The OPO must make reasonable efforts to obtain prior medical history so that a transplant center team may best determine the suitability of the potential donor based on the information available. A complete history of antiretroviral regimens and a history of viral load tests and resistance testing are especially valuable for evaluating the likelihood of donor HIV resistance to antiretroviral regimens. A history of OIs or cancers is also of high importance, due to the increased risk for both attributable to HIV, and the additional difficulty of treating some infections and neoplasms in a post-transplant setting. It is possible that deceased donors with lower CD4+ T-cell counts may pose an increased risk of harboring transmissible diseases (*e.g.,* opportunistic infections or neoplasms) that may be difficult to detect during organ harvest and transplantation; teams conducting transplants under the HOPE Act are urged to assess donors with low CD4+ T-cell counts (*e.g.,* ≤200/μL) with special caution and to promptly inform IRBs and protocol sponsors of known or suspected disease transmission events.

Minimum eligibility criteria for all HIV-positive deceased donors:

i. Documented HIV infection using an FDA-licensed, approved, or cleared test device(s).

ii. No evidence of invasive opportunistic complications of HIV infection.

iii. Pre-implant donor organ biopsy to be stored, at a minimum, for the duration of the study (or at least 5 years); additional specimens may be obtained to support specific research goals.

Additional eligibility criteria for HIV-positive deceased donors with a known history of HIV and prior treatment with ART:

i. The study team must describe the anticipated post-transplant antiretroviral regimen(s) to be prescribed for the recipient and justify their conclusion that the proposed regimen will be safe, tolerable, and effective.

1.1.2 HIV-Positive Living Donors

Minimum eligibility criteria for HIV-positive living donors:

i. Documented HIV infection using an FDA-licensed, approved, or cleared test device.

ii. Well-controlled HIV infection, as evidenced by:

a. CD4+ T-cell count ≥500/μL for the 6-month period preceding donation.

b. Fewer than 50 copies/mL of HIV–1 RNA detectable by ultrasensitive or real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assay.

iii. A complete history of ART regimens and ART resistance.

iv. The study team must be able to predict a safe, tolerable, and effective regimen to be prescribed for the recipient based on the donor's current ART regimen as well as the donor's history of ART resistance.

v. No evidence of invasive opportunistic complications of HIV infection.

vi. A liver biopsy (in liver donors) or a kidney biopsy (in kidney donors) showing no evidence of a disease process that would put the donor at increased risk of progressing to end-stage organ failure after donation, or that would present a risk of poor graft function to the recipient.

2 Recipient Eligibility

A key consideration when evaluating potential HIV-positive transplant candidates is the ability to suppress HIV viral load post-transplant. This includes a thorough assessment by the transplant team of the candidate recipient's prescribed antiretroviral medications, HIV RNA levels while on medications, adherence to HIV treatment, and any available HIV resistance testing; a similar evaluation of the donor must also be carried out. A transplant should only take place if, after evaluating both recipient and donor, the team is confident they can define a post-transplant antiretroviral regimen that will be safe, tolerable, and effective. If there is any doubt on the part of the transplant team about the ability to suppress viral replication post-transplant, the transplant should not move forward. Concerns about transmitted drug resistance must be included in the recipient informed consent process for the research study. At the time of an organ offer, the recipient informed consent must address the transplant team's assessment of risk specific to the organ they are being offered.

2.1 HIV-Positive Recipient Eligibility Criteria

The following HIV-specific criteria must be met when screening for an HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplant (also refer to Table 1):

i. CD4+ T-cell count ≥200/μL (kidney) and ≥100/μL (liver) within 16 weeks prior to transplant; any patient with history of OI must have a CD4 positive T-cell count ≥200/uL.

ii. HIV RNA less than 50 copies/mL and on a stable antiretroviral regimen.*

iii. No evidence of active opportunistic complications of HIV infection.

iv. No history of primary CNS lymphoma or progressive PML.

v. Concurrence by the study team that, based on medical history and ART, viral suppression can be achieved in the recipient post-transplant.

*Patients who are unable to tolerate ART due to organ failure or who have only recently started ART may have detectable viral load and still be considered eligible if the study team is confident there will be a safe, tolerable, and effective antiretroviral regimen for the patient once organ function is restored after transplantation.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF DONOR AND RECIPIENT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR HIV-POSITIVE SERO-CONCORDANT ORGAN TRANSPLANT PAIRS UNDER THE HOPE ACT

HIV-Related variables	Deceased donor	Living donor	HIV-Positive recipient
Current CD4+ T-cell count (T lymphocytes/μL)	No requirement	≥500 for 6 months prior to organ donation.	If no history of OI • ≥200 If history of OI • ≥200 (kidney) • ≥100 (liver) CD4+ T-cell count measured within 16 weeks of transplantation
Plasma HIV RNA viral load (copies/mL).	No requirement**	<50	<50*
Opportunistic infection	No invasive OI	No invasive OI	Currently, • No active OI Historically, no • CNS lymphoma • PML

*Organ recipients who are unable to tolerate ART due to organ failure or who have only recently started ART may have detectable viral load and still be considered eligible if the study team is confident there will be a safe, tolerable, and effective antiretroviral regimen to be used by the recipient once organ function is restored after transplantation.

**In deceased donors with a known history of HIV infection and prior treatment with ART, the study team must describe the anticipated post-transplant antiretroviral regimen(s) to be used by the organ recipient and justify their conclusion that the proposed regimen will be safe, tolerable, and effective.

3 Transplant Hospital Criteria

Expertise in the management of individuals with HIV infection is essential for this research. A transplant hospital participating in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation must include experts in the field of transplantation as well as experts in the management of HIV infection working collaboratively as a part of a study team.

3.1 Specific Transplant Hospital Criteria

i. An established program for the care of individuals infected with HIV.

ii. In order for a transplant hospital to initiate HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation, there must be a study team consisting of (at a minimum) a transplant surgeon, a transplant physician, and an HIV physician. The transplant physician and HIV physician collectively must have experience with at least 5 HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplants with the designated organ(s) over the last 4 years. This constitutes the minimal experience necessary, and the IRB must evaluate key personnel (*i.e.,* transplant surgeon, transplant physician, and HIV physician) in the context of total expertise and experience with respect to HIV and/or organ transplantation (confirm and document HIV-negative to HIV-positive transplant experience of the team).

iii. Defined SOPs and training for the hospital personnel involved in procurement and/or implantation regarding the following issues:

a. Donor evaluation
b. Organ recovery
c. Handling, processing, packaging, shipping, and transporting of blood, lymph nodes, tissues, and organs to and/or within the transplant hospital
d. Transplant procedure

iv. Transplant hospitals with an IRB-approved research protocol in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation

must inform the OPTN of additional organ-specific acceptance criteria for organs from HIV-positive donors.

v. Transplant hospitals with an IRB-approved research protocol in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation with HIV-positive candidates on the wait list willing to accept an HIV-positive organ must specify any additional acceptance criteria to the OPO.

vi. The transplant hospital must verify the HIV status of both the donor and the recipient.

vii. Defined SOPs and training regarding an institutional biohazard plan, which outlines the measures taken to prevent and manage inadvertent exposure and/or transmission of HIV.

viii. Defined policies and SOPs for governing the necessary knowledge, experience, skills, and training for independent advocates.

3.2 Independent Advocates

A transplant program conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation under these research criteria must provide each HIV-positive living donor and recipient with an independent advocate.

In the setting of a living donor transplant, there must be two independent advocates, one for the donor and another for the recipient. Each advocate must be independent of the research team and must have knowledge and experience with both HIV infection and organ transplantation.

At a minimum, transplant hospitals conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation shall develop policies and procedures addressing the role, knowledge, and experience of independent advocates in the setting of HIV infection, transplantation, medical ethics, informed consent, and the potential impact of external pressure on the HIV-positive recipient's decision, and HIV-positive living donor's decision (if applicable) about whether to enter the HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplant research study.

3.2.1 Independent HIV-Positive Recipient Advocate

Transplant programs performing HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplants must designate and provide each HIV-positive recipient and prospective HIV-positive recipient with an independent advocate who is responsible for protecting and promoting the rights and interests of the HIV-positive recipient (or prospective recipient). The independent advocate for the HIV-positive recipient must:

i. Promote and protect the interests of the HIV-positive recipient (including with respect to having access to a suitable HIV-negative organ if it becomes available) and take steps to ensure that the HIV-positive recipient's decision is informed and free from coercion.

ii. Review whether the potential HIV-positive recipient has received information regarding the results of SOT in general and transplantation in HIV-positive recipients in particular and the unknown risks associated with HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplant.

iii. Demonstrate knowledge of HIV infection and transplantation.

3.2.2 Independent HIV-Positive Living Donor Advocate

Transplant programs performing HIV-positive donor transplantations must designate and provide each living HIV-positive donor and living prospective HIV-positive donor with an independent advocate who is responsible for promoting and protecting the rights and interests of the HIV-positive donor (or prospective donor). More specifically, the independent advocate for the HIV-positive living donor must:

i. Promote and protect the interests of the HIV-positive donor (including with respect to having ample opportunity to withdraw consent from donation) and take steps to ensure that the HIV-positive donor's decision is informed and free from external pressure.

ii. Review whether the potential HIV-positive donor has received information regarding (a) risks of organ donation in general, as well as the additional potential risks that are the specific to the HIV-positive donor, including accelerated organ failure, and limitations of future use of specific antiretroviral agents; and (b) the unknown outcome of HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation.

iii. Demonstrate knowledge of HIV infection and transplantation.

4 OPO Responsibilities

Clinical research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive organ transplantation requires a partnership between OPOs and transplant programs. OPOs participating in the evaluation and allocation of HIV-positive organs to centers conducting research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation must adhere to the following criteria:

i. Develop SOPs and staff training procedures to effectively work with the family and other sources of medical history for HIV-positive donors in assessing medical and behavioral risks; HIV clinic and pharmacy medical record abstraction; obtaining research consent from next of kin of HIV-positive donors; performing physical examination of HIV-positive donors; collecting blood, tissue, and other biospecimens (*e.g.,* urine, bronchoalveolar lavage, spleen, lymph nodes, and biopsy material); and handling, processing, storing, labeling, and shipping of the biospecimens.

ii. Conduct training in obtaining relevant and pertinent HIV-positive history, duration of HIV infection, opportunistic illnesses and their therapy, risk factors for HIV, CD4+ T-cell counts (lows and highs), HIV resistance, ART medication history use and response, history of ART resistance, present ART, HIV viral loads, and HIV genotype and tropism, when known.

iii. Develop a biohazard plan to prevent and manage exposure to or transmission of HIV.

These criteria are in addition to, not in place of, current Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (OPTN) policies and bylaws, state or local laws, and federal regulations governing organ transplantation and research that pertains to OPOs.

5 Prevention of Inadvertent Transmission of HIV

Although the use of HIV-positive organs may help alleviate transplant shortages and reduce patient waiting list times, there also are patient safety concerns to consider. Prevention or management of inadvertent transmission of HIV or exposure of an HIV-negative recipient to organs or tissues from an HIV-positive donor due to identification error is paramount (Ison, 2009, 2011a, 2011b). The transplant community, with regulatory oversight at multiple levels, has been able to achieve a high level of safety through routine procedures and clinical practice. The precautions taken with ABO compatible donor-recipient pairs and HCV-infected donor organs in HCV-infected recipients (Morales, 2010; Kucirka, 2010; Mandal, 2000; Tector, 2006) are existing models. However, vulnerabilities still exist, and mishaps still occur. For instance, the risks of error during manual transcription of information are well documented.

Each transplant hospital shall have an institutional biohazard plan for handling of HIV-positive organs—to include, for example, organ quarantine measures, electronic information capture on infectious disease testing results, communication protocols between OPOs and transplant hospitals—that is designed to prevent and/or manage inadvertent transmission of or exposure to HIV.

Tissues (*e.g.,* cornea, blood vessels, or cartilage) not associated with the organ to be transplanted and organs are often recovered from organ donors. The FDA regulates human cells, tissues, and cellular and tissue-based products (HCT/Ps) that are intended for implantation, transplantation, infusion, or transfer into a human recipient under the authority of section 361 of the Public Health Service Act and the implementing regulations in 21 CFR part 1271. Under 21 CFR part 1271, persons with risk factors for, or clinical evidence of, relevant communicable diseases, or whose test results are positive or reactive for relevant communicable diseases (including HIV) are ineligible to donate HCT/Ps. Procedures must be in place to ensure that HCT/Ps are not recovered from HIV-positive donors for implantation, transplantation, infusion, or transfer into a human recipient; however, HCT/Ps from a donor who has been determined to be ineligible may be made available for nonclinical purposes.

6 Study Design/Required Outcome Measures

There is a wide range of clinical and immunologic questions that might be addressed in the context of research in HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation. These include, for example, questions related to HIV superinfection; incidence and severity of OIs (including transmission of occult OIs from donor to recipient); immunologic mechanisms contributing to the increased rate of kidney rejection observed in HIV-positive recipients; quality of life for recipients of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation; outcomes of living HIV-positive donors; and a host of others. The questions will be determined by the investigators who design research protocols for studying HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation. However, to ensure that all studies of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation can contribute to evaluation of the safety of the procedure, the following key donor and recipient characteristics and outcome measures must be incorporated into the design of all clinical trials of HIV-positive to HIV-positive transplantation.

6.1 Wait List Candidates

- HIV status
- CD4+ T-cell count
- Co-infection (HCV, HBV)
- HIV viral load
- ART resistance
- Removal from wait list (death or other reason)
- Time on wait list

6.2 Donors (all)

- Type (living or deceased)
- HIV status (HIV-positive new diagnosis, HIV-positive known diagnosis)
- CD4+ T-cell count
- Co-infection (HCV, HBV)
- HIV viral load
- ART resistance
- Pre-transplant donor allograft biopsy

6.3 Living Donors (6, 12, and 24 Months Following Organ Donation)

- Progression to renal insufficiency in kidney donors:
  - Proteinuria defined as urinary protein excretion >150 mg/day or urine protein/creatinine ratio >0.2
  - eGFR <60 mL/minute/1.73m^2
- Progression to hepatic insufficiency in liver donors (INR >1.5 and/or total bilirubin >2.0)
- Change in ART regimen as a result of decreased organ function
- Progression to AIDS
- Failure to suppress viral replication (persistent viremia)
- Death

6.4 Transplant Recipients

- Rejection rate (annual up to 5 years)
- Progression to AIDS
- New OIs
- Failure to suppress viral replication (persistent viremia)
- HIV-associated organ failure
- Malignancy
- Graft failure
- Mismatched ART resistance versus donor
- Death

References

Bertani, A., Grossi, P., Vitulo, P., et al. (2009). Successful lung transplantation in an HIV- and HBV-positive patient with cystic fibrosis. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 9, 2190–2196.

Bisleri, G., Morgan, J. A., Deng, M. C., et al. (2003). Should HIV-positive recipients undergo heart transplantation? Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, 126, 1639–1640.

Blumberg, E. A., & Stock, P. (2009). Solid organ transplantation in the HIV-infected patient. American Journal of Transplantation, 9 Suppl 4, S131–135.

Blumberg, E. A., & Rogers, C. C. (2013a). Human immunodeficiency virus in solid organ transplantation. American Journal of Transplantation, 13 Suppl 4, 169–178.

Blumberg, E. A., Ison, M. G., Pruett, T. L., & Segev, D. L. (2013b). Optimal testing of the live organ donor for blood-borne viral pathogens: the report of a consensus conference. American Journal of Transplantation, 13(6), 1405–1415.

Boyarsky, B. J., Hall, E. C., Singer, A. L., Montgomery, R. A., Gebo, K. A., & Segev, D. L. (2011). Estimating the potential pool of HIV-infected deceased organ donors in the United States. American Journal of Transplantation, 11(6), 1209–1217.

Boyarsky, B. J., Durand C. M., Palella F. J., Segev D.L., (2015). Challenges and clinical decision-making in HIV-to-HIV transplantation: insights from the HIV literature. American Journal of Transplantation, 15:2023–2030.

Brucato, A., Colombo, T., Bonacina, E., et al. (2004). Fulminant myocarditis during HIV seroconversion: recovery with temporary left ventricular mechanical assistance. Italian Heart Journal, 5, 228–231.

Calabrese, L. H., Albrecht, M., Young, J., et al. (2003). Successful cardiac transplantation in an HIV–1-infected patient with advanced disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 348, 2323–2328.

Castel, M. A., Pérez-Villa, F., Roig, E., & Miró, J. M. (2011a). Heart transplantation in an HIV–1-infected patient with ischemic cardiomyopathy and severe pulmonary hypertension. Revista Española de Cardiología, 64, 1066–1067.

Castel, M. A., Pérez-Villa, F., & Miró, J. M. (2011b). Heart transplantation in HIV-infected patients: more cases in Europe. The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation, 30, 1418.

Chen, J. Y., Feeney, E. R., & Chung, R. T. (2014). HCV and HIV co-infection: mechanisms and management. Nature Reviews: Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 11(6), 362–371.

Cooper, C., Kanters, S., Klein, M., Chaudhury, P., Marotta, P., Wong, P., et al. (2011). Liver transplant outcomes in HIV-infected patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis with synthetic cohort. AIDS, 25(6), 777–786.

Dieterich, D.T. (2007). Special considerations and treatment of patients with HBV–HIV coinfection. Antiviral Therapy, 12, H43–H51.

Duclos-Vallee, J. C., Falissard, B., & Samuel, D. (2011). Liver transplant outcomes in HIV-infected patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis with a synthetic cohort. AIDS, 25(13), 1675–1676.

Durante-Mangoni, E., Maiello, C., & Sbreglia, C. (2011). A European first: successful heart transplant in a human immunodeficiency virus-positive recipient. The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation, 30, 845.

Durante-Mangoni, E., Maiello, C., Limongelli, G., et al. (2014). Management of immunosuppression and antiretroviral treatment before and after heart transplant for HIV-associated dilated cardiomyopathy. International Journal of Immunopathology and Pharmacology, 27(1), 113–120.

Fieno, D. S., Czer, L. S., Schwarz, E. R., et al. (2009). Left ventricular assist device placement in a patient with end-stage heart failure and human immunodeficiency virus. Interactive Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery, 9, 919–920.

Fox, A. N., Vagefi, P. A., & Stock, P. G. (2012). Liver transplantation in HIV

patients. Seminars in Liver Disease, 32(2), 177–185.
Frassetto, L. A., Browne, M., Cheng, A., et al. (2007). Immunosuppressant pharmacokinetics and dosing modifications in HIV–1 Infected liver and kidney transplant recipients. American Journal of Transplantation, 7(12), 2816–2820.
Frassetto, L. A., Tan-Tam, C., & Stock, P. G. (2009). Renal transplantation in patients with HIV. Nature Review: Nephrology, 5(10), 582–589.
Frassetto, L. A., Tan-Tam, C. C., Barin, B., Browne, M., Wolfe, A. R., Stock, P. G., et al. (2014). Best Single Time Point Correlations with AUC for Cyclosporine and Tacrolimus in HIV-Infected Kidney and Liver Transplant Recipients. Transplantation, 97(6), 701–707.
Freedman, B.I. (2013). APOL1 and nephropathy progression in populations of African ancestry. Seminars in Nephrology, 33(5):425–432.
Freedman, B.I., Julian, B. A., Pastan, S. O. et al. (2015). Apolipoprotein L1 gene variants in deceased organ donors are associated with renal allograft failure. American Journal of Transplantation, 15:1615–1622.
Genovese, G., Friedman, D. J., Ross, M. D., Lecordier, L., Uzureau, P., Freedman, B. I., et al. (2010). Association of trypanolytic APOL1 variants with kidney disease in African Americans. Science, 329(5993), 841–845.
Gomez, V., Fernandez, A., Galeano, C., Oliva, J., Diez, V., Bueno, C., et al. (2013). Renal transplantation in HIV-infected patients: experience at a tertiary hospital in Spain and review of the literature. Transplant Proceedings, 45(3), 1255–1259.
Grossi, P. A. (2012). Update in HIV infection in organ transplantation. *Current Opinion Organ Transplantation,* 17(6), 586–593.
Harbell, J., Terrault, N. A., & Stock, P. (2013). Solid organ transplants in HIV-infected patients. *Current HIV/AIDS Reports,* 10(3), 217–225.
Humbert, M., Sitbon, O., Chaouat A., et al. (2006). Pulmonary arterial hypertension in France: results from a national registry. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine,* 173, 1023.
Huprikar, S. (2009). Solid organ transplantation in HIV-infected individuals: an update. *Reviews in Medical Virology,* 19(6), 317–323.
Ison, M. G., Hager, J., Blumberg, E., Burdick, J., Carney, K., Cutler, J., et al. (2009). Donor-derived disease transmission events in the United States: data reviewed by the OPTN/UNOS Disease Transmission Advisory Committee. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 9(8), 1929–1935.
Ison, M. G., Llata, E., Conover, C. S., Friedewald, J. J., Gerber, S. I., Grigoryan, A., et al. (2011a). Transmission of human immunodeficiency virus and hepatitis C virus from an organ donor to four transplant recipients. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 11(6), 1218–1225.
Ison, M. G., & Nalesnik, M. A. (2011b). An update on donor-derived disease transmission in organ transplantation. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 11(6), 1123–1130.
Kaplan, J. E., Masur, H., Holmes, K.K., et al. (1995a). USPHS/IDSA guidelines for the prevention of opportunistic infections in persons infected with human immunodeficiency virus: introduction. USPHS/IDSA Prevention of Opportunistic Infections Working Group. *Clinical Infectious Diseases,* 21 Suppl 1:S1–11. Available at *http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8547495.*
Kaplan, J. E., Masur, H., Jaffe, H.W., Holmes, K.K. (1995b). Reducing the impact of opportunistic infections in patients with HIV infection. New guidelines. *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 274(4):347–348. Available at *http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7609267.*
Kern, R. M., Seethamraju, H., Blanc, P. D., et al. (2014a). The feasibility of lung transplantation in HIV seropositive patients. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* (in press, online).
Kern, R., Seethamraju, H., Blanc, P., Sinha, N., Loebe, M., Golden, J., et al. (2014b). Lung Transplantation in HIV Seropositive Patients. *Chest,* 145(3 Suppl), 642A.
Kim, D., Ziebell, R., Sadulvala, N., Kline, R., Ocfemia, C., Prejean, J., et al. (2013). Trends in Transmitted Drug Resistance Associated Mutations: 10 HIV Surveillance Areas, US, 2001–2010. Paper presented at the 20th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections.
Kim, W. R., Smith, J. M., Skeans, M. A., et al. (2014). OPTN/SRTR 2012 Annual Data Report: Liver. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 1, 69–96.
Kucirka, L. M., Singer, A. L., Ross, R. L., et al. (2010). Underutilization of hepatitis C-positive kidneys for hepatitis C-positive recipients. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 10(5), 1238–1246.
Kucirka, L.M., Bowring, M. G., Massie, A. B., et al, (2015) Landscape of deceased donors labeled increased risk for disease transmission under new guidelines. *American Journal of Transplantation,* (in press).
Liang, T. J., & Ghany, M. G. (2013). Current and future therapies for hepatitis C virus infection. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 368(20), 1907–1917.
Locke, J. E., James, N. T., Mannon, R. B., Mehta, S. G., Pappas, P. G., Baddley, J. W., et al. (2014). Immunosuppression Regimen and the Risk of Acute Rejection in HIV-Infected Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Transplantation,* 97(4), 446–450.
Locke, J. E., Reed R. D., Mehta S. G., et al. (2015a). Center-level experience and kidney transplant outcomes in HIV-infected recipients. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 15:2096–2104.
Locke, J. E., Mehta, S., Reed, R. D., et al. (2015b). A national study of outcomes among HIV-infected kidney transplant recipients. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology,* 26:1–8.
Mandal, A. K., Kraus, E.S., Samaniego, M., et al. (2000). Shorter waiting times for hepatitis C virus seropositive recipients of cadaveric renal allografts from hepatitis C virus seropositive donors. *Clinical Transplantation,* 14, 391–396.
Mascolini, M. (2014). Four to Five HIV+ Dying in Care Yearly in Philadelphia Are Potential Organ Donors. 54th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy: Abstract H–1199a. Presented September 7, 2014.
Matas, A. J., Smith, J. M., Skeans, M. A., et al. (2014) OPTN/SRTR 2012 Annual Data Report: Kidney. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 1, 11–44.
Megens, S., & Laethem, K. V. (2013). HIV–1 genetic variation and drug resistance development. *Expert Review of Anti-Infective Therapy,* 11(11), 1159–1178.
Mehmood, S., Blais, D., Martin S., & Sai-Sudhakar, C. (2009). Heartmate XVE destination therapy for end-stage heart failure in a patient with human immunodeficiency virus. *Interactive Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery,* 9, 909–910.
Mehta, N. J., Khan, I. A., Mehta, R. N., et al. (2000). HIV-related pulmonary hypertension: analytic review of 131 cases. *Chest,* 118, 1133.
Mgbako, O., Glazier, A., Blumberg, E., & Reese, P. P. (2013). Allowing HIV-positive organ donation: ethical, legal and operational considerations. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 13(7), 1636–1642.
Miro, J. M., Montejo, M., Castells, L., Rafecas, A., Moreno, S., Aguero, F., et al. (2012). Outcome of HCV/HIV-coinfected liver transplant recipients: a prospective and multicenter cohort study. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 12(7), 1866–1876.
Miro, J. M., Stock, P., Teicher, E., et al, (2015). Outcome and management of HCV/HIV coinfection pre- and post-liver transplantation. A 205 update. *Journal of Hepatology,* 62:701–711.
Morales, J. M., Campistol, J. M., Dominguez-Gil, B., Andres, A., Esforzado, N., Oppenheimer, F., et al. (2010). Long-term experience with kidney transplantation from hepatitis C-positive donors into hepatitis C-positive recipients. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 10(11), 2453–2462.
Moreno, A., Cervera, C., Fortun, J., et al. (2012). Epidemiology and outcome of infections in human immunodeficiency virus/hepatitis C virus-coinfected liver transplant recipients: a FIPSE/GESIDA prospective cohort study. *Liver Transplantation,* 18, 70–81.
Muller, E., Kahn, D., & Mendelson, M. (2010). Renal transplantation between HIV-positive donors and recipients. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 362(24), 2336–2337.
Muller, E., Barday, Z., Mendelson, M., & Kahn, D. (2012). Renal transplantation between HIV-positive donors and recipients justified. *South African Medical Journal,* 102(6), 497–498.
Muller, E., Barday, Z., Mendelson, M., Kahn,

D., et al. (2015). HIV-positive-to-HIV-positive kidney transplantation—results at 3 to 5 years. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 372:613–20.
Neuhaus, J., Angus, B., Kowalska, J. D., et al. (2010). Risk of all-cause mortality associated with nonfatal AIDS and serious non-AIDS events among adults infected with HIV. *AIDS,* 24(5), 697–706.
OPTN Policies and Bylaws. From *http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/policiesandbylaws/policies.asp.*
Pais, R. & Benhamou, Y. (2010). Long-term therapy for chronic hepatitis B in HIV co-infected patients. *Gastroentérologie Clinique et Biologique,* 34, 136–41.
Parsa, A., Kao, W. H. L., Xie, D., et al, (2013). *APOL1* risk variants, race, and progression of chronic kidney disease. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 369:2183–96.
Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents; recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at *http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf.* (Accessed September 2015).
Pelletier S. J., Norman S. P., Christensen L. L., et al. (2004). Review of transplantation in HIV patients during the HAART era. *Clinical Transplantation,* 63–82.
Petrosillo, N., Chinello, P., & Cicalini, S. (2006). Pulmonary hypertension in individuals with HIV infection. *AIDS,* 20, 2128.
Prevention, C. f. D. C. a. (2013). HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report.
Ragni, M. V., Dodson, S. F., Hunt, S. C., et al. (1999). Liver transplantation in a hemophilia patient with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *Blood,* 93, 1113–1114.
Redd A. D., Quinn T. C., Tobian A. A. (2013). Frequency and implications of HIV superinfection. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases,* 13(7), 622–628.
Reeves-Daniel, A. M., DePalma, J. A., Bleyer, A. J., Rocco, M. V., Murea, M., Adams, P. L., et al. (2011). The APOL1 Gene and Allograft Survival after Transplantation. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 11(5), 1025–1030.
Richterman, A., Blumberg, E., (2015). The challenges and promise of HIV-infected donors for solid organ transplantation. *Current Infectious Disease Reports,* 17:1–8.
Richterman, A., Sawinski, D., Reese, P.P., et al, (2015). An assessment of HIV-infected patients dying in care for deceased organ donation in a United States urban center. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 15:2105–2116.
Riella, L.V., Sheridan, A.M., (2015). Testing for high-risk APOL1 alleles in potential living kidney donors. *American Journal of Kidney Disease,* (in press).
Roland, M., Carlson, L., & Stock, P. (2002). Solid organ transplantation in HIV-infected individuals. *AIDS Clinical Care,* 14(7), 59–63.
Roland, M. E., Adey, D., Carlson, L. L., & Terrault, N. A. (2003a). Kidney and liver transplantation in HIV-infected patients: case presentations and review. *AIDS Patient Care STDS,* 17(10), 501–507.
Roland, M. E., Lo, B., Braff, J., & Stock, P. G. (2003b). Key clinical, ethical, and policy issues in the evaluation of the safety and effectiveness of solid organ transplantation in HIV-infected patients. *Archives of Internal Medicine,* 163(15), 1773–1778.
Roland, M. E., & Stock, P. G. (2003c). Review of solid-organ transplantation in HIV-infected patients. *Transplantation,* 75(4), 425–429.
Sawinski, D., Goldberg, D. S., Blumberg, E., et al. (2015) Beyond the NIH multicenter HIV transplant trial experience: Outcomes of HIV+ liver transplant recipients compared to HCV+ or HIV+/HCV+ coinfected recipients in the United States. *Clinical Infectious Disease,* (in Press).
Sherman, K. E., Thomas, D., & Chung, R. T. (2014). Human immunodeficiency virus and liver disease forum 2012. *Hepatology,* 59(1), 307–317.
Sims, D. B., Uriel, N., González-Costello, J., et al. (2011). Human immunodeficiency virus infection and left ventricular assist devices: a case series. *Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation,* 30, 1060–1064.
Soriano, V., Tuma, P., Labarga, P., et al. (2009). Hepatitis B in HIV patients: what is the current treatment and what are the challenges? *Journal of HIV Therapy,* 14(1), 13–18.
Stock, P. G., Barin, B., Murphy, B., Hanto, D., Diego, J. M., Light, J., et al. (2010). Outcomes of kidney transplantation in HIV-infected recipients. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 363(21), 2004–2014.
Taege, A. (2013). Organ transplantation and HIV progress or success? A review of current status. Curr *Infectious Disease Reports,* 15, 67–76.
Tector, A. J., Mangu, R. S., Chestovich, P., et al. (2006). Use of extended criteria livers decreases wait time for liver transplantation without adversity impacting posttransplant survival. *Annals of Surgery,* 244, 439–450.
Terrault, N. A., Roland, M. E., Schiano, T., Dove, L., Wong, M. T., Poordad, F., et al. (2012). Outcomes of liver transplant recipients with hepatitis C and human immunodeficiency virus coinfection. *Liver Transplantation,* 18(6), 716–726.
Touzot, M., Pillebout, E., Matignon, M., Tricot, L., Viard, J. P., Rondeau, E., et al. (2010). Renal transplantation in HIV-infected patients: the Paris experience. *American Journal of Transplantation,* 10(10), 2263–2269.
Uriel, N., Jorde, U. P., Cotarlan, V., et al. (2009). Heart transplantation in human immunodeficiency virus-positive patients. *Journal of Heart and Lung Transplant,* 28, 667–669.
Uriel, N., Nahumi, N., Colombo, P. C., et al. (2014). Advance heart failure in patients infected with human immunodeficiency virus: is there equal access to care? *Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* (in press, online).
Wada, N., Jacobson, L. P., Cohen, M., French, A., Phair, J., & Munoz, A. (2013). Cause-specific life expectancies after 35 years of age for human immunodeficiency syndrome-infected and human immunodeficiency syndrome-negative individuals followed simultaneously in long-term cohort studies, 1984–2008. *American Journal of Epidemiology,* 177(2), 116–125.
Wada, N., Jacobson, L. P., Cohen, M., French, A., Phair, J., & Munoz, A. (2014). Cause-specific mortality among HIV-infected individuals, by CD4 (+) cell count at HAART initiation, compared with HIV-uninfected individuals. *AIDS,* 28(2), 257–265.
Yoon, S. C., Hurst, F. P., Jindal, R. M., George, S. A., Neff, R. T., Agodoa, L. Y., et al. (2011). Trends in renal transplantation in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection: an analysis of the United States renal data system. *Transplantation,* 91(8), 864–868.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Francis S. Collins,

Director, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc. 2015–30172 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center for Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Member Conflict: Reproductive Biology.

Date: December 8, 2015.

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Virtual Meeting).

Contact Person: Michael Knecht, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of

Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 6176, MSC 7892, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1046, *knechtm@csr.nih.gov.*

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Vascular Biology and Hematology AREA.

Date: December 18, 2015.

Time: 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, (Telephone Conference Call).

Contact Person: Larry Pinkus, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 4132, MSC 7802, Bethesda, MD 20892, (301) 435–1214, *pinkusl@csr.nih.gov.*

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Carolyn Baum,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29940 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Amended Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the meeting of the NHLBI Institutional Training Mechanism Review Committee, December 11, 2015, 8:00 a.m. to December 11, 2015, 5:00 p.m., National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892 which was published in the **Federal Register** on November 12, 2015, 80 FR 69975.

This meeting is being amended because the meeting will now start at 10 a.m. and will be conducted as a teleconference. The meeting is closed to the public.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Michelle Trout,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–29941 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001]

Changes in Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final notice.

SUMMARY: New or modified Base (1-percent annual chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs), base flood depths, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundaries or zone designations, and/or regulatory floodways (hereinafter referred to as flood hazard determinations) as shown on the indicated Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for each of the communities listed in the table below are finalized. Each LOMR revises the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), and in some cases the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports, currently in effect for the listed communities. The flood hazard determinations modified by each LOMR will be used to calculate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and their contents.

DATES: The effective date for each LOMR is indicated in the table below.

ADDRESSES: Each LOMR is available for inspection at both the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the table below and online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) makes the final flood hazard determinations as shown in the LOMRs for each community listed in the table below. Notice of these modified flood hazard determinations has been published in newspapers of local circulation and 90 days have elapsed since that publication. The Deputy Associate Administrator for Mitigation has resolved any appeals resulting from this notification.

The modified flood hazard determinations are made pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.,* and with 44 CFR part 65.

For rating purposes, the currently effective community number is shown and must be used for all new policies and renewals.

The new or modified flood hazard information is the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

This new or modified flood hazard information, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities.

This new or modified flood hazard determinations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings, and for the contents in those buildings. The changes in flood hazard determinations are in accordance with 44 CFR 65.4.

Interested lessees and owners of real property are encouraged to review the final flood hazard information available at the address cited below for each community or online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.*

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Illinois:					
Adams (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	City of Quincy (15–05–3495P).	The Honorable Kyle Moore, Mayor, City of Quincy, 730 Maine Street, Quincy, IL 62301.	Quincy City Hall, 730 Maine Street, Quincy, IL 62301.	September 8, 2015	170003.
Adams (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	Unincorporated areas of Adams County (15–05–3495P).	The Honorable Les Post, Adams County Chairman, 101 North 54th Street, Quincy, IL 62305.	Adams County Highway Department, 101 North 54th Street, Quincy, IL 62305.	September 8, 2015	170001.
Sangamon (FEMA Docket No.: B–1525).	City of Springfield (14–05–6241P).	The Honorable J. Michael Houston, Mayor, City of Springfield, 800 East Monroe, Room 300, Springfield, IL 62701.	Springfield-Sangamon Regional Planning Commission, 200 South 9th, Room 212, Springfield, IL 62701.	September 29, 2015	170604.
Sangamon (FEMA Docket No.: B–1525).	Unincorporated areas of Sangamon County (14–05–6241P).	The Honorable Andy Van Meter, Sangamon County Chairman, 200 South 9th Street, Room 201, Springfield, IL 62701.	Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission, 200 South 9th, Room 212, Springfield, IL 62701.	September 29, 2015	170912.
Massachusetts: Middlesex (FEMA Docket No.: B–1525).	Town of Dracut (15–01–0572P).	Mrs. Cathy Richardson, Chairperson, Board of Selectman, Town Hall, 62 Arlington Street, Dracut, MA 01826.	62 Arlington Street, Dracut, MA 01826.	September 24, 2015	250190.
Michigan: Grand Traverse (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	City of Traverse City (15–05–0036P).	The Honorable Michael Estes, Mayor, City of Traverse City, 400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, MI 49684.	400 Boardman Avenue, Traverse City, MI 49684.	September 10, 2015	260082.
Missouri:					
Greene (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	City of Springfield (14–07–2873P).	The Honorable Bob Stephens, Mayor, City of Springfield, 840 Boonville Avenue, Springfield, MO 65802.	Springfield City Hall, 840 Boonville Avenue, Springfield, MO 65802.	September 9, 2015	290149.
Greene (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	Unincorporated areas of Greene County (14–07–2873P).	The Honorable Bob Cirtin, Presiding Commissioner, Greene County, 933 N.Robberson Avenue, Springfield, MO 65802.	Greene County Courthouse, 840 Boonville Avenue, Springfield, MO 65802.	September 9, 2015	290782.
Jefferson, (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	City of Herculaneum (14–07–1995P).	The Honorable Bill Haggard, Mayor, City of Herculaneum, City Hall, 1 Parkwood Court, Herculaneum, MO 63048.	1 Parkwood Ct., Herculaneum, MO 63048.	September 14, 2015	290192.
Nebraska:					
Merrick, (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	Village of Clarks (15–07–0548P).	Mr. James Kava, Board Chairman, Village of Clarks, 209 North Green Street, Clarks, NE 68628.	209 North Green Street, Clarks, NE 68628.	September 11, 2015	310149.
Merrick, (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	Unincorporated areas of Merrick County (15–07–0548P).	Mr. Roger Wiegert, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Merrick County Courthouse, 1510 18th Street, #1, Central City, NE 68826.	1510 18th Street, #1, Central City, NE 68826.	September 11, 2015	310457.
New Hampshire: Merrimack, (FEMA Docket No.: B–1518).	Town of Hooksett (14–01–3205P).	The Honorable James Sullivan, Town of Hooksett Councilor at Large, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH 03106.	16 Main Street, Hooksett, NH 03106.	September 15, 2015	330115.
Oregon: Tillamook (FEMA Docket No.: B–1525).	Unincorporated areas of Tillamook County. (14–10–1727P).	Mr. Tim Josi, Board of County Commissioners, Tillamook County, 201 Laurel Avenue, Tillamook, OR 97141.	Courthouse, 201 Laurel Avenue, Tillamook, OR 97141.	September 24, 2015	410196.
Washington: Pacific, (FEMA Docket No.: B–1531).	Unincorporated areas of Pacific County (15–10–0999X).	The Honorable Lisa Ayers, Pacific County Commissioner, District 3, P.O. Box 187, 1216 West Robert Bush Drive, South Bend, WA 98586.	300 Memorial Drive, South Bend, WA 98586.	September 22, 2015	530126.

[FR Doc. 2015–30035 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA–B–1549]

Changes in Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice lists communities where the addition or modification of Base Flood Elevations (BFEs), base flood depths, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundaries or zone designations, or the regulatory floodway (hereinafter referred to as flood hazard determinations), as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), and where applicable, in the supporting Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports, prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for each community, is appropriate because of new scientific or technical data. The FIRM, and where applicable, portions of the FIS report, have been revised to reflect these flood hazard determinations through issuance of a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), in accordance with Title 44, Part 65 of the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR part 65). The LOMR will be used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and the contents of those buildings. For rating purposes, the currently effective community number is shown in the table below and must be used for all new policies and renewals.

DATES: These flood hazard determinations will become effective on the dates listed in the table below and revise the FIRM panels and FIS report in effect prior to this determination for the listed communities.

From the date of the second publication of notification of these changes in a newspaper of local circulation, any person has 90 days in which to request through the community that the Deputy Associate Administrator for Mitigation reconsider the changes. The flood hazard determination information may be changed during the 90-day period.

ADDRESSES: The affected communities are listed in the table below. Revised flood hazard information for each community is available for inspection at both the online location and the respective community map repository address listed in the table below. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

Submit comments and/or appeals to the Chief Executive Officer of the community as listed in the table below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The specific flood hazard determinations are not described for each community in this notice. However, the online location and local community map repository address where the flood hazard determination information is available for inspection is provided.

Any request for reconsideration of flood hazard determinations must be submitted to the Chief Executive Officer of the community as listed in the table below.

The modifications are made pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.,* and with 44 CFR part 65.

The FIRM and FIS report are the basis of the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

These flood hazard determinations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. The flood hazard determinations are in accordance with 44 CFR 65.4.

The affected communities are listed in the following table. Flood hazard determination information for each community is available for inspection at both the online location and the respective community map repository address listed in the table below. Additionally, the current effective FIRM and FIS report for each community are accessible online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* for comparison.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Online location of letter of map revision	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Arkansas:						
Benton	City of Rogers (15–06–0704P).	The Honorable Greg Hines, Mayor, City of Rogers, 301 West Chestnut Street, Rogers, AR 72756.	City Hall, 301 West Chestnut Street, Rogers, AR 72756.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 6, 2016	050013
Washington ...	City of Fayetteville (14–06–3204P).	The Honorable Lioneld Jordan, Mayor, City of Fayetteville, 113 West Mountain Street, Fayetteville, AR 72701.	City Hall, 113 West Mountain Street, Fayetteville, AR 72701.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 25, 2016	050216
Colorado:						
Arapahoe	Unincorporated areas of Arapahoe County (15–08–0217P).	The Honorable Nancy N. Sharpe, Chair, Arapahoe County Board of Commissioners, 5334 South Prince Street, Littleton, CO 80120.	Arapahoe County Public Works and Development Department, 10730 East Briarwood Avenue, Centennial, CO 80112.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 15, 2016	080011
El Paso	City of Colorado Springs (15–08–0117P).	The Honorable John Suthers, Mayor, City of Colorado Springs, 30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 601, Colorado Springs, CO 80901.	City Hall, 30 South Nevada Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80901.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 13, 2016	080060
Jefferson	City and County of Broomfield (15–08–0066P).	The Honorable Randy Ahrens, Mayor, City of Broomfield, 1901 Aspen Street, Broomfield, CO 80020.	City Hall, 1 Descombes Drive, Broomfield, CO 80020.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 11, 2016	085073
Jefferson	City of Lakewood (15–08–0111P).	The Honorable Bob Murphy, Mayor, City of Lakewood, Lakewood Civic Center South, 480 South Allison Parkway, Lakewood, CO 80226.	Public Works Department, 480 South Allison Parkway, Lakewood, CO 80226.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 22, 2016	085075
Jefferson	City of Westminster (15–08–0066P).	The Honorable Herb Atchison, Mayor, City of Westminster, 4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster, CO 80031.	City Hall, 4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster, CO 80031.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 11, 2016	080008

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Online location of letter of map revision	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Delaware:						
Kent	Unincorporated areas of Kent County (15–03–0350P).	The Honorable P. Brooks Banta, President, Kent County Board of Commissioners, 555 Bay Road, Dover, DE 19901.	Kent County Public Works Department, 555 Bay Road, Dover, DE 19901.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 29, 2016	100001
Florida:						
Charlotte	City of Punta Gorda (15–04–4050P).	The Honorable Carolyn Freeland, Mayor, City of Punta Gorda, 326 West Marion Avenue, Punta Gorda, FL 33950.	City Hall, 126 Harvey Street, Punta Gorda, FL 33950.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 22, 2016	120062
Manatee	Town of Longboat Key (15–04–1422P).	The Honorable Jack Duncan, Mayor, Town of Longboat Key, 501 Bay Isles Road, Longboat Key, FL 34228.	Town Hall, 600 General Harris Street, Longboat Key, FL 34228.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 19, 2016	125126
Manatee	Unincorporated areas of Manatee County (15–04–1422P).	The Honorable Betsy Benac, Chair, Manatee County Board of Commissioners, P.O. Box 1000, Bradenton, FL 34206.	Manatee County Public Works Department, 1022 26th Avenue, East, Bradenton, FL 34205.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 19, 2016	120153
Miami-Dade	City of Miami (15–04–5201P).	The Honorable Tomas P. Regalado, Mayor, City of Miami, 3500 Pan American Drive, Miami, FL 33133.	City Hall, 444 Southwest 2nd Avenue, Miami, FL 33130.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 26, 2016	120650
Monroe	Village of Islamorada (15–04–4517P).	The Honorable Mike Forster, Mayor, Village of Islamorada, 86800 Overseas Highway, Islamorada, FL 33036.	Village Hall, 86800 Overseas Highway, Islamorada, FL 33036.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 14, 2016	120424
Monroe	Unincorporated areas of Monroe County (15–04–3973P).	The Honorable Danny Kolhage, Mayor, Monroe County, 530 Whitehead Street, Suite 102, Key West, FL 33040.	Monroe County Building Department, 2798 Overseas Highway, Suite 300, Marathon, FL 33050.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 29, 2016	125129
Osceola	Unincorporated areas of Osceola County (15–04–1788P).	The Honorable Brandon Arrington, Chairman, Osceola County Board of Commissioners, 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 4700, Kissimmee, FL 34741.	Osceola County Stormwater Division, 1 Courthouse Square, Suite 3100, Kissimmee, FL 34741.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 8, 2016	120189
Orange	Unincorporated areas of Orange County (15–04–1610P).	The Honorable Teresa Jacobs, Mayor, Orange County, 201 South Rosalind Avenue, 5th Floor, Orlando, FL 32801.	Orange County Public Works Department, 4200 South John Young Parkway, Orlando, FL 32839.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 28, 2016	120179
Seminole	City of Lake Mary (15–04–5338P).	The Honorable David J. Mealor, Mayor, City of Lake Mary, 100 North Country Club Road, Lake Mary, FL 32746.	City Hall, 911 Wallace Court, Lake Mary, FL 32746.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 28, 2016	120416
Georgia:						
Douglas	City of Douglasville (15–04–4421P).	The Honorable Harvey Persons, Mayor, City of Douglasville, 6695 Church Street, Douglasville, GA 30134.	Building Department, 6695 Church Street, Douglasville, GA 30134.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 25, 2016	130305
Douglas	Unincorporated areas of Douglas County (15–04–4421P).	The Honorable Tom Worthan, Chairman, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, 8700 Hospital Drive, 3rd Floor, Douglasville, GA 30134.	Douglas County Development Services Department, 8700 Hospital Drive, 1st Floor, Douglasville, GA 30134.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 25, 2016	130306
Mississippi:						
Harrison	City of Gulfport (15–04–4242P).	The Honorable Billy Hewes, Mayor, City of Gulfport, P.O. Box 1780, Gulfport, MS 39501.	City Hall, 1410 24th Avenue, Gulfport, MS 39501.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 15, 2016	285253
Montana:						
Yellowstone	City of Laurel (15–08–1029P).	The Honorable Mark Mace, Mayor, City of Laurel, 803 West 4th Street, Laurel, MT 59044.	City Planner's Office, 115 West 1st Street, Laurel, MT 59044.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 8, 2016	300086
North Carolina:						

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Online location of letter of map revision	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Wake	Town of Fuquay-Varina (15–04–2204P).	The Honorable John Byrne, Mayor, Town of Fuquay-Varina, 401 Old Honeycutt Road, Fuquay-Varina, NC 27256.	Engineering Department, 401 Old Honeycutt Road, Fuquay-Varina, NC 27256.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Dec. 18, 2015	370239
Wake	Unincorporated areas of Wake County (15–04–2204P).	The Honorable James West, Chairman, Wake County Board of Commissioners, P.O. Box 550, Raleigh, NC 27602.	Wake County Public Works Department, 222 Hargett Street, Raleigh, NC 27601.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Dec. 18, 2015	370368
North Dakota:						
Dunn	City of Killdeer (15–08–0619P).	The Honorable Chuck Muscha, President, City of Killdeer Council, P.O. Box 270, Killdeer, ND 58640.	Planning and Zoning Department, 165 Railroad Street, Killdeer, ND 58640.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Mar. 2, 2016	380030
Dunn	Unincorporated areas of Dunn County (15–08–0619P).	The Honorable Reinhard Hauck, Chairman, Dunn County Board of Commissioners, 205 Owens Street, Manning, ND 58642.	Dunn County Planning and Zoning Department, 205 Owens Street, Manning, ND 58642.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Mar. 2, 2016	380026
McKenzie	City of Watford City (15–08–0808P).	The Honorable Brent Sanford, Mayor, City of Watford City, P.O. Box 422, Watford City, ND 58854.	Planning and Zoning Department, 213 2nd Street Northeast, Watford City, ND 58854.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 28, 2016	380344
McKenzie	Unincorporated areas of McKenzie County (15–08–0808P).	The Honorable Richard Cayko, Chairman, McKenzie County Board of Commissioners, 201 5th Street Northwest, Suite 543, Watford City, ND 58854.	McKenzie County Planning and Zoning Department, 201 5th Street Northwest, Suite 699, Watford City, ND 58854.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 28, 2016	380054
Pennsylvania:						
Westmoreland	Borough of Irwin (14–03–1433P).	The Honorable Robert Wayman, Mayor, Borough of Irwin, 424 Main Street, Irwin, PA 15642.	Borough Hall, 424 Main Street, Irwin, PA 15642.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 21, 2016	420881
South Carolina:						
Charleston	Town of Mount Pleasant (15–04–5450P).	The Honorable Linda Page, Mayor, Town of Mount Pleasant, 100 Ann Edwards Lane, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464.	Town Hall, 100 Ann Edwards Lane, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 13, 2016	455417
Charleston	Town of Mount Pleasant (15–04–7267P).	The Honorable Linda Page, Mayor, Town of Mount Pleasant, 100 Ann Edwards Lane, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464.	Town Hall, 100 Ann Edwards Lane, Mount Pleasant, SC 29464.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 15, 2016	455417
Charleston	Unincorporated areas of Charleston County (15–04–7267P).	The Honorable J. Elliot Summey, Chairman, Charleston County Council, 4045 Bridgeview Drive, North Charleston, SC 29405.	Charleston County, Planning and Zoning Department, 4045 Bridgeview Drive, North Charleston, SC 29405.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 15, 2016	455413
Texas:						
Bexar	City of Castle Hills (14–06–2603P).	The Honorable Timothy A. Howell, Mayor, City of Castle Hills, 209 Lemonwood Drive, Castle Hills, TX 78213.	City Hall, 6915 West Avenue, Castle Hills, TX 78213.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 25, 2016	480037
Bexar	City of San Antonio (14–06–2603P).	The Honorable Ivy R. Taylor, Mayor, City of San Antonio, P. O. Box 839966, San Antonio, TX 78283.	Planning and Community Development Department, 100 Military Plaza, San Antonio, TX 78205.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 25, 2016	480045
Collin	Town of Prosper (15–06–0487P).	The Honorable Ray Smith, Mayor, Town of Prosper, P.O. Box 307, Prosper, TX 75078.	Engineering Services Department, 407 East 1st Street, Prosper, TX 75078.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 28, 2016	480141
Dallas	City of Cedar Hill (15–06–1030P).	The Honorable Rob Franke, Mayor, City of Cedar Hill, 285 Uptown Boulevard, Building 100, Cedar Hill, TX 75104.	City Hall, 285 Uptown Boulevard, Building 100, Cedar Hill, TX 75104.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 7, 2016	480168
Denton	Town of Prosper (15–06–1600P).	The Honorable Ray Smith, Mayor, Town of Prosper, P.O. Box 307, Prosper, TX 75078.	Engineering Services Department, 407 East 1st Street, Prosper, TX 75078.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 21, 2016	480141

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Online location of letter of map revision	Effective date of modification	Community No.
McLennan	City of Waco (15–06–1601P).	The Honorable Malcolm Duncan, Jr., Mayor, City of Waco, P.O. Box 2570, Waco, TX 76702.	Engineering Department, 401 Franklin Avenue, Waco, TX 76701.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 22, 2016	480461
McLennan	Unincorporated areas of McLennan County (15–06–1601P).	The Honorable Scott Felton, McLennan County Judge, 501 Washington Avenue, Waco, TX 76701.	McLennan County Engineering Department, 215 North 5th Street, Suite 130, Waco, TX 76701.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 22, 2016	480456
Virginia:						
Fairfax	Unincorporated areas of Fairfax County (15–03–1596P).	The Honorable Edward L. Long, Jr., Fairfax County Executive, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, VA 22035.	Fairfax County Planning and Zoning Department, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, VA 22035.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 7, 2016	515525
Utah:						
Washington ...	City of Washington (15–08–0247P).	The Honorable Ken Neilson, Mayor, City of Washington, 111 North 100 East, Washington, UT 84780.	Planning and Zoning Department, 111 North 100 East, Washington, UT 84780.	*http://www.msc.fema.gov/lomc.*	Jan. 27, 2016	490182

[FR Doc. 2015–30041 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001]

Changes in Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final notice.

SUMMARY: New or modified Base (1-percent annual chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs), base flood depths, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundaries or zone designations, and/or regulatory floodways (hereinafter referred to as flood hazard determinations) as shown on the indicated Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for each of the communities listed in the table below are finalized. Each LOMR revises the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), and in some cases the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports, currently in effect for the listed communities. The flood hazard determinations modified by each LOMR will be used to calculate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings and their contents.

DATES: The effective date for each LOMR is indicated in the table below.

ADDRESSES: Each LOMR is available for inspection at both the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the table below and online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) makes the final flood hazard determinations as shown in the LOMRs for each community listed in the table below. Notice of these modified flood hazard determinations has been published in newspapers of local circulation and 90 days have elapsed since that publication. The Deputy Associate Administrator for Mitigation has resolved any appeals resulting from this notification.

The modified flood hazard determinations are made pursuant to section 206 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.,* and with 44 CFR part 65.

For rating purposes, the currently effective community number is shown and must be used for all new policies and renewals.

The new or modified flood hazard information is the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

This new or modified flood hazard information, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities.

This new or modified flood hazard determinations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and also are used to calculate the appropriate flood insurance premium rates for new buildings, and for the contents in those buildings. The changes in flood hazard determinations are in accordance with 44 CFR 65.4.

Interested lessees and owners of real property are encouraged to review the final flood hazard information available at the address cited below for each community or online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.*

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Colorado:					
Arapahoe (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Englewood (15–08–0562P)..	The Honorable Randy Penn Mayor, City of Englewood, 1000 Englewood Parkway, Englewood, CO 80110.	Engineering Services Department, 3400 South Elati Street, Englewood, CO 80110.	September 25, 2015	085074
Denver (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City and County of Denver (15–08–0562P).	The Honorable Michael B. Hancock, Mayor, City and County of Denver, 1437 Bannock Street, Suite 350 Denver, CO 80202.	City and County of Denver Department of Public Works, 201 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80202.	September 25, 2015	080046
Douglas (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Unincorporated areas of Douglas County (14–08–1222P).	The Honorable Jill Repella, Chair, Douglas County Board of Commissioners, 100 3rd Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104.	Douglas County Department of Public Works, 100 3rd Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104.	September 18, 2015	080049
Florida:					
Orange (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Orlando (15–04–4309X).	The Honorable Buddy Dyer, Mayor, City of Orlando, 400 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, FL 32802.	Stormwater Management Department, 4200 South John Young Parkway, Orlando, FL 32839.	October 5, 2015	120186
Orange (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Unincorporated areas of Orange County (15–04–4309X).	The Honorable Teresa Jacobs, Mayor, Orange County, 201 South Rosalind Avenue, 5th Floor Orlando, FL 32801.	Orange County Permitting Services Division, 400 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, FL 32801.	October 5, 2015	120179
New York:					
Niagara (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Town of Niagara (15–02–0453P).	The Honorable Lee S. Wallace, Supervisor, Town of Niagara, 7105 Lockport Road, Niagara Falls, NY 14305.	Town Hall, 7105 Lockport Road, Niagara Falls, NY 14305.	October 16, 2015	360507
Niagara (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Town of Wheatfield (15–02–0453P).	The Honorable Robert B. Cliffe, Supervisor, Town of Wheatfield, 2800 Church Road, Wheatfield, NY 14120.	Town Hall, 2800 Church Road, Wheatfield, NY 14120.	October 16, 2015	360513
Suffolk (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Town of Southampton (15–02–0499P).	The Honorable Anna Throne-Holst, Supervisor, Town of Southampton, 116 Hampton Road Southampton, NY 11968.	Building Department, 116 Hampton Road, Southampton, NY 11968.	October 16, 2015	365342
Texas:					
Bell (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Temple (14–06–3184P).	The Honorable Danny Dunn, Mayor, City of Temple, 2 North Main Street, Suite 103, Temple, TX 76501.	Planning Department, 2 North Main Street, Temple, TX 76501.	September 25, 2015	480034
Bexar (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of San Antonio (14–06–4529P).	The Honorable Ivy R. Taylor, Mayor, City of San Antonio, P.O. Box 839966, San Antonio, TX 78283.	Storm Water Division, 1901 South Alamo Street, 2nd Floor, San Antonio, TX 78204.	October 2, 2015	480045
Bexar (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of San Antonio (15–06–0641P).	The Honorable Ivy R. Taylor, Mayor, City of San Antonio, P.O. Box 839966, San Antonio, TX 78283.	Storm Water Division, 1901 South Alamo Street, 2nd Floor, San Antonio, TX 78204.	September 22, 2015	480045
Brazoria (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Iowa Colony (15–06–1613P).	The Honorable Robert Wall, Mayor, City of Iowa Colony, 12003 County Road, 65 Iowa Colony, TX 77583.	City Hall, 12003 County Road, 65 Iowa Colony, TX 77583.	September 28, 2015	481071
Brazoria (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Manvel (15–06–1613P).	The Honorable Delores Martin, Mayor, City of Manvel, 20025 Highway 6, Manvel, TX 77578.	City Hall, 20025 Highway 6, Manvel, TX 77578.	September 28, 2015	480076
Brazoria (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Unincorporated areas of Brazoria County (15–06–1613P).	The Honorable Matt Sebesta, Jr., Brazoria County Judge ,111 East Locust Street, Suite 102, Angleton, TX 77515.	Brazoria County Floodplain Department, 111 East Locust Street, Building A–29, Angleton, TX 77515.	September 28, 2015	485458
Denton (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Unincorporated areas of Denton County (15–06–2283X).	The Honorable Mary Horn, Denton County Judge, 110 West Hickory Street, 2nd Floor, Denton, TX 76201.	Denton County Government Center, 1505 East McKinney Street, Suite 175, Denton, TX 76209.	October 5, 2015	480774
El Paso (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	Town of Anthony (15–06–0836P).	The Honorable Luis Vela, Mayor, Town of Anthony, 401 Wildcat Drive Anthony, TX 79281.	Town Hall, 401 Wildcat Drive, Anthony, TX 79281.	September 15, 2015	480804
Fort Bend (FEMA Docket No.: B–1509).	Pecan Grove Municipal Utility District (15–06–0769P).	Mr. Chad Howard, President, Pecan Grove Municipal Utility District, 3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2600, Houston, TX 77027.	Pecan Grove Municipal Utility District, Jones and Carter Engineering, 6335 Gulfton Drive, Suite 200 Houston, TX 77081.	July 9, 2015	481486
Fort Bend (FEMA Docket No.: B–1509).	City of Richmond (15–06–0769P).	The Honorable Evalyn W. Moore, Mayor, City of Richmond, 402 Morton Street, Richmond, TX 77469.	City Hall, 402 Morton Street, Richmond, TX 77469.	July 9, 2015	480231
Fort Bend (FEMA Docket No.: B–1509).	Unincorporated areas of Fort Bend County (15–06–0769P).	The Honorable Robert Hebert, Fort Bend County Judge, 401 Jackson Street, Richmond, TX 77469.	Fort Bend County Engineering Department, 301 Jackson Street, Richmond, TX 77469.	July 9, 2015	480228
Harris (FEMA Docket No.: B–1526).	City of Houston (15–06–1456P).	The Honorable Annise D. Parker, Mayor, City of Houston, P.O. Box 1562, Houston, TX 77251.	Office of Emergency Management, 5320 North Shepherd Drive, Houston, TX 77091.	September 25, 2015	480296
Hunt (FEMA Docket No.: B–1534).	City of Greenville (14–06–4302P).	The Honorable Steve Reid, Mayor, City of Greenville, P.O. Box 1049, Greenville, TX 75403.	Public Works Department, 2315 Johnson Street, Greenville, TX 75401.	July 8, 2015	485473
Tarrant (FEMA Docket No.: B–1534).	City of Fort Worth (14–06–4046P).	The Honorable Betsy Price, Mayor, City of Fort Worth, 1000 Throckmorton Street, Fort Worth, TX 76102.	City Hall, 1000 Throckmorton Street, Fort Worth, TX 76102.	September 15, 2015	480596
Tarrant (FEMA Docket No.: B–1534).	City of Fort Worth (15–06–0295P).	The Honorable Betsy Price, Mayor, City of Fort Worth, 1000 Throckmorton Street, Fort Worth, TX 76102.	City Hall, 1000 Throckmorton Street, Fort Worth, TX 76102.	August 25, 2015	480596

State and county	Location and case No.	Chief executive officer of community	Community map repository	Effective date of modification	Community No.
Virginia: Independent City (FEMA Docket No.: B–1538).	City of Fairfax (14–03–2004P).	The Honorable Robert Sisson, Manager, City of Fairfax, 10455 Armstrong Street, Room 316, Fairfax, VA 22030.	Public Works Department, 10455 Armstrong Street, Room 200, Fairfax, VA 22030.	August 25, 2015	515524

[FR Doc. 2015–30017 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001]

Final Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final notice.

SUMMARY: Flood hazard determinations, which may include additions or modifications of Base Flood Elevations (BFEs), base flood depths, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundaries or zone designations, or regulatory floodways on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) and where applicable, in the supporting Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports have been made final for the communities listed in the table below.

The FIRM and FIS report are the basis of the floodplain management measures that a community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In addition, the FIRM and FIS report are used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for buildings and the contents of those buildings.

DATES: The effective date of January 20, 2016 which has been established for the FIRM and, where applicable, the supporting FIS report showing the new or modified flood hazard information for each community.

ADDRESSES: The FIRM, and if applicable, the FIS report containing the final flood hazard information for each community is available for inspection at the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables below and will be available online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* by the effective date indicated above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) makes the final determinations listed below for the new or modified flood hazard information for each community listed. Notification of these changes has been published in newspapers of local circulation and 90 days have elapsed since that publication. The Deputy Associate Administrator for Mitigation has resolved any appeals resulting from this notification.

This final notice is issued in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR part 67. FEMA has developed criteria for floodplain management in floodprone areas in accordance with 44 CFR part 60.

Interested lessees and owners of real property are encouraged to review the new or revised FIRM and FIS report available at the address cited below for each community or online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.* The flood hazard determinations are made final in the watersheds and/or communities listed in the table below.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Community	Community map repository address
Amador County, California, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1445	
City of Ione	Department of Public Works, 1 East Main Street, Ione, CA 95460.
Unincorporated Areas of Amador County	Amador County Department of Public Works, 810 Court Street, Jackson, CA 95642.
Fresno County, California, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1445	
Unincorporated Areas of Fresno County	Fresno County Recorder's Office, 2281 Tulare Street, Room 302, Fresno, CA 93721.
Adams County, Colorado, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1418	
City of Northglenn	11701 Community Center Drive, Northglenn, CO 80233.
City of Thornton	12450 Washington Street, Thornton, CO 80241.
Unincorporated Areas of Adams County	4430 South Adams County Parkway, Suite W2000B, Brighton, CO 80601.

Community	Community map repository address
City and County of Broomfield, Colorado Docket No.: FEMA–B–1418	
City and County of Broomfield	City Hall, Engineering Department, One Descombes Drive, Broomfield, CO 80020.
Jefferson County, Colorado, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1418	
City of Arvada	Engineering Department, 8101 Ralston Road, Arvada, CO 80001.
City of Westminster	4800 West 92nd Avenue, Westminster, CO 80031.
Unincorporated Areas of Jefferson County	Jefferson County Department of Planning and Zoning, 100 Jefferson County Parkway, Suite 3550, Golden, CO 80419.
Weld County, Colorado, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1427	
City of Dacono	City Hall, 512 Cherry Street, Dacono, CO 80514.
City of Evans	City Hall, 110 37th Street, Evans, CO 80620.
City of Fort Lupton	City Hall, 130 South McKinley Avenue, Fort Lupton, CO 80621.
City of Greeley	City Hall, 1000 10th Street, Greeley, CO 80631.
Town of Ault	Town Hall, 201 1st Street, Ault, CO 80610.
Town of Eaton	Town Hall, 223 1st Street, Eaton, CO 80615.
Town of Firestone	Town Hall, 151 Grant Avenue, Firestone, CO 80520.
Town of Frederick	Town Hall, 401 Locust Street, Frederick, CO 80530.
Town of Gilcrest	Town Hall, 304 8th Street, Gilcrest, CO 80623.
Town of Hudson	Town Hall, 557 Ash Street, Hudson, CO 80642.
Town of Keenesburg	Town Hall, 140 South Main Street, Keenesburg, CO 80643.
Town of La Salle	Town Hall, 128 North 2nd Street, La Salle, CO 80645.
Town of Mead	Town Hall, 441 3rd Street, Mead, CO 80542.
Town of Milliken	Town Hall, 1101 Broad Street, Milliken, CO 80543.
Town of Nunn	Town Hall, 185 Lincoln Avenue, Nunn, CO 80648.
Town of Pierce	Town Hall, 240 Main Street, Pierce, CO 80650.
Town of Platteville	Town Hall, 400 Grand Avenue, Platteville, CO 80651.
Town of Severance	Town Hall, 231 West 4th Avenue, Severance, CO 80546.
Town of Windsor	Town Hall, 301 Walnut Street, Windsor, CO 80550.
Unincorporated Areas of Weld County	Weld County Commissioner's Office, 915 10th Street, Greeley, CO 80632.
Outagamie County, Wisconsin, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1299	
City of Appleton	City Hall, 100 North Appleton Street, Appleton, WI 54911.
Unincorporated Areas of Outagamie County	County Building, 410 South Walnut Street, Appleton, WI 54911.

[FR Doc. 2015–30049 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

[Docket ID FEMA–2015–0001]

Final Flood Hazard Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Final notice.

SUMMARY: Flood hazard determinations, which may include additions or modifications of Base Flood Elevations (BFEs), base flood depths, Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) boundaries or zone designations, or regulatory floodways on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) and where applicable, in the supporting Flood Insurance Study (FIS) reports have been made final for the communities listed in the table below.

The FIRM and FIS report are the basis of the floodplain management measures that a community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of having in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In addition, the FIRM and FIS report are used by insurance agents and others to calculate appropriate flood insurance premium rates for buildings and the contents of those buildings.

DATES: The effective date of January 6, 2016 which has been established for the FIRM and, where applicable, the supporting FIS report showing the new or modified flood hazard information for each community.

ADDRESSES: The FIRM, and if applicable, the FIS report containing the final flood hazard information for each community is available for inspection at the respective Community Map Repository address listed in the tables below and will be available online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov* by the effective date indicated above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Luis Rodriguez, Chief, Engineering Management Branch, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, FEMA, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646–4064, or (email) *Luis.Rodriguez3@fema.dhs.gov;* or visit the FEMA Map Information eXchange (FMIX) online at *www.floodmaps.fema.gov/fhm/fmx_main.html.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) makes the final determinations

listed below for the new or modified flood hazard information for each community listed. Notification of these changes has been published in newspapers of local circulation and 90 days have elapsed since that publication. The Deputy Associate Administrator for Mitigation has resolved any appeals resulting from this notification.

This final notice is issued in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR part 67. FEMA has developed criteria for floodplain management in floodprone areas in accordance with 44 CFR part 60.

Interested lessees and owners of real property are encouraged to review the new or revised FIRM and FIS report available at the address cited below for each community or online through the FEMA Map Service Center at *www.msc.fema.gov.*

The flood hazard determinations are made final in the watersheds and/or communities listed in the table below.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, ''Flood Insurance.'')

Dated: October 30, 2015.

Roy E. Wright,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

I. Watershed-based studies:

II. Non-watershed-based studies:

Community	Community map repository address
Los Angeles County, California, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.:FEMA–B–1440	
City of Calabasas	City of Calabasas, 26134 Mureau Road, Suite 200, Calabasas, CA 91302.
City of Palos Verdes Estates	City of Palos Verdes Estates, 340 Palos Verdes Drive West, Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274.
Unincorporated Areas of Los Angeles County	Los Angeles County Dept of Public Works, 900 S. Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803.
Rensselaer County, New York (All Jurisdictions) Docket No.: FEMA–B–1419	
Town of Hoosick	Hoosick Town Building Department, New York State Armory, 80 Church Street, Hoosick Falls, NY 12090.
Town of Pittstown	Pittstown Town Hall, 97 Tomhannock Road, Valley Falls, NY 12185.
Town of Schaghticoke	Schaghticoke Town Hall, 290 Northline Drive, Melrose, NY 12121.
Village of Hoosick Falls	Municipal Building, 24 Main Street, Hoosick Falls, NY 12090.
Village of Schaghticoke	Municipal Building , 163 Main Street, Schaghticoke, NY 12154.
Village of Valley Falls	Village Office, 11 Charles Street, Valley Falls, NY 12185.
Bastrop County, Texas, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1419	
Unincorporated Areas of Bastrop County	Bastrop County Developmental Services, 211 Jackson Street, Bastrop, TX 78602.
Travis County, Texas, and Incorporated Areas Docket No.: FEMA–B–1419	
City of Austin	Watershed Engineering Division, 505 Barton Springs Road, 12th Floor, Austin, TX 78704.
City of Creedmoor	City Hall, 5008 Hartung Lane, Creedmoor, TX 78610.
City of Mustang Ridge	City Offices, 12800 U.S. Highway 183 South, Mustang Ridge, TX 78610.
Unicorporated Areas of Travis County	Travis County Transportation and Natural Resources Department, 700 Lavaca Street, 5th Floor, Austin, TX 78701.

[FR Doc. 2015–30038 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–12–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Transportation Security Administration

Intent To Request Renewal From OMB of One Current Public Collection of Information: Transportation Security Officer Medical Questionnaire

AGENCY: Transportation Security Administration (TSA), DHS.

ACTION: 60-day Renewal Notice.

SUMMARY: The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) invites public comment on one currently approved Information Collection Request (ICR), Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number 1652–0032, abstracted below, that we will submit to the OMB for renewal in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. The collection involves using a questionnaire to collect medical information from candidates for the job of Transportation Security Officer (TSO) to ensure applicants are qualified to perform TSO duties pursuant to 49 U.S.C 44935. In certain cases, TSO candidates' health care providers may be asked to complete supplemental forms.

DATES: Send your comments by January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be emailed to *TSAPRA@dhs.gov* or delivered to the TSA PRA Officer, Office of Information Technology (OIT), TSA–11, Transportation Security Administration, 601 South 12th Street, Arlington, VA 20598–6011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joanna Johnson at the above address, or by telephone (571) 227–3651.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Therefore, in preparation for OMB review and approval of the following information collection, TSA is soliciting comments to—

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed information requirement is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including using appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Information Collection Requirement

OMB Number 1652–0032; Security Officer Medical Questionnaire

TSA currently collects relevant medical information from TSO candidates who successfully complete the steps in the hiring process leading up to the medical portion. This information is used to assess whether the candidates meet the medical qualification standards the agency has established pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44935. TSA collects this information through a medical questionnaire completed by TSO candidates and, in certain cases, supplemental forms completed by TSO candidates' health care providers. The medical questionnaire and supplemental forms are used to evaluate a candidate's physical and medical qualifications to be a TSO, including visual and aural acuity, and physical coordination and motor skills.

Candidates who disclose certain medical conditions on the medical questionnaire may be asked to have their health care provider complete one or more supplemental forms. These supplemental forms pertain to particular body systems and medical conditions, including cardiac, orthopedic, endocrine, and vital signs; the type of supplemental form(s) completed by a candidate's health care provider depend(s) on the condition(s) revealed during a candidate's initial medical evaluation and disclosed on the initial medical questionnaire. For example, a candidate who discloses a previous back injury may be asked to have his/her health care provider complete a supplemental form to enable the agency to better evaluate whether the candidate can perform the TSO job safely and efficiently without substantial risk of accident or injury to himself/herself or others.

Historical data indicates that on average 17,480 candidates for TSO positions annually complete initial medical exams at the 3,000 health care provider clinics/facilities nationwide provided by TSA, at no cost to the candidates. The initial medical exam form takes approximately 45 minutes (0.75 hours) for the candidates to complete, resulting in an estimated burden of 13,110 hours (17,480 × 0.75 hours). Also, the initial exam form takes an estimated 5 minutes (0.083 hours) for the health care providers to complete, resulting in an estimated burden of 1,451 hours (17,480 × 0.083 hours). The estimated total burden time for the completion of the initial medical exam form is 14,561 annual hours (13,110 hours + 1,451 hours). The estimated total respondents for the completion of the initial examination is 20,480.

Of these 17,480 initial medical exams, approximately 55 percent of those reaching the medical evaluation will be requested to complete one additional supplemental evaluation form. This yields an additional estimated 9,614 candidates (55% × 17,480) required to complete one further evaluation (FE) form. It is estimated that completing the FE form will take the candidates 5 minutes (0.083 hours), resulting in an estimated 798 hours (9,614 × 0.083 hours). The FE form will also need to be completed by the candidates' health care providers. It is estimated that it will take 9,614 health care providers an estimated 5 minutes (0.083 hours) to review and complete, resulting in an estimated burden of 798 hours (9,614 × 0.083 hours). Therefore, to complete the first FE form, the estimated total burden is 1,596 annual hours (798 hours + 798 hours) and the estimated total respondents are 19,228 (9,614 candidates + 9,614 health care providers).

In addition, of the 9,614 applicants required to complete a FE form, TSA estimates that 20 percent of them will need to complete a second FE form. Thus, 1,923 candidates (20% × 9,614) will complete a second FE form. It is estimated that completing a second FE form will take the candidate 5 minutes (0.083 hours), resulting in a total of 160 hours (1,923 × 0.083 hours). The second FE form will also need to be completed by the candidates' health care providers. It is estimated that it will take 1,923 health care providers 5 minutes (0.083 hours) to complete the second FE form, resulting in an estimated burden of 160 hours (1,923 × 0.083 hours). Therefore, the estimated total hour burden for completing the second FE forms is 320 annual hours (160 hours + 160 hours) and the estimated total respondents are 3,846 (1,923 TSO candidates + 1,923 health care providers).

Therefore, the total estimated annual number of respondents for this collection will be 58,032 (29,016 TSO candidates (17,480 initial exam forms + 9,614 first FE exam forms + 1,922 second FE exam forms) plus 14,536 health care providers (3,000 initial exam forms + 9,614 first FE exam forms + 1,922 second FE exam forms)). The total estimated annual hour burden for completing the initial medical exam and the FE forms will be 16,477 hours (14,561 initial exam forms + 1,596 first FE forms + 320 second FE forms).

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Joanna Johnson,

Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Office of Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2015–29925 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9100–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5831–N–58]

30-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: HUD Standard Grant Application Forms

AGENCY: Office of the Chief Information Officer, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: HUD has submitted the proposed information collection requirement described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act. The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days of public comment.

DATES: *Comments Due Date:* December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number (2501–0017) and (2535–0018) should be sent to: HUD Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; fax: 202–395–5806. Email: *OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anna Guido, Reports Management Officer, QMAC, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410; email at *Anna Guido@hud.gov* or telephone 202–402–5535. This is not a toll-free number. Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access this number through TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Relay Service at (800) 877–8339.

Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Guido.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice informs the public that HUD is seeking approval from OMB for the information collection described in Section A.

The **Federal Register** notice that solicited public comment on the information collection for a period of 60 days was published on September 18, 2015 at 80 FR 56489.

A. Overview of Information Collection

Title of Information Collection: HUD Standard Grant Application forms: Detailed Budget Form (HUD–424–CB), Budget Worksheet (HUD–424CBW), Application for Federal Assistance (SF–424), and the Third-Party Documentation Facsimile Transmittal Form (HUD–96011).

OMB Approval Number: 2501–0017.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Form Number: HUD–424CB, HUD–424CBW, SF–424 and HUD–96011.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: HUD-Common Budget Form and Worksheet intended to offer consolidated and streamlined grant application processes in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 106–107, The Federal Financial Assistance Improvement Act of 1999.

The use of the Third-Party Documentation Facsimile Transmittal Form allows the Department to collect the same information electronically as we would for a paper-based application. It also produces an electronic version of the document that will be matched with the electronic application submitted through grants.gov to HUD.

Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of response, and hours of response: An estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the forms for each grant application is 5 minutes per response, however, the burden will be assessed against each individual grant program submission under the Paperwork Reduction Act; number of respondents is 33,000, frequency of response is on the occasion of application for benefits. An estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the forms for each grant application is estimated to average 30 minutes per response however, the burden will be assessed against each individual grant program submission under the Paperwork Reduction Act; number of respondents is 33,000, frequency of response is on the occasion of application for benefits.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 1701z–1 Research and Demonstrations.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Anna Guido,

Department Reports Management Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–30112 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS–R4–ES–2015–N086; 40120–1112–0000–F2]

Receipt of Applications for Endangered Species Permits

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, invite the public to comment on the following applications to conduct certain activities with endangered species. With some exceptions, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibits activities with listed species unless a Federal permit is issued that allows such activities. The ESA requires that we invite public comment before issuing these permits.

DATES: We must receive written data or comments on the applications at the address given below by *December 28, 2015.*

ADDRESSES: Documents and other information submitted with the applications are available for review, subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the following office within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 200, Atlanta, GA 30345 (Attn: James Gruhala, Permit Coordinator).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Gruhala, 10(a)(1)(A) Permit Coordinator, telephone 404–679–7097; facsimile 404–679–7081.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The public is invited to comment on the following applications for permits to conduct certain activities with endangered and threatened species under section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and our regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR 17. This notice is provided under section 10(c) of the Act.

If you wish to comment, you may submit comments by any one of the following methods. You may mail comments to the Fish and Wildlife Service's Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES** section) or send them via electronic mail (email) to *permitsR4ES@fws.gov.* Please include your name and return address in your email message. If you do not receive a confirmation from the Fish and Wildlife Service that we have received your email message, contact us directly at the telephone number listed above (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to the Fish and Wildlife Service office listed above (see **ADDRESSES**).

Before including your address, telephone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comments to withhold your personal identifying information from public

review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Permit Applications

Permit Application Number: TE 68616B–0

Applicant: Carla Atkinson, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

The applicant requests a permit to take (capture, handle, mark, and release) 32 species of endangered and threatened mussels and the Tulotoma snail (*Tulotoma magnifica*) for qualitative and quantitative surveys and collect tissue samples and sacrifice 21 individual Southern clubshells (*Pleurobema decisum*) for studies on excretion, filtration, and respiration and genetic analyses in Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee.

Permit Application Number: TE 78650–B

Applicant: Cassie Schmidt, Fayetteville, Arkansas

The applicant requests a permit to take (capture, handle, release) the federally endangered American burying beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*) for the purpose of conducting presence/absence surveys in the states of Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

Permit Application Number: TE 045109–4

Applicant: Kenneth Jack Kilgore, US Army ERDC WES, Vicksburg, Mississippi

The applicant requests renewal and amendment of the permit to continue previously permitted take (capture, release and salvage shells) fat pocketbook (*Potamilus capax*), rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula c. cylindrica*), sheepnose (*Plethobasus cyphyus*), orangefoot pimpleback (*Plethobasus cooperianus*), and pink mucket (*Lampsilis abrupta*) in Illinois and Kentucky for presence/absence surveys; continue previously permitted take (capture, tag, tissue sample, insert internal and external radio transmitters) pallid sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus albus*) in Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri and Illinois for surveys, population monitoring, and research purposes; take (capture, release and salvage shells) Alabama heelsplitter (*Potamilus inflatus*), spectaclecase (*Cumberlandia monodonta*), take (lethal take and mantle clips for metal bioaccumulation and genetic analyses) spectaclecase, and take (retain for captive propagation) orangefoot pimpleback in Arkansas, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia; and take (capture, tag, tissue sample, insert internal and external radio transmitters) Gulf sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus desotoi*) in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for surveys, population monitoring, and research purposes.

Permit Application Number: TE 237535–2

Applicant: Bok Tower Gardens, Lake Wales, Florida

The applicant requests an amendment to their current permit to add authorization to remove and reduce to possession (collect) seeds of Carter's mustard (*Warea carteri*) from Lake Wales Ridge National Wildlife Refuge, Florida, for germplasm storage, seed germination, and seed storage research purposes.

Permit Application Number: TE 81500B–0

Applicant: Sara Samoray, BDY Environmental, LLC, Nashville, TN

The applicant requests a permit to take (enter hibernacula or maternity roost caves; capture with mist-nets, harp traps, or by hand; collect biometric data, tissue, and/or hair; band; and radio-tag) Virginia big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus*), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) for presence/absence surveys, population monitoring, and research purposes throughout these species' ranges.

Permit Application Number: TE 81492B–0

Applicant: Dylan Brooks, Sylva, NC

The applicant requests a permit to take (enter hibernacula; salvage; capture with mist-nets or harp traps; handle; measure; identify; collect hair and fecal samples; apply fungal lift tape; swab; wing-punch; band; radio-tag; and light-tag Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) for presence/absence surveys, studies to document habitat use, population monitoring, and other research purposes throughout these species' ranges.

Permit Application Number: TE 81353B–0

Applicant: Stephanie Penk, Perth, Sylva, NC

The applicant requests a permit to take (enter hibernacula; salvage; capture with mist-nets or harp traps; handle; measure; identify; collect hair and fecal samples; apply fungal lift tape; swab; wing-punch; band; radio-tag; and light-tag Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) for presence/absence surveys, studies to document habitat use, population monitoring, and other research purposes throughout these species' ranges.

Permit Application Number: TE 81430B–0

Applicant: Heather Wallace, Mulkey Engineers and Consultants, Cary, NC

The applicant requests a permit to take (enter hibernacula or maternity roost caves; capture with mist-nets and harp traps; collect fur, fecal, and tissue samples; swab; band; and radio-tag) Virginia big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus*), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) for presence/absence surveys, population monitoring, and research purposes in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Permit Application Number: TE 34778A–1

Applicant: U.S. Geological Survey, Virginia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Blacksburg, VA

The applicant requests amendment of their current permit to add authorization to take (enter hibernacula or maternity roost caves; capture with mist-nets and harp traps; wing-punch; band; and radio-tag) Virginia big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus*), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) for research purposes and add authorization to take (collect hair samples) of the Carolina northern flying squirrel (*Glaucomys sabrinus coloratus*) for genetic analyses throughout these species' ranges.

Permit Application Number: TE 102292–10

Applicant: Jeremy Jackson, Jackson Group, Richmond, Kentucky

The applicant requests a permit to take (mist-net, harp trap, handle, band, and radio tag) Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens),* and the Virginia big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus)* throughout the species' ranges for conducting presence/absence surveys, studies to document habitat use, and population monitoring.

Permit Application Number: TE 31057A–1

Applicant: North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission

The applicant requests to amend their current permit to take (collect, handle, maintain in captivity, propagate, release, and translocate) individuals from 10 federally listed mussel species for the purpose of restoring and augmenting wild populations in the state of North Carolina.

Permit Application Number: TE 86220A–2

Applicant: Jaret Daniels, University of Florida, Museum of Natural History, Gainesville, Florida

The applicant requests to amend their current permit to take (capture, hold, propagate in captivity, collect body parts or tissues, attach markers and release) Schaus swallowtail butterfly (*Heraclides aristodemus ponceanus*) and Miami blue butterflies (*Cyclargus thomasi bethunebakeri*) for enhancement of propagation and survival of the species.

Permit Application Number: TE 021030–3

Applicant: Stanley Rudzinski, Mt. Juliet, Tennessee

The applicant requests a permit to take (capture, identify, release) Nashville crayfish (*Orconectes shoupi*) for the purpose of conducting presence/absence surveys in Tennessee.

Permit Application Number: TE 81587B–0

Applicant: Alexander Silvis, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA

The applicant requests a permit to take (mist-net, harp trap, handle, wing-punch, band, and radio tag) Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens),* and the Virginia big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii virginianus)* for migration, day-roost, and foraging ecology research in the eastern United States and central and southern Appalachians.

Permit Application Number: TE 121073

Applicant: Christopher Skelton, Little Rock, Arkansas

The applicant requests to amend their current permit to take (capture, identify, release) an additional eighteen species of federally listed fish, nineteen species of federally listed mussels, the Nashville crayfish (*Orconectes shoupi*), and the interrupted rocksnail (*Leptoxis foremani*) for the purpose of conducting presence/absence surveys in Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Franklin J. Arnold III,

Acting Assistant Regional Director—Ecological Services, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 2015–30002 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS–R4–ES–2015–N214; FXES11120400000–167–FF04EF2000]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Receipt of Application for an Incidental Take Permit; Availability of Low-Effect Habitat Conservation Plan and Associated Documents; Polk County, FL

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comment/information.

SUMMARY: We, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of an incidental take permit (ITP) and a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Verano Land Investment, LLC (applicant) requests ITP TE67461B–0 under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). The applicant anticipates taking about 4 acres of feeding, breeding, and sheltering habitat used by the sand skink (*Neoseps reynoldsi*) and blue-tailed mole skink (*Eumeces egregius lividus*) (skinks) incidental to land preparation and construction in Polk County, Florida. The applicant's HCP describes proposed minimization measures and mitigation measures to address the effects of development on the covered species.

DATES: We must receive your written comments on the ITP application and HCP on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for information on how to submit your comments on the ITP application and HCP. You may obtain a copy of the ITP application and HCP by writing the South Florida Ecological Services Office, Attn: Permit number TE67461B–0, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, FL 32960–3559. In addition, we will make the ITP application and HCP available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Alfredo Begazo, South Florida Ecological Services Office (see **ADDRESSES**); telephone: 772–469 –4234.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Submitting Comments

If you wish to comment on the ITP application or HCP, you may submit comments by any one of the following methods:

Email: alfredo_begazo@fws.gov. Use ''Attn: Permit number ''TE67461B–0'' as your message subject line.

Fax: Alfredo Begazo, 772–469–4234, Attn.: Permit number ''TE67461B–0.''

U.S. mail: Alfredo Begazo, South Florida Ecological Services Field Office, Attn: Permit number ''TE67461B–0,'' U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, FL 32960–3559.

In-person drop-off: You may drop off comments or request information during regular business hours at the above office address.

Public Availability of Comments

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can request in your comments that your personal identifying information be withheld from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Applicant's Proposed Project

We received an application from the applicant for an incidental take permit, along with a proposed habitat conservation plan. The applicant requests an ITP under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). If we approve the application, the applicant anticipates taking a total of approximately 4 acres of skink breeding, feeding, and sheltering habitat, incidental to land preparation and construction in Section 25, Township 25 South, Range 26 East, Polk County, Florida. The applicant currently has neither a time-frame for development, nor a specific site plan; however, development of this parcel would likely include construction of one or more structures, a parking area, and installation of associated utilities.

The applicant proposes to minimize impacts to skinks by preserving a total of 8 acres of skink-occupied habitat off site. The Service listed the skinks as threatened in 1987 (November 6, 1987; 52 FR 20715), effective December 7, 1987.

Our Preliminary Determination

The Service has made a preliminary determination that the applicant's project, including the mitigation measures, will individually and cumulatively have a minor or negligible effect on the species covered in the HCP. Therefore, issuance of the ITP is a ''low-effect'' action and qualifies as a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR 1506.6), as provided by the Department of the Interior Manual (516 DM 2 Appendix 1 and 516 DM 6 Appendix 1). We base our preliminary determination that issuance of the ITP qualifies as a low-effect action on the following three criteria: (1) Implementation of the project would result in minor or negligible effects on federally listed, proposed, and candidate species and their habitats; (2) Implementation of the project would result in minor or negligible effects on other environmental values or resources; and (3) Impacts of the project, considered together with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable similarly situated projects, would not result, over time, in cumulative effects to environmental values or resources that would be considered significant. This preliminary determination may be revised based on our review of public comments that we receive in response to this notice.

Next Steps

The Service will evaluate the HCP and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the application meets the requirements of section 10(a) of the Act. The Service will also evaluate whether issuance of the section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP complies with section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service section 7 consultation. The results of this consultation, in combination with the above findings, will be used in the final analysis to determine whether or not to issue the ITP. If it is determined that the requirements of the Act are met, the ITP will be issued.

Authority: We provide this notice under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: November 13, 2015.

Roxanna Hinzman,

Field Supervisor, South Florida Ecological Services Office.

[FR Doc. 2015–29995 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

[167A2100DD/AAKC001030/A0A501010.999900 253G]

Renewal of Agency Information Collection for Bureau of Indian Education Tribal Colleges and Universities; Application for Grants and Annual Report Form

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of submission to OMB.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for renewal for the collection of information for the Tribal Colleges and Universities Application for Grants, authorized by OMB Control Number 1076–0018, and the Tribal Colleges and Universities Annual Report Form, authorized by OMB Control Number 1076–0105. Both of these information collections expire November 30, 2015.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at the Office of Management and Budget, by facsimile to (202) 395–5806 or you may send an email to: *OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov.* Please send a copy of your comments to Juanita Mendoza, Acting Chief of Staff, Bureau of Indian Education, 1849 C Street NW., MIB—Mail Stop 4657, Washington, DC 20240; email *Juanita.Mendoza@bie.edu.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Juanita Mendoza, (202) 208–3559. You may review the information collection requests online at *http://www.reginfo.gov.* Follow the instructions to review Department of the Interior collections under review by OMB.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Each Tribally-controlled college or university requesting financial assistance under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Assistance Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–471), which provides grants to Tribally Controlled Colleges or Universities for the purpose of ensuring continued and expanded educational opportunities for Indian students. Similarly, each Tribally Controlled College or University that receives financial assistance under the Act is required by Public Law 95–471 Sec.107(c)(1) and 25 CFR 41 to provide a report on the use of funds received.

II. Request for Comments

The Bureau of Indian Education requests your comments on these collections concerning: (a) The necessity of this information collection for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (hours and cost) of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) Ways we could enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways we could minimize the burden of the collection of the information on the respondents, such as through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Please note that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and an individual need not respond to, a collection of information unless it has a valid OMB Control Number.

It is our policy to make all comments available to the public for review at the location listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. Before including your address, phone number, email address or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 1076–0018.

Title: Tribal Colleges and Universities Application for Grants Form.

Brief Description of Collection: Collection of the information is required under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Assistance Act of 1978, Public Law 95–471, as amended, for the respondent to receive or maintain a benefit.

Type of Review: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Tribal college and university administrators.

Number of Respondents: 28 per year, on average.

Total Number of Responses: 28 per year, on average.

Frequency of Response: Annually.

Obligation to Respond: Response required to obtain a benefit.

Estimated Time per Response: 11 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 308 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Non-Hour Dollar Cost: $0.

* * * * *

OMB Control Number: 1076–0105.

Title: Tribal Colleges and Universities Annual Report Form.

Brief Description of Collection: Collection of the information is required under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Assistance Act of 1978, Public Law 95–471, as amended, for the respondent to receive or maintain a benefit.

Type of Review: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Tribal college and university administrators.

Number of Respondents: 28 per year, on average.

Total Number of Responses: 28 per year, on average.

Frequency of Response: Annually.

Obligation to Respond: Response required to obtain a benefit.

Estimated Time per Response: 11 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden: 308 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Non-Hour Dollar Cost: $0.

Elizabeth K. Appel,

Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2015–29954 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4337–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLWO260000.L10600000.PC0000. LXSIADVSBD00]

Second Call for Nominations for the Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to solicit public nominations for three positions on the Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board (Board). The Board provides advice concerning the management, protection, and control of wild free-roaming horses and burros on public lands administered by the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Department of Agriculture through the U.S. Forest Service. The BLM will accept public nominations for 30 days after the publication of this Notice.

DATES: Nominations must be post marked or submitted to the address listed below no later than December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: All mail sent via the U.S. Postal Service should be sent as follows: Division of Wild Horses and Burros, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, 1849 C Street NW., Room 2134 LM, Attention: Quiana Davis, WO–260, Washington, DC 20240. All mail and packages that are sent via FedEx or UPS should be addressed as follows: Division of Wild Horses and Burros, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134 LM, Attention: Sarah Bohl, Washington, DC 20003. You may also send a fax to Sarah Bohl at 202–912–7182, or email her at *stbohl@blm.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Crystal Cowan, Wild Horse and Burro Program Specialist, 202–912–7263. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Members of the Board serve without compensation. However, while away from their homes or regular places of business, Board and subcommittee members engaged in Board or subcommittee business, approved by the Designated Federal Official (DFO), may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in government service under Section 5703 of Title 5 of the United States Code. Nominations for a term of 3 years are needed to represent the following categories of interest:

Humane Advocacy Groups
Wildlife Management Organizations
Livestock Management Organizations

The Board will meet one to four times annually. The DFO may call additional meetings in connection with special needs for advice. Individuals may nominate themselves or others. Any individual or organization may nominate one or more persons to serve on the Board. Nominations will not be accepted without a complete resume. The following information must accompany all nominations for the individual to be considered for a position:

1. The position(s) for which the individual wishes to be considered;
2. The individual's first, middle, and last name;
3. Business address and phone number;
4. Home address and phone number;
5. Email address;
6. Present occupation/title and employer;
7. Education: (colleges, degrees, major field(s) of study);
8. Career Highlights: Significant related experience, civic and professional activities, elected offices (include prior advisory committee experience or career achievements related to the interest to be represented). Attach additional pages, if necessary;
9. Qualifications: Education, training, and experience that qualify you to serve on the Board;
10. Experience or knowledge of wild horse and burro management;
11. Experience or knowledge of horses or burros (equine health, training, and management);
12. Experience in working with disparate groups to achieve collaborative solutions (*e.g.,* civic organizations, planning commissions, school boards, etc.);
13. Identification of any BLM permits, leases, or licenses held by the individual or his or her employer;
14. Indication of whether the individual is a federally registered lobbyist; and
15. Explanation of interest in serving on the Board.

At least one letter of reference sent from special interests or organizations the individual may represent, including, but not limited to, business associates, friends, co-workers, local, State, and/or Federal government representatives, or members of Congress should be included along with any other information that is relevant to the individual's qualifications.

As appropriate, certain Board members may be appointed as special government employees. Special government employees serve on the Board without compensation, and are subject to financial disclosure requirements in the Ethics in Government Act and 5 CFR 2634. Nominations are to be sent to the address listed under **ADDRESSES** above.

Privacy Act Statement: The authority to request this information is contained in 5 U.S.C. 301, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and 43 CFR part 1784. The appointment officer uses this information to determine education, training, and experience related to possible service on a BLM advisory council. If you are appointed as an advisor, the information will be retained by the appointing official for as long as

you serve. Otherwise, it will be destroyed 2 years after termination of your membership or returned (if requested) following announcement of the Board's appointments. Submittal of this information is voluntary. However, failure to complete any or all items will inhibit fair evaluation of your qualifications, and could result in you not receiving full consideration for appointment.

Membership Selection: Individuals shall qualify to serve on the Board because of their education, training, or experience that enables them to give informed and objective advice regarding the interest they represent. They should demonstrate experience or knowledge of the area of their expertise and a commitment to collaborate in seeking solutions to resource management issues. The Board is structured to provide fair membership and balance, both geographic and interest specific, in terms of the functions to be performed and points of view to be represented. Members are selected with the objective of providing representative counsel and advice about public land and resource planning. No person is to be denied an opportunity to serve because of race, age, sex, religion, or national origin. The Administration prohibits individuals who are currently federally registered lobbyists from serving on FACA or non-FACA boards, committees or councils. Pursuant to Section 7 of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act, members of the Board cannot be employed by either Federal or State governments.

Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–1.

Jolie Pollet,

Acting Deputy Assistant Director, Resources and Planning.

[FR Doc. 2015–30019 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[15X L1109AF LLUT03000 L16100000.P00000 24–1A]

Call for Nominations for Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Advisory Committee, Utah

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to request public nominations for six members to the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Advisory Committee (MAC). The MAC provides advice and recommendations to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on science issues and the achievement of Monument Management Plan objectives. The Monument will receive public nominations for 30 days from the date this notice is posted.

DATES: A completed nomination form and accompanying nomination/recommendation letters must be received at the address listed below no later than December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Nominations and completed applications should be sent to the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Headquarters Office, 669 South Highway 89A, Kanab, UT 84741.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Larry Crutchfield, Public Affairs Officer, Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, 669 South Highway 89A, Kanab, UT 84741; phone (435) 644–1209, or email: *lcrutchf@blm.gov.* Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to leave a message or question with the above individual. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Replies will be received during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary of the Interior established the Monument pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (43U.S.C. 1739) and in conformity with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2). The 15 appointed members of the MAC perform several primary tasks: (1) Review evaluation reports produced by the Management Science Team and make recommendations on protocols and projects to meet overall objectives; (2) Review appropriate research proposals and make recommendations on project necessity and validity; (3) Make recommendations regarding allocation of research funds through review of research and project proposals as well as needs identified through the evaluation process above; and (4) Could be consulted on issues such as protocols for specific projects.

The Secretary appoints persons to the Committee who are representatives of the various major citizen interests pertaining to land use planning and management of the lands under BLM management in the Monument.

Each MAC member will be a person who, as a result of training and experience, has knowledge or special expertise which qualifies him or her to provide advice from among the categories of interest listed below. As appropriate, certain committee members may be appointed as Special Government Employees. Special Government Employees serve on the Committee without compensation, and are subject to financial disclosure requirements in the Ethics in Government Act and 5 CFR 2634.

Any individual or organization may nominate one or more persons to serve on the MAC. Individuals may also nominate themselves. Nomination forms may be obtained from the Monument Headquarters Office (address listed above). To make a nomination, submit a letter of nomination, a completed nomination form, letters of reference from the represented interests or organizations associated with the interest represented by the candidate, and any other information that speaks to the candidate's qualifications. The six open positions are as follows: One member with expertise in archaeology; one member with expertise in botany; one member with expertise in geology; one member to represent tribal interests in the Monument; an elected official from Garfield County; and an elected official from Kane County.

The specific category the nominee would be representing should be identified in the letter of nomination and in the nomination form. The BLM-Utah State Director and Monument Manager will review the nomination forms and letters of reference. The State Director shall confer with the governor of the State of Utah on potential nominations. The BLM-Utah State Director will then forward recommended nominations to the Secretary of the Interior who has responsibility for making the appointments.

Members will serve without monetary compensation, but will be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses at current rates for government employees. The committee will meet at least twice a year. Additional meetings may be called by the Designated Federal Officer.

Megan Crandall,

Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–30027 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–DQ–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLWO210000.16X.L11100000.PH0000 LXSISGST0000]

Extension of Public Comment Period and Schedule of Public Scoping Meetings and Public Meetings for the Proposed Withdrawal of Sagebrush Focal Areas in Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, and an Associated Environmental Impact Statement; Correction

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of correction.

SUMMARY: This action corrects the first date in a table that published on November 13, 2015 (80 FR 70252). The table announces the dates, times, and locations of public meetings.

On page 70252, column 1 of the table, line 2, which reads ''Dec. 14, 2051,'' is hereby corrected to read ''Dec. 14, 2015.''

Brian Amme,

Acting Division Chief, Decision Support, Planning and NEPA.

[FR Doc. 2015–30029 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNV912000.L12100000.PH0000 LXSS006F0000 MO# 4500086714]

Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council Call for Nominees To Complete Elected Official Term

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to open the request for public nominations for the Elected Official representative on the Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council (RAC). The selected individual would complete the remaining two years of the current three-year term that concludes on May 6, 2017. The RAC provides advice and recommendations to the BLM on land use planning and management of the National System of Public Lands within its geographic area, which approximately coincides with the Southern Nevada Basin and Range, and Sonoran Basin and Range major land resource area in Esmeralda, Nye, Lincoln, and Clark Counties, in Nevada. The BLM will accept public nominations for 30 days after the publication of this notice.

DATES: All nominations must be received no later than December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for the address of the BLM Office accepting nominations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chris Hanefeld, Ely District Office, BLM, 702 North Industrial Way, Ely, NV 89301; 775–289–1842 or *chanefled@blm.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) directs the Secretary of the Interior to involve the public in planning and issues related to management of lands administered by the BLM. Section 309 of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1739) directs the Secretary to establish 10- to 15-member citizen-based advisory councils that are consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). As required by FACA, RAC membership must be balanced and representative of the various interests concerned with the management of the public lands. The rules governing RACs are found at 43 CFR subpart 1784.

Individuals may nominate themselves or others. Nominees must be residents of the State in which the RAC has jurisdiction. The BLM will evaluate nominees based on their education, training, experience, and knowledge of the geographical area of the RAC. Nominees should demonstrate a commitment to collaborative resource decision-making. The Obama Administration prohibits individuals who are currently federally registered lobbyists from being appointed or re-appointed to FACA and non-FACA boards, committees, or councils.

The following must accompany all nominations for the RAC:

—Letters of reference from represented interests or organizations;

—A completed Resource Advisory Council application; and

—Any other information that addresses the nominee's qualifications.

Simultaneous with this notice, the BLM will issue a press release providing additional information for submitting nominations. Nominations and completed applications should be sent to Chris Hanefeld, Ely District Office, BLM, 702 North Industrial Way, Ely, NV 89301, 775–289–1842.

(Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–1)

Tim Smith,

District Manager, Southern Nevada District, Designated Federal Officer, Mojave-Southern Great Basin RAC.

[FR Doc. 2015–30009 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–84–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLCAC01000 L16600000.XZ0000 15XL1109AF LXSIOVHD0000]

Call for Nominations for Central California Resource Advisory Council

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is seeking nominations for the Central California District Resource Advisory Council (RAC). The RAC advises BLM officials from the Hollister, Mother Lode, Bakersfield, Ukiah and Bishop field offices. The Central California District will receive public nominations for 30 days from the date this notice is published.

DATES: A completed nomination form and accompanying nomination/recommendation letters must be received at the address listed below no later than December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Completed applications should be sent to the Bureau of Land Management, 5152 Hillsdale Circle, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762; attn: David Christy, email *dchristy@blm.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Christy, Public Affairs Officer, Central California District, 5152 Hillsdale Circle, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762, phone (916) 941–3146, or email: *dchristy@blm.gov*. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to leave a message or question for the above individual. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Replies are provided during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary of the Interior established the Central California RAC pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1739) and in conformity with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2). The 12-member council advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of planning and

management issues associated with public land management in the Central California District. The Secretary appoints persons to the Central California RAC who are representatives of the various major citizen interests pertaining to land-use planning and management of the lands under BLM management in the Central California District.

Each RAC member will be a person who, as a result of training and experience, has knowledge or special expertise which qualifies him or her to provide advice from among the categories of interest listed below. As appropriate, certain committee members may be appointed as Special Government Employees. Special Government Employees serve on the committee without compensation, and are subject to financial disclosure requirements in the Ethics in Government Act and 5 CFR part 2634.

This notice, published pursuant to 43 CFR 1784.4–1, solicits public nominations to fill four positions on the committee. Any individual or organization may nominate one or more persons to serve on the RAC. Individuals may nominate themselves for RAC membership.

Nomination forms may be obtained from the Central California District Office, address listed above. Nominations packages must include a letter of nomination, a completed nomination form, letters of reference from the represented interest groups or organizations associated with the interests represented by the candidate, and any other information that speaks to the candidate's qualifications.

The four open member positions are:

Category Two (one position)—Representatives of nationally or regionally recognized environmental organizations, archaeological and historical organizations, dispersed recreation activities, and wild horse and burro organizations.

Category Three (three positions)—Representatives of State, county, or local elected office; representatives and employees of a State agency responsible for the management of natural resources; representatives of Indian tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the RAC is organized; representatives and employees of academic institutions who are involved in natural sciences; and the public-at-large.

The specific category the nominee would represent should be identified in the letter of nomination and in the nomination form. The BLM-California State Director and District Manager will review the nomination forms and letters of reference. The State Director shall confer with the Governor of the State of California on potential nominations, then will forward recommended nominations to the Secretary of the Interior, who has responsibility for making the appointments.

Members will serve without monetary compensation, but will be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses at current U.S. General Services Administration rates. The Committee will meet at least twice a year. Additional meetings may be called by the Designated Federal Officer.

The Obama Administration prohibits individuals who are currently federally registered lobbyists to serve on all FACA and non-FACA boards, committees or councils.

Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–1.

David Christy,

District Public Affairs Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–30005 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–40–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLCON00000. L18200000.XX0000. LXSICADR0000]

Notice of Public Meeting Postponement, BLM Colorado Northwest Resource Advisory Council

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting Postponement.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a notice in the **Federal Register** on January 16, 2015, notifying the public of meeting dates and locations for the BLM Colorado Northwest Resource Advisory Council (RAC). The BLM is postponing the December 3, 2015, meeting until further notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joe Meyer, BLM Northwest Colorado District Manager, 2815 H Road, CO 81506, 970–244–3000; or Chris Joyner, Public Affairs Specialist, 2815 H Road, CO 81506, 970–244–3000. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The RAC meets in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), 5 U.S.C.

Greg Shoop,

BLM Colorado Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–29994 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–JB–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLCAD07000.L51010000. ER0000.LVRWB10B3860.XXX]

Notice of Intent To Amend the Resource Management Plan for the California Desert Conservation Area and Prepare an Associated Environmental Assessment for the Plan Amendment and the Eagle Crest Pumped Storage Project, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLPMA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) California Desert District, Moreno Valley, California, intends to prepare a Resource Management Plan (RMP) amendment with an associated Environmental Assessment (EA) for both the plan amendment and the Eagle Crest Pumped Storage Project in the California Desert Conservation Area. By this notice the BLM is announcing the beginning of the scoping process to solicit public comments and identify issues for both proposals.

DATES: This notice initiates the public scoping process for the Eagle Crest Pumped Storage Project plan amendment/EA. Comments on issues may be submitted in writing until December 28, 2015. The date(s) and location(s) of any scoping meetings will be announced at least 15 days in advance through local news media, newspapers and the BLM Web site at: *http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/palmsprings.html.* In order to be included in the analysis, all comments must be received prior to the close of the 30-day scoping period. We will provide additional opportunities for public participation as appropriate.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on issues and planning criteria related to Eagle Mountain Pumped Storage

Hydroelectric plan amendment/EA by any of the following methods:

- *Email: blm_ca_eagle_mountain_pumped_storage_project@blm.gov*
- *Fax:* (951) 697–5299.
- *Mail:* Bureau of Land Management, California Desert District, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.

Documents pertinent to this proposal may be examined at the California Desert District, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Miller, Deputy District Manager—Resources, telephone (951) 697–5200; address, Bureau of Land Management, California Desert District, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, CA 92553; email, *gmiller@blm.gov.* Contact Mr. Miller to have your name added to our mailing list. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at (800) 877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document provides notice that the BLM California Desert District Office intends to prepare a plan amendment/EA for the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, announces the beginning of the scoping process, and seeks public input on issues related to the plan amendment and proposed right-of-way, as well as the planning criteria. The planning area is located in Riverside County, California, and encompasses approximately 676 acres of public land. Eagle Crest Energy Company has applied to the BLM for a right-of-way (ROW) grant to construct, operate, maintain and decommission a 500 kilovolt (kV) generation interconnect (gen-tie) line and a water pipeline. The gen-tie line would transmit electricity generated by Eagle Crest's pumped storage facility to the Southern California Edison's Red Bluff sub-station located on BLM lands in Riverside County, California. The water line would draw water from an area below private land, traverse BLM land, and fill the reservoirs at the pumped storage facility. The purpose of the public scoping process is to determine relevant issues that will influence the scope of the EA, including alternatives for both the planning effort and the ROW grant, and guide the planning process. The preliminary issues of visual resources and hydrology for the plan amendment/ROW area have been identified by BLM personnel; Federal, State, and local agencies; and other stakeholders. Preliminary planning criteria include: (a) The plan will be completed in compliance with FLPMA, NEPA, and all other relevant Federal laws, Executive orders, and management policies of the BLM; (b) Existing planning decisions will remain unchanged unless specifically proposed to be changed; (c) The plan amendment will recognize valid existing rights; and (d) Native American tribal consultations will be conducted in accordance with policy and tribal concerns will be given due consideration. The planning process will include the consideration of any impacts on Indian trust assets.

You may submit comments on issues and planning criteria in writing to the BLM using one of the methods listed in the **ADDRESSES** section above. For these comments to be most helpful, you should submit them by the close of the 30-day scoping period. The BLM will utilize and coordinate the NEPA scoping process to help fulfill the public involvement process under the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. 306108) as provided in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). The information about historic and cultural resources within the area potentially affected by the proposed action will assist the BLM in identifying and evaluating impacts to such resources.

The BLM will consult with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis in accordance with Executive Order 13175 and other policies. Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets and potential impacts to cultural resources, will be given due consideration. Federal, State, and local agencies, along with tribes and other stakeholders that may be interested in or affected by the proposed actions that the BLM is evaluating, are invited to participate in the scoping process and, if eligible, may request or be requested by the BLM to participate in the development of the EA as a cooperating agency.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. The BLM will evaluate identified issues to be addressed in the plan, and will place them into one of three categories:

1. Issues to be resolved in the plan amendment;
2. Issues to be resolved through policy or administrative action; or
3. Issues beyond the scope of this plan amendment.

The BLM will provide an explanation in the Draft RMP amendment/EA as to why an issue was placed in category two or three. The public is also encouraged to help identify any management questions and concerns that should be addressed in the plan, and/or pertain to the proposed ROWs. The BLM will work collaboratively with interested parties to identify the management decisions that are best suited to local, regional, and national needs and concerns.

The BLM will use an interdisciplinary approach to develop the plan amendment, and make a decision regarding the ROW grant, in order to consider the variety of resource issues and concerns identified. Specialists with expertise in the following disciplines will be involved in the planning process: Archaeology, wildlife, lands and realty, hydrology, sociology and economics.

Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 43 CFR 1610.2.

Thomas Pogacnik,

Deputy State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–29982 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–40–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLIDC00000.15XL1125AF.LF1000000.HT0000.241A0; 4500082681]

2015 Third Call for Nominations for Coeur d'Alene Resource Advisory Committee, Idaho

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to reopen the request for public nominations for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Coeur d'Alene Resource Advisory Committee (RAC), which has member terms expiring this year. The RAC provides advice and recommendations to the BLM on land use planning and management of the National System of Public Lands within the respective geographic area. The BLM will accept public nominations for 30 days after the publication of this notice.

DATES: All nominations must be received no later than December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Nominations for the Coeur d'Alene RAC should be sent to Coeur d'Alene RAC, Attn. Suzanne Endsley, BLM Coeur d'Alene District Office, 3815 Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83835, (208) 769–5004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Endsley, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Coeur d'Alene District Public Affairs Officer, 3815 Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815, 208–769–5004.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) directs the Secretary of the Interior to involve the public in planning and issues related to management of lands administered by the BLM. Section 309 of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1739) directs the Secretary to establish 10- to 15-member citizen-based advisory councils that are consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). As required by FACA, Resource Advisory Council (RAC) membership must be balanced and representative of the various interests concerned with the management of the public lands. The rules governing RACs are found at 43 CFR 1784 and include the following three membership categories:

Category One—Holders of Federal grazing permits and representatives of organizations associated with energy and mineral development, timber industry, transportation or rights-of-way, developed outdoor recreation, off-highway vehicle use, and commercial recreation;

Category Two—Representatives of nationally or regionally recognized environmental organizations, archaeological and historic organizations, dispersed recreation activities, and wild horse and burro organizations; and

Category Three—Representatives of State, county, or local elected office, employees of a state agency responsible for management of natural resources, representatives of Indian tribes within or adjacent to the area for which the council is organized, representatives of academia who are employed in natural sciences, and the public-at-large.

Those who have already submitted a nomination in response to the first or second call for nominations (published in the **Federal Register** on February 3, 2015 and on May 21, 2015, respectively) do not need to resubmit. Individuals may nominate themselves or others. Nominees must be residents of the State of Idaho. The BLM will evaluate nominees based on their education, training, experience, and knowledge of the geographical area of the RAC. Nominees should demonstrate a commitment to collaborative resource decision-making. Current Presidential policies prohibit individuals who are currently federally registered lobbyists from being appointed or re-appointed to FACA and non-FACA boards, committees, or councils.

The following must accompany all nominations for the RAC:

—Letters of reference from represented interests or organizations;
—A completed Resource Advisory Council application; and
—Any other information that addresses the nominee's qualifications.

Simultaneous with this notice, the BLM Idaho State Office will issue news releases providing additional information for submitting nominations, with specifics about the number and categories of member positions available for the RAC. If you have already submitted your RAC nomination materials for 2015, you will not need to resubmit.

Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–1

Jeffery L. Foss,

Acting BLM Idaho State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–30012 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–GG–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

[Docket No. BOEM–2015–0125]

Environmental Assessment for Commercial Wind Leasing and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Offshore South Carolina; MMAA104000

AGENCY: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Assessment.

SUMMARY: BOEM is announcing its intent to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) for potential commercial wind leasing and site assessment activities on the Atlantic OCS offshore South Carolina. The EA will address environmental and socioeconomic effects related to the proposed action, issuance of commercial wind energy leases, and approval of site assessment activities on those leases. This notice serves to announce the beginning of the formal scoping process. The scope of the EA is the range of issues, alternatives, impacts, and mitigation measures to be considered. Scoping will help identify reasonable alternatives and focus the analysis in the EA on potentially significant issues and eliminate from detailed consideration those issues that are insignificant, irrelevant, or that have not changed from previous analyses. BOEM will also use the scoping process to seek public comment and input under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Additional information on the proposed action may be found at *http://www.boem.gov/South-Carolina/*.

DATES: Comments should be submitted no later than January 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Morin, BOEM Office of Renewable Energy Programs, 45600 Woodland Road, VAM–OREP, Sterling, Virginia 20166, (703) 787–1722, or *michelle.morin@boem.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Proposed Action

The proposed action that will be the subject of the EA is the issuance of wind energy leases within all or some of the Call Areas offshore South Carolina and the approval of site assessment activities (including the installation and operation of a meteorological tower and/or buoys) on those leases. BOEM will also consider the environmental impacts associated with the site characterization activities (including geophysical, geotechnical, archaeological, and biological surveys) that it anticipates lessees might eventually undertake to fulfill the information requirements for Site Assessment Plans and Construction and Operations Plans found at 30 CFR 585.610 and 585.626 respectively.

2. Description of the Call Areas

A detailed description of the Call Areas can be found in the *Commercial Leasing for Wind Power on the Outer Continental Shelf Offshore South Carolina—Call for Information and Nominations* that is being published concurrently with this notice. A map of the Call Areas can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/South-Carolina/*. BOEM identified the four Call Areas in consultation with other Federal agencies and the BOEM South Carolina Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Force.

3. National Historic Preservation Act

BOEM will use the NEPA process to inform the Section 106 consultation process of the NHPA (54 U.S.C. 300101 *et seq.*), as provided for in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). BOEM is seeking public comment and input regarding the identification of historic properties or potential impacts to historic properties from the proposed action, as defined by the NHPA.

4. Cooperating Agencies

BOEM invites other Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments to consider becoming cooperating agencies in the preparation of this EA. We invite qualified government entities to inquire about cooperating agency status. You may contact OREP (listed above).

5. Public Scoping Meetings

BOEM will hold public scoping meetings in South Carolina on the following dates:

- Tuesday, January 5, 2016; Mason Preparatory School; 56 Halsey Boulevard, Charleston, South Carolina 29401; 6:00–8:00 p.m.;
- Wednesday, January 6, 2016; St. James High School; 10800 SC–707, Murrells Inlet, South Carolina 29576; 6:00–8:00 p.m.; and
- Thursday, January 7, 2016; Boulineau's (Second Floor Meeting Room); 212 Sea Mountain Highway, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29582; 6:00–8:00 p.m.

6. Comments

Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments and/or agencies and the public are requested to send their written comments regarding environmental issues and the identification of reasonable alternatives related to the proposed action described in this notice through one of the following methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* In the field entitled ''Enter Keyword or ID,'' enter BOEM–2015–0125, and then click ''search.'' Follow the instructions to submit public comments and view supporting and related materials available for this notice;

2. U.S. mail in an envelope labeled ''Comments on South Carolina EA'' and addressed to Program Manager, Office of Renewable Energy Programs, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 45600 Woodland Road, VAM–OREP, Sterling, Virginia 20166. Comments must be postmarked by the last day of the comment period to be considered. This date is January 25, 2016.

Before including your address, phone number, email address or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comments to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority: This Notice of Intent to prepare an EA is in compliance with NEPA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4231 *et seq.*), and is published pursuant to 43 CFR 46.305.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Abigail Ross Hopper,

Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

[FR Doc. 2015–29907 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

[Docket No. BOEM–2015–0134]

Commercial Leasing for Wind Power on the Outer Continental Shelf Offshore South Carolina—Call for Information and Nominations (Call) MMAA104000

AGENCY: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), Interior.

ACTION: Call for Information and Nominations for Commercial Leasing for Wind Power on the Outer Continental Shelf, Offshore South Carolina.

SUMMARY: BOEM invites the submission of nominations for commercial wind leases that would allow a lessee to propose the construction of a wind energy project on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) offshore South Carolina, and to develop the project if approved after further environmental review. Although this announcement is not itself a leasing announcement, the Call Areas described herein, or portions thereof, may be available for future leasing. BOEM will use responses to this Call for Information and Nominations (Call) to gauge specific interest in acquiring commercial wind leases in some or all of the Call Areas, as required by 43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(3).

Parties wishing to submit a nomination in response to this Call should submit detailed and specific information in response to the requirements described in the section entitled, ''Required Nomination Information.''

This announcement also requests comments and information from interested and affected parties about site conditions, resources, and multiple uses in close proximity to, or within, the Call Areas that would be relevant to BOEM's review of any nominations submitted and/or to BOEM's subsequent decision to offer all or part of the Call Areas for commercial wind leasing. The information that BOEM is requesting is described in the section of this Call entitled, ''Requested Information from Interested or Affected Parties.''

This Call is published pursuant to subsection 8(p)(3) of the OCS Lands Act, 43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(3), which was added by section 388 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct), as well as the implementing regulations at 30 CFR part 585.

The Call Areas described in this notice are located on the OCS offshore South Carolina and are delineated as Grand Strand, Cape Romain, Winyah, and Charleston. The four Call Areas include 110 whole OCS blocks and 84 partial blocks in total and comprise approximately 1,007.56 square nautical miles (nmi) (345,584 hectares). These Call Areas were established in consultation with the BOEM South Carolina Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Force (Task Force). A detailed description of the areas and how they were developed is described in the section of this Call entitled, ''Description of the Area.''

DATES: BOEM must receive nominations describing your interest in one or more, or any portion of the Call Areas, by a postmarked date of January 25, 2016 January 25, 2016 for your nomination to be considered. BOEM requests comments or submissions of information to be postmarked or delivered by this same date. BOEM will consider only those nominations received that conform to this requirement.

Submission Procedures: If you are submitting a nomination for a lease in response to this Call, please submit your nomination to the following address: BOEM, Office of Renewable Energy Programs, 45600 Woodland Road (VAM–OREP), Sterling, Virginia 20166. In addition to a paper copy of the nomination, include an electronic copy of the nomination on a data storage device. BOEM will list the parties that submitted nominations and the location of the proposed lease areas (*i.e.,* OCS blocks nominated) on the BOEM Web site after the 60-day comment period has closed.

Comments and other submissions of information may be submitted by either of the following two methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* In the entry titled ''Enter Keyword or ID,'' enter BOEM–2015–0134, and then click ''search.'' Follow the instructions to submit public comments and view supporting and related materials available for this notice.

2. U.S. Postal Service or other delivery service. Send your comments and information to the following address: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Office of Renewable Energy Programs, 45600 Woodland Road (VAM–OREP), Sterling, Virginia 20166.

All responses will be reported on *http://www.regulations.gov.*

If you wish to protect the confidentiality of your nominations or comments, clearly mark the relevant sections and request that BOEM treat them as confidential. Please label privileged or confidential information ''Contains Confidential Information,'' and consider submitting such information as a separate attachment. Treatment of confidential information is addressed in the section of this Call entitled, ''Protection of Privileged or Confidential Information.'' Information that is not labeled as privileged or confidential will be regarded by BOEM as suitable for public release.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Browning, BOEM, Office of Renewable Energy Programs, 45600 Woodland Road (VAM–OREP), Sterling, Virginia 20166, (703) 787–1577 or *Jeffrey.Browning@boem.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Call for Information and Nominations

The Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Lands Act requires BOEM to award leases competitively, unless BOEM makes a determination that there is no competitive interest (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(3)). BOEM will make this determination after reviewing the nominations received in response to this Call.

This Call also requests information from interested and affected parties on issues relevant to BOEM's review of nominations for potential leases in the Call Areas. A lease, whether issued through a competitive or noncompetitive process, gives the lessee the exclusive right to subsequently seek BOEM approval for the development of the leasehold. The lease does not grant the lessee the right to construct any facilities; rather, the lease grants the lessee the right to use the leased area to develop its plans, which BOEM must approve before the lessee may proceed to the next stage of the process (30 CFR 585.600 and 585.601). The responses to this Call could lead to the initiation of a competitive leasing process in some parts of the Call Areas (*i.e.,* where competition exists), and a noncompetitive process in other parts of the Call Areas (*i.e.,* where no competitive interest exists). The leasing process is described more completely under the ''Determination of Competitive Interest'' and ''Noncompetitive Leasing Process'' sections of this Call. In any parts of the Call Areas where BOEM determines there is no competitive interest, BOEM may proceed with the noncompetitive lease process pursuant to 30 CFR 585.232. If BOEM determines that there is competitive interest in some or all of the Call Areas, then BOEM may proceed with Area Identification (Area ID), as set forth in 30 CFR 585.211(b), and the competitive leasing process set forth under 30 CFR 585.211 through 585.225. Whether the leasing process is competitive or noncompetitive, it will include additional opportunities for the public to provide input, and any proposed actions will be reviewed thoroughly for potential environmental and multiple use impacts. The area(s) that may be finally offered for lease, if any, has/have not yet been determined, and may include less than the total footprint of the Call Areas as identified in this Call.

Background

Energy Policy Act of 2005

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct) amended the OCS Lands Act by adding subsection 8(p)(1)(C), which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant leases, easements, or rights-of-way (ROWs) on the OCS for activities that are not otherwise authorized by law and that produce or support production, transportation, or transmission of energy from sources other than oil or gas, including renewable energy sources. The EPAct also required the issuance of regulations to carry out the new authority pertaining to renewable energy on the OCS. The Secretary delegated this authority to issue leases, easements, and ROWs, and to promulgate regulations, to the Director of BOEM. On April 29, 2009, BOEM published the rule, Renewable Energy and Alternate Uses of Existing Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf, at 30 CFR part 585, which can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/30_CFR_585.pdf.*

Executive Order 13547: Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes

On July 19, 2010, the President signed Executive Order 13547 (Order) establishing a national ocean policy and the National Ocean Council (75 FR 43023). The Order establishes a comprehensive, integrated national policy for the stewardship of the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes. Where BOEM actions affect the ocean or coast, the Order requires BOEM to take such action as necessary to implement the policy, stewardship principles, and national priority objectives adopted by the Order, with guidance from the National Ocean Council.

BOEM appreciates the importance of coordinating its planning endeavors with other OCS users, regulators and relevant Federal Agencies (*e.g.,* the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) and intends to follow principles of marine planning, and coordinate with the regional planning bodies as established by the National Ocean Council. BOEM anticipates that continued coordination with its Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Forces will help inform comprehensive marine planning efforts.

BOEM South Carolina Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Force

BOEM formed the South Carolina Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Force (the ''Task Force'') in March 2012, to facilitate coordination among relevant Federal agencies and affected state, local, and tribal governments throughout the leasing process. The Task Force meeting materials are available on the BOEM Web site at: *http://www.boem.gov/State-Activities-South-Carolina/.*

Environmental Review Process

BOEM intends to prepare an environmental assessment (EA), which will consider the environmental consequences associated with issuing commercial wind leases and approving site assessment activities on those leases within all or some of the Call Areas. BOEM is publishing, concurrently with this Call, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EA, which seeks public input in identifying the environmental issues and reasonable alternatives to be considered in the EA.

The EA will consider the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences associated with leasing and site characterization scenarios within the Call Areas (including geophysical, geotechnical, archaeological, and biological surveys), and site assessment scenarios (including the installation and operation of meteorological towers and/or buoys) on the potential leaseholds. The environmental effects of the construction or operation of any wind energy facility would be considered under a separate, project-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The NOI also solicits information pertaining to impacts to historic properties, which include historic districts, archaeological sites, and National Historic Landmarks.

Several consultations will be conducted concurrently with, and integrated into, the current NEPA process. These consultations include, but are not limited to, those required by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and Executive Order 13175—''Consultation and Coordination with Tribal Governments.'' The results of these consultations will assist BOEM in deciding whether and where leases may be issued.

Actions Taken by the State of South Carolina in Support of Offshore Renewable Energy Development

BOEM recognizes the importance of the steps that the State of South Carolina has taken to encourage environmentally sound offshore wind energy development. While a state may promote such development, BOEM has the exclusive authority to issue leases, easements, and ROWs on the OCS for renewable energy purposes.

The State of South Carolina has been engaged in a planning process to evaluate and identify areas of the OCS that may be suitable for offshore wind energy development. This process helped inform state recommendations to BOEM regarding potentially suitable areas for BOEM to consider when moving forward with its offshore wind energy leasing process.

In 2008, the South Carolina General Assembly passed Act 318 to create the Wind Energy Production Farms Feasibility Study Committee (Committee) to study and make recommendations regarding the feasibility of wind turbines in the state, as well as the potential economic and environmental impacts of development.

Also in 2008, the State of South Carolina, along with multiple partners, obtained a DOE grant entitled, *The South Carolina Roadmap to Gigawatt-Scale Coastal Clean Energy Generation: Transmission, Regulation & Demonstration.* The grant funded an offshore wind transmission study; a wind, wave, and current study; and a comprehensive spatial database on existing resources and activities.

Also funded under this grant was a South Carolina Regulatory Task Force, which was established in April 2009 to review the current regulatory environment and identify potential barriers to wind, wave and tidal energy development off the coast of South Carolina. This group is composed of State and Federal regulatory and resource protection agencies, universities, private industry and utility companies, and is distinct from BOEM's Task Force.

In 2014, BOEM initiated a cooperative research agreement with South Carolina that was coordinated through the South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium. Information from this research agreement will assist BOEM in planning efforts offshore South Carolina, including environmental documents and consultations.

BOEM's Planning and Leasing Process

Determination of Competitive Interest

The first step in the leasing process is to determine whether or not there is any interest in acquiring a lease within the Call Areas for the purpose of offshore wind development. At the same time, BOEM can determine whether there is overlapping interest in any particular portion of the Call Areas that would result in the need for a competitive process. At the conclusion of the comment period for this Call, BOEM will review the nominations received, undertake completeness and qualifications reviews, and determine whether competitive interest exists in any specific location within the Call Areas.

If two nominated areas of interest fully or partially overlap, BOEM may proceed with competitive leasing as described in the section of this Call entitled, ''Competitive Leasing Process.'' For areas where BOEM determines that there is no competitive interest, BOEM may proceed with noncompetitive leasing described in the section entitled, ''Noncompetitive Leasing Process.'' BOEM may consult with the Task Force throughout the leasing process.

Situations may arise in which multiple parties nominate areas that do not overlap. Under those circumstances, BOEM could choose to employ an allocation system of leases that involves the creation of competition across tracts. This system is referred to as intertract competition and would also be implemented under the competitive process outlined in the regulations. BOEM may consult with the Task Force in determining the need for, and/or use of, intertract competition.

Respondents to this Call and members of the public should be aware that no lease will be issued, either competitively or noncompetitively, until the necessary consultations and environmental analysis have been completed and the public has been given an opportunity to comment. As a result, it is also possible that certain areas nominated may not be leased, or that the areas nominated may be modified from their original, proposed form before being offered for lease. It is possible that responses to this Call may result in a determination that there is competitive interest in acquiring leases in some areas, but not in others. BOEM will publicly announce its determinations before proceeding with any type of leasing process.

Competitive Leasing Process

If, after receiving responses and nominations to this Call, BOEM proceeds with the competitive leasing process for certain areas, it would follow the steps required by 30 CFR 585.211 through 585.225.

(1) Area Identification: Based on the information submitted in response to this Call and the NOI, BOEM would determine the level of interest and identify the area(s) that would be appropriate to move forward within the planning and leasing process. The area(s) identified will constitute a Wind Energy Area (WEA) under the Secretary's ''Smart from the Start'' wind energy initiative and will be subject to environmental analysis, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, states, local governments, tribes, and other interested parties.

(2) Proposed Sale Notice (PSN): If BOEM decides to proceed with competitive lease issuance in the WEAs after completion of the environmental analysis, then BOEM would publish the PSN in the **Federal Register** with a comment period of 60 days and send the PSN to the Governor of each affected state, and the executive of any affected local government. BOEM will also share the PSN with the Task Force. The PSN would describe the area(s) to be offered for leasing, the proposed conditions of a lease sale, and the proposed auction format, lease document, and lease provisions/stipulations. Additionally, the PSN would describe the criteria and process for evaluating bids.

(3) Final Sale Notice (FSN): If BOEM decides to proceed with competitive lease issuance after considering comments on the PSN, then it would publish the FSN in the **Federal Register** at least 30 days before the date of the lease sale.

(4) Bid Submission and Evaluation: Following publication of the FSN in the **Federal Register,** BOEM would offer the leases through a competitive process, using procedures specified in the FSN. The conduct of the sale, including bids and bid deposits, would be reviewed for technical and legal adequacy. BOEM will ensure that bidders have complied with all applicable regulations. BOEM reserves the right to reject any or all bids

and the right to withdraw an offer to lease an area, even after bids have been submitted.

(5) Issuance of a Lease: Following the selection of a winning bid(s) by BOEM, the bidder(s) would be notified of the decision and provided a set of official lease documents for execution. The successful bidder(s) would be required to sign and return the lease, pay the remainder of the bonus bid, if applicable, and file the required financial assurance within 10 days of receiving the lease documents. Upon receipt of the required payments, financial assurance, and properly signed lease forms, BOEM would execute a lease with the successful bidder(s).

Noncompetitive Leasing Process

(1) Determination of No Competitive Interest: If, after evaluating the responses to this Call, BOEM determines that there is no competitive interest in a proposed lease area, it may proceed with the noncompetitive lease issuance process pursuant to 30 CFR 585.232, as amended by the rulemaking which took effect on June 15, 2011 (76 FR 28178). Should BOEM decide to proceed with the noncompetitive leasing process, it would ask if the sole respondent who nominated a particular area wants to proceed with acquiring the lease. If so, the respondent must submit an acquisition fee as specified in 30 CFR 585.502(a). After receiving the acquisition fee, BOEM would follow the process outlined in 30 CFR 585.231(d) through (i). If BOEM determines there is no competitive interest, BOEM would publish a notice of Determination of No Competitive Interest in the **Federal Register**.

(2) Review of Lease Request: BOEM would comply with the requirements of NEPA, CZMA, ESA, NHPA, and other applicable Federal statutes before issuing a lease noncompetitively. BOEM would coordinate and consult, as appropriate, with relevant Federal agencies, affected tribes, and affected state and local governments prior to issuing a noncompetitive lease, and in formulating lease terms, conditions, and stipulations.

(3) Lease Issuance: After completing the review of the lease request, BOEM may offer a noncompetitive lease. BOEM will require a $100,000 lease-specific bond from the lessee before lease issuance. The first 12 months' rent payment is due within 45 days of the date that the lease is received by the Lessee for execution.

Description of the Area

The Call Areas offshore South Carolina are delineated as Grand Strand, Cape Romain, Charleston, and Winyah. The four Areas include 110 whole OCS blocks and 84 partial blocks in total, and comprise approximately 1,007.56 square nmi (345,584 hectares).

Call Area Grand Strand

The boundary of Call Area Grand Strand begins 3 nmi from the shore and extends roughly 23 nmi seaward. It extends from northeast to southwest approximately 46 nmi. Respondents should be aware that Georgetown NI17–09 Blocks 6224,6225,6273,6274, 6322, 6323 border the edge of Submerged Lands Act (SLA) boundary. As a result, while these blocks are considered full OCS lease blocks, they vary in area and are smaller than standard OCS blocks. Official acreages for the blocks located within Official Protraction Diagram (OPD) Georgetown NI17–09 can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/Oil-and-Gas-Energy-Program/Mapping-and-Data/NI17-09-01-APR-2008.aspx.* The entire area is approximately 740.96 square nmi (254,144 hectares) and is described in the table below:

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
Georgetown	NI17–09	6224	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6225	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6226	I,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6273	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6274	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6275	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6276	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6277	E,F,G,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6278	I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6279	I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6280	D,G,H,K,L,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6322	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6323	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6324	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6325	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6326	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6327	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6328	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6329	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6330	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6331	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6372	D,H,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6373	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6374	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6375	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6376	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6377	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6378	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6379	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6380	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6381	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6382	A,B,C,E,F,I.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6421	D,G,H,K,L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6422	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6423	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6424	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6425	All.

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
Georgetown	NI17–09	6426	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6427	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6428	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6429	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6430	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6431	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6472	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6473	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6474	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6475	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6476	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6477	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6478	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6479	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6480	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6481	A,B,C,E,F,I,J,M.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6521	A,B,C,D,F,G,H,J,K,L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6522	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6523	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6524	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6525	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6526	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6527	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6528	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6529	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6530	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6571	B,C,D,G,H,K,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6572	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,L,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6573	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6574	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6575	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6576	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6577	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6578	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,L,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6579	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6580	A,B,F.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6621	C,D,G,H,L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6622	D,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6623	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6624	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6625	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6626	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6627	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6628	D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6629	A,B,E.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6671	B,C,D,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6672	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6673	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6674	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6675	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6676	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6677	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6678	A,B,C,E,F,I.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6720	H,K,L,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6721	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6722	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6723	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6724	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6725	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6726	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6727	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,I,J,M.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6769	L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6770	B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6771	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6772	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6773	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6774	A,E,I,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6775	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6776	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M,N.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6777	A.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6818	D.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6819	A,B,E,F,I,J,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6820	A,B,C,D,F,G,H,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6821	All.

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
Georgetown	NI17–09	6822	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6823	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6824	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6825	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6826	A,B,E.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6869	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6870	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6871	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6872	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6873	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6874	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6875	A,B,C,E,F,I.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6920	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6921	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6922	A,B,C,D,E,F,I,J,M,N.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6923	A,B,C,D,F,G,H,J,K,L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6924	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,I,J,M.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6971	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6972	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6973	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,M.
Georgetown	NI17–09	6974	A.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7022	A,B,C,D,E,F,I.

Call Area Cape Romain

The boundary of Call Area Cape Romain begins 6 nmi from the shore and extends roughly 11.5 nmi seaward. It extends from northeast to southwest approximately 32 nmi. The entire area is approximately 183.46 square nmi (62,928 hectares) and is described in the table below:

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
James Island	NI17–12	6014	H,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6015	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6016	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6017	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N.
James Island	NI17–12	6018	A,B,C,E.
James Island	NI17–12	6062	J,K,L,M,N.
James Island	NI17–12	6063	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6064	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6065	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6066	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,M.
James Island	NI17–12	6111	L,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6112	A,E,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6113	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6114	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O.
James Island	NI17–12	6115	A,B,C,E,F.
James Island	NI17–12	6159	P.
James Island	NI17–12	6160	C,D,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6161	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6162	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6163	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M.
James Island	NI17–12	6164	A,B.
James Island	NI17–12	6209	C,D,F,G,H,J,K,L,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6210	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6211	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6212	A,B,C,D,E,F,I.
James Island	NI17–12	6259	B,C,D,F,G,H,K,L.
James Island	NI17–12	6260	A,B,C,D,E,F,G.
James Island	NI17–12	6261	A,B.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7016	H,L,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7017	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7065	P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7066	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7067	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M,N.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7068	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,J,K,L,N,O.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7115	B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7116	All.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7117	A,B,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7118	B,C,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
Georgetown	NI17–09	7119	C,D,G,I.

Call Area Charleston

The boundary of Call Area Charleston begins approximately 23 nmi from the shore and extends roughly 10.5 nmi seaward. It extends from northeast to southwest approximately 10 nmi. The entire area is approximately 41.98 square nmi (14,400 hectares) and is described in the table below:

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
James Island	NI17–12	6414	O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6415	G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6462	O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6463	I,J,M,N,O,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6464	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6511	D,H.
James Island	NI17–12	6512	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,J,K,L,P.
James Island	NI17–12	6513	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6514	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6563	B,C,D,G,H.
James Island	NI17–12	6564	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,J,K,L,O,P.

Call Area Winyah

The boundary of Call Area Winyah begins 35 nmi from the shore and extends roughly 6 nmi seaward. It extends from northeast to southwest approximately 16 nmi. The entire area is approximately 41.14 square nmi (14,112 hectares) and is described in the table below:

Protraction name	Protraction No.	Block No.	Sub-block
James Island	NI17–12	6179	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O.
James Island	NI17–12	6180	A,B,C,D,E,F,I.
James Island	NI17–12	6226	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6227	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6228	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,M,N.
James Island	NI17–12	6229	A,B,E.
James Island	NI17–12	6276	All.
James Island	NI17–12	6277	A,B,C,D,E,F,G,I.
James Island	NI17–12	6326	A,B,C,E.

Areas Not Included in the Call

BOEM considered the findings of several studies conducted by the State of South Carolina, Task Force input, and other relevant studies and removed the following areas from further leasing consideration:

1. Artificial reefs that are managed as Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC's): Lease blocks containing known artificial reefs have not been included because it would likely be impractical to conduct ocean-bottom penetrating activities or install foundations on existing subsea structures or hazards. In addition, there could be the potential for multiple-use issues (*i.e.,* commercial and recreational vessel use, fishing hotspots, and commercial fishing areas). Artificial reefs and their name, reef ID, and known inventory are described in the following table. BOEM may later require set-backs from these or other features.

Reef name	Reef ID	Known inventory
Bp-25 Reef	Pa–06	160′ Ship (Bp–25), New York City Subway Cars.
Little River Offshore Reef	Pa–02	Reef Buoy, Landing Craft, Concrete Culvert Pipe, Concrete Rubble, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, 150′ Dive Barge, 120′ Deck Barge, 50′ Tugboat.
Bill Perry Jr Reef	Pa–08	Reef Buoy, 115′ Landing Craft, 56′ Landing Craft, 45′ Shrimp Boat, 56′ Landing Craft, 65′ Tugboat, 20 Shipping Containers, New York City Subway Cars.
Vermilion Reef	Pa–17	460′ Ship (Vermilion), New York City Subway Cars.
Will Goldfinch Reef	Pa–03	Reef Buoy, 175′ Ship (Yo–225), 120′ Fuel Barge, Concrete Zs.
Wayne Upchurch Reef	Pa–13	Reef Buoy, Concrete Structures, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, 45′ Tugboat.
Bruce Rush Reef	Pa–10	Reef Buoys, 100 Concrete Cones, 65′ Crewboat, 78′ Shrimp Boat, Concrete Reef Balls, Deck Barges, Tugboat & Barge, A–7 Airplane, Shipping Containers.
Greenville Reef	Pa–18	140′ Deck Barge, Drydock Units, 130′ Deck Barge, 175′ Ship (Yog–78), 106′ Fuel Barge, 105′ Tugboat (America), 105′ Tugboat (Eagle), 175′ Ship.
Paradise Reef	Pa–09	Reef Buoy, Deck Barge, Concrete Reef Balls, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, 100 Concrete Cones, Concrete Zs, 65′ Barge & Culvert Pipe, Concrete Culvert Pipe.
Georgetown Reef	Pa–14	Reef Buoy, 100′ Ship Wreck, Steel Structures, 100′ Deck Barge, 56′ Landing Craft, Concrete Cones, Shipping Containers, 50′ Tugboat, Army Armored Personnel Carriers.
Pawleys Island Reef	Pa–11	Reef Buoy, 56′ Landing Craft, Concrete Cones, 48′ Tugboat, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, Concrete Culvert Pipe.

Reef name	Reef ID	Known inventory
C.J. Davidson Jr Reef	Pa–16	Reef Buoy, 140′ Deck Barge, Steel & Tire Units, 200 Concrete Reef Balls, 20 Army Armored Personnel Carriers, 100 Concrete Cones, Concrete Culvert Pipe.
North Inlet Reef	Pa–12	Shipping Containers, 200 Concrete Reef Balls, Reef Buoy, 175 Steel Pup Tents, Concrete Culvert Pipe.
Cape Romain Reef	Pa–19	Reef Buoy, 100′ Deck Barge, 65′ Tugboat, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, Concrete Rubble, 90′ Tugboat (Dolphin), Concrete Culvert Pipe.
Hector Reef	Pa–20	300′ Ship (Hector), 22′ Bk Barges, 56′ Landing Craft, Deck Barge, Concrete Culvert Pipe.
Y–73 Reef	Pa–23	180′ Tanker (Y–73), 90′ Tug Boats, Steel Pyramid, Shipping Containers, Cooper River Bridge Rubble.
Comanche Reef	Pa–27	165′ Ship (Comanche), 105′ Tug Boat (Anne Richards), New York City Subway Cars, Cooper River Bridge Rubble, 80′ Trawler.
Cca-Mcclellanville Reef	Pa–34	Reef Buoy, Concrete Rubble, 105′ Tugboat, Cooper River Bridge Rubble, 45′ Tug Boat, Concrete Culvert Pipe.
Capers Reef (R8)	Pa–22	Reef Buoy, CG Buoy R8, Reef Balls, Tug Boats, Deck Barges, Caisson, 56′ Landing Craft, Cooper Bridge Rubble, Concrete Filled Steel Drums, Army Armored Personnel Carriers.
Charleston 60′ Reef	Pa–24	Reef Buoy, Concrete Reef Balls & Cones, Equipment Sections, Steel, Missile Sleeves, Army Armored Personnel Carriers, Deck Barges, Cooper River Bridge Rubble, Memorial Plaque.

2. Areas of High Avian Densities: BOEM attempts to avoid leasing areas with high concentrations of marine birds that are most vulnerable to offshore wind development. In order to protect marine birds, BOEM has removed areas with moderate or greater concentration of near-shore marine birds. Counts of birds from USFWS's wintering sea duck surveys from 2008–2011 were used to identify areas of high concentrations of scoters. In addition, a map that predicts relatively high concentrations of near-shore marine bird species near the Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Winyah Bay was used to fill in information gaps between the sea duck transect lines and to cover other migratory species. The map uses data from an ongoing BOEM/NOAA study entitled, ''Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Seabird Distribution and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf,'' which can be found at *http://www.boem.gov/AT-13-03/.* The map is based on NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science's (NCCOS) version 1.0 models for the US Atlantic (Florida to Maine) that fused environmental predictors with a large database of at-sea transect survey data (extracted from the Avian Compendium database as of August 1, 2014, which can be found at *http://www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5209.pdf*) for the following near-shore marine birds: Black scoter; brown pelican; common loon; common tern; least tern; red-throated loon; and white-winged scoter. Relative to the 177 bird species that use the Atlantic OCS, these near-shore species, except the least tern, ranked high in their relative vulnerability to collision with wind turbines. In addition, these species, except the brown pelican and least tern, ranked high in their vulnerability to displacement from wind facilities according to the BOEM study entitled, ''The Relative Vulnerability of Migratory Bird Species to Offshore Wind Energy Projects on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf,'' which can be found at *http://www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5319.pdf.*

As with the sea duck survey data, the BOEM/NOAA study confirms that the concentration of birds declines dramatically with distance from shore and that the distance from shore before the dramatic decline in concentration varies widely along the South Carolina coast. Lastly, a study of 28 black scoters that were fitted with satellite transmitters found that most bird locations along the portion of the South Carolina coast encompassing the Call Areas were within five miles of the coast. In fact, out of the 20,333 scoters observed off South Carolina in February during the USFWS winter sea duck surveys, approximately 100 scoters were within the proposed Call Areas.

3. Cape Romain NWR: BOEM has taken steps to protect species that use the Cape Romain NWR by removing blocks with high concentrations of near-shore marine birds. Although Call Area Cape Romain is located offshore of the Cape Romain NWR, certain onshore activities associated with offshore wind energy, such as cable landfalls and staging activities, may not be compatible with the Cape Romain NWR. BOEM will work with the USFWS regarding potential impacts to Cape Romain NWR and, if necessary, will develop appropriate stipulations and mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce impacts.

4. Military Areas: The Department of Defense (DOD) conducts operations and readiness activities for both hardware and personnel on the OCS. The Call Areas were refined based on DOD assessments of compatibility between potential commercial offshore wind development and DOD testing, training and operational activities. OCS blocks determined to be incompatible with these activities were removed from consideration, although site specific stipulations may be necessary for remaining lease blocks in the Call Areas to avoid conflicts with DOD activities. BOEM will consult with the DOD regarding potential issues concerning offshore testing, training and operational activities, and will develop appropriate stipulations to avoid or mitigate conflicts with DOD in the Call Areas.

5. Navigation: The United States Coast Guard (USCG) ensures the safety of navigation and provides safe access routes for the movement of vessel traffic proceeding to or from ports or places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The USCG uses a color-coding system to designate portions of the four Call Areas as green, yellow, or red for navigational safety. A designation of green indicates that the USCG believes that an area, if developed, would pose minimal to no detrimental impact on navigational safety, but that the area should still be subject to further study. A designation of yellow indicates that the USCG believes that development of the area could have unacceptable effects on navigational safety and that further study is required to determine the potential effect that development of the

area would have on navigational safety. A designation of red indicates that the USCG believes that development of that area would have an unacceptable effect on navigational safety based on existing navigational routes. BOEM has refined the Call Areas based on USCG assessments and areas designated as red have been removed from the Call. Although OCS blocks determined to pose the greatest risk to navigational safety were removed from consideration, site-specific stipulations may be necessary for remaining lease blocks in the Call Areas. A map showing the OCS blocks (including sub-blocks) and their corresponding color coding can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/State-Activities-South-Carolina/.*

6. Pawleys Island Historic District—Visual Impacts: BOEM has removed aliquots from the Grand Strand Call Area that are located within 18.5 km kilometers (10 nmi) of the shoreline surrounding the Pawleys Island Historic District. In making its decision, BOEM considered the following information: Comments shared with BOEM at the South Carolina Task Force meeting on September 9, 2015; NHPA Section 106 consultations for the development of the South Atlantic Programmatic Agreement, during which the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office requested that BOEM consider the visual effects of the introduction of a wind energy facility on the historic setting and feeling of onshore historic properties; and a letter sent to BOEM from the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office on September 18, 2015, asking BOEM to consider ''how the views of the ocean contribute to the historic location, setting, feeling, and association'' of these historic properties.

The unique characteristics of Pawleys Island Historic District that may qualify it for the National Register of Historic Places include integrity of setting and feeling. As described by the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Nomination Form for Pawleys Island Historic District, ''this Island, especially the central part, exemplifies a way of life in its beauty, its setting, and its overall land use. Pawleys is one of the earliest—if not the earliest—of South Carolina's summer beach settlements and maintains integrity in the natural relationship of marsh, beach, and dune.'' The nomination form can be found here: *http://www.nationalregister.sc.gov/georgetown/S10817722005/S10817722005.pdf.*

The decision to set the buffer at 10 nmi is consistent with information obtained from the North Carolina Visual Simulations study, which analyzed meteorological conditions within the North Carolina study areas and are expected to be meteorologically similar to the South Carolina Call Areas. This is the best information presently available to us for use in estimating an effective setback for the purposes of reducing impacts to viewshed for sensitive areas in South Carolina. The study may be found here: *http://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/State-Activities/NC/Task-6—Meteorological-Conditions-Final-Report.aspx.*

With a setback of 10 nmi, the turbines will not be visible from the shoreline for a majority of the time. The data show that, for an average 24-hour period, there is visibility to 18.5 km (10 nmi) for the majority of the day, 132 days per year (or 36% of the year). At a 10 nmi setback, there will be no effect on the viewshed for the majority of the day, 233 days per year (or 64% of the year). Additional consideration of viewshed impacts to potentially affected historic properties—including the Pawleys Island Historic District—may be undertaken during subsequent Section 106 reviews conducted by BOEM for activities proposed within this area.

7. Grand Strand Call Area—Visual Impacts on Sunset Beach, NC: Portions of the adjacent Grand Strand Call Area are within 10 nmi of Sunset Beach, NC. During the public comment period for the North Carolina Call (published in December 2012), certain stakeholders raised concerns regarding potential visual impacts of offshore wind energy development in areas within the Wilmington West Wind Energy Area (WEA). Based on BOEM's analysis of these concerns, including the North Carolina Visual Simulations study described above, BOEM announced that areas within 10 nmi of Sunset Beach, NC would not be included as part of the Wilmington West WEA. Consistent with its approach in North Carolina, BOEM has therefore removed the OCS blocks from the Grand Strand Call Area that are within 10 nmi of Sunset Beach, NC.

Areas of Interest for Further Analysis

Based on requests received from members of the Task Force, comments received during public information meetings, and initiatives passed by local government officials, BOEM is considering the potential effects of wind energy development on historic properties early in the planning process. BOEM therefore requests specific information on historic properties located in nearshore areas adjacent to the Call Areas. Specifically, BOEM is requesting information on historic sites, districts, and National Historic Landmarks, as well as cultural corridors and other historic properties, whose viewsheds may be a contributing element to eligibility to the NRHP.

There are a total of 88 known properties listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the NRHP located along the coastline within Horry, Georgetown, and Beaufort Counties. These properties include sites, structures, districts, and objects. Specifically, there are seven NRHP-listed lighthouses located within the coastal vicinity of South Carolina (Georgetown Light, Cape Romain Lighthouse, Morris Island Light, Hunting Island Light, Hilton Head Range Light, and Bloody Point Range Lights (within the Daufuskie Island Historic District)). In addition, there are five National Historic Landmarks located within the coastal vicinity of South Carolina (Atalaya and Brookgreen Gardens, Robert William Roper House, USS *Yorktown,* USS *Laffey,* and USS *Clamagore*).

Early in the planning process, BOEM considers the effects of introducing visual elements associated with offshore wind energy development into the landscape. As such, BOEM is requesting information that may guide early development of effective mitigation measures. Potential visual impacts may be mitigated through various means, including siting facilities away from sensitive areas.

Areas Under National Park Service (NPS) Jurisdiction

The mission of the NPS, as set forth under the NPS Organic Act, is to protect the natural and cultural resources, including the scenery, in units of the National Park System, and to provide for their enjoyment in a manner that will leave them unimpaired for future generations (*http://www.nps.gov/aboutus/index.htm;* also see 16 U.S.C. 1). The NPS has advised BOEM that they are concerned with any project features that would impact the viewshed from Fort Sumter National Monument and other historic properties.

Proposed North Atlantic Right Whale Critical Habitat Expansion

On February 20, 2015, NMFS published a proposed rule to expand critical habitat for North Atlantic right whales in the North Atlantic, adding two new areas (80 FR 9314). Proposed Critical Habitat Unit 2 includes marine waters from Cape Fear, NC southward to 29′ N latitude (approximately 43 miles north of Cape Canaveral, Florida). The Grand Strand and Cape Romain Call Areas overlap with Unit 2 areas in the

proposed rule. The proposed critical habitat in the areas that overlap with the Call Areas is based on habitat suitable for North Atlantic right whale calving. BOEM will work with NOAA NMFS regarding potential impacts to any critical habitats and, if necessary, develop appropriate stipulations and mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce impacts.

Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor

The Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor (Corridor) was designated by Congress in 2006 (Pub. L. 109–338) and extends from Wilmington, North Carolina to Jacksonville, Florida. The Corridor is home to a unique culture that was first shaped by West African slaves brought to the southern United States. Their traditions continue today through their descendants, known as the Gullah/Geechee people. The Corridor was established to:

- Recognize the important contributions made to American culture and history by African Americans known as the Gullah/Geechee who settled in the coastal counties of South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and Florida;
- assist state and local governments and public and private entities in South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, and Florida in interpreting the story of the Gullah/Geechee and preserving Gullah/Geechee folklore, arts, crafts, and music; and
- assist in identifying and preserving sites, historical data, artifacts, and objects associated with the Gullah/Geechee for the benefit and education of the public.

As a Federal agency potentially affecting the Corridor, BOEM has the responsibility to:

- consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission (GGCHCC) with respect to such activities;
- cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior and the GGCHCC in carrying out their duties and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and
- to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner which the GGCHCC determines will not have an adverse effect on the Corridor.

BOEM is asking for information on areas within the Corridor which may be affected by wind energy development on the OCS offshore South Carolina and any mitigation measures which may be implemented to reduce potential impacts.

Navigational Issues

BOEM has analyzed USCG 2009 through 2012 Automatic Identification System (AIS) data, including density plots (by 1/16th of an OCS Block) for various individual vessel types (*e.g.* tankers, cargo vessels, tugs, etc.) that traverse the OCS offshore South Carolina. The AIS data used to conduct this analysis, in addition to other AIS tools, can be downloaded at: *http://www.marinecadastre.gov/AIS/default.aspx.* BOEM encourages respondents and interested parties to incorporate this information into their decision-making and comments and when nominating areas.

The USCG considers the placement of offshore wind assessment and generation facilities in any area within 2 nmi of traditional shipping routes poses a risk to navigational safety and therefore does not recommend placement of such facilities in those areas. The USCG considers placement of such wind facilities in areas greater than 5 nmi from existing shipping routes to pose minimal risk to navigational safety. Areas considered for placement of wind facilities between 2 nmi and 5 nmi would require additional USCG analysis to determine if mitigation factors could be applied to bring navigational safety risk within USCG acceptable levels.

North Carolina: Wilmington West Wind Energy Area

The Grand Strand Call Area is adjacent to the Wilmington West WEA in North Carolina. Certain North Carolina stakeholders have expressed concerns over visual impacts from offshore wind energy development. The state of North Carolina and other local governments have requested a 24 nmi buffer from the North Carolina coastline. BOEM considers the effects of visual elements associated with offshore wind energy development, and will continue to do so throughout the planning process offshore South Carolina. As such, BOEM is requesting information and comments that may guide the early development of potential mitigation measures for visual impacts in Call Areas offshore South Carolina.

Required Nomination Information

If you intend to submit a nomination for a commercial wind energy lease in the areas identified in this notice, you must provide the following information: (1) The BOEM Protraction name, number, and specific whole or partial OCS blocks within the Call Area(s) that are of interest for commercial wind leasing, including any required buffer area. This information should be submitted as a spatial file compatible with ArcGIS 10.0 in a geographic coordinate system (NAD 83) in addition to your hard copy submittal. If your proposed lease area(s) includes one or more partial blocks, please describe those partial blocks in terms of a sixteenth (*i.e.,* sub-block) of an OCS block. BOEM will not consider any areas outside of the Call Areas in this process.

(2) A description of your objectives and the facilities that you would use to achieve those objectives.

(3) A preliminary schedule of proposed activities, including those leading to commercial operations.

(4) Available and pertinent data and information concerning renewable energy resources and environmental conditions in the area(s) that you wish to lease, including energy and resource data and information used to evaluate the Call Areas. Where applicable, spatial information should be submitted in a format compatible with ArcGIS 10.0 in a geographic coordinate system (NAD 83).

(5) Documentation demonstrating that you are legally qualified to hold a lease, as set forth in 30 CFR 585.106 and 107. Examples of the documentation appropriate for demonstrating your legal qualifications and related guidance can be found in Chapter 2 and Appendix B of the BOEM Renewable Energy Framework Guide Book available at: *http://www.boem.gov/REnGuidebook_03/.* Legal qualification documents will be placed in an official file that may be made available for public review. If you wish that any part of your legal qualification documentation be kept confidential, clearly identify what should be kept confidential, and submit it under separate cover (see ''Protection of Privileged or Confidential Information Section'', below).

(6) Documentation demonstrating that you are technically and financially capable of constructing, operating, maintaining and decommissioning the facilities described in (2) above. Guidance regarding the required documentation to demonstrate your technical and financial qualifications can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/Regulatory-Information/QualificationGuidelines-pdf.aspx.* Any documentation you submit to demonstrate your legal, technical, and financial qualifications must be provided to BOEM in both paper and electronic formats. BOEM considers an Adobe PDF file on a storage media device to be an acceptable format for an electronic copy.

It is critical that you submit a complete nomination so that BOEM may evaluate your submission in a timely manner. If BOEM reviews your nomination and determines that it is incomplete, BOEM will inform you of this determination in a letter describing the information that BOEM determined to be missing from your nomination. You must then submit this information in order for BOEM to deem your submission complete. You will be given 15 business days from the date of that letter to submit the information that BOEM found to be missing from your original submission. If you do not meet this deadline, or if BOEM determines this second submission is insufficient and has failed to complete your nomination, then BOEM retains the right to deem your nomination invalid. In such a case, BOEM will not process your nomination.

It is not required that you submit a nomination in response to this Call in order to submit a bid in a potential competitive lease sale offshore South Carolina, should BOEM determine that competitive interest exists in one or more portions of the Call Areas after the close of the Call comment period. However, you will not be able to participate in such a lease sale unless you demonstrate prior to the sale that you are legally qualified to hold a BOEM renewable energy lease, and you demonstrate that you are technically and financially capable of constructing, operating, maintaining, and decommissioning the facilities you would propose to install on your lease. To ensure that BOEM has sufficient time to process your qualifications package, you should submit this package during the PSN 60-day public comment period. More information can be found at: *http://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/Regulatory-Information/QualificationGuidelines-pdf.aspx.*

Requested Information From Interested or Affected Parties

BOEM is requesting specific and detailed comments from the public and other interested or affected parties regarding the following:

1. Geological, geophysical, and biological conditions (including bottom and shallow hazards and live bottom) in the area described in this notice.

2. Known archaeological and/or cultural resource sites on the seabed in the areas described in this notice.

3. Historic properties potentially affected by the construction of meteorological towers, the installation of meteorological buoys, or commercial wind development in the areas identified in this Call.

4. Multiple uses of the areas, including navigation (commercial and recreational vessel use), fishing hotspots, and commercial fishing areas.

5. Information relating to whether or not offshore wind turbines located in the areas identified in this notice would adversely affect the South Carolina seascape, and ideas or strategies that could be used to help mitigate or minimize any adverse visual effects, such as: how far offshore turbines should be placed to minimize the visual impact from the coastline; specific locations or areas to avoid development altogether; or any other strategies to help reduce the visual footprint (for example, the color of the turbines [towers, nacelle, blades], the arrangement or pattern of the turbine array, the dimension of the turbines (*e.g.,* height and blade span), visual navigational lighting requirements, the maximum number of turbines that should be allowed in a specific area, etc.).

6. The type of transmission system (*e.g.,* Alternating Current (AC), High Voltage-Direct Current (HVDC), etc.) a prospective developer would likely utilize for a wind facility offshore South Carolina. If AC, please state and explain the maximum distance you would be willing to run an AC transmission system to deliver power from an offshore wind facility to an onshore substation.

7. General interest by a developer(s) in constructing a backbone transmission system that would transport electricity generated by wind projects located offshore South Carolina, including a general description of the transmission's proposed path and potential interconnection points.

8. Available and pertinent data and information concerning renewable energy resources and environmental conditions in the area identified in this notice. Where applicable, spatial information should be submitted in a format compatible with ArcGIS 10.0 in a geographic coordinate system (NAD 83).

9. Habitats that may require special attention during siting and construction.

10. Other relevant socioeconomic, biological, and environmental information.

Protection of Privileged or Confidential Information

Freedom of Information Act

BOEM will protect privileged or confidential information that you submit when required by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Exemption 4 of FOIA applies to trade secrets and commercial or financial information that you submit that is privileged or confidential. If you wish to protect the confidentiality of such information, clearly mark it and request that BOEM treat it as confidential. BOEM will not disclose such information if it qualifies for exemption from disclosure under FOIA. Please label privileged or confidential information ''Contains Confidential Information'' and consider submitting such information as a separate attachment.

BOEM will not treat as confidential any aggregate summaries of such information or comments not containing such information. Additionally, BOEM will not treat as confidential (1) the legal title of the nominating entity (for example, the name of your company), or (2) the list of whole or partial blocks that you are nominating. Information that is not labeled as privileged or confidential will be regarded by BOEM as suitable for public release.

Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470w–3(a))

BOEM is required, after consultation with the Secretary, to withhold the location, character, or ownership of historic resources if it determines that disclosure may, among other things, risk harm to the historic resources or impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners. Tribal entities should designate information that falls under Section 304 of NHPA as confidential.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Abigail Ross Hopper,

Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

[FR Doc. 2015–29908 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Certain Chassis Parts Incorporating Movable Sockets and Components Thereof, DN 3102;* the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission's

Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS,[1] and will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at USITC.[2] The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS) at EDIS.[3] Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Federal-Mogul Motorparts Corporation on November 19, 2015. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain chassis parts incorporating movable sockets and components thereof. The complaint names as a respondent Mevotech, L.P. of Canada. The complainant requests that the Commission issue a general exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

(i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;

(ii) identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;

(iii) identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;

(iv) indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and

(v) explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR. 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number (''Docket No. 3102'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures).[4] Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202–205–2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.[5]

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.
Issued: November 19, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29958 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–467 and 731–TA–1164–1165 (Review)]

Narrow Woven Ribbons With Woven Selvedge From China and Taiwan; Notice of Commission Determinations To Conduct Full Five-Year Reviews

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it will proceed with full reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''The Act'') to determine whether revocation of the countervailing duty order on narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge from China and revocation of the antidumping duty orders on narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge from China and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. A schedule for the reviews will be established and announced at a later date.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 6, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Szustakowski (202–205–3169), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office

[1] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov*

[2] United States International Trade Commission (USITC): *http://edis.usitc.gov*

[3] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov*

[4] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf*

[5] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *http://edis.usitc.gov*

of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov.*

For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 6, 2015, the Commission determined that it should proceed to full reviews in the subject five-year reviews pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)). The Commission found that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (80 FR 46048, August 3, 2015) was adequate and that the respondent interested party group with respect to the review on subject imports from Taiwan was adequate, and decided to conduct a full review of the antidumping duty order on narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge from Taiwan. Although the Commission received a response to its notice of institution from Chinese respondent interested parties, the Commission found that the respondent interested party group response with respect to the reviews on subject imports from China was inadequate.[1] However, the Commission determined to conduct full reviews concerning the orders on narrow woven ribbons with woven selvedge from China to promote administrative efficiency in light of its decision to conduct a full review with respect to the review on subject imports from Taiwan. A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

Authority: These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 19, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–29938 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA–392]

Importer of Controlled Substances Application: VHG Labs DBA LGC Standards Warehouse

ACTION: Notice of application.

DATES: Registered bulk manufacturers of the affected basic classes, and applicants therefore, may file written comments on or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a) on or before December 28, 2015. Such persons may also file a written request for a hearing on the application pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative/ODXL, 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152. Request for hearings should be sent to: Drug Enforcement Administration, Attention: Hearing Clerk/LJ, 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Attorney General has delegated her authority under the Controlled Substances Act to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), 28 CFR 0.100(b). Authority to exercise all necessary functions with respect to the promulgation and implementation of 21 CFR part 1301, incident to the registration of manufacturers, distributors, dispensers, importers, and exporters of controlled substances (other than final orders in connection with suspension, denial, or revocation of registration) has been redelegated to the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the DEA Office of Diversion Control (''Deputy Assistant Administrator'') pursuant to section. 7 of 28 CFR part 0, appendix to subpart R.

In accordance with 21 CFR 1301.34(a), this is notice that on December 03, 2014, VHG Labs DBA LGC Standards Warehouse, 3 Perimeter Road, Manchester, New Hampshire 03103 applied to be registered as an importer of the following basic classes of controlled substances:

Controlled substance	Schedule
3-Fluoro-N-methylcathinone (3-FMC) (1233)	I
Cathinone (1235)	I
Methcathinone (1237)	I
4-Fluoro-N-methylcathinone (4-FMC) (1238)	I
Pentedrone (*a*-methylaminovalerophenone) (1246)	I
Mephedrone (4-Methyl-N-methylcathinone) (1248)	I
4-Methyl-N-ethylcathinone (4-MEC) (1249)	I
Naphyrone (1258)	I
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475)	I
N,N-Dimethylamphetamine (1480)	I
Fenethylline (1503)	I
4-Methylaminorex (cis isomer) (1590)	I
Gamma Hydroxybutyric Acid (2010)	I
Methaqualone (2565)	I
Mecloqualone (2572)	I
JWH-250 (1-Pentyl-3-(2-methoxyphenylacetyl) indole) (6250)	I
SR-18 (Also known as RCS-8) (1-Cyclohexylethyl-3-(2-methoxyphenylacetyl) Indole) (7008)	I
5-Fluoro-UR-144 and XLR11 [1-(5-Flouro-pentyl)-1H-indol-3-yl] (2,2,3,3-tetramethylcyclopropyl) methanone (7011)	I
AB-FUBINACA (N-(1-amino-3-methyl-1-oxobutan-2-yl) -1-(4-fluorobenzyl)-1H-indazole-3-carboxamide) (7012)	I
JWH-019 (1-Hexyl-3-(1-naphthoyl)indole) (7019)	I
ADB-PINACA (N-1-amino-3,3-dimethyl-1-oxobutan-2-yl)-1-pentyl-1H-indazole-3-carboxamide) (7035)	I
APINACA and AKB48 N-(1-Adamantyl)-1-pentyl-1H-indazole-3-carboxamide (7048)	I

[1] Vice Chairman Pinkert and Commissioner Williamson determined that the Chinese respondent group responses were adequate and voted for full reviews.

Controlled substance	Schedule
JWH-081 (1-Pentyl-3-(1-(4-methoxynaphthoyl) Indole) (7081)	I
SR-19 (Also known as RCS-4) (1-Pentyl-3-[(4-methoxy)-benzoyl] indole (7104)	I
JWH-018 (also known as AM678) (1-Pentyl-3-(1-naphthoyl)indole) (7118)	I
JWH-122 (1-Pentyl-3-(4-methyl-1-naphthoyl)Indole) (7122)	I
UR-144 (1-Pentyl-1H-indol-3-yl) (2,2,3,3-tetramethylcyclopropyl) methanone (7144)	I
JWH-073 (1-Butyl-3-(1-naphthoyl)indole) (7173)	I
JWH-200 (1-[2-(4-Morpholinyl)ethyl]-3-(1-naphthoyl)indole) (7200)	I
AM-2201 (1-(5-Fluoropentyl)-3-(1-naphthoyl) Indole) (7201)	I
JWH-203 (1-Pentyl-3-(2-chlorophenylacetyl)Indole) (7203)	I
PB-22 (Quinolin-8-yl 1-pentyl-1H-indole-3-carboxylate) (7222)	I
5F-PB-22 (Quinolin-8-yl 1-(5-fluoropentyl)-1H-indole-3-carboxylate) (7225)	I
Alpha-ethyltryptamine (7249)	I
Ibogaine (7260)	I
CP-47,497 (5-(1,1-Dimethylheptyl)-2-[(1R,3S)-3-hydroxycyclohexyl-phenol) (7297)	I
CP-47497 C8 Homologue (5-(1,1-Dimethyloctyl)-2-[(1R,3S)3-hydroxycyclohexyl-phenol) (7298)	I
Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315)	I
2,5-Dimethoxy-4-(n)-propylthiophenethylamine (2C-T-7) (7348)	I
Marihuana (7360)	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
Parahexyl (7374)	I
Mescaline (7381)	I
2-(4-Elthylthio-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl) ethanamine (2C-T-2) (7385)	I
3,4,5-Trimethoxyamphetamine (7390)	I
4-Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7391)	I
4-Bromo-2,5-dimethoxyphenethylamine (7392)	I
4-Methyl-2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7395)	I
2,5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396)	I
JWH-398 (1-Pentyl-3-(4-chloro-1-naphthoyl)Indole (7398)	I
2,5-Dimethoxy-4-ethylamphetamine (7399)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400)	I
5-Methoxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (7401)	I
N-Hydroxy-3,4-methylenedioxyamphetaimine (7402)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-ethylamphetamine (7404)	I
3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (7405)	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411)	I
Peyote (7415)	I
5-Methoxy-N-N-dimethyltryptamine (7431)	I
Alpha-methyltryptamine (7432)	I
Bufotenine (7433)	I
Diethyltryptamine (7434)	I
Dimethyltryptamine (7435)	I
Psilocybin (7437)	I
Psilocyn (7438)	I
5-Methoxy-N,N-diisopropyltryptamine (7439)	I
N-Ethyl-1-phenylcyclohexylamine (7455)	I
1-(1-Phenylcyclohexyl)pyrrolidine (7458)	I
1-[1-(2-Thienyl)cyclohexyl]piperidine (7470)	I
1-[1-(2-Thienyl)cyclohexyl]pyrrolidine (7473)	I
N-Ethyl-3-piperidyl benzilate (7482)	I
N-Methyl-3-piperidyl benzilate (7484)	I
N-Benzylpiperazine (7493)	I
4-Methyl-alphapyrrolidinopropiophenone (4-MePPP) (7498)	I
2-(2,5-Dimethoxy-4-methylphenyl) ethanamine (2C-D) (7508)	I
2-(2,5-Dimethoxy-4-ethylphenyl) ethanamine (2C-E) (7509)	I
2-(2,5-Dimethoxyphenyl) ethanamine (2C-H) (7517)	I
2-(4-lodo-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl) ethanamine (2C-I) (7518)	I
2-(4-Chloro-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl) ethanamine (2C-C) (7519)	I
2-(2,5-Dimethoxy-4-nitro-phenyl) ethanamine (2C-N) (7521)	I
2-(4-Isopropylthio)-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl) ethanamine (2C-T-4) (7532)	I
MDPV (3,4-Methylenedioxypyrovalerone) (7535)	I
2-(4-bromo-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl)-N-(2-methoxybenzyl) ethanamine (25B-NBOMe) (7536)	I
2-(4-chloro-2,5-dimethoxyphenyl)-N-(2-methoxybenzyl) ethanamine (25C-NBOMe) (7537)	I
Methylone (3,4-Methylenedioxy-N-methylcathinone) (7540)	I
Butylone (7541)	I
Pentylone (7542)	I
alpha-pyrrolidinopentiophenone (*a*-PVP) (7545)	I
alpha-pyrrolidinobutiophenone (*a*-PBP) (7546)	I
AM-694 (1-(5-Fluropentyl)-3-(2-iodobenzoyl)Indole) (7694)	I
Acetyldihydrocodeine (9051)	I
Benzylmorphine (9052)	I
Codeine-N-oxide (9053)	I
Cyprenorphine (9054)	I
Desomorphine (9055)	I
Etorphine (except HCl) (9056)	I

Controlled substance	Schedule
Codeine methylbromide (9070)	I
Dihydromorphine (9145)	I
Difenoxin (9168)	I
Heroin (9200)	I
Hydromorphinol (9301)	I
Methyldesorphine (9302)	I
Methyldihydromorphine (9304)	I
Morphine methylbromide (9305)	I
Morphine methylsulfonate (9306)	I
Morphine-N-oxide (9307)	I
Myrophine (9308)	I
Nicocodeine (9309)	I
Nicomorphine (9312)	I
Normorphine (9313)	I
Pholcodine (9314)	I
Thebacon (9315)	I
Acetorphine (9319)	I
Drotebanol (9335)	I
Acetylmethadol (9601)	I
Allylprodine (9602)	I
Alphacetylmethadol except levo-alphacetyl-methadol (9603)	I
Alphameprodine (9604)	I
Alphamethadol (9605)	I
Benzethidine (9606)	I
Betacetylmethadol (9607)	I
Betameprodine (9608)	I
Betamethadol (9609)	I
Betaprodine (9611)	I
Clonitazene (9612)	I
Dextromoramide (9613)	I
Diampromide (9615)	I
Dimenoxadol (9617)	I
Dimepheptanol (9618)	I
Dimethylthiambutene (9619)	I
Dioxaphetyl butyrate (9621)	I
Dipipanone (9622)	I
Ethylmethylthiambutene (9623)	I
Etonitazene (9624)	I
Etoxeridine (9625)	I
Furethidine (9626)	I
Ketobemidone (9628)	I
Levomoramide (9629)	I
Levophenacylmorphan (9631)	I
Morpheridine (9632)	I
Noracymethadol (9633)	I
Normethadone (9635)	I
Norpipanone (9636)	I
Phenadoxone (9637)	I
Phenoperidine (9641)	I
Piritramide (9642)	I
Proheptazine (9643)	I
Properidine (9644)	I
Racemoramide (9645)	I
Trimeperidine (9646)	I
Phenomorphan (9647)	I
Propiram (9649)	I
1-Methyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperdine (9661)	I
1-(2-Phenylethyl)-4-phenyl-4-acetoxypiperdine (9663)	I
Tilidine (9750)	I
Para-Fluorofentanyl (9812)	I
3-Methylfentanyl (9813)	I
Alpha-methylfentanyl (9814)	I
Acetyl-alpha-methylfentanyl (9815)	I
Beta-hydroxyfentanyl (9830)	I
Beta-hydroxy-3-methylfentanyl (9831)	I
Alpha-methylthiofentanyl (9832)	I
3-Methylthiofentanyl (9833)	I
Thiofentanyl (9835)	I
Methamphetamine (1105)	II
Phenmetrazine (1631)	II
Amobarbital (2125)	II
Pentobarbital (2270)	II
Secobarbital (2315)	II
Glutethimide (2550)	II

Controlled substance	Schedule
Nabilone (7379)	II
1-Phenylcyclohexylamine (7460)	II
Phencyclidine (7471)	II
Phenylacetone (8501)	II
1-Piperidinocyclohexanecarbonitrile (8603)	II
Alphaprodine (9010)	II
Anileridine (9020)	II
Etorphine HCl (9059)	II
Dihydrocodeine (9120)	II
Diphenoxylate (9170)	II
Ecgonine (9180)	II
Ethylmorphine (9190)	II
Levomethorphan (9210)	II
Levorphanol (9220)	II
Isomethadone (9226)	II
Meperidine (9230)	II
Meperidine intermediate-A (9232)	II
Meperidine intermediate-B (9233)	II
Meperidine intermediate-C (9234)	II
Metazocine (9240)	II
Metopon (9260)	II
Dextropropoxyphene, bulk (non-dosage forms) (9273)	II
Dihydroetorphine (9334)	II
Levo-alphacetylmethadol (9648)	II
Noroxymorphone (9668)	II
Phenazocine (9715)	II
Piminodine (9730)	II
Racemethorphan (9732)	II
Racemorphan (9733)	II
Alfentanil (9737)	II
Remifentanil (9739)	II
Sufentanil (9740)	II
Carfentanil (9743)	II
Tapentadol (9780)	II
Bezitramide (9800)	II
Moramide-intermediate (9802)	II

The company plans to import analytical reference standards for distribution to its customers for research and analytical purposes. Placement of these drug codes onto the company's registration does not translate into automatic approval of subsequent permit applications to import controlled substances.

Approval of permit applications will occur only when the registrant's business activity is consistent with what is authorized under 21 U.S.C. 952(a)(2). Authorization will not extend to the import of FDA approved or non-approved finished dosage forms for commercial sale.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Louis J. Milione,

Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015–29934 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

William Mikaitis, M.D.; Decision and Order

On July 23, 2015, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to William Mikaitis, M.D. (Registrant), of Lockport, Illinois. The Show Cause Order proposed the revocation of Registrant's DEA Certificate of Registration AM1585770, and the denial of any applications to renew or modify the registration as well as any other applications for a DEA registration, on the ground that he ''do[es] not have authority to practice medicine or handle controlled substances in Illinois, the [S]tate in which [he] is registered with the DEA.'' Show Cause Order at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).

The Show Cause Order alleged that Registrant is registered with the DEA as a practitioner authorized to handle controlled substances in Schedules II through V at the registered address of 1206 E. 9th St., Suite 210, Lockport, Illinois. *Id.* The Order alleged that Registrant's registration expires by its terms on January 31, 2018. *Id.*

The Order further alleged that ''[e]ffective March 5, 2015, the State of Illinois, Department of Financial and Professional Regulation (IDFPR), Division of Professional Regulation, issued an Order in which the IDFPR temporarily suspended [his] Illinois [P]hysician and [S]urgeon [L]license and [his] controlled substance licenses'' and that ''[t]his Order remains in effect.'' *Id.* The Show Cause Order thus asserted that ''DEA must revoke [his] registration based upon [his] lack of authority to handle controlled substances in the State of Illinois.'' *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).

The Show Cause Order also notified Registrant of his right to request a hearing on the allegations or to submit a written statement in lieu of a hearing, the procedure for electing either option, and the consequence for failing to elect either option. *Id.* at 2 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43).

On July 30, 2015, a Diversion Investigator met Registrant at the office of his attorney and personally served the Show Cause Order on him. *See* GX 5 (Affidavit of DI). The Government

represents that since the date of service, neither Registrant, nor any person purporting to represent him, has requested a hearing or submitted a written statement while waiving his right to a hearing. *See* Govt. Req. for Final Agency Action, at 3–4. Because more than thirty (30) days have now passed since the date of service of the Show Cause Order and Registrant has neither requested a hearing nor submitted a written statement in lieu of a hearing, I find that he has waived his right to either request a hearing or to submit a written statement. 21 CFR 1301.43(d). I therefore issue this Decision and Final Order based on the record submitted by the Government. *Id.* § 1301.43(e). I make the following findings.

Findings

Registrant is the holder of DEA Certificate of Registration AM1585770, pursuant to which he is authorized to dispense controlled substances in schedules II–V as a practitioner, at the registered address of 1206 E. 9th St., Suite 210, Lockport, Illinois. GX 2. His registration does not expire until January 31, 2018. *Id.*

On March 5, 2015, the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation, Division of Professional Regulation, ordered the suspension of Respondent's Illinois Physician and Surgeon License, as well as his state Controlled Substance Licenses, pending proceedings before the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and the Medical Disciplinary Board of the State. GX 4 at 1. I take official notice that as of this date, the public Web site maintained by the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation shows that Registrant's Physician and Surgeon License as well as his Illinois Controlled Substance Licenses remain suspended based on the State's allegations that he engaged in ''unprofessional conduct, aid[ed] and abet[ed] [the] unlicensed practice of medicine and [committed] multiple violations of the Controlled Substance Act.'' [1] *See https://ilesonline.idfpr.illinois.gov/DPR/Lookup/LicenseLookup.aspx.*

Discussion

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), the Attorney General is authorized to suspend or revoke a registration issued under section 823, ''upon a finding that the registrant . . . has had his State license or registration suspended [or] revoked . . . by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the . . . dispensing of controlled substances.'' Moreover, DEA has repeatedly held that the possession of authority to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the State in which a practitioner engages in professional practice is a fundamental condition for obtaining and maintaining a practitioner's registration. *See James L. Hooper,* 76 FR 71371 (2011), *pet. for rev. denied,* 481 Fed. App'x 826 (4th Cir. 2012).

This rule derives from the text of two provisions of the CSA. First, Congress defined ''the term 'practitioner' [to] mean [ ] a . . . physician . . . or other person licensed, registered or otherwise permitted, by . . . the jurisdiction in which he practices . . . to distribute, dispense, [or] administer . . . a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.'' 21 U.S.C. 802(21). Second, in setting the requirements for obtaining a practitioner's registration, Congress directed that ''[t]he Attorney General shall register practitioners . . . to dispense . . . controlled substances . . . if the applicant is authorized to dispense . . . controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices.'' 21 U.S.C. 823(f). Because Congress has clearly mandated that a practitioner possess state authority in order to be deemed a practitioner under the Act, DEA has long held that the revocation of a practitioner's registration is the appropriate sanction whenever he is no longer authorized to dispense controlled substances under the laws of the State in which he practices medicine. *See, e.g., Calvin Ramsey,* 76 FR 20034, 20036 (2011); *Sheran Arden Yeates, M.D.,* 71 FR 39130, 39131 (2006); *Dominick A. Ricci,* 58 FR 51104, 51105 (1993); *Bobby Watts,* 53 FR 11919, 11920 (1988).

This is so even where a state board has suspended a practitioner's authority prior to providing the practitioner with a hearing to contest the board's allegations. *See Gary Alfred Shearer,* 78 FR 19009 (2013) (holding that revocation is warranted even where a state order has summarily suspended a practitioner's controlled substances authority and the state agency's order remains subject to challenge in either administrative or judicial proceedings); *see also Bourne Pharmacy, Inc.,* 72 FR 18273, 18274 (2007); *Winfield Drugs, Inc.,* 52 FR 27070 (1987). Accordingly, consistent with agency precedent, the revocation of Registrant's registration is warranted.

Because Registrant currently lacks authority to dispense controlled substances in Illinois, the State in which he holds his DEA registration, I will order that his registration be revoked and that any pending applications be denied.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a), as well as 21 CFR 0.100(b), I order that DEA Certificate of Registration AM1585770, issued to William Mikaitis, M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked. I further order that any pending application of William Mikaitis, M.D., to renew or modify his registration, as well as any other pending application of William Mikaitis, M.D., for a DEA Certificate of Registration, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective immediately.[2]

Dated: November 17, 2015

Chuck Rosenberg,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015–29935 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

[1] Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), an agency ''may take official notice of facts at any stage in a proceeding—even in the final decision.'' U.S. Dept. of Justice, Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act 80 (1947) (Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Inc., Reprint 1979).

[2] Based on the State's finding ''that Respondent's actions constitute an immediate danger to the public,'' I conclude that the public interest necessitates that this Order be effective immediately. 21 CFR 1316.67.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1117–0034]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection, eComments Requested; Extension Without Change of a Previously Approved Collection; Collection of Laboratory Analysis Data on Drug Samples Tested by Non-Federal (State and Local Government) Crime Laboratories

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-day Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until January 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have comments on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection

instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Barbara J. Boockholdt, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration; Mailing Address: 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152; Telephone: (202) 598–6812.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

—Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

—Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

—Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information proposed to be collected can be enhanced; and

—Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology, *e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection

1. *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

2. *Title of the Form/Collection:* Collection of Laboratory Analysis Data on Drug Samples Tested by Non-Federal (State and Local Government) Crime Laboratories.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* There are no applicable forms associated with this collection. The applicable component within the Department of Justice is the Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Diversion Control.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Affected public (Primary): Business or other for-profit.

Affected public (Other): Not-for-profit institutions; Federal, State, local, and tribal governments.

Abstract: This collection provides the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) with a national database on analyzed drug evidence from non-federal laboratories. Information from this database is combined with the other existing databases to develop more accurate, up-to-date information on abused drugs. This database represents a voluntary, cooperative effort on the part of participating laboratories to provide a centralized source of analyzed drug data.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* The DEA estimates that 140 persons annually for this collection at 1.6 hour per respondent, for an annual burden of 218 hours.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the proposed collection:* The DEA estimates that this collection takes 218 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required please contact: Jerri Murray, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Suite 3E.405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2015–29980 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Settlement Agreement Under the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby given that, for a period of 30 days, the United States will receive public comments on a proposed Settlement Agreement and Final Judgment on Consent (''Settlement Agreement'') in *United States* v. *ATP Oil & Gas Corp. et al.* (Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-0262), which was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana on November 19, 2015.

The Complaint in this case was filed against ATP Oil & Gas Corporation (''ATP'') and ATP Infrastructure Partners, LP (''ATP–IP'') in February 2013. The Complaint seeks civil penalties and injunctive relief under the Clean Water Act (''CWA'') and injunctive relief under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (''OCSLA'') related to unauthorized discharges of oil and chemicals from an oil platform, the ATP Innovator, into the Gulf of Mexico. ATP is going through a Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceeding and is no longer operating.

Under the proposed Settlement Agreement, ATP agrees to a final civil penalty judgment of $38 million for multiple alleged violations of the Clean Water Act. The penalty judgment will be treated as an allowed unsecured claim in ATP's bankruptcy proceeding. A prior settlement approved by the district court in May 2015 resolved the claims against ATP–IP and secured penalties as well as OCSLA and CWA injunctive relief related to the safe future operation of the ATP Innovator in U.S. waters.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Settlement Agreement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States* v. *ATP Oil & Gas Corp. et al.* (Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-0262), D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–1–10681/1. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	*Send them to:*
By e-mail	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.*
By mail	Assistant Attorney General U.S. DOJ–ENRD P.O. Box 7611 Washington, D.C. 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the proposed Settlement Agreement may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: *http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.* We will provide a paper copy of the proposed Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library,U.S. DOJ–ENRD,P.O. Box 7611,Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for $3.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Thomas P. Carroll,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2015–30053 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2016–005]

Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress; Meeting

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App), NARA announces an upcoming meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

DATES: The meeting will be on Monday, December 14, 2015, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. EST.

Location: National Archives and Records Administration, 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.; Archivist's Reception Room (Room 105), Washington, DC 20408.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Center for Legislative Archives, by mail at 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20408, by telephone at (202) 357–5350, or by email at *sharon.fitzpatrick@nara.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Committee purpose.* The committee advises NARA on the full range of programs, policies, and plans for the Center for Legislative Archives in the Office of Legislative Archives, Presidential Libraries, and Museum Services (LPM).

Agenda:

(1) Chair's Opening Remarks—Secretary of the U.S. Senate

(2) Recognition of Co-chair—Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives

(3) Recognition of the Archivist of the United States

(4) Approval of the minutes of the last meeting

(5) Senate Archivist's report

(6) House Archivist's report

(7) Center Update

(8) Other current issues and new business

Procedures. The meeting is open to the public. Due to space limitations and access procedures, you must submit the name and telephone number of individuals planning to attend to *sharon.fitzpatrick@nara.gov* no later than Thursday, December 10, 2015. You will also go through security screening when you enter the building.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Patrice Murray,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–30040 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

[NARA–2016–004]

Office of Government Information Services; Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App) and the second United States Open Government National Action Plan (NAP) released on December 5, 2013, NARA announces an upcoming Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Advisory Committee meeting.

DATES: The meeting will be on January 19, 2016, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. EST. You must register for the meeting by 5:00 p.m. EST on January 18, 2016.

Location: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA); 700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.; Archivist's Reception Room (Room 105); Washington, DC 20408.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christa Lemelin, Designated Federal Officer for this committee, by mail at National Archives and Records Administration; Office of Government Information Services; 8601 Adelphi Road—OGIS; College Park, MD 20740–6001, by telephone at 202–741–5773, or by email at *Christa.Lemelin@nara.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Agenda and meeting materials:* You may find all meeting materials at *https://ogis.archives.gov/foia-advisory-committee/meetings.htm.* The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the FOIA issues on which the Committee is focusing its efforts: oversight and accountability, proactive disclosures, and fees.

Procedures: The meeting is open to the public. Due to space limitations and access procedures, you must register in advance if you wish to attend the meeting. You will also go through security screening when you enter the building. Seating in the meeting room is limited and will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Registration for the meeting will go live via Eventbrite on January 4, 2016, at 10:00 a.m. EST. To register for the meeting, please do so at this Eventbrite link: *http://www.eventbrite.com/e/freedom-of-information-act-foia-advisory-committee-meeting-registration-19426061874.* Members of the media who wish to register, those who are unable to register online, and those who require special accommodations, should contact Christa Lemelin at the phone number, mailing address, or email address listed above.

Dated: November 18, 2015.

Patrice Little Murray,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–30033 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–P

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Notice of Appointments of Individuals To Serve as Members of Performance Review Boards

AGENCY: National Labor Relations Board

ACTION: The National Labor Relations Board is issuing this notice that the individuals whose names and position titles appear below have been appointed to serve as members of performance review boards in the National Labor Relations Board for the rating year beginning October 1, 2014 and ending September 30, 2015.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4).

Name and Title

Kathleen A. Nixon—Deputy Chief Counsel to the Chairman

William B. Cowen—Solicitor

Robert Schiff—Chief of Staff for the Chairman

Gary W. Shinners—Executive Secretary

Anne G. Purcell—Associate General Counsel, Division of Operations Management

Linda Dreeben—Deputy Associate General Counsel, Division of Enforcement Litigation

Barry J. Kearney—Associate General Counsel, Division of Advice

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Shinners, Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street NW., Washington, DC 20570, (202) 273–3737 (this is not a toll-free number), 1–866–315–6572 (TTY/TDD).

By Direction of the Board.

William B. Cowen,

Solicitor.

[FR Doc. 2015–30031 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7545–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–454 and 50–455; NRC–2013–0169]

License Renewal for Byron Station, Units 1 and 2

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: License renewal and record of decision; issuance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued renewed facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 to Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon or the licensee), the operator of Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 (Byron), respectively. Renewed facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 authorize operation of Byron Units 1 and 2 by the licensee at reactor core power levels not in excess of 3645 megawatts thermal each, in accordance with the provisions of the Byron Units 1 and 2 renewed licenses and technical specifications. In addition, the NRC has prepared a record of decision (ROD) that supports the NRC's decision to renew facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66.

DATES: The license renewal of facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 were effective on November 19, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2013–0169 when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

- Federal Rulemaking Web site: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2013–0169. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.* For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.
- NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS): You may obtain publicly-available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select ''*ADAMS Public Documents''* and then select ''*Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.''* For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.* The ADAMS accession number for each document referenced (if that document is available in ADAMS) is provided the first time that a document is referenced.
- NRC's PDR: You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Daily, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; telephone: 301–415–3873; email: *John.Daily@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Notice is hereby given that the NRC has issued renewed facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 to Exelon Generation Company, LLC, the operator of Byron. Renewed facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 authorize operation of Byron Units 1 and 2 by the licensee at reactor core power levels not in excess of 3645 megawatts thermal each, in accordance with the provisions of the Byron, Units 1 and 2 renewed licenses and technical specifications. The NRC's ROD that supports the NRC's decision to renew facility operating license Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML15187A304. As discussed in the ROD and the final supplemental environmental impact statement (FSEIS) for Byron Station, Supplement 54 to NUREG–1437, ''Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants Regarding Byron Station, Units 1 and 2,'' dated July 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15196A263), the NRC has considered a range of reasonable alternatives that included new nuclear generation, coal-integrated gasification combined cycle, natural gas combined-cycle (NGCC), combination (NGCC, wind, and solar generation), replacement power, and the no-action alternative. The ROD and FSEIS document the NRC determination that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Byron are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decision makers would be unreasonable.

Byron Station, Units 1 and 2 has two pressurized water reactors and is located in Ogle County, Illinois. The application for the renewed licenses, ''License Renewal Application, Byron and Braidwood Stations, Units 1 and 2,'' dated May 29, 2013 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML13155A420 and ML13155A421, respectively), as supplemented by letters dated through April 13, 2015, with respect to Byron Station, complied with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the NRC's regulations. As required by the Act and the NRC's regulations in Chapter I of title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations,* the NRC has made appropriate findings, which are set forth in each of the licenses. A public notice of the proposed issuance of the renewed licenses and an opportunity for a hearing was published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2013 (78 FR 44603).

For further details with respect to this action, see: (1) Exelon Generation Company, LLC's (Exelon) license renewal application for Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, and Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, dated May 29, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated through April 13, 2015; (2) the NRC's safety evaluation report dated July 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15182A051); (3) the NRC's final environmental impact statement (NUREG–1437, Supplement 54), for Byron, Units 1 and 2, published in July 2015; and (4) the NRC's ROD.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of November, 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christopher G. Miller,

Director, Division of License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation .

[FR Doc. 2015–30021 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2015–0245]

Performance Review Boards for Senior Executive Service

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Appointments.

SUMMARY: On October 27, 2015, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) announced its appointments to the NRC Performance Review Board (PRB) responsible for making recommendations on performance appraisal ratings and performance awards for the NRC Senior Executives and Senior Level System employees, and appointments to the NRC PRB Panel responsible for making recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities for the NRC PRB members. This notice announces a change in the membership of the Senior Executive Service PRB for the NRC.

DATES: November 25, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID NRC–2015–0245 when contacting the NRC about the availability of

information regarding this document. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this document using any of the following methods:

• *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID NRC–2015–0245. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301–415–3463; email: *Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.* For technical questions, contact the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

• *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at *http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.* To begin the search, select ''*ADAMS Public Documents*'' and then select ''*Begin Web-based ADAMS Search.*'' For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by email to *pdr.resource@nrc.gov.*

• *NRC's PDR:* You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1–F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Miriam L. Cohen, Secretary, Executive Resources Board, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555; telephone: 301–287–0747, email: *Miriam.Cohen@nrc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 27, 2015 (80 FR 65822), the NRC published its list of the NRC PRB appointees as required by the regulation at 5 CFR 430.310. The NRC PRB is responsible for making recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities on performance appraisal ratings and performance awards for Senior Executives and Senior Level employees. This notice announces the removal of Michael F. Weber, who is unavailable to participate as a member of the PRB.

For the public's convenience, an updated membership list of the PRB is provided.

The following individuals appointed as members of the NRC PRB are responsible for making recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities on performance appraisal ratings and performance awards for Senior Executives and Senior Level System employees:

Victor M. McCree, Executive Director for Operations
Margaret M. Doane, General Counsel
Cynthia A. Carpenter, Director, Office of Administration
William M. Dean, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Catherine Haney, Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
Michael R. Johnson, Deputy Executive Director for Reactor and Preparedness Programs, Office of the Executive Director for Operations
Nader L. Mamish, Director, Office of International Programs
Cynthia D. Pederson, Regional Administrator, Region III
Glenn M. Tracy, Deputy Executive Director for Materials, Waste, Research, State, Tribal, Compliance, Administration, and Human Capital, Office of the Executive Director for Operations
Maureen E. Wylie, Chief Financial Officer

The following individuals will serve as members of the NRC PRB Panel that was established to review appraisals and make recommendations to the appointing and awarding authorities for NRC PRB members:

Marian L. Zobler, Associate General Counsel for Hearings, Enforcement and Administration, Office of the General Counsel
Brian E. Holian, Director, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response
Jennifer L. Uhle, Director, Office of New Reactors

All appointments are made as required by Section 4314 of Chapter 43 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12 day of November 2015.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Miriam L. Cohen,

Secretary, Executive Resources Board.

[FR Doc. 2015–30026 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

PEACE CORPS

Information Collection Request; Submission for OMB Review

AGENCY: Peace Corps.

ACTION: 30-day notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Peace Corps will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval. In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Peace Corps invites the general public to comment on this request for approval of a new proposed information collection, Peace Corps Post Service Survey (OMB Control Number 0420-pending. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

DATES: Submit comments on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name/or OMB approval number and should be sent via email to: *oira_submission@omb.eop.gov* or fax to: 202–395–3086. Attention: Desk Officer for Peace Corps.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denora Miller, FOIA Officer, Peace Corps, 1111 20th Street NW., Washington, DC 20526, (202) 692–1236, or email at *pcfr@peacecorps.gov.* Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Denora Miller.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Post Service Survey.

OMB Control Number: 0420–XXXX.

Type of Request: New.

Affected Public: Individuals.

Respondents Obligation to Reply: Voluntary.

Respondents: Returned Peace Corps Volunteers.

Burdent to the Public:

a. Estimated number of respondents: 12,000.

b. Estimated average burden per response: 5 minutes.

c. Frequency of response: One time.

d. Annual reporting burden: 1,000 hours.

e. Estimated annual cost to respondents: $0.00.

General description of collection: The Peace Corps Office Health Service (OHS) is interested in the satisfaction levels of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs) with the services received through the Post-Service Unit. In addition, OHS is interested in the various experiences that RPCVs have with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) program so that OHS can better explain and assist RPCVs through the FECA application process. The information will be used by OHS to improve both our customer service as well as improve our ability to provide RPCVs with information related to the FECA system and the process by which RPCVs can apply and obtain benefits.

Request for Comment: Peace Corps invites comments on whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the Peace Corps, including whether the information will have

practical use; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the information to be collected; and, ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques, when appropriate, and other forms of information technology.

This notice is issued in Washington, DC on November 20, 2015.

Denora Miller,

FOIA/Privacy Act Officer, Management.

[FR Doc. 2015–29998 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6051–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee; Open Committee Meetings

AGENCY: U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice of Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee Meeting Dates in 2016.

SUMMARY: According to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), notice is hereby given that meetings of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee will be held on—

Thursday, January 21, 2016.	Thursday, July 21, 2016.
Thursday, February 18, 2016.	Thursday, August 18, 2016.
Thursday, March 17, 2016.	Thursday, September 15, 2016.
Thursday, April 21, 2016.	Thursday October 20, 2016.
Thursday, May 19, 2016.	Thursday, November 17, 2016.
Thursday, June 16, 2016.	Thursday, December 15, 2016.

The meetings will start at 10 a.m. and will be held in Room 5A06A, U.S. Office of Personnel Management Building, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC.

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is composed of a Chair, five representatives from labor unions holding exclusive bargaining rights for Federal prevailing rate employees, and five representatives from Federal agencies. Entitlement to membership on the Committee is provided for in 5 U.S.C. 5347.

The Committee's primary responsibility is to review the Prevailing Rate System and other matters pertinent to establishing prevailing rates under subchapter IV, chapter 53, 5 U.S.C., as amended, and from time to time advise the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

These scheduled meetings are open to the public with both labor and management representatives attending. During the meetings either the labor members or the management members may caucus separately to devise strategy and formulate positions. Premature disclosure of the matters discussed in these caucuses would unacceptably impair the ability of the Committee to reach a consensus on the matters being considered and would disrupt substantially the disposition of its business. Therefore, these caucuses will be closed to the public because of a determination made by the Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management under the provisions of section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) and 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B). These caucuses may, depending on the issues involved, constitute a substantial portion of a meeting.

Annually, the Chair compiles a report of pay issues discussed and concluded recommendations. These reports are available to the public. Reports for calendar years 2008 to 2014 are posted at *http://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/pay-systems/federal-wage-system/#url=FPRAC.* Previous reports are also available, upon written request to the Committee.

The public is invited to submit material in writing to the Chair on Federal Wage System pay matters felt to be deserving of the Committee's attention. Additional information on these meetings may be obtained by contacting the Committee at U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, Room 5H27, 1900 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20415, (202) 606–2858.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

Sheldon Friedman,

Chairman, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 2015–30034 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–49–P

PRESIDIO TRUST

Notice of Wireless Telecommunications Site

AGENCY: The Presidio Trust.

ACTION: Public notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the Presidio Trust's receipt of and availability for public comment on an application from GTE Mobilnet of California d/b/a Verizon Wireless to construct and operate a new wireless telecommunications facilities site (''Project'') in the Presidio of San Francisco. The proposed location of the Project is in the vicinity of 1450 Battery Caulfield Road.

The Project involves (i) installing a 130-foot lattice tower to accommodate up to 12 antenna mounted at a centerline of 126 feet, and (ii) placing the associated radio and communications equipment on a concrete pad beneath the tower. Power and fiber connections for the project will be provided through underground cables connected to existing power and fiber sources.

Comments: Comments on the proposed project must be sent to Steve Carp, Presidio Trust, 103 Montgomery Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129–0052, and be received by December 24, 2015. A copy of Verizon's application is available upon request to the Presidio Trust.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Carp, Presidio Trust, 103 Montgomery Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129–0052. Email: *scarp@presidiotrust.gov.* Telephone: 415.561.5300.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Andrea M. Andersen,

Acting General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2015–29993 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–4R–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76482; File No. SR–CBOE–2015–104]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Notice of Proposed Rule Change To Trade Expiring MSCI EAFE Index Options Until 3:00 p.m.

November 19, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 13, 2015, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated (the ''Exchange'' or ''CBOE'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

CBOE proposes to change the trading hours for expiring MSCI EEAFE [sic] Index (''EAFE'') options. The text of the proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's Web site *http://www.cboe.com/AboutCBOE/CBOELegalRegulatoryHome.aspx*), at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary, and at the Commission.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On April 8, 2015, the Commission approved CBOE's proposal to list and trade options on the MSCI EAFE Index (''EAFE'') and the MSCI Emerging Market Index (''EM'').[3] This filing is solely concerned with EAFE options.

When the Exchange filed to list EAFE options, the MSCI EAFE Index was not calculated and disseminated during the entire time period during which EAFE options would be traded.[4] Specifically, the MSCI EAFE Index was not calculated from approximately 11:30 a.m. (Chicago time) to 3:15 p.m. (Chicago time).[5]

Also, when CBOE originally filed to list EAFE options, MSCI, Inc. only included the companies of a component country that were listed on the component country's home market. For example, only those securities listed on domestic markets such as the Amsterdam Exchange were included for The Netherlands, a component country of the MSCI EAFE Index. Securities of Dutch companies listed on exchanges outside of The Netherlands were not included in the Index.

Beginning on December 1, 2015, foreign listed companies will become eligible for inclusion in the MSCI EAFE Index. This means that the MSCI EAFE Index will now include the prices of certain foreign listed companies that are listed and traded outside of their home markets on U.S. markets during the time that the U.S. equity markets are open, which is until 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time).[6] As a result, MSCI, Inc. will be now be calculating and disseminating the MSCI EAFE Index value during the majority of the time that CBOE trades EAFE options.[7] In addition, the closing MSCI EAFE Index level will now be distributed after the U.S. markets close.

As a result, the Exchange proposes to change the trading hours for expiring EAFE options. Currently, trading in expiring EAFE options ends at 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time) on their expiration date. The Exchange established these trading hours for expiring EAFE options to align the trading hours of expiring EAFE options with expiring EAFE futures traded on the Intercontinental Exchange, Inc. (''ICE''). Expiring EAFE futures listed on ICE trade stop trading at 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time) on the third Friday of the futures contract month.

Because the MSCI EAFE Index will now be calculated and disseminated through the close of trading on U.S. markets (until 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time)) and because ICE[8] is also changing the trading hours for expiring EAFE futures (to close at 3:15 p.m. (Chicago time)), CBOE proposes to change the closing time for trading in expiring EAFE options from 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time) to 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time) on their expiration date.

CBOE it [sic] is not proposing to close expiring EAFE option contracts at 3:15 p.m. (Chicago time) as ICE is doing for expiring EAFE futures contracts. This is because on the last day of trading, the closing prices of the component stocks, which are used to derive the exercise settlement value, are known at 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time) (or shortly soon after) when the U.S. equity markets close. As a result, the Exchange believes that it is appropriate to cease trading in expiring EAFE options at 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time) on their expiration day. The Exchange notes that this approach is consistent with the closing times for other expiring P.M.-settled contracts that underlie indexes that close when the U.S. equity markets close at 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time).[9]

To effectuate this change, CBOE proposes to amend Rule 24.6.05, which sets forth that expiring EAFE options may trade between 8:30 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time), by replacing 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time) with 3:00 p.m. (Chicago time).

The Exchange proposes to begin using the change set forth in this rule filing beginning with the December 2015 expiration, which occurs on December 18, 2015. The Exchange states that this change is needed to closely align the trading hours in expiring EAFE options with the trading hours in expiring EAFE futures that trade on ICE.[10] As a result, the Exchange is proposing to have this change apply to all EAFE options listed on or before the effective date of this filing and all EAFE options listed afterward.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder, including the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[11] In particular, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5)[12] requirements that the rules of an exchange be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and to perfect the mechanism for a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

Specifically, the Exchange believes the filing would benefit investors by permitting them to trade expiring EAFE options throughout their expiration day and not just during a portion of their

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74681 (April 8, 2015), 80 FR 20032 (April 14, 2015) (approving SR–CBOE–2015–023).

[4] The closing MSCI EAFE Index level is distributed between 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. (Chicago time) each trading day after the European markets close.

[5] As a result, the Exchange established listing criteria that permits the trading of EAFE options ''after trading in all component securities has closed for the day and the index level is no longer widely disseminated at least once every fifteen (15) seconds by one or more major market data vendors, provided that EAFE futures contracts are trading and prices for those contract may be used as a proxy for the current index value.'' *See* CBOE Rule 24.2.01(a)(8).

[6] The expected foreign listings for the MSCI EAFE Index would be components from Hong Kong, Israel and the Netherlands.

[7] The trading hours for non-expiring EAFE options are from 8:30 a.m. to 3:15 p.m. (Chicago time).

[8] *See* ICE Submission No. 15–183 (filed November 2, 2015), available at: *http://www.cftc.gov/filings/ptc/ptc110315iceusdcm001.pdf*.

[9] *See* CBOE Rules 24.6.01, 24.6.03, 24.6.04 and 24.9(e).

[10] CBOE understands that ICE is changing the trading hours for the expiring EAFE futures contract that trades on ICE from 10:00 a.m. (Chicago time) to 3:15 p.m. (Chicago), beginning with the December 2015 EAFE futures expiration.

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

expiration day. Also, by closely aligning the trading hours for options and futures products which trade on the MSCI EAFE Index, the Exchange would provide investors and market makers with greater opportunities to hedge across markets.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

This proposed rule change does not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. Specifically, CBOE believes that the filing would enable cross-market competition and facilitate hedging opportunities by closely aligning the trading hours in expiring EAFE options and futures. As a result, the Exchange does not believe that the filing would impose any burden on competition.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period up to 90 days (i) as the Commission may designate if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the Exchange consents, the Commission will:

A. By order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change, or

B. institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

The Exchange has requested accelerated approval of the proposed rule change. The Commission is considering granting accelerated approval of the proposed rule change at the end of a 15-day comment period.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number SR–CBOE–2015–104 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–CBOE–2015–104. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the CBOE. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–CBOE–2015–104 and should be submitted on or before December 10, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[13]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29929 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[13] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76478; File No. SR–BATS–2015–100]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; BATS Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change To Amend BATS Rule 14.11(i) To Adopt Generic Listing Standards for Managed Fund Shares

November 19, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 18, 2015, BATS Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''BATS'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is proposing a rule change to adopt generic listing standards for shares listed under BATS Rule 14.11(i) (''Managed Fund Shares'').

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's Web site at *www.batstrading.com,* at the principal office of the Exchange, and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 14.11(i) to adopt generic listing

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

standards for Managed Fund Shares. Under the Exchange's current rules, a proposed rule change must be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') for the listing and trading of each new series of Managed Fund Shares. The Exchange believes that it is appropriate to codify certain rules within Rule 14.11(i) that would generally eliminate the need for such proposed rule changes, which would create greater efficiency and promote uniform standards in the listing process.

Background

Rule 14.11(i) sets forth certain rules related to the listing and trading of Managed Fund Shares.[3] Under Rule 14.11(i)(3)(A), the term ''Managed Fund Share'' means a security that:

(a) represents an interest in a registered investment company (''Investment Company'') organized as an open-end management investment company or similar entity, that invests in a portfolio of securities selected by the Investment Company's investment adviser (hereafter ''Adviser'') consistent with the Investment Company's investment objectives and policies;

(b) is issued in a specified aggregate minimum number in return for a deposit of a specified portfolio of securities and/or a cash amount with a value equal to the next determined net asset value; and

(c) when aggregated in the same specified minimum number, may be redeemed at a holder's request, which holder will be paid a specified portfolio of securities and/or cash with a value equal to the next determined net asset value.

Effectively, Managed Fund Shares are securities issued by an actively-managed open-end Investment Company (*i.e.,* an exchange-traded fund (''ETF'') that is actively managed). Because Managed Fund Shares are actively-managed, they do not seek to replicate the performance of a specified passive index of securities. Instead, they generally use an active investment strategy to seek to meet their investment objectives. In contrast, an open-end Investment Company that issues Index Fund Shares, listed and traded on the Exchange pursuant to Rule 14.11(c), seeks to provide investment results that generally correspond to the price and yield performance of a specific foreign or domestic stock index, fixed income securities index, or combination thereof.

All Managed Fund Shares listed pursuant to Rule 14.11(i) are included within the definition of ''security'' or ''securities'' as such terms are used in the Rules of the Exchange and, as such, are subject to the full panoply of Exchange rules and procedures that currently govern the trading of securities on the Exchange.[4]

In addition, Rule 14.11(i) currently provides for the criteria that Managed Fund Shares must satisfy for initial and continued listing on the Exchange, including, for example, that a minimum number of Managed Fund Shares are required to be outstanding at the time of commencement of trading on the Exchange. However, the current process for listing and trading new series of Managed Fund Shares on the Exchange requires that the Exchange submit a proposed rule change with the Commission. In this regard, Rule 14.11(i)(2)(A) specifies that the Exchange will file separate proposals under Section 19(b) of the Act (hereafter, a ''proposed rule change'') before the listing of Managed Fund Shares, which, in conjunction with the proposal to create generic listing standards for Managed Fund Shares, the Exchange is proposing to delete.

Proposed Changes to Rule 14.11(i)

The Exchange is proposing to amend Rule 14.11(i) to specify that the Exchange may approve Managed Fund Shares for listing pursuant to SEC Rule 19b-4(e) under the Act, which pertains to derivative securities products (''SEC Rule 19b–4(e)'').[5] SEC Rule 19b–4(e)(1) provides that the listing and trading of a new derivative securities product by a self-regulatory organization (''SRO'') is not deemed a proposed rule change, pursuant to paragraph (c)(1) of Rule 19b–4,[6] if the Commission has approved, pursuant to section 19(b) of the Act, the SRO's trading rules, procedures and listing standards for the product class that would include the new derivative securities product and the SRO has a surveillance program for the product class. This is the current method pursuant to which ''passive'' ETFs are listed under Rule 14.11.

The Exchange would also specify within Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C) that components of Managed Fund Shares listed pursuant to SEC Rule 19b-4(e) must satisfy the requirements of Rule 14.11(i) on an initial and continued basis, which includes certain specific criteria that the Exchange is proposing to include within Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C), as described in greater detail below. As proposed, the Exchange would continue to file separate proposed rule changes before the listing and trading of Managed Fund Shares with components that do not satisfy the additional criteria described below or components other than those specified below. For example, if the components of a Managed Fund Share exceeded one of the applicable thresholds, the Exchange would file a separate proposed rule change before listing and trading such Managed Fund Share. Similarly, if the components of a Managed Fund Share included a security or asset that is not specified below, the Exchange would file a separate proposed rule change.

The Exchange would also amend the definition of the term ''Disclosed Portfolio'' under Rule 14.11(i)(3)(B) in order to require that the Web site for each series of Managed Fund Shares listed on the Exchange disclose the following information regarding the Disclosed Portfolio, to the extent applicable: ticker symbol, CUSIP or other identifier, a description of the holding, identity of the asset upon which the derivative is based, the strike price for any options, the quantity of each security or other asset held as measured by select metrics, maturity date, coupon rate, effective date, market value and percentage weight of the holding in the portfolio.[7]

The Exchange would also add to Rule 14.11(i)(4)(A) by specifying that all Managed Fund Shares must have a stated investment objective, which must be adhered to under normal market conditions.[8]

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65225 (August 30, 2011), 76 FR 55148 (September 6, 2011) (SR–BATS–2011–018) (Order Approving Proposed Rule Change to Adopt Rules for the Qualification, Listing and Delisting of Companies on the Exchange) (the ''Approval Order''). The Approval Order approved the rules permitting the listing of both Tier I and Tier II securities on the Exchange and the requirements associated therewith, which includes the listing and trading of Index Fund Shares and Managed Fund Shares, trading hours and halts, and listing fees originally applicable to Managed Fund Shares.

[4] *See* Rule 14.11(i)(2).

[5] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(e). As provided under SEC Rule 19b–4(e), the term ''new derivative securities product'' means any type of option, warrant, hybrid securities product or any other security, other than a single equity option or a security futures product, whose value is based, in whole or in part, upon the performance of, or interest in, an underlying instrument.

[6] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(c)(1). As provided under SEC Rule 19b–4(c)(1), a stated policy, practice, or interpretation of the SRO shall be deemed to be a proposed rule change unless it is reasonably and fairly implied by an existing rule of the SRO.

[7] Proposed rule changes for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly included disclosure requirements with respect to each portfolio holding, as applicable to the type of holding. *See, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72666 (July 3, 2014), 79 FR 44224 (July 30, 2014) (SR–NYSEArca-2013–122) (the ''PIMCO Total Return Use of Derivatives Approval'').

[8] The Exchange would also add a new defined term under Rule 14.11(i)(3)(E) to specify that the term ''normal market conditions'' includes, but is not limited to, the absence of trading halts in the

Finally, the Exchange would also amend the continued listing requirement in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(B) by changing the requirement that an Intraday Indicative Value for Managed Fund Shares be widely disseminated by one or more major market data vendors at least every 15 seconds during the time when the Managed Fund Shares trade on the Exchange to a requirement that an Intraday Indicative Value be widely disseminated by one or more major market data vendors at least every 15 seconds during Regular Trading Hours, as defined in Exchange Rule 1.5(w).

Proposed Managed Fund Share Portfolio Standards

The Exchange is proposing standards that would pertain to Managed Fund Shares to qualify for listing and trading pursuant to SEC Rule 19b–4(e). These standards would be grouped according to security or asset type. The Exchange notes that the standards proposed for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds equity securities, Derivative Securities Products, and Linked Securities are based in large part on the existing equity security standards applicable to Index Fund Shares in Exchange Rule 14.11(c)(3). The standards proposed for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds fixed income securities are based in large part on the existing fixed income security standards applicable to Index Fund Shares in Rule 14.11(c)(4). Many of the standards proposed for other types of holdings in a Managed Fund Share portfolio are based on previous proposed rule changes for specific series of Managed Fund Shares.[9]

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i) would describe the standards for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds equity securities, which are defined to be U.S. Component Stocks,[10] Non-U.S. Component Stocks,[11] Derivative Securities Products,[12] and Linked Securities [13] listed on a national securities exchange. For Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities, no more than 25% of the equity weight of the portfolio could include leveraged and/or inverse leveraged Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities.

As proposed in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i)(a), the component stocks of the equity portion of a portfolio that are U.S. Component Stocks shall meet the following criteria initially and on a continuing basis:

(1) Component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) that in the aggregate account for at least 90% of the equity weight of the portfolio (excluding such Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) each must have a minimum market value of at least $75 million; [14]

(2) Component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) that in the aggregate account for at least 70% of the equity weight of the portfolio (excluding such Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) each must have a minimum monthly trading volume of 250,000 shares, or minimum notional volume traded per month of $25,000,000, averaged over the last six months; [15]

(3) The most heavily weighted component stock (excluding Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) must not exceed 30% of the equity weight of the portfolio, and, to the extent applicable, the five most heavily weighted component stocks (excluding Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities) must not exceed 65% of the equity weight of the portfolio;[16]

(4) Where the equity portion of the portfolio does not include Non-U.S. Component Stocks, the equity portion of the portfolio shall include a minimum of 13 component stocks; provided, however, that there would be no minimum number of component stocks if (a) one or more series of Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities constitute, at least in part, components underlying a series of Managed Fund Shares, or (b) one or more series of Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities account for 100% of the equity weight of the portfolio of a series of Managed Fund Shares; [17]

(5) Except as provided in proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i)(a), equity securities in the portfolio must be U.S. Component Stocks listed on a national securities exchange and must be NMS Stocks as defined in Rule 600 of Regulation NMS; [18] and

(6) American Depositary Receipts (''ADRs'') may be sponsored or unsponsored. However no more than 10% of the equity weight of the portfolio shall consist of unsponsored ADRs.

applicable financial markets generally; operational issues causing dissemination of inaccurate market information; or force majeure type events such as systems failure, natural or man-made disaster, act of God, armed conflict, act of terrorism, riot or labor disruption, or any similar intervening circumstance.

[9] Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 74193 (February 3, 2015), 80 FR 7066 (February 9, 2015) (SR–BATS–2014–054) (the ''iShares Short Maturity Municipal Bond Approval''); 74297 (February 18, 2015), 80 FR 9788 (February 24, 2015) (SR–BATS–2014–056) (the ''iShares U.S. Fixed Income Balanced Risk Approval''); 66321 (February 3, 2012), 77 FR 6850 (February 9, 2012) (SR–NYSEArca–2011–95) (the ''PIMCO Total Return Approval''); the PIMCO Total Return Use of Derivatives Approval; 69244 (March 27, 2013), 78 FR 19766 (April 2, 2013) (SR–NYSEArca–2013–08) (the ''SPDR Blackstone/GSO Senior Loan Approval''); 68870 (February 8, 2013), 78 FR 11245 (February 15, 2013) (SR–NYSEArca–2012–139) (the ''First Trust Preferred Securities and Income Approval''); 69591 (May 16, 2013), 78 FR 30372 (May 22, 2013) (SR–NYSEArca–2013–33) (the ''International Bear Approval''); 61697 (March 12, 2010), 75 FR 13616 (March 22, 2010) (SR–NYSEArca-2010–04) (the ''WisdomTree Real Return Approval''); and 67054 (May 24, 2012), 77 FR 32161 (May 31, 2012) (SR–NYSEArca-2012–25) (the ''WisdomTree Brazil Bond Approval''). Certain standards proposed herein for Managed Fund Shares are also based on previously proposed rule changes for specific index-based series of Index Fund Shares that did not satisfy the standards for those products on their respective listing exchange and for which Commission approval was required prior to listing and trading. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 67985 (October 4, 2012), 77 FR 61804 (October 11, 2012) (SR–NYSEArca–2012–92); 63881(February 9, 2011), 76 FR 9065 (February 16, 2011) (SR–NYSEArca–2010–120); 63176 (October 25, 2010), 75 FR 66815 (October 29, 2010) (SR–NYSEArca-2010–94); and 69373 (April 15, 2013), 78 FR 23601 (April 19, 2013) (SR–NYSEArca–2012–108) (the ''NYSE Arca U.S. Equity Synthetic Reverse Convertible Index Fund Approval'').

[10] For the purposes of Rule 14.11(i) and this proposal, the term ''U.S. Component Stocks'' will have the same meaning as defined in Rule 14.11(c)(1)(D).

[11] For the purposes of Rule 14.11(i) and this proposal, the term ''Non-U.S. Component Stocks'' will have the same meaning as defined in Rule 14.11(c)(1)(E).

[12] For the purposes of Rule 14.11(i) and this proposal, the term ''Derivative Securities Products will have the same meaning as defined in Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(a).

[13] Linked Securities are the securities eligible for listing on the Exchange under Rule 14.11(d).

[14] The proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(a), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the addition of the reference to Linked Securities.

[15] This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(b), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the addition of the reference to Linked Securities.

[16] This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(c), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the addition of the reference to Linked Securities.

[17] This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(d), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, the addition of the reference to Linked Securities, the reference to the equity portion of the portfolio not including Non-U.S. Component Stocks, and the reference to the 100% limitation applying to the ''equity weight'' of the portfolio—this last difference is included because the proposed standards in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C) permit the inclusion of non-equity securities, whereas Rule 14.11(c)(3) applies only to equity securities.

[18] 17 CFR 240.600. This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i)(e), except for the addition of ''equity'' to make clear that the standard applies to ''equity securities'' and the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable.

As proposed in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i)(b), the component stocks of the equity portion of a portfolio that are Non-U.S. Component Stocks shall meet the following criteria initially and on a continuing basis:

(1) Non-U.S. Component Stocks each shall have a minimum market value of at least $100 million; [19]

(2) Non-U.S. Component Stocks each shall have a minimum global monthly trading volume of 250,000 shares, or minimum global notional volume traded per month of $25,000,000, averaged over the last six months; [20]

(3) The most heavily weighted Non-U.S. Component Stock shall not exceed 25% of the equity weight of the portfolio, and, to the extent applicable, the five most heavily weighted Non-U.S. Component Stocks shall not exceed 60% of the equity weight of the portfolio; [21]

(4) Where the equity portion of the portfolio includes Non-U.S. Component Stocks, the equity portion of the portfolio shall include a minimum of 20 component stocks; provided, however, that there shall be no minimum number of component stocks if (a) one or more series of Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities constitute, at least in part, components underlying a series of Managed Fund Shares, or (b) one or more series of Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities account for 100% of the equity weight of the portfolio of a series of Managed Fund Shares; [22] and

(5) Each Non-U.S. Component Stock shall be listed and traded on an exchange that has last-sale reporting.[23]

The Exchange notes that, as approved by the Commission for certain Managed Fund Shares [24] and also not required under corresponding Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii) related to Index Fund Shares,[25] it is not proposing to require that any of the equity portion of the equity portfolio composed of Non-U.S. Component Stocks be listed on markets that are either a member of the Intermarket Surveillance Group (''ISG'') or a market with which the Exchange has a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement (''CSSA'').[26] However, as further detailed below, the Exchange or the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''), on behalf of the Exchange, will communicate as needed regarding trading in Managed Fund Shares with other markets that are members of the ISG, including all U.S. securities exchanges and futures exchanges on which the components are traded.

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii) would describe the standards for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds fixed income securities, which are debt securities [27] that are notes, bonds, debentures or evidence of indebtedness that include, but are not limited to, U.S. Department of Treasury securities (''Treasury Securities''), government-sponsored entity securities (''GSE Securities''), municipal securities, trust preferred securities, supranational debt and debt of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof, investment grade and high yield corporate debt, bank loans, mortgage and asset backed securities, and commercial paper. The components of the fixed income portion of a portfolio shall meet the following criteria initially and on a continuing basis:

(1) Components that in the aggregate account for at least 75% of the fixed income weight of the portfolio shall each have a minimum original principal amount outstanding of $100 million or more; [28]

(2) No component fixed-income security (excluding Treasury Securities and GSE Securities) could represent more than 30% of the fixed income weight of the portfolio, and the five most heavily weighted fixed income securities in the portfolio shall not in the aggregate account for more than 65% of the fixed income weight of the portfolio; [29]

(3) An underlying portfolio (excluding exempted securities) that includes fixed income securities shall include a minimum of 13 non-affiliated issuers, provided, however, that there shall be no minimum number of non-affiliated issuers required for fixed income securities if at least 70% of the weight of the portfolio consists of equity securities as described in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i); [30]

(4) Component securities that in aggregate account for at least 90% of the fixed income weight of the portfolio must be either: (a) From issuers that are required to file reports pursuant to Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Act; (b) from issuers that have a worldwide market value of its outstanding common equity held by non-affiliates of $700 million or more; (c) from issuers that have outstanding securities that are notes, bonds, debentures, or evidence of indebtedness having a total remaining principal amount of at least $1 billion; (d) exempted securities as defined in Section 3(a)(12) of the Act; or (e) from issuers that are a government of a

[19] The proposed text is identical to the corresponding representation from the Non-U.S. Components Release, as defined in footnote 24, below. The proposed text is also identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(a), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and that each Non-U.S. Component Stock must have a minimum market value of at least $100 million instead of the 70% required under Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(a).

[20] The proposed text is identical to the corresponding representation from the Non-U.S. Components Release, as defined in footnote 24, below. This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(b), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the addition of the reference to Linked Securities.

[21] This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(c), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the addition of the reference to Linked Securities.

[22] This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(d), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, the addition of the reference to Linked Securities, the reference to the equity portion of the portfolio including Non-U.S. Component Stocks, and the reference to the 100% limitation applying to the ''equity weight'' of the portfolio—this last difference is included because the proposed standards in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C) permit the inclusion of non-equity securities, whereas Rule 14.11(c)(3) applies only to equity securities.

[23] 17 CFR 240.600. This proposed text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii)(e), except for the addition of ''equity'' to make clear that the standard applies to ''equity securities'' and the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable.

[24] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 75023 (May 21, 2015), 80 FR 30519 (May 28, 2015) (SR–NYSEArca–2014–100) (the ''Non-U.S. Components Release'').

[25] Under Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(ii), index fund shares with components that include Non-U.S. Component Stocks can hold a portfolio that is entirely composed of Non-U.S. Component Stocks that are listed on markets that are neither members of ISG, nor with which the Exchange has in place a CSSA.

[26] ISG is comprised of an international group of exchanges, market centers, and market regulators that perform front-line market surveillance in their respective jurisdictions. *See https://www.isgportal.org/home.html.*

[27] Debt securities include a variety of fixed income obligations, including, but not limited to, corporate debt securities, government securities, municipal securities, convertible securities, and mortgage-backed securities. Debt securities include investment-grade securities, non-investment-grade securities, and unrated securities. Debt securities also include variable and floating rate securities. To the extent a fund holds a convertible security, the equity security into which such security is converted would be required to meet the criteria of proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i).

[28] This proposed text of 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii)(a)(1) is based on the corresponding text of 14.11(c)(4)(B)(i)(b).

[29] This proposed rule text is identical to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(4)(B)(i)(d), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable, and the exclusion of ''GSE Securities,'' which is consistent with the corresponding text of NYSE Arca, Inc. (''Arca'') Commentary .02(a)(4) to Rule 5.2(j)(3).

[30] This proposed text is similar to the corresponding text of Rule 14.11(c)(4)(B)(i)(e), except for the omission of the reference to ''index,'' which is not applicable and the provision that there shall be no minimum number of non-affiliated issuers required for fixed income securities if at least 70% of the weight of the portfolio consists of equity securities as described in proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i).

foreign country or a political subdivision of a foreign country; and

(5) Non-agency, non-GSE and privately-issued mortgage-related and other asset-backed securities components of a portfolio shall not account, in the aggregate, for more than 20% of the weight of the fixed income portion of the portfolio.

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(iii) describes the standards for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds cash and cash equivalents.[31] Specifically, the portfolio may hold short-term instruments with maturities of less than 3 months. There would be no limitation to the percentage of the portfolio invested in such holdings. Short-term instruments would include the following: [32] (1) U.S. Government securities, including bills, notes and bonds differing as to maturity and rates of interest, which are either issued or guaranteed by the U.S. Treasury or by U.S. Government agencies or instrumentalities; (2) certificates of deposit issued against funds deposited in a bank or savings and loan association; (3) bankers' acceptances, which are short-term credit instruments used to finance commercial transactions; (4) repurchase agreements and reverse repurchase agreements; (5) bank time deposits, which are monies kept on deposit with banks or savings and loan associations for a stated period of time at a fixed rate of interest; (6) commercial paper, which are short-term unsecured promissory notes; and (7) money market funds.

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(iv) describes the standards for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds listed derivatives, including futures, options and swaps on commodities, currencies and financial instruments (*e.g.,* stocks, fixed income, interest rates, and volatility) or a basket or index of any of the foregoing.[33] There would be no limitation to the percentage of the portfolio invested in such holdings; provided, however, that, in the aggregate, at least 90% of the weight of such holdings invested in futures and exchange-traded options shall, on both an initial and continuing basis, consist of futures and options whose principal market is a member of the ISG or is a market with which the Exchange has a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement CSSA.[34] Such limitation will not apply to listed swaps because swaps are listed on swap execution facilities (''SEFs''), the majority of which are not members of ISG.

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(v) describes the standards for a Managed Fund Share portfolio that holds over the counter (''OTC'') derivatives, including forwards, options and swaps on commodities, currencies and financial instruments (*e.g.,* stocks, fixed income, interest rates, and volatility) or a basket or index of any of the foregoing.[35] Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(v) also provides that no more than 20% of the assets in the portfolio may be invested in OTC derivatives.

Proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(vi) provides that, to the extent that listed or OTC derivatives are used to gain exposure to individual equities and/or fixed income securities, or to indexes of equities and/or fixed income securities, such equities and/or fixed income securities, as applicable, shall meet the criteria set forth in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i) and 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii), respectively. The Exchange notes that, for purposes of this proposal, a portfolio's investment in OTC derivatives will be calculated as the amount of any margin required by a counterparty for the purchase of a derivative by a fund.

The Exchange believes that the proposed standards would continue to ensure transparency surrounding the listing process for Managed Fund Shares. Additionally, the Exchange believes that the proposed portfolio standards for listing and trading Managed Fund Shares, many of which track existing Exchange rules relating to Index Fund Shares, are reasonably designed to promote a fair and orderly market for such Managed Fund Shares. These proposed standards would also work in conjunction with the existing initial and continued listing criteria related to surveillance procedures and trading guidelines.

In support of this proposal, the Exchange represents that: (1) Generically listed Managed Fund Shares will conform to the initial and continued listing criteria under Rule 14.11(i)(4)(A) and (B); (2) the Exchange's surveillance procedures are adequate to continue to properly monitor the trading of the Managed Fund Shares in all trading sessions and to deter and detect violations of Exchange rules. Specifically, the Exchange intends to utilize its existing surveillance procedures applicable to derivative products, which will include Managed Fund Shares, to monitor trading in the Managed Fund Shares; (3) prior to the commencement of trading of a particular series of Managed Fund Shares, the Exchange will inform its Members in an information circular of the special characteristics and risks associated with trading the Managed Fund Shares, including procedures for purchases and redemptions of Managed Fund Shares, suitability requirements under Rule 3.7, the risks involved in trading the Managed Fund Shares during the Pre-Opening and After Hours Trading Sessions when an updated Intraday Indicative Value will not be calculated or publicly disseminated, how information regarding the Intraday Indicative Value and Disclosed Portfolio is disseminated, prospectus delivery requirements, and other trading information. In addition, the information circular will disclose that the Managed Fund Shares are subject to various fees and expenses, as described in the registration statement, and will discuss any exemptive, no-action, and interpretive relief granted by the Commission from any rules under the Act. Finally, the Bulletin will disclose that the net asset value for the Managed Fund Shares will be calculated after 4 p.m. ET each trading day; and (4) the issuer of a series of Managed Fund Shares will be required to comply with Rule 10A–3 under the Act for the initial and continued listing of Managed Fund Shares, as provided under Rule 14.10(c)(3).

The Exchange notes that the proposed change is not otherwise intended to address any other issues and that the Exchange is not aware of any problems that Members or issuers would have in complying with the proposed change.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)

[31] Proposed rule changes for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly included the ability for such Managed Fund Share holdings to include cash and cash equivalents. *See, e.g.,* iShares U.S. Fixed Income Balanced Risk Approval at 9789, SPDR Blackstone/GSO Senior Loan Approval at 19768–69, and First Trust Preferred Securities and Income Approval at 76150.

[32] Proposed rule changes for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly specified short-term instruments with respect to their inclusion in Managed Fund Share holdings. *See, e.g.,* First Trust Preferred Securities and Income Approval at 76150–51.

[33] Proposed rule changes for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly included the ability for such Managed Fund Share holdings to include listed derivatives. *See, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 75 FR 13616 (March 22, 2010) (SR–NYSEArca–2010–04) at 13617; and 67054 (May 24, 2012), 77 FR 32161 (May 31, 2012) (SR–NYSEArca–2012–25) at 32163.

[34] *See* supra note 26.

[35] Proposed rule changes for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly included the ability for such Managed Fund Shares to include OTC derivatives, specifically OTC down-and-in put options, which are not NMS Stocks as defined in Rule 600 of Regulation NMS and therefore would not satisfy the requirements of Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i) or the analogous rule on another listing exchange. *See, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 69373 (April 15, 2013), 78 FR 23601 (April 19, 2013) (SR–NYSEArca–2012–108) at 23602.

of the Act [36] in general and Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [37] in particular in that it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The proposed rule change is designed to perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest because it would facilitate the listing and trading of additional Managed Fund Shares, which would enhance competition among market participants, to the benefit of investors and the marketplace. Specifically, after more than six years under the current process, whereby an exchange is required to file a proposed rule change with the Commission for the listing and trading of each new series of Managed Fund Shares, the Exchange believes that it is appropriate to codify certain rules within Rule 14.11(i) that would generally eliminate the need for separate proposed rule changes. The Exchange believes that this would facilitate the listing and trading of additional types of Managed Fund Shares that have investment portfolios that are similar to investment portfolios for Index Fund Shares, which have been approved for listing and trading, thereby creating greater efficiencies in the listing process for the Exchange and the Commission. In this regard, the Exchange notes that the standards proposed for Managed Fund Share portfolios that include equity securities, Derivative Securities Products, and Linked Securities are based in large part on the existing equity security standards applicable to Index Fund Shares based on either a U.S. index or portfolio or an international or global index or portfolio found in Rule 14.11(c)(3)(A)(i) [38] and (ii),[39] respectively, and that the standards proposed for Managed Fund Share portfolios that include fixed income securities are based in large part on the existing fixed income standards applicable to Index Fund Shares in 14.11(c)(4). Additionally, many of the standards proposed for other types of holdings of series of Managed Fund Shares are based on previous proposed rule changes for specific series of Managed Fund Shares.[40]

With respect to the proposed addition to the criteria of Rule 14.11(i)(3)(B) to provide that the Web site for each series of Managed Fund Shares shall disclose certain information regarding the Disclosed Portfolio, to the extent applicable, the Exchange notes that proposed rule changes approved by the Commission for previously-listed series of Managed Fund Shares have similarly included disclosure requirements with respect to each portfolio holding, as applicable to the type of holding.[41] With respect to the proposed exclusion of Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities from the requirements of proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i)(a) and (b), the Exchange believes it is appropriate to exclude Linked Securities as well as Derivative Securities Products from certain component stock eligibility criteria for Managed Fund Shares in so far as Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities are themselves subject to specific quantitative listing and continued listing requirements of a national securities exchange on which such securities are listed. Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities that are components of a fund's portfolio would have been listed and traded on a national securities exchange pursuant to a proposed rule change approved by the Commission pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act [42] or submitted by a national securities exchange pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [43] or would have been listed by a national securities exchange pursuant to the requirements of Rule 19b–4(e) under the Act.[44] The Exchange also notes that Derivative Securities Products and Linked Securities are derivatively priced, and, therefore, the Exchange believes that it would not be necessary to apply the proposed generic quantitative criteria (*e.g.,* market capitalization, trading volume, or portfolio component weighting) applicable to equity securities other than Derivative Securities Products or Linked Securities (*e.g.,* common stocks) to such products.

With respect to the proposed amendment to the continued listing requirement in Rule 14.11(i)(4)(B)(i) to require dissemination of an Intraday Indicative Value at least every 15 seconds during Regular Trading Hours, such requirement conforms to the requirement applicable to the dissemination of the Intraday Indicative Value for Index Fund Shares in Rule 14.11(c)(3)(C) and 14.11(c)(6)(A). In addition, such dissemination is consistent with representations made in proposed rule changes for issues of Managed Fund Shares previously approved by the Commission.[45]

As proposed, pursuant to Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii)(c) an underlying portfolio (excluding exempted securities) that includes fixed income securities must include a minimum of 13 non-affiliated issuers, provided, however, that there would be no minimum number of non-affiliated issuers required for fixed income securities if at least 70% of the weight of the portfolio consists of equity securities. The Exchange notes that when evaluated in conjunction with proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii)(b), the proposed rule is consistent with current Rules 14.11(c)(4)(B)(i)(d) and (e) in that it provides for a maximum weighting of a fixed income security in the fixed income portion of the portfolio of a fund that is comparable to the existing rules applicable to Index Fund Shares based on fixed income indexes.

With respect to the proposed amendment to Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(iii) relating to cash and cash equivalents, while there is no limitation on the amount of cash and cash equivalents can make up of the portfolio, such instruments are short-term, highly liquid, and of high credit quality, making them less susceptible than other asset classes both to price manipulation and volatility. Further, the requirement is consistent with representations made in proposed rule changes for issues of Managed Fund Shares previously approved by the Commission.[46]

With respect to proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(iv) relating to listed derivatives, the Exchange believes that it is appropriate that there be no limit to the percentage of a portfolio invested in such holdings, provided that, in the aggregate, at least 90% of the weight of such holdings invested in futures and exchange-traded options would consist of futures and options whose principal market is a member of ISG or is a market with which the Exchange has a CSSA. Such a requirement would facilitate information sharing among market participants trading shares of a series of Managed Fund Shares as well as futures and options that such series may hold. Such limitation would not apply to listed swaps because swaps are listed on SEFs, the majority of which are not members of ISG. Thus, if the limitation applied to swaps, there would effectively be a cap of 10% of the

[36] 15 U.S.C. 78f.

[37] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[38] *See* supra notes 14 through 18.

[39] *See* supra notes 19 through 26.

[40] *See* supra note 9.

[41] *See* supra note 7.

[42] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[43] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[44] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(e).

[45] *See* supra note 9.

[46] *See* supra note 31.

portfolio invested in listed swaps. In addition, listed swaps would be centrally cleared, reducing counterparty risk and thereby furthering investor protection.[47]

With respect to proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(v) relating to OTC derivatives, the Exchange believes that the limitation to 20% of a fund's assets would assure that, to the extent that a fund holds derivatives, the preponderance of fund investments would not be in derivatives that are not listed and centrally cleared. The Exchange believes that such a limitation is sufficient to mitigate the risks associated with price manipulation because a 20% cap on OTC derivatives will ensure that any series of Managed Fund Shares will be sufficiently broad-based in scope to minimize potential manipulation associated with OTC derivatives because the remaining 80% of the portfolio will consist of instruments subject to numerous restrictions designed to prevent manipulation, including equity securities (which, as proposed, would be subject to market cap, trading volume, and diversity requirements, among others), fixed income securities (which, as proposed, would be subject to principal amount outstanding, diversity, and issuer requirements, among others), cash and cash equivalents (which, as proposed, would be limited to short-term, highly liquid, and high credit quality instruments), and/or listed derivatives (which, as proposed, 90% of the weight of futures and options will be futures and options whose principal market is a member of ISG). With respect to proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(vi) related to a fund's use of listed or OTC derivatives to gain exposure to individual equities and/or fixed income securities, or to indexes of equities and/or indexes of fixed income securities, the Exchange notes that such exposure would be required to meet the numerical and other criteria set forth in proposed Rule 14.11(i)(4)(C)(i) and 14.11(i)(4)(C)(ii), respectively.

Quotation and other market information relating to listed futures and options is available from the exchanges listing such instruments as well as from market data vendors. With respect to centrally-cleared swaps[48] and non-centrally-cleared swaps regulated by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (the ''CFTC''),[49] the Dodd-Frank Act mandates that swap information be reported to swap data repositories (''SDRs'').[50] SDRs provide a central facility for swap data reporting and recordkeeping and are required to comply with data standards set by the CFTC, including real-time public reporting of swap transaction data to a derivatives clearing organization or SEF.[51] SDRs require real-time reporting of all OTC and centrally cleared derivatives, including public reporting of the swap price and size. The parties responsible for reporting swaps information are CFTC-registered swap dealers (''RSDs''), major swap participants, and SEFs. If swap counterparties do not fall into the above categories, then one of the parties to the swap must report the trade to the SDR. Cleared swaps regulated by the CFTC must be executed on a Designated Contract Market (''DCM'') or SEF. Such cleared swaps have the same reporting requirements as futures, including end-of-day price, volume, and open interest. CFTC swaps reporting requirements require public dissemination of, among other items, product ID (if available); asset class; underlying reference asset, reference issuer, or reference index; termination date; date and time of execution; price, including currency; notional amounts, including currency; whether direct or indirect counterparties include an RSD; whether cleared or un-cleared; and platform ID of where the contract was executed (if applicable).

With respect to security-based swaps regulated by the Commission, the Commission has adopted Regulation SBSR under the Act implementing requirements for regulatory reporting and public dissemination of security-based swap transactions set forth in Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. Regulation SBSR provides for the reporting of security-based swap information to registered security-based swap data repositories (''Registered SDRs'') or the Commission, and the public dissemination of security-based swap transaction, volume, and pricing information by Registered SDRs.[52]

Price information relating to forwards and OTC options will be available from major market data vendors.

The Exchange notes that a fund's investments in derivative instruments would be subject to limits on leverage imposed by the 1940 Act. Section 18(f) of the 1940 Act and related Commission guidance limit the amount of leverage an investment company can obtain. A fund's investments would be consistent with its investment objective and would not be used to enhance leverage. To limit the potential risk associated with a fund's use of derivatives, a fund will segregate or ''earmark'' assets determined to be liquid by a fund in accordance with the 1940 Act (or, as permitted by applicable regulation, enter into certain offsetting positions) to cover its obligations under derivative instruments. A fund's investments will not be used to seek performance that is the multiple or inverse multiple (*i.e.,* 2xs or 3xs) of a fund's broad-based securities market index (as defined in Form N–1A).[53]

The proposed rule change is also designed to protect investors and the public interest because Managed Fund Shares listed and traded pursuant to Rule 14.11(i), including pursuant to the proposed new portfolio standards, would continue to be subject to the full panoply of Exchange rules and procedures that currently govern the trading of equity securities on the Exchange, as further described in the Approval Order.

The proposed rule change is also designed to protect investors and the public interest as well as to promote just and equitable principles of trade in that any Non-U.S. Component Stocks will each meet the following criteria initially and on a continuing basis: (1) Have a minimum market value of at least $100 million; (2) have a minimum global monthly trading volume of 250,000 shares, or minimum global notional volume traded per month of $25,000,000, averaged over the last six months; (3) most heavily weighted Non-U.S. Component Stock shall not exceed 25% of the equity weight of the

[47] The Commission has noted that ''[c]entral clearing mitigates counterparty risk among dealers and other institutions by shifting that risk from individual counterparties to [central counterparties (''CCPs'')], thereby protecting CCPs from each other's potential failures.'' See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 67286 (June 28, 2012) (File No. S7–44–10) (Process for Submissions for Review of Security-Based Swaps for Mandatory Clearing and Notice Filing Requirements for Clearing Agencies).

[48] There are currently five categories of swaps eligible for central clearing: interest rate swaps; credit default swaps; foreign exchange swaps; equity swaps; and commodity swaps. The following entities provide central clearing for OTC derivatives: ICE Clear Credit (U.S.); ICE Clear (E.U.); CME Group; LCH.Clearnet; and Eurex.

[49] Pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act, OTC and centrally-cleared swaps are regulated by the CFTC with the exception of security-based swaps, which are regulated by the Commission.

[50] The following entities are provisionally registered with the CFTC as SDRs: BSDR LLC. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Inc., DTCC Data Repository, and ICE Trade Vault.

[51] Approximately 21 entities are currently temporarily registered with the CFTC as SEFs.

[52] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74244 (February 11, 2015), 80 FR 14564 (March 19, 2015) (Regulation SBSR—Reporting and Dissemination of Security-Based Swap Information).

[53] *See, e.g.,* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 7482 (April 29, 2015), 86 FR 25723 (May 5, 2015) (SR–NYSEArca–2014–89) (order approving listing and trading of shares of eight PIMCO exchange-traded funds).

portfolio, and, to the extent applicable, the five most heavily weighted Non-U.S. Component Stocks shall not exceed 60% of the equity weight of the portfolio; and (4) each Non-U.S. Component Stock shall be listed and traded on an exchange that has last-sale reporting. The Exchange believes that such quantitative criteria are sufficient to mitigate any concerns that may arise on the basis of a series of Managed Fund Shares potentially holding 100% of its assets in Non-U.S. Component Stocks that are neither listed on members of ISG nor exchanges with which the Exchange has in place a CSSA because, as stated above, such criteria are either the same or more stringent than the portfolio requirements for Index Fund Shares that hold Non-U.S. Component Stocks and there are no such requirements related to such securities being listed on an exchange that is a member of ISG or with which the Exchange has in place a CSSA. Further, the Exchange has not encountered and is not aware of any instances of manipulation or other negative impact in any series of Index Fund Shares that has occurred by virtue of the Index Fund Shares holding such Non-U.S. Component Stocks. As such, the Exchange believes that there should be no difference in the portfolio requirements for Managed Fund Shares and Index Fund Shares as it relates to holding Non-U.S. Component Stocks that are not listed on an exchange that is a member of ISG or with which the Exchange has in place a CSSA.

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices because the Managed Fund Shares will be listed and traded on the Exchange pursuant to the initial and continued listing criteria in Rule 14.11(i). The Exchange has in place surveillance procedures that are adequate to properly monitor trading in the Managed Fund Shares in all trading sessions and to deter and detect violations of Exchange rules and applicable federal securities laws. The Exchange or FINRA, on behalf of the Exchange, will communicate as needed regarding trading in Managed Fund Shares with other markets that are members of the ISG, including all U.S. securities exchanges and futures exchanges on which the components are traded. In addition, the Exchange or FINRA on behalf of the Exchange may obtain information regarding trading in Managed Fund Shares from other markets that are members of the ISG, including all U.S. securities exchanges and futures exchanges on which the components are traded, or with which the Exchange has in place a CSSA.

The Exchange also believes that the proposed rule change would fulfill the intended objective of Rule 19b–4(e) under the Act by allowing Managed Fund Shares that satisfy the proposed listing standards to be listed and traded without separate Commission approval. However, as proposed, the Exchange would continue to file separate proposed rule changes before the listing and trading of Managed Fund Shares that do not satisfy the additional criteria described above.

For the above reasons, the Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purpose of the Act. Instead, the Exchange believes that the proposed rule change would facilitate the listing and trading of additional types of Managed Fund Shares and result in a significantly more efficient process surrounding the listing and trading of Managed Fund Shares, which will enhance competition among market participants, to the benefit of investors and the marketplace. The Exchange believes that this would reduce the time frame for bringing Managed Fund Shares to market, thereby reducing the burdens on issuers and other market participants and promoting competition. In turn, the Exchange believes that the proposed change would make the process for listing Managed Fund Shares more competitive by applying uniform listing standards with respect to Managed Fund Shares.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange has neither solicited nor received written comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period up to 90 days (i) as the Commission may designate if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will: (a) By order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change; or (b) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–BATS–2015–100 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–BATS–2015–100. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–BATS–2015–100 and should be submitted on or before December 16, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[54]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29926 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76480; File No. S7–08–14]

Order Granting a Conditional Exemption Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 From the Confirmation Requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) for Certain Transactions in Money Market Funds

November 19, 2015.

I. Introduction

On July 23, 2014, the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') published a notice requesting comment on a proposal to grant a conditional exemption to broker-dealers, subject to certain conditions, from the immediate confirmation requirements of Rule 10b–10 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'') for transactions effected in shares of institutional prime money market funds.[1] Concurrent with the issuance of the Notice, the Commission adopted amendments to Rule 2a–7 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (''Investment Company Act'')[2] that, among other things, require institutional prime money market funds[3] to sell and redeem fund shares based on the current market-based value of the securities held in their portfolios (*i.e.,* transact at a ''floating'' net asset value (''NAV'')).[4] The Commission received two comments in response to the Notice.[5] After careful consideration the Commission is granting the proposed exemption pursuant to Exchange Act Section 36(a)[6] and Rule 10b–10(f),[7] and providing certain clarifications to address comments received.

II. Proposal for Exemptions Pursuant to Notice

Exchange Act Rule 10b-10(a) generally requires broker-dealers to provide customers with specified information relating to their securities transactions at or before the completion of the transactions.[8] Rule 10b-10(b), however, provides an exception from this requirement for certain transactions in money market funds that attempt to maintain a stable NAV when no sales load or redemption fee is charged.[9] The exception permits broker-dealers to provide transaction information to money market fund shareholders on a monthly, rather than immediate, basis, subject to the conditions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of Rule 10b–10(b).[10] Accordingly, customers historically have received information about their transactions in shares of money market funds, including institutional prime money market funds, on a monthly basis.

Given that share prices of institutional prime money market funds likely will fluctuate under the Commission's amendments to Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7,[11] absent an exemption, broker-dealers would not be able to continue to rely on the exception under Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b) for transactions in money market funds operating in accordance with Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii).[12] Instead, broker-dealers would be required to provide immediate confirmations for such transactions in accordance with Rule 10b–10(a).

To address the potential burdens created by such a requirement, the Commission published the Notice proposing to exempt broker-dealers from the requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) when effecting transactions in money market funds operating in accordance with Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii), for or with the account of a customer, where: (i) no sales load is deducted upon the purchase or redemption of shares in the money market fund, (ii) the broker-dealer complies with the provisions of Rule 10b–10(b)(2) and Rule 10b–10(b)(3) that are applicable to money market funds that attempt to maintain a stable NAV referenced in Rule 10b-10(b)(1),[13] and (iii) the broker-dealer has notified the customer of its ability to request delivery of an immediate confirmation consistent with the written notification requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–

---

[54] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] *See* Notice of Proposed Exemptive Order Granting Permanent Exemptions Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 from the Confirmation Requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10 for Certain Money Market Funds, Exchange Act Release No. 72658 (July 23, 2014), 79 FR 44076 (July 29, 2014) (''Notice'').

[2] 17 CFR 270.2a–7.

[3] ''Institutional prime money market funds'' are money market funds operating in accordance with Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii), which include funds that are often referred to as (i) ''tax exempt'' or (ii) ''municipal'' funds that do not qualify as a ''retail money market fund'' as defined in Rule 2a–7(a)(25).

[4] *See* Money Market Fund Reform; Amendments to Form PF, Securities Act Release No. 9616, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 3879, Investment Company Act Release No. 31166 (July 23, 2014), 79 FR 47736, at section III.B (Aug. 14, 2014) (''Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release'').

[5] *See* Letters to Kevin M. O'Neill, Deputy Secretary, Commission, from J. Charles Cardona, President, The Dreyfus Corporation (Aug. 19, 2014) (''Dreyfus Letter''), *http://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-14/s70814-2.pdf;* and Dorothy Donohue, Acting General Counsel, Investment Company Institute (Aug. 15, 2014) (''ICI Letter''), *http://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-14/s70814-1.pdf.*

[6] Section 36(a) of the Exchange Act generally authorizes the Commission to conditionally or unconditionally exempt any person, security, or transaction, or any class or classes of persons, securities, or transactions, from certain provisions of the Exchange Act or certain rules or regulations thereunder, by rule, regulation, or order, to the extent that such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and is consistent with the protection of investors. 15 U.S.C. 78mm.

[7] Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(f) provides that the Commission may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any broker or dealer from the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of Rule 10b–10 with regard to specific transactions or specific classes of transactions for which the broker or dealer will provide alternative procedures to effect the purposes of the rule. 17 CFR 240.10b–10(f).

[8] 17 CFR 240.10b–10(a).

[9] 17 CFR 240.10b–10(b).

[10] With respect to such money market funds, Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b)(2) requires a broker-dealer to give or send to a customer within five business days after the end of each monthly period: A written statement disclosing, each purchase or redemption, effected for or with, and each dividend or distribution credited to or reinvested for, the account of such customer during the month; the date of such transaction; the identity, number, and price of any securities purchased or redeemed by such customer in each such transaction; the total number of shares of such securities in such customer's account; any remuneration received or to be received by the broker or dealer in connection therewith; and that any other information required by [Rule 10b–10(a)] will be furnished upon written request: *Provided, however,* that the written statement may be delivered to some other person designated by the customer for distribution to the customer. 17 CFR 240.10b–10(b)(2). Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b)(3) requires the customer to be provided with prior notification in writing disclosing the intention to send the written information referred to in Rule 10b–10(b)(1) in lieu of an immediate confirmation. 17 CFR 240.10b–10(b)(3).

[11] 17 CFR 270.2a–7.

[12] *See generally* Money Market Fund Reform; Amendments to Form PF, Securities Act Release No. 9408, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 3616, Investment Company Act Release No. 30551 (June 5, 2013), 78 FR 36834, 36934 (June 19, 2013); *see also* Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b)(1), 17 CFR 240.10b-10(b)(1) (limiting alternative monthly reporting to money market funds that attempt to maintain a stable NAV).

As adopted, government and retail money market funds are exempt from the Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii) floating NAV requirement, and therefore, will continue to maintain a stable NAV. *See* Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, *supra* note 4, at sections III.C.1 and III.C.2. Accordingly, for investor transactions in the exempt funds, broker-dealers would continue to qualify for the exception under Rule 10b–10 and be permitted to send monthly transaction reports.

[13] The proposed conditions under ''(i)'' and ''(ii)'' are consistent with the confirmation delivery requirements in Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b) for all transactions in investment company securities that attempt to maintain a stable NAV where no sales load or redemption fee is charged. 17 CFR 240.10b–10(b).

10(a) and has not received such a request from the customer.

III. Comments on Proposal

The Commission received two comments on the Notice, both expressing general support for the proposal.[14] However, both commenters requested clarification regarding the third condition, which would require a broker-dealer to notify its customer of the customer's ability to request delivery of an immediate confirmation consistent with the written notification requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a). Specifically, commenters questioned whether the notification may be made on a one-time basis or whether it would need to be made on a transaction-by-transaction basis.[15] In response, the Commission is clarifying that these notifications may be made on a one-time basis.

IV. Discussion of the Exemption

The Commission finds that it is necessary and appropriate in the public interest, and consistent with the protection of investors to allow broker-dealers, subject to certain conditions, to provide transaction information to investors in any money market fund operating pursuant to Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii) on a monthly basis in lieu of providing immediate confirmations as required under Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a). In making this finding, the Commission considered several factors, as discussed more fully below as well as in the Notice.

First, the attributes of institutional prime money market funds mitigate the need for the protections intended by confirmation delivery under Rule 10b–10(a).[16] For example, institutional prime money market funds will continue to be subject to the ''risk limiting'' provisions of Rule 2a–7, including those provisions governing the credit quality, liquidity, diversification, and maturity of fund investments.[17] Under those ''risk limiting'' provisions, mutual funds that hold themselves out as money market funds—including institutional prime money market funds—may acquire only investments that are short-term, high-quality, dollar-denominated instruments.[18] As a result, while the prices of institutional prime money market funds likely will fluctuate, they are not likely to exhibit regular day-to-day fluctuations, primarily due to the high quality and short duration of these funds' underlying portfolio securities.[19]

Second, customers that need daily pricing information may obtain it through means other than confirmation statements.[20] For example, under the fund disclosure requirements of Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(h)(10)(iii), customers—including institutional investors—will be able to access an institutional prime money market fund's daily mark-to-market NAV per share through the fund's Web site.[21]

Third, absent an exemption, broker-dealers are likely to incur significant costs associated with providing immediate, rather than monthly, confirmations for transactions in shares of institutional prime money market funds. Such costs, in turn, would likely be passed along to investors.[22]

However, given that there likely will be some price fluctuations in institutional prime money market funds, the Commission believes that it is also necessary and appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors to condition the exemption on a broker-dealer providing immediate confirmations upon a customer's request. Accordingly, to be eligible for the exemption, a broker-dealer must (1) provide an initial written notification to the customer of its ability to request delivery of immediate confirmations consistent with the written notification requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a), and (2) not receive any such request from the customer.[23] In addition, consistent with conditions applicable to confirmation delivery requirements provided in Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(b) for all transactions in investment company securities that attempt to maintain a stable NAV where no sales load or redemption fee is charged, the Commission is imposing the conditions that no sales load is deducted upon the purchase or redemption of shares in the institutional prime money market fund, and that the broker-dealer complies with the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of Rule 10b–10(b) that are applicable to money market funds that attempt to maintain a stable NAV referenced in Rule 10b–10(b)(1).

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, and in accordance with Exchange Act Section 36[24] and Rule 10b–10(f),[25] the Commission finds that conditionally exempting broker-dealers from the requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) for transactions in institutional prime money market funds is necessary and appropriate in the public interest, and consistent with the protection of investors.

Therefore, it is hereby ordered, pursuant to Section 36 of the Exchange Act and Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(f), that broker-dealers shall be exempt from the written notification requirements under Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) when effecting transactions in money market funds operating in accordance with Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(c)(1)(ii), for or with the account of a customer, where: (i) No sales load is deducted upon the purchase or redemption of shares in the money market fund, (ii) the broker-dealer complies with the provisions of Rule 10b–10(b)(2) and Rule 10b–10(b)(3) that are applicable to money market funds that attempt to maintain a stable NAV referenced in Rule 10b–10(b)(1), and (iii) the broker-dealer has provided an initial written notification to the customer of such account of its ability to request delivery of immediate confirmations consistent with the written notification requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) and has not received such a request from the customer.

VI. Paperwork Reduction Act

This Order contains ''collection of information requirements'' within the meaning of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (''PRA''). The Commission has submitted the information to the Office of Management and Budget (''OMB'') for review in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 3507 and 5 CFR 1320.10. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a current valid control number. The title of this collection is ''Money Market Fund Reform/Exchange Act Rule

[14] *See* Dreyfus Letter; ICI Letter, *supra* note 5.

[15] Dreyfus Letter, at 1; ICI Letter, at 2.

[16] *See* Notice, 79 FR at 44077.

[17] Investment Company Act Rule 2a–7(d), 17 CFR 270.2a–7(d) (risk-limiting conditions).

[18] *Id.; see also* Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, 79 FR at 47775.

[19] Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, 79 FR at 47779 n.491.

[20] *Id.,* at section III.E.9.c; *see also* Notice, 79 FR at 44078.

[21] 17 CFR 270.2a–7(h)(10)(iii).

[22] An analysis of the costs and benefits of providing immediate trade confirmations requirements under Rule 10b–10 with respect to institutional prime money market funds is discussed in the Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release. *See* Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, 79 FR at 47785–86; Notice, 79 FR at 44077–78.

[23] This Order has been modified from the proposal to specify that, to meet the notification condition, the broker-dealer must provide an ''initial written notification to the customer of such account.'' The condition was modified to clarify that the notification may be made on a one-time basis for each applicable account and not on a transaction-by-transaction basis.

[24] 15 U.S.C. 78mm.

[25] 17 CFR 240.10b–10(f).

10b–10.'' We are applying for a new OMB Control Number for this collection in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 3507(j).

A. Summary of Collection of Information

In addition to the conditions typically applicable under Rule 10b–10(b),[26] under the terms of this Order, to be exempt from the immediate confirmation requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a) for purposes of an institutional prime money market fund, a broker-dealer must also (1) notify the customer of its ability to request delivery of an immediate confirmation, consistent with the written notification requirements of Rule 10b–10(a), and (2) not receive any such request from the customer.[27] The condition of notifying the customer of its ability to request delivery of an immediate confirmation creates a burden under the PRA, and must be satisfied by sending a notification to a customer on a one-time basis for each applicable account.

B. Proposed Use of Information

The notification condition in this Order will alert customers of their ability to request immediate confirmations, consistent with the terms of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a). The notification condition allows customers to obtain immediate confirmations should they choose to request them.

C. Respondents

As stated in the Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, based on FOCUS report data as of December 31, 2013, the Commission estimates that there are approximately 320 broker-dealers that clear customer transactions or carry customer funds and securities.[28] In the Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, the Commission also conservatively estimated that those broker-dealers are the respondents that would provide trade confirmations to customers in institutional prime money market funds.[29]

D. Total Burden Estimates Relating to This Order

The Commission estimates that the initial one-time burden required to implement, modify, or reprogram existing systems to generate and transmit the required notifications to customers would be 36 hours for each of the 320 broker-dealers that clear customer transactions or carry customer funds and securities.[30] Thus, the Commission estimates that the initial burden for issuance of the notifications in accordance with this Order, including burdens to implement, modify, or reprogram existing systems to generate such notifications will be approximately 11,520 burden hours.[31] The Commission anticipates that after broker-dealers incur the initial costs to establish systems to generate and transmit the notifications to existing customers, broker-dealers will be able to minimize any additional costs, such as by providing the notifications as part of a new account application.[32] As a result, the Commission anticipates that any additional annual burdens arising from the notification condition will be minimal,[33] and conservatively estimates that broker-dealers will, on average, incur annual costs of 5% of those initial costs, or 576 burden hours.[34]

E. The Collection of Information Is Required To Obtain a Benefit

The collection of information results from a condition of this Order and will be required for a broker-dealer to be exempt from the immediate confirmation requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a).

F. Confidentiality

The notification would be provided by a broker-dealer directly to a customer and thus would not be kept confidential.

G. Request for Comment

Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A), the Commission solicits comment to:

1. Evaluate whether the proposed collection is necessary for the proper performance of our functions, including whether the information shall have practical utility;

2. Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

3. Determine whether there are ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. Evaluate whether there are ways to minimize the burden of collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Persons submitting comments on the collection of information requirements should direct them to the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503, and should also send a copy of their comments to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090, with reference to File No. S7–08–14. Requests for materials submitted to OMB by the Commission with regard to this collection of information should be in writing, with reference to File No. S7–08–14, and be submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Records Management, Office of Filings and Information Services, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549. As OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collections of information between 30 and 60 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29928 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[26] The Commission has previously estimated the PRA burdens associated with providing immediate confirmations and/or monthly statements to customers under Rule 10b–10 regarding securities transactions, including money market funds. *See* Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request, 78 FR 39023 (June 28, 2013). That submission, however, does not address the PRA burden associated with the notification condition set forth in this Order.

[27] If the conditions of this Order are satisfied, broker-dealers will be eligible to provide monthly statements for transactions in institutional prime money market funds in lieu of the immediate confirmation requirements of Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a)—as has historically been the case for money market funds prior to the adoption of the money market fund reform amendments. When requested by a customer, the broker-dealer would be required under this Order to provide immediate confirmations in accordance with Exchange Act Rule 10b–10(a).

[28] Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, 79 FR at 47785 & n.563.

[29] *Id.*

[30] In the Money Market Fund Reform Adopting Release, the Commission estimated that the initial one-time burden to implement, modify, or reprogram existing systems to generate immediate confirmations (rather than monthly statements) would be 355 burden hours for each of the 320 broker-dealers that clear customer transactions or carry customer funds and securities. *Id.* at 47785 & n.562. Given the non-repeat nature of the notification requirement and substantial savings in resources noted by commenters, the Commission estimates that the burdens to develop system changes to provide the notices to all applicable customers would be no more than 10% of the prior 355 burden hours estimate associated with requiring immediate confirmations.

[31] This estimate is based on the following: 36 hours × 320 firms = 11,520 hours.

[32] *See, e.g.,* ICI Letter, *supra* note 5, at 2.

[33] As stated, *supra* note 26, other than the notification condition set forth in this Order, the Commission has previously estimated the additional burdens associated with providing immediate confirmations and/or monthly statements under Rule 10b-10. *See* Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request, 78 FR 39023 (June 28, 2013).

[34] This estimate is based on the following: 11,520 hours × 5% = 576 hours.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76479; File No. SR–ICC–2015–015]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; ICE Clear Credit LLC; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change Related to the ICC Rule Enforcement Process for Missed Submissions

November 19, 2015.

I. Introduction

On September 30, 2015, ICE Clear Credit LLC (''ICC'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change (SR–ICC–2015–015) to the ICC Clearing Rules (the ''Rules'') related to the ICC rule enforcement process for Missed Submissions. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on October 16, 2015.[3] The Commission did not receive comments on the proposed rule change. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission is approving the proposed rule change.

II. Description of the Proposed Rule Change

As part of ICC's end-of-day price discovery process, ICC Clearing Participants (''CPs'') are required to submit end-of-day prices for specific instruments related to their open interest at ICC, in accordance with Rule 404(b) and ICC Procedures. Failure of a CP to provide submissions required by ICC pursuant to Rule 404(b) and ICC Procedures constitute a Missed Submission. In order to provide incentive against Missed Submissions, ICC has adopted a summary assessment approach described in Rule 702(e) and Schedule 702 of the Rules.

Currently, under Rule 702(e)(ii)(2), a CP may be eligible for a once-in-a-lifetime conditional waiver from such assessments if one or more Missed Submissions are the first instance(s) of a Missed Submission for the type of instrument (index or single name) and the CP provides adequate explanation of the cause and plans for remedial actions.

Given the increased automation of price submissions, ICC recognizes that there may be circumstances, due to technological failures, which may result in Missed Submissions. ICC also notes that, due to the significant length of time since the inception of the end-of-day process, many CPs have utilized their once-in-a-lifetime waiver. As such, ICC believes it is reasonable to provide, under limited circumstances, a conditional once-a-year waiver for such Missed Submissions caused by technical failures, as described below. ICC believes that such Rule changes will not affect the integrity and effectiveness of the end-of-day price discovery process. ICC believes such Rule changes provide a valuable and practical balance between the technicalities of the price discovery process and appropriate penalization for Missed Submissions.

The proposed Rule text provides for the replacement of ICC's current once-in-a-lifetime waiver for Missed Submissions with a conditional once-a-year waiver for Missed Submissions caused by technical failures. Under revised Rule 702(e)(ii)(2), a CP would be eligible for one waiver per year for single name Missed Submissions, and one waiver per year for index Missed Submissions. A CP may request such wavier(s) be applied against all Missed Submissions for a given instrument class on a given day. CPs would be required to provide documentation with a waiver request, explaining that the root-cause of the Missed Submission was a technology issue and including a remediation plan to fix the cause of the Missed Submission. ICC states that it would review and evaluate the waiver request and accept unless it had legitimate concerns that the root-cause of the Missed Submission had not been adequately identified, was not due to a technical issue, and/or would not be corrected by the provided remediation plan. ICC would maintain its current ability to provide waivers for Missed Submissions deemed to be due to extraordinary circumstances outside of a CP's control, as set forth in Rule 702(e)(ii)(3). Pending regulatory approval, ICC plans to implement these changes on January 1, 2016, and apply the once-a-year waiver to the 2016 calendar year, and each calendar year going forward. ICC represents that there are no changes to ICC policies and procedures as a result of the Rule changes.

III. Discussion and Commission Findings

Section 19(b)(2)(C) of the Act[4] directs the Commission to approve a proposed rule change of a self-regulatory organization if the Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to such self-regulatory organization. Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act[5] requires, among other things, that the rules of a clearing agency are designed to promote the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions and, to the extent applicable, derivative agreements, contracts, and transactions. Section 17A(b)(3)(G) of the Act[6] requires that rules the of the clearing agency provide that its participants shall be appropriately disciplined for violation of any provision of the rules of the clearing agency, including through the use of fines or any other fitting sanctions. Furthermore, Section 17A(b)(3)(H) of the Act[7] requires, among other things, that rules the of the clearing agency, in general, provide a fair procedure with respect to the disciplining of participants.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 17A of the Act[8] and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to ICC. The proposed rule change would replace ICC's current once-in-a-lifetime waiver for Missed Submissions, which has already been utilized by many of ICC's CPs, with a conditional once-a-year waiver for Missed Submissions (one waiver each for single name and index Missed Submissions) caused by technical failures. The proposed rule change also provides details surrounding the process by which CPs can request such conditional waivers and ICC's review and evaluation of each request. The Commission believes that allowing for a once-per-year waiver for technical failures causing Missed Submissions is appropriate given the increased automation of end-of-day price submissions and is reasonably designed to maintain the integrity of ICC's end-of-day pricing process, thereby promoting the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of securities transactions and, to the extent applicable, derivative agreements, contracts, and transactions in accordance with Section 17A(b)(3)(F) of the Act.[9]

Additionally, the Commission believes that allowing for a once-per-year conditional waiver for technical failures in the summary assessment process for Missed Submissions is designed to ensure that CPs are

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34–76122 (Oct. 9, 2015), 80 FR 62593 (Oct. 16, 2015) (SR–ICC–2015–015).

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(C).

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(F).

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(G).

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(H).

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1.

[9] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(F).

appropriately disciplined for violations of ICC's rules consistent with Section 17A(b)(3)(G) of the Act.[10] The Commission also finds that the proposed process for the requesting and review of the conditional waivers is reasonably designed to provide for a fair procedure with respect to the disciplining of CPs for Missed Submissions in accordance with Section 17A(b)(3)(H) of the Act.[11]

IV. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, the Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and in particular with the requirements of Section 17A of the Act[12] and the rules and regulations thereunder.

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[13] that the proposed rule change (File No. SR–ICC–2015–015) be, and hereby is, approved.[14]

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[15]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29927 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76483; File No. SR–FINRA–2015–047]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change To Adopt FINRA Rule 6191(a) To Implement the Quoting and Trading Requirements of the Regulation NMS Plan To Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program

November 19, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 13, 2015, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by FINRA. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

FINRA is proposing to adopt FINRA Rule 6191 to implement the quoting and trading requirements of the Regulation NMS Plan to Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program (''Plan'').

The text of the proposed rule change is available on FINRA's Web site at *http://www.finra.org*, at the principal office of FINRA and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, FINRA included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. FINRA has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On August 25, 2014, NYSE Group, Inc., on behalf of Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''), BATS Exchange, Inc., BATS Y-Exchange, Inc., Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., EDGA Exchange, Inc., EDGX Exchange, Inc., NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc., NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC, the Nasdaq Stock Market LLC, New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE''), NYSE MKT LLC, and NYSE Arca, Inc. (collectively ''Participants''), filed with the Commission, pursuant to Section 11A of the Act[3] and Rule 608 of Regulation NMS thereunder, the Plan to implement a tick size pilot program (''Pilot'').[4] The Participants filed the Plan to comply with an order issued by the Commission on June 24, 2014.[5] The Plan[6] was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on November 7, 2014, and approved by the Commission, as modified, on May 6, 2015.[7]

The Plan is designed to allow the Commission, market participants, and the public to study and assess the impact of increment conventions on the liquidity and trading of the common stocks of small-capitalization companies. Each Participant is required to comply with, and to enforce compliance by its members, as applicable, with the provisions of the Plan. As is described more fully below, the proposed rules would require members to comply with the applicable quoting and trading increments for Pilot Securities.[8]

The Pilot Securities will include stocks of companies with $3 billion or less in market capitalization, an average daily trading volume of one million shares or less, and a volume weighted average price of at least $2.00 for every trading day. The Pilot will consist of a Control Group of approximately 1400 Pilot Securities and three test groups with 400 Pilot Securities in each selected by a stratified sampling.[9] During the pilot, Pilot securities in the Control Group will be quoted and traded at the currently permissible increments. Pilot Securities in the first test group (''Test Group One'') will be quoted in $0.05 minimum increments but will continue to trade at any price increment that is currently permitted.[10] Pilot Securities in the second test group (''Test Group Two'') will be quoted in $0.05 minimum increments and will trade at $0.05 minimum increments subject to a midpoint exception, a retail investor order exception, and a negotiated trade exception.[11] Pilot Securities in the third test group (''Test Group Three'') will be subject to the same restrictions as Test Group Two and also will be subject to the ''Trade-at'' requirement to prevent price matching by a market participant that is not displaying at the price of a Trading

---

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(G).

[11] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1(b)(3)(H).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78q–1.

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[14] In approving the proposed rule change, the Commission considered the proposal's impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

[15] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1.

[4] *See* Letter from Brendon J. Weiss, Vice President, Intercontinental Exchange, Inc., to Secretary, Commission, dated August 25, 2014.

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72460 (June 24, 2014), 79 FR 36840 (June 30, 2014).

[6] Unless otherwise specified, capitalized terms used in this rule filing are defined as set forth in the Plan. FINRA also proposes supplementary material as part of this proposed rule change to, among other things, provide that the terms used in proposed Rule 6191 shall have the same meaning as provided in the Plan, unless otherwise specified.

[7] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74892 (May 6, 2015), 80 FR 27514 (May 13, 2015) (''Approval Order'').

[8] Proposed Rule 6191 shall be in effect during a pilot period to coincide with the pilot period for the Plan (including any extensions to the pilot period for the Plan).

[9] *See* Section V of the Plan for identification of Pilot Securities, including criteria for selection and grouping.

[10] *See* Section VI(B) of the Plan.

[11] *See* Section VI(C) of the Plan.

Center's [12] ''Best Protected Bid'' or ''Best Protected Offer,'' unless an enumerated exception applies.[13] In addition to the exceptions provided under Test Group Two, an exception for Block Size orders and exceptions that mirror those under Rule 611 of Regulation NMS [14] apply to the Trade-at requirement.

Compliance With the Quoting and Trading Increments of the Plan

The Plan requires FINRA to establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to comply with applicable quoting and trading requirements specified in the Plan.[15] Accordingly, FINRA is proposing new Rule 6191 (Compliance with Regulation NMS Plan to Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program) to require members to comply with the Plan.

Proposed Rule 6191(a) (Compliance with Quoting and Trading Restrictions) (the ''Rule'') sets forth the requirements for FINRA and FINRA members in meeting their quoting and trading obligations, as applicable, under the Plan. Rule 6191(a)(1) will require members to establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to comply with the applicable quoting and trading requirements of the Plan. Rule 6191(a)(2) provides that FINRA systems will not display quotations in violation of the Plan and this Rule.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(3) clarifies the treatment of Pilot Securities that drop below $1.00 during the Pilot Period. In particular, Rule 6191(a)(3) provides that, if the price of a Pilot Security drops below $1.00 during regular trading hours on any trading day, such Pilot Security will continue to be a Pilot Security subject to the Plan. However, if the Closing Price of a Pilot Security on any given trading day is below $1.00, such Pilot Security will be moved out of its Pilot Test Group into the Control Group, and may then be quoted and traded at any price increment that is currently permitted for the remainder of the Pilot Period. Rule 6191(a)(3) also provides that, notwithstanding anything contained within these rules to the contrary, Pilot Securities (whether in the Control Group or any Pilot Test Group) will continue to be subject to the data collection requirements of the Plan at all times during the Pilot Period and for the six-month period following the end of the Pilot Period.

In approving the Plan, the Commission noted that the Participants had proposed additional selection criteria to minimize the likelihood that securities that trade with a share price of $1.00 or less would be included in the Pilot, and stated that, once established, the universe of Pilot Securities should stay as consistent as possible so that the analysis and data can be accurate throughout the Pilot Period.[16] FINRA notes that a Pilot Security that drops below $1.00 during regular trading hours will remain in its applicable Test Group; a Pilot Security will only be moved to the Control Group if its Closing Price on any given trading day is below $1.00. FINRA believes that this provision is appropriate because it will help ensure that Pilot Securities in Test Groups One, Two and Three continue to reflect the Pilot's selection criteria, helping ensure that they yield useful data. FINRA also believes that this provision is appropriate because it responds to comments that the Plan address the treatment of securities that trade below $1.00 during the Pilot Period.[17]

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(4) sets forth the applicable limitations for securities in Test Group One. Consistent with the language of the Plan, Rule 6191(a)(4) provides that no member may display, rank, or accept from any person any displayable or non-displayable bids or offers, orders, or indications of interest in any Pilot Security in Test Group One in increments other than $0.05. However, orders priced to execute at the midpoint of the national best bid and national best offer (''NBBO'') or best protected bid and best protected offer (''PBBO'') [18] and orders entered in a Participant-operated retail liquidity program may be ranked and accepted in increments of less than $0.05. Pilot Securities in Test Group One may continue to trade at any price increment that is currently permitted by applicable Participant, SEC and FINRA rules.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(5) sets forth the applicable quoting and trading requirements for securities in Test Group Two. This provision states that no member may display, rank, or accept from any person any displayable or non-displayable bids or offers, orders, or indications of interest in any Pilot Security in Test Group Two in increments other than $0.05. However, orders priced to execute at the midpoint of the NBBO or PBBO and orders entered in a Participant-operated retail liquidity program may be ranked and accepted in increments of less than $0.05.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(5) also sets forth the applicable trading restrictions for Test Group Two securities. Absent any of the exceptions listed in the Rule, no member may execute orders in any Pilot Security in Test Group Two in price increments other than $0.05. The $0.05 trading increment will apply to all trades, including Brokered Cross Trades.[19]

Consistent with the language of the Plan, the proposed Rule provides that Pilot Securities in Test Group Two may trade in increments of less than $0.05 under the following circumstances: (1) Trading may occur at the midpoint between the NBBO or the PBBO; (2) Retail Investor Orders may be provided with price improvement that is at least $0.005 better than the PBBO; and (3) Negotiated Trades may trade in increments of less than $0.05.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(6) sets forth the applicable quoting and trading restrictions for Pilot Securities in Test Group Three. The proposed Rule provides that no member may display, rank, or accept from any person any displayable or non-displayable bids or

[12] The Plan incorporates the definition of ''Trading Center'' from Rule 600(b)(78) of Regulation NMS. Regulation NMS defines a Trading Center as ''a national securities exchange or national securities association that operates an SRO trading facility, an alternative trading system, an exchange market maker, an OTC market maker, or any other broker or dealer that executes orders internally by trading as principal or crossing orders as agent.''

[13] *See* Section VI(D) of the Plan.

[14] 17 CFR 242.611.

[15] FINRA is also required by the Plan to develop appropriate policies and procedures that provide for data collection and reporting to the Commission of data described in Appendixes B and C of the Plan. FINRA is separately proposing rules that would require compliance by FINRA members with the data collection and submission provisions of the Plan described in Section VII of the Plan, and has reserved Paragraph (b) for such rules.

[16] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27535.

[17] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27535. FINRA notes that this proposed change is also the subject of an application for exemptive relief from the Plan, filed pursuant to Rule 608(e) of Regulation NMS by NYSE on behalf of all the Participants. *See* Letter from Elizabeth K. King, NYSE, to Brent J. Fields, Secretary, Commission, dated October 14, 2015.

[18] Regulation NMS defines a protected bid or protected offer as a quotation in an NMS stock that (1) is displayed by an automated trading center; (2) is disseminated pursuant to an effective national market system plan; and (3) is an automated quotation that is the best bid or best offer of a national securities exchange, the best bid or best offer of The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc., or the best bid or best offer of a national securities association other than the best bid or best offer of The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. *See* 17 CFR 242.600(57). In the Approval Order, the Commission noted that the protected quotation standard encompasses the aggregate of the most aggressively priced displayed liquidity on all Trading Centers, whereas the NBBO standard is limited to the single best order in the market. *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27539.

[19] A brokered cross trade is a trade that a broker-dealer that is a member of a Participant executes directly by matching simultaneous buy and sell orders for a Pilot Security. *See* Section I(G) of the Plan.

offers, orders, or indications of interest in any Pilot Security in Test Group Three in increments other than $0.05. However, orders priced to execute at the midpoint of the NBBO or PBBO and orders entered in a Participant-operated retail liquidity program may be ranked and accepted in increments of less than $0.05. The rule also states that, absent any of the applicable exceptions, no member that operates a Trading Center may execute orders in any Pilot Security in Test Group Three in price increments other than $0.05. The $0.05 trading increment will apply to all trades, including Brokered Cross Trades.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(6)(C) sets forth the exceptions pursuant to which Pilot Securities in Test Group Three may trade in increments of less than $0.05. First, trading may occur at the midpoint between the NBBO or PBBO. Second, Retail Investor Orders may be provided with price improvement that is at least $0.005 better than the PBBO. Third, Negotiated Trades may trade in increments of less than $0.05.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(6)(D) sets forth the ''Trade-at Prohibition,'' which is the prohibition against executions by a member that operates a Trading Center of a sell order for a Pilot Security in Test Group Three at the price of a Protected Bid or the execution of a buy order for a Pilot Security in Test Group Three at the price of a Protected Offer during regular trading hours, absent any of the exceptions set forth in Rule 6191(a)(6)(D). Consistent with the Plan, the proposed Rule reiterates that a member that operates a Trading Center that is displaying a quotation, via either a processor or an SRO quotation feed, that is at the price of a Protected Bid or Protected Offer is permitted to execute orders at that level, but only up to the amount of its displayed size. A member that operates a Trading Center that was not displaying a quotation that is the same price as a Protected Quotation, via either a processor or an SRO quotation feed, is prohibited from price-matching protected quotations unless an exception applies.

Consistent with the Plan, proposed Rule 6191(a)(6)(D) also sets forth the exceptions to the Trade-at prohibition, pursuant to which a member that operates a Trading Center may execute a sell order for a Pilot Security in Test Group Three at the price of a Protected Bid or execute a buy order for a Pilot Security in Test Group Three at the price of a Protected Offer. The first exception to the Trade-at Prohibition is the ''display exception,'' which allows a trade to occur at the price of the Protected Quotation, up to the Trading Center's full displayed size, if the order ''is executed by a trading center that is displaying a quotation.'' [20]

In Rule 6191(a)(6)(D), FINRA proposes that a member that utilizes the independent aggregation unit concept may satisfy the display exception only if the same independent aggregation unit that displays interest via either a processor or an SRO Quotation Feed also executes an order in reliance upon this exception. The rule provides that ''independent aggregation unit'' has the same meaning as provided under Rule 200(f) of SEC Regulation SHO.[21] This provision also recognizes that not all members may utilize the independent aggregation unit concept as part of their regulatory structure, and still permits such members to utilize the display exception if all the other requirements of that exception are met.

As initially proposed by the Participants, the Plan contained an additional condition to the display exception, which would have required that, where the quotation is displayed through a national securities exchange, the execution at the size of the order must occur against the displayed size on that national securities exchange; and where the quotation is displayed through the Alternative Display Facility or another facility approved by the Commission that does not provide execution functionality, the execution at the size of the order must occur against the displayed size in accordance with the rules of the Alternative Display Facility of such approved facility (''venue limitation'').[22] Some commenters stated that this provision was anti-competitive, as it would have forced off-exchange Trading Centers to route orders to the venue on which the order was displayed.[23]

In approving the Plan, the Commission modified the Trade-At Prohibition to remove the venue limitation.[24] The Commission noted that the venue limitation was not prescribed in its Order mandating the filing of the Plan.[25] The Commission also noted that the venue limitation would have unnecessarily restricted the ability of off-exchange market participants to execute orders in Test Group Three Securities, and that removing the venue limitation should mitigate concerns about the cost and complexity of the Pilot by reducing the need for off-exchange Trading Centers to route to the exchange.[26] The Commission also stated that the venue limitation did not create any additional incentives to display liquidity in furtherance of the purposes of the Trade-At Prohibition, because the requirement that a Trading Center could only trade at a protected quotation up to its displayed size should be sufficient to incentivize displayed liquidity.[27]

Consistent with Plan and the SEC's determination to remove the venue limitation, FINRA is making clear that the display exception applies to trades executed by a Trading Center otherwise than on an exchange where the Trading Center has previously displayed a quotation in either an agency, riskless principal or principal capacity. As part of the display exception, FINRA also proposes that a Trading Center that is displaying a quotation as agent or riskless principal may only execute as agent or riskless principal, while a Trading Center displaying a quotation as principal (excluding riskless principal) may execute either as principal or agent or riskless principal. FINRA believes this is consistent with the Plan and the objective of the Trade-at Prohibition, which is to promote the display of liquidity and generally to prevent any Trading Center that is not quoting from price-matching Protected Quotations. Providing that a Trading Center may not execute on a proprietary basis in reliance on a quotation representing customer interest (whether agency or riskless principal) ensures that the Trading Center cannot avoid compliance with the Trade-at Prohibition by trading on a proprietary basis in reliance on a quotation that does not represent such Trading Center's own interest. Where a Trading Center is displaying a quotation at the same price as a Protected Quotation in a proprietary capacity, transactions in any capacity at the price and up to the size of such Trading Center's displayed quotation would be permissible.

[20] *See* Section VI(D)(1) of the Plan.

[21] 17 CFR 242.200. Treatment as an independent aggregation unit is available if traders in an aggregation unit pursue only the particular trading objective(s) or strategy(ies) of that aggregation unit and do not coordinate that strategy with any other aggregation unit. Therefore, one independent aggregation unit within a Trading Center cannot execute trades pursuant to the display exception in reliance on quotations displayed by a different independent aggregation unit. As an example, an agency desk of a Trading Center cannot rely on the quotation of a proprietary desk in a separate independent aggregation unit at that same Trading Center.

[22] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 73511 (November 3, 2014), 79 FR 66423, 66437 (November 7, 2014).

[23] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27540.

[24] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27540.

[25] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27540.

[26] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27540.

[27] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27540.

Transactions executed pursuant to the display exception may occur on the venue on which such quotation is displayed or over the counter.

The proposal also excepts Block Size orders [28] and permits Trading Centers to trade at the price of a Protected Quotation, provided that the order is of Block Size at the time of origin and is not an aggregation of non-block orders, broken into orders smaller than Block Size prior to submitting the order to a Trading Center for execution; or executed on multiple Trading Centers.[29] The Plan only provides that Block Size orders shall be exempted from the Trade-At Prohibition. In requiring that the order be of Block Size at the time of origin and not an aggregation of non-block orders, or broken into orders smaller than Block Size prior to submitting the order to a Trading Center for execution; or executed on multiple Trading Centers, FINRA believes that it is providing clarity as to the circumstances under which a Block Size order will be excepted from the Trade-At Prohibition.

Consistent with the Plan, the proposal also excepts an order that is a Retail Investor Order that is executed with at least $0.005 price improvement.

The exceptions set forth in proposed Rule 6191(a)(6)(D)(iii) d. through l. are based on the exceptions found in Rule 611 of Regulation NMS.[30] The subparagraph d. exception applies when the order is executed when the Trading Center displaying the Protected Quotation that was traded at was experiencing a failure, material delay, or malfunction of its systems or equipment. The subparagraph e. exception applies to an order that is executed as part of a transaction that was not a ''regular way'' contract. The subparagraph f. exception applies to an order that is executed as part of a single-priced opening, reopening, or closing transaction by the Trading Center. The subparagraph g. exception applies to an order that is executed when a Protected Bid was priced higher than a Protected Offer in a Pilot Security. The subparagraph h. exception applies when the order is identified as a Trade-at Intermarket Sweep Order. The subparagraph i. exception applies when the order is executed by a Trading Center that simultaneously routed Trade-at Intermarket Sweep Orders to execute against the full displayed size of the Protected Quotation that was traded at. The subparagraph j. exception applies when the order is executed as part of a Negotiated Trade. The subparagraph k. exception applies when the order is executed when the Trading Center displaying the Protected Quotation that was traded at had displayed, within one second prior to execution of the transaction that constituted the Trade-at, a Best Protected Bid or Best Protected Offer, as applicable, for the Pilot Security with a price that was inferior to the price of the Trade-at transaction.

The exception proposed in subparagraph l. applies to a ''stopped order.'' Both the Plan and Rule 6191(a)(6) define a ''stopped order'' as an order that is executed by a Trading Center which, at the time of order receipt, the Trading Center had guaranteed an execution at no worse than a specified price, where (1) the stopped order was for the account of a customer; (2) the customer agreed to the specified price on an order-by-order basis; and (3) the price of the Trade-at transaction was, for a stopped buy order, equal to the National Best Bid in the Pilot Security at the time of execution or, for a stopped sell order, equal to the National Best Offer in the Pilot Security at the time of execution.

Consistent with the Plan, the final exception to the Trade-At Prohibition and its accompanying supplementary material applies to an order that is for a fractional share of a Pilot Security. The supplementary material provides that such fractional share orders may not be the result of breaking an order for one or more whole shares of a Pilot Security into orders for fractional shares or that otherwise were effected to evade the requirements of the Trade-at Prohibition or any other provisions of the Plan. In approving the Plan, the Commission noted that this exception was appropriate, as there could be potential difficulty in the routing and executing of fractional shares.[31]

Rule 6191(a)(7) addresses the operation of certain exceptions to the Pilot. Rule 6191(a)(7)(A) relates to the Retail Investor Order exception. Consistent with the Plan, the proposed Rule defines a ''Retail Investor Order'' as an order that originates from a natural person, provided that, prior to submission, no change is made to the terms of the order with respect to price or side of market and the order does not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology.[32] A Retail Investor Order may be an odd lot, round lot, or partial round lot.

Proposed Rule 6191(a)(7)(A) addresses the execution of Retail Investor Orders other than on a national securities exchange. Given that the definition of a ''Retail Investor Order'' in the Plan includes that the order is an agency or riskless principal order, orders received directly from a customer, without an accompanying capacity, and executed by the receiving Trading Center would not currently fall within the scope of the Plan's definition of ''Retail Investor Order'' and the corresponding exceptions from Test Groups Two and Three. FINRA is therefore proposing that any member that operates a Trading Center may execute against an order received directly from a natural person that did not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology. This proposed provision generally tracks the Plan's definition of ''Retail Investor Order'' while allowing a member to execute against orders received directly from retail customers.

The Plan also provides that the Trading Center executing a Retail Investor Order must sign an attestation that substantially all orders to be executed as Retail Investor Orders will qualify as such under the Plan. Rule 6191(a)(7)(A) provides that any member for which FINRA is the Designated Examining Authority (DEA) that operates a Trading Center and executes Retail Investor Orders must submit a signed attestation to FINRA that substantially all orders to be executed as Retail Investor Orders will qualify as such under this Rule.

Finally, FINRA is proposing 6191(a)(7)(B) to clarify how members should report trades when utilizing one of the enumerated exceptions to the Trade-at requirement. Rule 6191(a)(7)(B) provides that a member that is relying on an exception to the Trade-at prohibition for a transaction otherwise than on a national securities exchange must include all applicable modifiers in trade reports pursuant to Rules 6282, 6380A and 6380B. This provision will facilitate the accurate and complete reporting of transactions in Pilot Securities by member.

If the Commission approves the proposed rule change, the proposed rule change will become operative on October 3, 2016.

[28] ''Block Size'' is defined in the Plan as an order (1) of at least 5,000 shares or (2) for a quantity of stock having a market value of at least $100,000.

[29] Once a Block Size order or portion of such Block Size order is routed from one Trading Center to another Trading Center in compliance with Rule 611 of Regulation NMS, the Block Size order would lose the proposed Trade-at exemption, unless the Block Size remaining after the first route and execution meets the Block Size definition under the Plan.

[30] *See* 17 CFR 242.611.

[31] *See* Approval Order, *supra* note 7, 80 FR at 27541.

[32] *See* Section I(DD) of the Plan.

2. Statutory Basis

FINRA believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[33] which requires, among other things, that FINRA rules must be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 15A(b)(9) of the Act,[34] which requires that FINRA rules not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate.

FINRA believes that this proposal is consistent with the Act because it implements and clarifies the provisions of the Plan, and is designed to assist FINRA and members in meeting regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. In approving the Plan, the SEC noted that the Pilot was an appropriate, data-driven test that was designed to evaluate the impact of a wider tick size on trading, liquidity, and the market quality of securities of smaller capitalization companies, and was therefore in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. To the extent that this proposal implements and clarifies the Plan and applies specific requirements to members, FINRA believes that this proposal is in furtherance of the objectives of the Plan, as identified by the SEC, and is therefore consistent with the Act.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

FINRA does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. FINRA notes that the proposed rule change implements the provisions of the Plan, and is designed to assist FINRA in meeting its regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. FINRA also notes that the quoting and trading requirements of the Plan will apply equally to all firms that trade Pilot Securities.

Economic Impact Assessment

Need for the Rule

As noted above, the Plan directs FINRA to establish rules and procedures for itself and member firms necessary in meeting their obligations under the Plan. The rules and procedures proposed here should be reasonably designed to allow the Commission, market participants, and the public to study and assess the impact of increment conventions on the liquidity and trading of the common stocks of small-capitalization companies.

The rule, as proposed here, essentially codifies the Plan as approved by the Commission. FINRA is proposing rules relating to the operation of the Plan, including provisions intended to modify the obligations and prohibitions of the Plan market participants in a manner that is consistent with the stated objectives of the Plan.

First, as discussed above, in Rule 6191(a)(6)(D), FINRA proposes to permit that a member that operates a Trading Center and chooses to use aggregation units may rely upon the display exception only with respect to a transaction executed at the price of a Protected Quotation if the order is executed within the same independent aggregation unit that displayed a quotation that is equal in price to the Protected Quotation.

Second, as part of the display exception, FINRA also proposes to provide that a Trading Center that is displaying a quotation as agent or riskless principal may only execute as agent or riskless principal, while a Trading Center displaying a quotation as principal (excluding riskless principal) may execute either as principal or agent or riskless principal.

Third, under proposed Rule 6191(a)(7)(A), FINRA is proposing that any member that operates a Trading Center may execute against an order received directly from a natural person that did not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology and continue to qualify for the Retail Investor Order exception.

Economic Baseline

The baseline used by FINRA to evaluate the impact of the proposed rule change is the regulatory framework under the Plan, specifically the Control Group consisting of securities that will be quoted and traded at the currently permissible increments. An additional baseline considered corresponds to the current regulatory framework, prior to the implementation of the Plan. These two baselines serve as the primary points of comparison for assessing economic impacts, including the incremental benefits and costs of the proposed rule.

Trading Centers currently can quote in the common stock of small and middle-capitalization companies at the minimum increment permissible by the SEC of $0.01. In the Approval Order, the SEC identified concerns with decimalization, particularly with respect to the market quality for securities of small and middle-sized capitalization companies, such as the potential for reduced incentives to underwriters, limited sell-side research on these companies, and less market-making in these securities.

Under the Plan, all market participants who are active in Pilot Securities will quote and trade securities in the Pilot Test Groups in the manner prescribed by the Plan. The conditions for each Test Group are discussed above. All market participants that will participate in the Pilot by virtue of their activity in Pilot Securities will have established the functionality within their systems to trade and quote at the permissible increments, as well as update the set of securities in each Test Group on a daily basis.

Economic Impacts

The analysis of economic impacts focuses on the instances where the proposed rule modifies requirements to the Plan as adopted.

Anticipated Benefits

The Display Exception

As noted above, proposed Rule 6191(a)(6)(D) would limit the ability of a Trading Center operated by a member that chooses to use independent aggregation units to avail itself of the display exception only with respect to a transaction executed at the price of a Protected Quotation if the order is executed within the same independent aggregation unit that displayed the Protected Quotation. This clarification would enhance the incentives of any independent aggregation unit to provide liquidity under the Plan.

In its absence, all independent aggregation units of the same trading center could conceivably take advantage of the display exception when any one unit were to post a quotation that meets the exception, in essence creating an opportunity for related aggregation units to ''free ride'' on the eligible quotation. Thus, the proposal may promote displayed liquidity by aggregation units that are active in Pilot Securities in Test Group 3, which would be consistent with the objectives of the Pilot.

Capacity of the Orders Displayed

The second proposal requires that the Trading Center in taking advantage of a trade exception provided by the Plan, must act as agent or riskless principal if the quotation that provides the exception is an agency or riskless principal quotation. In its absence, a trading center could conceivably execute proprietary trades on its own behalf even when it is not providing the additional liquidity through a quotation

[33] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–3(b)(6).

[34] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–3(b)(9).

representing its own interest, in essence possibly allowing a Trading Center to avoid displaying proprietary interest while still availing itself of the exception. By facilitating the display of liquidity representing the Trading Center's capital commitment, the proposal may facilitate the goals of the Pilot.

Definition of Retail Investor Order

The third proposal extends the definition of Retail Investor Order to include any order received directly from a natural person that did not originate from a trading algorithm or any other computerized methodology, without requiring that such order be an agency or riskless principal order.

In the absence of this change, many orders that are currently sent to Trading Centers that otherwise satisfy the Retail Order definition would not be eligible for the exceptions of the Plan in the OTC market solely due to the capacity (or lack thereof) of that order. Retail customers could avail themselves of the exemption by placing additional conditions on the order, but this might preclude some Trading Centers from being able to interact with these orders. Therefore, this may provide greater liquidity to Test Group Two and Three Pilot Securities.

Anticipated Costs

The Display Exception

Under the clarification proposed, independent aggregation units not displaying quotations are not covered by the exception. Members that operate Trading Centers that utilize multiple independent aggregation units may be disadvantaged compared to members that operate Trading Centers with a single independent aggregation unit, or members that do not utilize aggregation units. But this impact may be small, as there is no prohibition from multiple independent aggregation units providing quotations covered by the exceptions. Thus all are eligible to take advantage of the exceptions provide under the Plan.

Capacity of the Order Displayed

Trading Centers would be limited in their capacity to transact under FINRA's proposed exception to this rule. Some orders that would be able to trade under the exception as set forth in the Plan would no longer be eligible. These orders may thus have a lower probability of execution and potentially worse execution quality, if executed. It is difficult to assess the extent to which this might occur prior to the Pilot, but the data collected by the Plan will permit an analysis of this potential impact.

Definition of Retail Investor Order

To the extent that this clarification creates added competition by Trading Centers to provide executions under the exceptions of the Plan, some Trading Centers may lose order flow to trading centers that would not have been permitted to execute these trades but for the clarification. FINRA notes that others may gain from this increase in competition, so that the overall effect could be beneficial.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) By order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change, or

(B) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–FINRA–2015–047 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–FINRA–2015–047. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of FINRA. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–FINRA–2015–047 and should be submitted on or before December 16, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[35]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29930 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–76484; File No. SR–FINRA–2015–048]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change To Adopt FINRA Rule 6191(b) and Amend FINRA Rule 7440 To Implement the Data Collection Requirements of the Regulation NMS Plan To Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program

November 19, 2015.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on November 13, 2015, Financial Industry Regulatory

[35] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

Authority, Inc. (''FINRA'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by FINRA. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

FINRA is proposing to adopt FINRA Rule 6191 and amend Rule 7440 to implement the Regulation NMS Plan to Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program (Plan).

The text of the proposed rule change is available on FINRA's Web site at *http://www.finra.org,* at the principal office of FINRA and at the Commission's Public Reference Room.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, FINRA included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. FINRA has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On August 25, 2014, NYSE Group, Inc., on behalf of BATS Exchange, Inc., BATS Y-Exchange, Inc., Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc., EDGA Exchange, Inc., EDGX Exchange, Inc., Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''), NASDAQ OMX BX, Inc., NASDAQ OMX PHLX LLC, the Nasdaq Stock Market LLC, New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE''), NYSE MKT LLC, and NYSE Arca, Inc. (collectively ''Participants''), filed with the Commission, pursuant to Section 11A of the Act [3] and Rule 608 of Regulation NMS thereunder,[4] the Plan to Implement a Tick Size Pilot Program (''Pilot'').[5] The Participants filed the Plan to comply with an order issued by the Commission on June 24, 2014.[6] The Plan[7] was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on November 7, 2014, and approved by the Commission, as modified, on May 6, 2015.[8]

The Plan is designed to allow the Commission, market participants, and the public to study and assess the impact of increment conventions on the liquidity and trading of the common stocks of small-capitalization companies. Each Participant is required to comply, and to enforce compliance by its member organizations, as applicable, with the provisions of the Plan. As is described more fully below, the proposed rules would require member organizations to comply with the applicable data collection requirements of the Plan.

The Pilot will include stocks of companies with $3 billion or less in market capitalization, an average daily trading volume of one million shares or less, and a volume weighted average price of at least $2.00 for every trading day. The Pilot will consist of a control group of approximately 1400 Pilot Securities and three test groups with 400 Pilot Securities in each (selected by a stratified random sampling process).[9] During the pilot, Pilot Securities in the control group will be quoted at the current tick size increment of $0.01 per share and will trade at the currently permitted increments. Pilot Securities in the first test group (''Test Group One'') will be quoted in $0.05 minimum increments but will continue to trade at any price increment that is currently permitted.[10] Pilot Securities in the second test group (''Test Group Two'') will be quoted in $0.05 minimum increments and will trade at $0.05 minimum increments subject to a midpoint exception, a retail investor order exception, and a negotiated trade exception.[11] Pilot Securities in the third test group (''Test Group Three'') will be subject to the same quoting and trading increments as Test Group Two and also will be subject to the ''Trade-at'' requirement to prevent price matching by a market participant that is not displaying at a Trading Center's ''Best Protected Bid'' or ''Best Protected Offer,'' unless an enumerated exception applies.[12] In addition to the exceptions provided under Test Group Two, an exception for Block Size orders and exceptions that mirror those under Rule 611 of Regulation NMS [13] will apply to the Trade-at requirement.

In approving the Plan, the Commission noted that the Trading Center data reporting requirements would facilitate an analysis of the effects of the Pilot on liquidity (*e.g.,* transaction costs by order size), execution quality (*e.g.,* speed of order executions), market maker activity, competition between trading venues (*e.g.,* routing frequency of market orders), transparency (*e.g.,* choice between displayed and hidden orders), and market dynamics (*e.g.,* rates and speed of order cancellations).[14] The Commission noted that Market Maker profitability data would assist the Commission in evaluating the effect, if any, of a widened tick increment on market marker profits and any corresponding changes in the liquidity of small-capitalization securities.[15]

Compliance With the Data Collection Requirements of the Plan

The Plan contains requirements for collecting and transmitting data to the Commission and to the public. Specifically, Appendix B.I to the Plan (Market Quality Statistics) requires Trading Centers [16] to submit variety of market quality statistics, including information about an order's original size, whether the order was displayable or not, the cumulative number of orders, the cumulative number of shares of orders, and the cumulative number of shares executed within specific time increments, *e.g.,* from 30 seconds to less than 60 seconds after the time of order receipt. This information shall be categorized by security, order type, original order size, hidden status, and coverage under Rule 605.[17] Appendix B.I to the Plan also contains additional requirements for market orders and marketable limit orders, including the share-weighted average effective spread for executions of orders; the cumulative number of shares of orders executed

[3] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1.

[4] 17 CFR 242.608.

[5] *See* Letter from Brendon J. Weiss, Vice President, Intercontinental Exchange, Inc., to Secretary, Commission, dated August 25, 2014.

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72460 (June 24, 2014), 79 FR 36840 (June 30, 2014).

[7] Unless otherwise specified, capitalized terms used in this rule filing are based on the defined terms of the Plan.

[8] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 74892 (May 6, 2015), 80 FR 27513 (May 13, 2015) (''Approval Order'').

[9] *See* Section V of the Plan for identification of Pilot Securities, including criteria for selection and grouping.

[10] *See* Section VI(B) of the Plan.

[11] *See* Section VI(C) of the Plan.

[12] *See* Section VI(D) of the Plan.

[13] 17 CFR 242.611.

[14] *See* Approval Order, 80 FR at 27543.

[15] *See* Approval Order, 80 FR at 27543.

[16] The Plan incorporates the definition of a ''Trading Center'' from Rule 600(b)(78) of Regulation NMS. Regulation NMS defines a ''Trading Center'' as ''a national securities exchange or national securities association that operates an SRO trading facility, an alternative trading system, an exchange market maker, an OTC market maker, or any other broker or dealer that executes orders internally by trading as principal or crossing orders as agent.'' *See* 17 CFR 242.600(b)(78).

[17] 17 CFR 242.605.

with price improvement; and, for shares executed with price improvement, the share-weighted average amount per share that prices were improved.

Appendix B.II to the Plan (Market and Marketable Limit Order Data) requires Trading Centers to submit information relating to market orders and marketable limit orders, including the time of order receipt, order type, the order size, the National Best Bid and National Best Offer (''NBBO'') quoted price, the NBBO quoted depth, the average execution price-share-weighted average, and the average execution time-share-weighted average.

The Plan requires Appendix B.I and B.II data to be submitted by Participants that operate a Trading Center, and by members of the Participants that operate Trading Centers. The Plan provides that each Participant that is the Designated Examining Authority (''DEA'') for a member of Participant that operates a Trading Center shall collect such data in a pipe delimited format, beginning six months prior to the Pilot Period and ending six months after the end of the Pilot Period. The Plan also requires the Participant, operating as DEA, to transmit this information to the SEC within 30 calendar days following month end.

FINRA is therefore proposing Rule 6191(b) to set forth the requirements for the collection and transmission of data pursuant to Appendix B.I and B.II of the Plan. Proposed Rule 6191(b)(1) requires that a member that operates a Trading Center shall establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to comply with the data collection and transmission requirements of Items I and II to Appendix B of the Plan, and a member that is a Market Maker shall establish, maintain and enforce written policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to comply with the data collection and transmission requirements of Item IV of Appendix B to the Plan and Item I of Appendix C of the Plan.

Rule 6191(b)(2) requires that a member that operates a Trading Center subject to the Plan and for which FINRA is the DEA shall collect and transmit to FINRA the data described in Items I and II of Appendix B of the Plan with respect to each Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security for the period beginning six months prior to the Pilot Period through the trading day immediately preceding the Pilot Period; and each Pilot Security for the period beginning on the first day of the Pilot Period through six months after the end of the Pilot Period.

Section IV of the Plan (Policies and Procedures) provides that each Participant that is the DEA of a member of a Participant operating a Trading Center is required to develop appropriate policies and procedures for collecting and reporting the data described in Items I and II of Appendix B, as applicable, to the DEA Participant. FINRA has determined that much of the data required by Appendix B.I and B.II to the Plan currently is reported to FINRA through the Order Audit Trail System (''OATS''). In the interest of increasing the efficiency of the data collection process and the consistency of that data to be collected under the Plan, FINRA proposes to use OATS as the vehicle through which Trading Centers must comply with their reporting obligations pursuant to Appendix B.I and B.II.

Accordingly, proposed Rule 6191(b)(2) provides that members that operate Trading Centers that are subject to the Plan, and for which FINRA serves as the DEA, shall meet the data collection and reporting requirements in Items I and II of Appendix B by reporting the necessary order information in Pilot Securities and Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities to OATS; however, because the current OATS reports do not contain all of the information required by Appendix B to the Plan, the proposed rule change adds four new fields to OATS to capture the necessary information for Pilot Securities and Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities.[18] Specifically, the proposed rule change would require OATS Reporting Members [19] that operate a Trading Center to record and report the following information for orders involving Pilot Securities and Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities if FINRA serves as the member's DEA:

- Whether the member is a Trading Center in either a Pilot Security or a Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security and, if the member is a participant on the Alternative Display Facility (''ADF''), the display size of the order;
- Whether the order is routable; and
- Whether the member is relying on the retail investor order exception with respect to the order.

As an initial matter, only those OATS Reporting Members that operate a Trading Center and for which FINRA is the DEA are required to make any changes to their OATS reporting. OATS Reporting Members that do not operate Trading Centers or that have another self-regulatory organization as DEA will be permitted to leave the new fields blank (*i.e.,* they are not required to populate the new Trading Center field to affirmatively indicate that they are not a Trading Center). OATS Reporting Members that operate Trading Centers will be required to indicate their status as a Trading Center on all OATS reports for new orders involving Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities and Pilot Securities, including new order reports, combined order/route reports, combined order execution reports, and cancel/replace reports. In addition, OATS Reporting Members that operate Trading Centers and that also are ADF Market Participants [20] will be required to indicate their status as an ADF Market Participant and must indicate the display size of the order so that OATS can capture the information required by Appendix B regarding hidden and displayed size.[21]

As described above, the proposed rule change adds new OATS fields to capture whether an order in a Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security or a Pilot Security received by an OATS Reporting Member that operates a Trading Center is routable and whether the member is relying on the retail investor order exception in the Plan with respect to the order. These additional fields are necessary so that OATS can capture the information required by Item II(n) and II(o) of Appendix B to the Plan. This information will be required on all OATS reports for new orders, including New Order Reports, Combined Order/Route Reports, Combined Order/Execution Reports, and Cancel/Replace Reports.

In addition to information on new orders, the proposed rule change requires OATS Reporting Members that operate Trading Centers and for which FINRA is the DEA to report executions in Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities and Pilot Securities when the order, or

[18] In addition to adding the new fields in the proposed rule change, FINRA will add additional values to existing fields that are necessitated by the Tick Size Pilot. These new values will be described fully in the *OATS Reporting Technical Specifications.* FINRA anticipates that, for order receipt or origination as well as on Desk Reports, there would be new Special Handling Codes, including one for slides and for counterparty restrictions. FINRA also will provide additional guidance in the *OATS Reporting Technical Specifications* regarding the use of existing values that may be affected by members participating in the Tick Size Pilot.

[19] Rule 7410(o) generally defines ''Reporting Member'' as a member that receives or originates an order and has an obligation to record and report information under Rules 7440 and 7450.

[20] Rule 6220(a)(3) defines ''ADF Market Participant'' or ''Market Participant'' as a Registered Reporting ADF Market Maker, as defined in Rule 6220(a)(13), or a Registered Reporting ADF ECN, as defined in Rule 6220(a)(12).

[21] Sections I(a)(5), (29), and (30) of Appendix B to the Plan all require that hidden (*i.e.,* non-displayed) order information be provided to the SEC.

any part of the order, is executed on a venue that does not provide execution information to FINRA. Currently, OATS Reporting Members report to OATS the routing of any order to a non-FINRA member, which includes orders routed to a national securities exchange.[22] For those exchanges that provide FINRA with execution information, FINRA is able to link the route to any executions occurring on the exchange. OATS data, however, does not currently link to executions occurring on venues that do not provide this information to FINRA (*e.g.,* foreign exchanges). To provide the execution information required by Items I and II of Appendix B to the Plan, FINRA must collect the execution information, either from the venue to which the order was routed, or from the firm routing the order to the venue, to match the routed order to the execution. Because some venues do not provide execution data to FINRA, the proposed rule change would require members that route orders in a Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security or a Pilot Security to a venue that does not provide execution information to FINRA to report any execution on such venue through an OATS Execution Report or Combined Order/Execution Report.

To facilitate compliance with this provision, FINRA will identify in the *OATS Reporting Technical Specifications* those exchanges for which these reports are not necessary; thus, for orders routed to those identified exchanges, OATS Reporting Members would continue to report only routes to those exchanges rather than any executions occurring on those exchanges. For orders routed to a venue that is not identified, OATS Reporting Members would be required to report any executions on that venue in an OATS Execution Report or Combined Order/Execution Report.

As set forth in Section VII of the Plan (Collection of Pilot Data), proposed Rule 6191(b)(2)(B) provides that FINRA shall transmit this data collected by Trading Centers required by Items I and II of Appendix B to the Plan, and collected pursuant to paragraph (b)(2)(A), to the SEC in a pipe delimited format on a disaggregated basis by Trading Center within 30 calendar days following month end. FINRA also shall make such data publicly available on the FINRA Web site on a monthly basis at no charge and will not identify the Trading Center that generated the data.

Appendix B.IV (Daily Market Maker Participation Statistics) requires a Participant to collect data related to Market Maker participation from each Market Maker [23] engaging in trading activity on a Trading Center operated by the Participant. FINRA is therefore proposing Rule 6191(b)(3) to gather data about a Market Maker's participation in Pilot Securities and Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities. Proposed Rule 6191(b)(3)(A) provides that a member that is a Market Maker for which FINRA is the DEA shall collect and transmit to FINRA data relating to Item IV of Appendix B to the Plan with respect to activity conducted on any Trading Center in Pilot Securities and Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities in furtherance of its status as a registered Market Maker, including a Trading Center that executes trades otherwise than on a national securities exchange, for transactions that have settled or reached settlement date. The proposed rule requires Market Makers to transmit such data in a pipe delimited format, by 12 p.m. EST on T+4 for (1) transactions in each Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security for the period beginning six months prior to the Pilot Period through the trading day immediately preceding the Pilot Period; and (2) for transactions in each Pilot Security for the period beginning on the first day of the Pilot Period through six months after the end of the Pilot Period.

Proposed Rule 6191(b)(3)(B) provides that FINRA shall transmit the data relating to Market Maker activity required by Item IV of Appendix B to the Plan, and collected pursuant to paragraph (b)(3)(A) above, to the Participant operating the Trading Center on which such activity occurred in a pipe delimited format on a disaggregated basis by Market Maker during the Pre-Pilot and within 15 calendar days following month end during the Pilot Period.

As required by the Plan, proposed Rule 6191(b)(3)(C) provides that FINRA shall transmit the data relating to Market Maker activity conducted otherwise than on a national securities exchange required by Item IV of Appendix B to the Plan, and collected pursuant to paragraph (b)(3)(A), to the SEC in a pipe delimited format, on a disaggregated basis by Trading Center, within 30 calendar days following month end. FINRA shall also make such data publicly available on the FINRA Web site on a monthly basis at no charge and will not identify the Trading Center that generated the data.[24]

Appendix C.I (Market Maker Profitability) requires a Participant to collect data related to Market Maker profitability from each Market Maker for which it is the DEA. Specifically, the Participant is required to collect the total number of shares of orders executed by the Market Maker, the raw Market Maker realized trading profits, and the raw Market Maker unrealized trading profits. Data shall be collected for dates starting six months prior to the Pilot Period through six months after the end of the Pilot Period. This data shall be collected on a monthly basis, to be provided in a pipe delimited format to the Participant, as DEA, within 30 calendar days following month end. Appendix C.II (Aggregated Market Maker Profitability) requires the Participant, as DEA, to aggregate the Appendix C.I data, and to categorize this data by security as well as by the control group and each Test Group. That aggregated data shall contain information relating to total raw Market Maker realized trading profits, volume-weighted average of raw Market Maker realized trading profits, the total raw Market Maker unrealized trading profits, and the volume-weighted average of Market Maker unrealized trading profits.

FINRA is therefore proposing Rule 6191(b)(4) to set forth the requirements for the collection and transmission of data pursuant to Appendix C.I and of the Plan. Proposed Rule 6191(b)(4)(A) requires that a member that is a Market Maker, and for which FINRA is the DEA, shall collect and transmit to FINRA the data described in Item I of Appendix C to the Plan, as modified by Paragraph (b)(5) with respect to executions in Pilot Securities that have settled or reached settlement date that were executed on any Trading Center. The proposed rule also requires members to provide such data in a pipe delimited format by 12 p.m. EST on T+4 for (1) for executions during and outside of Regular Trading Hours in each Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security for the period beginning six months prior to the Pilot Period through the trading day immediately preceding the Pilot Period; and (2) for executions during and outside of Regular Trading Hours in each Pilot Security for the period beginning on the first day of the Pilot Period through six months after the end of the Pilot Period.

Proposed Rule 6191(b)(4)(B) provides that FINRA shall collect this data and, on a monthly basis, transmit such data,

[22] *See* Rule 7440(c)(6).

[23] The Plan defines a Market Maker as ''a dealer registered with any self-regulatory organization, in accordance with the rules thereof, as (i) a market maker or (ii) a liquidity provider with an obligation to maintain continuous, two-sided trading interest.''

[24] FINRA notes that Appendix B.III, which requires a Participant that is a national securities exchange to collect daily Market Maker registration statistics, does not apply to FINRA. Accordingly, FINRA is not proposing a rule to implement this aspect of the Plan.

categorized by the control group and each Test Group, to the SEC in a pipe delimited format; provided, however, that the data transmitted to the SEC shall include the profitability statistics categorized by Market Maker and by security. In calculating unrealized trading profits, FINRA shall also report the number of excess (deficit) shares held by the Market Maker, the volume weighted average price of that excess (deficit) and the closing price of the security as reported by the primary listing exchange used in reporting unrealized profit. The proposed rule also provides that FINRA shall make this aggregated data, categorized by the control group and each Test Group, publicly available on the FINRA Web site on a monthly basis at no charge and will not identify the Market Makers that generated the data or the individual securities.

FINRA also is proposing a rule setting forth the manner in which Market Maker participation and profitability will be calculated. Proposed Rule 6191(b)(5) provides that a member that is a Market Maker subject to the requirements of proposed Rule 6191(b)(3)(A) and (b)(4)(A) in a Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security or a Pilot Security, and for which FINRA is the DEA, shall be deemed to have satisfied the requirements of proposed Rule 6191(b)(3)(A) and (b)(4)(A), in addition to the requirements of Appendix B.IV and Item I of Appendix C, if such Market Maker submits to FINRA the specified data for any principal trade, not including riskless principal, in a Pre-Pilot Data Collection Security or a Pilot Security executed in furtherance of its status as a Market Maker on any Trading Center. The proposed rule requires Market Makers to submit (1) Ticker Symbol; (2) Trading Center where the trade was executed, or if not known, the destination where the order originally was routed for further handling and execution; (3) Time of execution; (4) Price; (5) Size; (6) Buy/sell; (7) for trades executed away from the Market Maker, a unique identifier, as specified by the Market Maker's DEA, that will allow the trade to be associated with the Trading Center where the trade was executed; and (8) for trades cancelled or corrected beyond T+3, whether the trade represents a cancellation or correction.

FINRA is also proposing, through Supplementary Material, to clarify other aspects of the data collection requirements.[25] Proposed Supplementary Material .02 relates to the use of the retail investor order flag for purposes of Appendix B.II(n) reporting. The Plan currently states that market and marketable limit orders shall include a ''yes/no'' field relating to the Retail Investor Order flag. FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .02 to clarify that, for purposes of the reporting requirement in Appendix B.II(n), a Trading Center shall report ''y'' where it is relying upon the Retail Investor Order exception to Test Groups Two and Three, and ''n'' for all other instances. FINRA believes that requiring the identification of a Retail Investor Orders only where the exception may apply (*i.e.,* Pilot Securities in Test Groups Two and Three) is consistent with Appendix B.II(n).

Supplementary Material .03 requires that members populate a field to identify whether an order is affected by the bands in place pursuant to the National Market System Plan to Address Extraordinary Market Volatility.[26] Pursuant to the Limit-Up Limit-Down Plan, between 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., the Securities Information Processor (''SIP'') calculates a lower price band and an upper price band for each NMS stock. These price bands represent a specified percentage above or below the stock's reference price, which generally is calculated based on reported transactions in that stock over the preceding five minutes. When one side of the market for an individual security is outside the applicable price band, the SIP identifies that quotation as non-executable. When the other side of the market reaches the applicable price band (*e.g.,* the offer reaches the lower price band), the security enters a Limit State. The stock would exit a Limit State if, within 15 seconds of entering the Limit State, all Limit State Quotations were executed or canceled in their entirety. If the security does not exit a Limit State within 15 seconds, then the primary listing exchange declares a five-minute trading pause, which would be applicable to all markets trading the security.

FINRA and the other Participants have determined that it is appropriate to create a new flag for reporting orders that are affected by the Limit-Up Limit-Down bands. Accordingly, a Trading Center shall report a value of ''Y'' when the ability of an order to execute has been affected by the Limit-Up Limit-Down bands in effect at the time of order receipt. A Trading Center shall report a value of ''N'' when the ability of an order to execute has not been affected by the Limit-Up Limit-Down bands in effect at the time of order receipt.

Supplementary Material .03 also requires, for dually-listed securities, that the Participant indicate whether the order was handled domestically, or routed to a foreign venue. Accordingly, the Participant will indicate, for purposes of Appendix B.I, whether the order was: (1) Fully executed domestically, or (2) fully or partially executed on a foreign market. For purposes of Appendix B.II, the Participant will classify all orders in dually-listed Pilot and Pre-Pilot Securities as: (1) Directed to a domestic venue for execution; (2) may only be directed to a foreign venue for execution; or (3) was fully or partially directed to a foreign venue at the discretion of the member. FINRA believes that this proposed flag will better identify orders in dually-listed securities, as such orders that were executed in foreign venues would not be subject to the Plan's quoting and trading requirements, and could otherwise compromise the integrity of the data.

Supplementary Material .04 relates to the time ranges specified in Appendix B.I.a(14), B.I.a(15), B.I.a(21) and B.I.a(22).[27] FINRA and the other Participants have determined that it is appropriate to change the reporting times in these provisions to require more granular reporting for these categories. Accordingly, FINRA proposes to add Appendix B.I.a(14A), which will require Trading Centers to report the cumulative number of shares of orders executed from 100 microseconds to less than 1 millisecond after the time of order receipt. Appendix B.I.a(15) will be changed to require the cumulative number of shares of orders executed from 1 millisecond to less than 100 milliseconds after the time of order receipt. FINRA also proposes to add Appendix B.I.a(21A), which will require Trading Centers to report the

[25] FINRA is also proposing Supplementary Material .01 to Rule 6191 to clarify that certain enumerated terms used throughout Rule 6191 shall have the same meaning as set forth in the Plan.

[26] *See* National Market System Plan to Address Extraordinary Market Volatility, Securities Exchange Act Release No. 67091 (May 31, 2012), 77 FR 33498 (June 6, 2012) (File No. 4–631) (''Limit-Up Limit-Down Plan'').

[27] Specifically, Appendix B.I.a(14) requires reporting of the cumulative number of shares of orders executed from 0 to less than 100 microseconds after the time of order receipt; Appendix B.I.a(15) requires reporting of the cumulative number of shares of orders executed from 100 microseconds to less than 100 milliseconds after the time of order receipt; Appendix B.I.a(21) requires reporting of the cumulative number of shares of orders cancelled from 0 to less than 100 microseconds after the time of order receipt; and Appendix B.I.a(22) requires reporting of the cumulative number of shares of orders cancelled from 100 microseconds to less than 100 milliseconds after the time of order receipt.

cumulative number of shares of orders canceled from 100 microseconds to less than 1 millisecond after the time of order receipt. Appendix B.I.a(22) will be changed to require the cumulative number of shares of orders canceled from 1 millisecond to less than 100 milliseconds after the time of order receipt. FINRA believes that these new reporting requirements will contribute to a meaningful analysis of the Pilot by producing more granular data on these points.[28]

Supplementary Material .05 relates to the requirement in Appendix B.I.a(33) requiring the share-weighted average BBO Spread of the reporting exchange as part of the market quality statistics to be reported. FINRA and the other Participants have determined that this requirement should apply to both the reporting exchange and to a Trading Center that displays such quote on the ADF, and is proposing to make this clarification through Supplementary Material .05.

Supplementary Material .06 relates to the relevant measurement for purposes of Appendix B.I.a(31)–(33) reporting. Currently, the Plan states that this data shall be reported as of the time of order execution. FINRA and the other Participants believe that this information should more properly be captured at the time of order receipt, as evaluating share-weighted average prices at the time of order receipt is more consistent with the goal of observing the effect of the Pilot on the liquidity of Pilot Securities. FINRA is therefore proposing to make this change through Supplementary Material .06.[29] This change will make these provisions consistent with the remainder of the statistics in Appendix B.I.a, which are all based on order receipt.

Supplementary Material .07 clarifies that, for purposes of Appendix B.I.a(33), only a Trading Center that is displaying in its own name as a Trading Center when executing an order shall enter a value in this field. FINRA believes that the Appendix B.I.a(33) reporting requirement is only relevant for a Trading Center that is a display venue and not Trading Centers that may display through other Trading Centers (such as a market maker displaying a quote on a national securities exchange).

Supplementary Material .08 addresses the status of not-held and auction orders for purposes of Appendix B.I reporting. Currently, Appendix B.I sets forth eight categories of orders, including market orders, marketable limit orders, and inside-the-quote resting limit orders, for which daily market quality statistics must be reported. Currently, Appendix B.I does not provide a category for not held orders, clean cross orders, auction orders, or orders received when the NBBO is crossed. FINRA and the other Participants have determined that it is appropriate to include separate categories both not held orders and auction orders for purposes of Appendix B reporting. FINRA is therefore proposing Supplementary Material .07 to provide that not held orders shall be included as an order type for purposes of Appendix B reporting, and shall be assigned the number (18). Clean cross orders shall be included as an order type for purposes of Appendix B reporting, and shall be assigned the number (19); auction orders shall be included an as order type for purposes of Appendix B reporting, and shall be assigned the number (20); and orders that cannot be otherwise be classified, including, for example, orders received when the NBBO is crossed shall be included as an order type for purposes of Appendix B reporting, and shall be assigned the number (21). All of these orders already are included in the scope of Appendix B; however, without this proposed change, these order types would be categorized with other orders, such as regular held orders, that should be able to be fully executed upon receipt, which would compromise the value of this data.

FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .09 to clarify the scope of the Plan as it relates to members that only execute orders for limited purposes. Specifically, FINRA and the other Participants believe that a member that only executes orders otherwise than on a national securities exchange for the purpose of (1) correcting a bona fide error related to the execution of a customer order; (2) purchasing a security from a customer at a nominal price solely for purposes of liquidating the customer's position; or (3) completing the fractional share portion of an order[30] shall not be deemed a Trading Center for purposes of Appendix B to the Plan. FINRA is therefore proposing Supplementary Material .09 to make this clarification.

FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .10 to clarify that, for purposes of the Plan, Trading Centers must begin the data collection required pursuant to Appendix B.I.a(1) through B.II.(y) to the Plan and Item I of Appendix C to the Plan on April 4, 2016. While FINRA will provide the information required by Appendix B and C to the Plan to the SEC during the Pre-Pilot period, the requirement that FINRA, as DEA, provide information to the SEC within 30 calendar days following month end and make such data publicly available on its Web site pursuant to Appendix B and C to the Plan shall commence as of the beginning of the Pilot Period.[31]

FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .11 to address the requirement in Appendix C.I(b) to the Plan that the calculation of raw Market Maker realized trading profits utilize a last in, first out (''LIFO'')-like method to determine which share prices shall be used in that calculation. FINRA and the other Participants believe that is more appropriate to utilize a methodology that yields LIFO-like results, rather than utilizing a LIFO-like method, and FINRA is therefore proposing Supplementary Material .11 to make this change.[32] FINRA is proposing that, for purposes of Item I of Appendix C, the Participants shall calculate daily Market Maker realized profitability statistics for each trading day on a daily LIFO basis using reported trade price and shall include only trades executed on the subject trading day. The daily LIFO calculation shall not include any positions carried over from previous trading days. For purposes of Item I.c of Appendix C, the Participants shall calculate daily Market Maker unrealized profitability statistics for each trading day on an average price basis.

[28] FINRA notes that it intends to file an exemptive request seeking relief from certain of the Plan's data collection requirements, including the requirements that Trading Centers report information in either microseconds or milliseconds, as not all Trading Centers currently capture and report orders in either microseconds or milliseconds.

[29] This proposed change is also part of an exemptive request that FINRA and the other Participants will be submitting to the SEC pursuant to Rule 608(e) of Regulation NMS.

[30] FINRA notes that where a member purchases a fractional share from a customer, the Trading Center that executes the remaining whole shares of that customer order would be subject to Appendix B of the Plan.

[31] In its order approving the Plan, the SEC noted that the Pilot shall be implemented within one year of the date of publication of its order, *e.g.,* by May 6, 2016. *See* Approval Order, 80 FR at 27545. However, on November 6, 2015, the SEC extended the implementation date approximately five months to October 3, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 76382 (November 6, 2015), 80 FR 70284 (November 13, 2015).

[32] Appendix C.I currently requires Market Maker profitability statistics to include (1) the total number of shares of orders executed by the Market Maker; (2) raw Market Maker realized trading profits, which is the difference between the market value of Market Maker shares and the market value of Market Maker purchases, using a LIFO-like method; and (3) raw Market Maker unrealized trading profits, which is the difference between the purchase or sale price of the end-of-day inventory position of the Market Maker and the Closing Price. In the case of a short position, the Closing Price from the sale will be subtracted; in the case of a long position, the purchase price will be subtracted from the Closing Price.

Specifically, the Participants must calculate the volume weighted average price of the excess (deficit) of buy volume over sell volume for the current trading day using reported trade price. The gain (loss) of the excess (deficit) of buy volume over sell volume shall be determined by using the volume weighted average price compared to the closing price of the security as reported by the primary listing exchange. In reporting unrealized trading profits, the Participant shall also report the number of excess (deficit) shares held by the Market Maker, the volume weighted average price of that excess (deficit) and the closing price of the security as reported by the primary listing exchange used in reporting unrealized profit.

FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .12 to address the securities that will be used for data collection purposes prior to the commencement of the Pilot. FINRA and the other Participants have determined that it is appropriate to collect data for a group of securities that is larger, and using different quantitative thresholds, than the group of securities that will Pilot Securities. FINRA is therefore proposing Supplementary Material .12 to define ''Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities'' as the securities designated by the Participants for purposes of the data collection requirements described in Items I, II and IV of Appendix B and Item I of Appendix C to the Plan for the period beginning six months prior to the Pilot Period and ending on the trading day immediately preceding the Pilot Period. The Participants shall compile the list of Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities by selecting all NMS stocks with a market capitalization of $5 billion or less, a Consolidated Average Daily Volume (CADV) of 2 million shares or less and a closing price of $1 per share or more. The market capitalization and the closing price thresholds shall be applied to the last day of the Pre-Pilot measurement period, and the CADV threshold shall be applied to the duration of the Pre-Pilot measurement period. The Pre-Pilot measurement period shall be the three calendar months ending on the day when the Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities are selected. The Pre-Pilot Data Collection Securities shall be selected thirty days prior to the commencement of the six-month Pre-Pilot Period. On the trading day that is the first trading day of the Pilot Period through six months after the end of the Pilot Period, the data collection requirements will become applicable to the Pilot Securities only. A Pilot Security will only be eligible to be included in a Test Group if it was a Pre-Pilot Security.

Finally, FINRA is proposing Supplementary Material .13, which states that the Rule shall be in effect during a pilot period to coincide with the pilot period for the Plan (including any extensions to the pilot period for the Plan).

If the Commission approves the proposed rule change, the proposed rule change will be effective upon Commission approval. The implementation date will be April 4, 2016.

2. Statutory Basis

FINRA believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act,[33] which requires, among other things, that FINRA rules must be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest, and Section 15A(b)(9) of the Act,[34] which requires that FINRA rules not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate.

FINRA believes that this proposal is consistent with the Act because it implements and clarifies the provisions of the Plan, and is designed to assist FINRA in meeting its regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. In approving the Plan, the SEC noted that the Pilot was an appropriate, data-driven test that was designed to evaluate the impact of a wider tick size on trading, liquidity, and the market quality of securities of smaller capitalization companies, and was therefore in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. FINRA believes that this proposal is in furtherance of the objectives of the Plan, as identified by the SEC, and is therefore consistent with the Act because the proposal implements and clarifies the requirements of the Plan and applies specific obligations to members in furtherance of compliance with the Plan.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

FINRA does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. FINRA notes that the proposed rule change implements the provisions of the Plan, and is designed to assist FINRA in meeting its regulatory obligations pursuant to the Plan. FINRA notes that the data collection requirements for members that operate Trading Centers will apply equally to all such members, as will the data collection requirements for Market Makers.

FINRA estimates that there are approximately 250 members that operate Trading Centers, and for which FINRA is the DEA, that would be required to submit data pursuant to Appendix B.I and B.II. While the Plan imposes comprehensive data collection requirements on members that operate Trading Centers, FINRA notes that some of the data requirements are modeled upon Rule 605 data, and that it is leveraging existing OATS data and systems to assist firms in complying with their Appendix B.I and B.II reporting obligations. FINRA also estimates that there are approximately 100 members that qualify as Market Makers for which FINRA is the DEA. While the Plan imposes new reporting obligations on Market Makers, FINRA notes that some of the requested Market Maker profitability data may already be captured by members for internal purposes.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) By order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change, or

(B) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

[33] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–3(b)(6).

[34] 15 U.S.C. 78*o*–3(b)(9).

Electronic Comments

• Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or

• Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–FINRA–2015–048 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

• Send paper comments in triplicate to Robert W. Errett, Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–FINRA–2015–048. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549, on official business days between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of FINRA. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–FINRA–2015–048 and should be submitted on or before December 16, 2015.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[35]

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–29931 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[35] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9358]

Modification of Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act Measures Against a Russian Entity

AGENCY: Department of State.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A decision has been made, pursuant to the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act, to modify nonproliferation measures pursuant to this Act on a Russian foreign person.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 25, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pamela K. Durham, Office of Missile, Biological, and Chemical Nonproliferation, Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation, Department of State, Telephone (202) 647–4930.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 2, 2015, the United States Government announced the imposition of measures including the following against Rosoboronexport (ROE) (Russia) and any successor, sub-unit, or subsidiary thereof: ''No department or agency of the United States Government may procure or enter into any contract for the procurement of any goods, technology, or services from [Rosoboronexport (ROE) (Russia) and any successor, sub-unit, or subsidiary thereof], except to the extent that the Secretary of State otherwise may determine . . . .'' (See 80 FR 53222, Public Notice 9251; and 80 FR 65844, Public Notice 9329).

The United States Government has decided to modify the measure described above against ROE and any successor, sub-unit, or subsidiary thereof as follows. The measure described above shall not apply to subcontracts at any tier with ROE and any successor, sub-unit, or subsidiary thereof made on behalf of the United States Government for goods, technology, and services for the maintenance, repair, overhaul, or sustainment of Mi-17 helicopters for the purpose of providing assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan, as well as for the purpose of combating terrorism and violent extremism globally.

Such subcontracts include the purchase of spare parts, supplies, and related services for these purposes. This modification applies retroactively as of the effective date of the sanctions, and will remain in place for two years from that date, except to the extent that the Secretary of State may otherwise determine.

This modification does not apply to any other measures imposed pursuant to the INKSNA and announced in Public Notice 9251 published on September 2, 2015 (80 FR 53222).

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Thomas M. Countryman,

Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation.

[FR Doc. 2015–30058 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–27–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9356]

Notice of Meeting of Advisory Committee on International Law

A meeting of the Department of State's Advisory Committee on International Law will take place on Thursday, December 10, from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the George Washington University Law School, Michael K. Young Faculty Conference Center, 716 20th Street NW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC. Principal Deputy Legal Adviser Mary McLeod will chair the meeting, which will be open to the public up to the capacity of the conference room. It is anticipated that the agenda of the meeting will cover a range of current international legal topics, including the development of non-legally binding norms and instruments, the International Criminal Court and the ''crime of aggression,'' the upcoming ICRC Commentaries on the Geneva Conventions, and issues related to cross-border electronic data access.

Members of the public who wish to attend should contact the Office of the Legal Adviser by December 7 at *thorntonnc@state.gov* or 202–776–8356 and provide their name, professional affiliation, address, and phone number. A valid photo ID is required for admission to the meeting. Attendees who require reasonable accommodation should make their requests by December 4. Late requests will be considered but might not be possible to accommodate.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Nicole C. Thornton,

Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, Executive Director, Advisory Committee on International Law, United States Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2015–30063 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9357]

Removal of Sanctions on Person on Whom Sanctions Have Been Imposed Under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as Amended

AGENCY: Department of State.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of State has decided to terminate sanctions imposed under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–172) (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) (''ISA''), as amended, on Dettin S.p.A. (a.k.a. Dettin) on the basis that the company is no longer engaging in sanctionable activity described in section 5(a) of ISA, and that this person has provided reliable assurances that it will not knowingly engage in sanctionable activities in the future. Therefore, certain sanctions that were imposed on Dettin on August 29, 2014 are no longer in effect.

DATES: *Effective date:* The sanctions on Dettin are lifted effective November 2, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: On general issues: Office of Sanctions Policy and Implementation, Department of State, Telephone: (202) 647–7489.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 29, 2014, the Secretary of State made a determination to impose certain sanctions on, *inter alia,* Dettin S.p.A. (a.k.a. Dettin) under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended (P.L. 104–172) (50 U.S.C. 1701 note). See 79 FR 59890 (October 3, 2014). Additional information regarding the basis for imposing sanctions and the specific sanctions imposed on Dettin is contained in the **Federal Register** notice cited above.

Pursuant to section 9(b)(2) of ISA and the authority delegated to the Secretary of State in the October 9, 2012 Memorandum to relevant agency heads, ''Delegation of Certain Functions and Authorities Under the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012,'' (''Delegation Memorandum''), the Secretary now has decided to terminate sanctions on Dettin on the basis that the company is no longer engaging in sanctionable activity described in section 5(a) of ISA, and that this person has provided reliable assurances that they will not knowingly engage in sanctionable activities in the future. The sanctions on Dettin, therefore, are no longer in effect.

Pursuant to the authority delegated to the Secretary of State in the Delegation Memorandum, relevant agencies and instrumentalities of the United States Government shall take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this notice.

The following constitutes a current, as of this date, list of persons on whom sanctions are imposed under ISA. The particular sanctions imposed on an individual person are identified in the relevant **Federal Register** Notice.

—Bimeh Markazi-Central Insurance of Iran (See Public Notice 8268, 78 FR 21183, April 9, 2013)

—Cambis, Dimitris (See Public Notice 8268, 78 FR 21183, April 9, 2013)

—FAL Oil Company Limited (see Public Notice 7776, 77 FR 4389, January 27, 2012)

—Ferland Company Limited (See Public Notice 8352, 78 FR 35351, June 12, 2013)

—Goldentex FZE (see Public Notice 8897, 79 FR 59890, October 3, 2014)

—Impire Shipping (See Public Notice 8268, 78 FR 21183, April 9, 2013)

—Jam Petrochemical Company (See Public Notice 8352 78 FR 35351, June 12, 2013)

—Kish Protection and Indemnity (a.k.a. Kish P&I) (See Public Notice 8268, 78 FR 21183, April 9, 2013)

—Kuo Oil (S) Pte. Ltd. (see Public Notice 7776, 77 FR 4389, January 27, 2012)

—Naftiran Intertrade Company (see Public Notice 7197, 75 FR 62916, October 13, 2010)

—Niksima Food and Beverage JLT (See Public Notice 8352, 78 FR 35351, June 12, 2013)

—Petrochemical Commercial Company International (a.k.a. PCCI) (see Public Notice 7585, 76 FR 56866, September 14, 2011)

—Petróleos de Venezuela S.A. (a.k.a. PDVSA) (see Public Notice 7585, 76 FR 56866, September 14, 2011)

—Royal Oyster Group (see Public Notice 7585, 76 FR 56866, September 14, 2011)

—Speedy Ship (a.k.a. SPD) (see Public Notice 7585, 76 FR 56866, September 14, 2011)

—Sytrol (see Public Notice 8040, 77 FR 59034, September 25, 2012)

—Zhuhai Zhenrong Company (see Public Notice 7776, 77 FR 4389, January 27, 2012)

Dated: November 5, 2015.

Kurt W. Tong,

Acting Assistant, Secretary for Economic, and Business Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2015–30062 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

[Docket No. DHS–2015–0076]

Homeland Security Advisory Council—New Tasking

AGENCY: The Office of Intergovernmental Affairs/Partnership and Engagement, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of task assignment for the Homeland Security Advisory Council.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Jeh Johnson, tasked his Homeland Security Advisory Council to establish a subcommittee entitled Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Subcommittee on September 28, 2015. The CVE Subcommittee will provide findings and recommendations to the Homeland Security Advisory Council on best practices sourced from the technology and philanthropic sectors, education and mental health professionals, and community leaders. This notice informs the public of the establishment of the CVE Subcommittee and is not a notice for solicitation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah E. Morgenthau, Executive Director of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs/Partnership and Engagement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security at (202) 447–3135 or *hsac@hq.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Homeland Security Advisory Council provides organizationally independent, strategic, timely, specific, and actionable advice and recommendations for the consideration of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security on matters related to homeland security. The Council is comprised of leaders of local law enforcement, first responders, state and local government, the private sector, and academia.

Tasking: The CVE Subcommittee will develop actionable findings and recommendations for the Department of Homeland Security. The subcommittee will address the following: (1) What opportunities or platforms will be useful for the facilitation of public-private partnerships with both the technology and philanthropic sectors? (2) How can the Department develop new networks and a framework for sustained dialogue and engagement with technology companies, foundations and philanthropic organizations? (3) What other non-government sectors, besides technology and philanthropic, should be leveraged for CVE and how should the Department engage those sectors? (4) How can the Department work with

education and mental health professionals on CVE efforts to help parents and schools understand how they can counter youth radicalization to violence? (5) How can the Department inspire peer-to-peer attempts to challenge violent extremism through public/private partnership?

Schedule: The CVE Subcommittee findings and recommendations will be submitted to the Homeland Security Advisory Council for their deliberation and vote during a public meeting. Once the report is voted on by the Homeland Security Advisory Council, it will be sent to the Secretary for his review and acceptance.

Dated: November 19, 2015.

Sarah E. Morgenthau,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–30064 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–9M–P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9359]

60-Day Notice of Proposed Information Collection: Reporting Requirements for Responsible Investment in Burma

ACTION: Notice of request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Department of State is seeking Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the information collection described below. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are requesting comments on this collection from all interested individuals and organizations. The purpose of this notice is to allow 60 days for public comment preceding submission of the collection to OMB.

DATES: The Department will accept comments from the public up to January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Web:* Persons with access to the Internet may comment on this notice by going to *www.Regulations.gov.* You can search for the document by entering ''Docket Number: DOS–2015–0070'' in the Search field. Then click the ''Comment Now'' button and complete the comment form.
- *Email: steinJL@state.gov*
- *Regular Mail:* Send written comments to: Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, C/O Jennifer Stein, Rm 7822, U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street NW.

You must include the DS form number (if applicable), information collection title, and the OMB control number in any correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Direct requests for additional information regarding the collection listed in this notice, including requests for copies of the proposed collection instrument and supporting documents, to Jennifer Stein, who may be reached on 202–647–1211 or at *SteinJL@state.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- *Title of Information Collection:* Reporting Requirements for Responsible Investment in Burma.
- *OMB Control Number:* 1405–0209.
- *Type of Request:* Extension of a Currently Approved Collection.
- *Originating Office:* Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, DRL/EAP.
- *Form Number:* No form.
- *Respondents:* U.S. persons and entities engaged in new investment in Burma in an amount over $500,000 in aggregate, per OFAC General License 17, which authorizes new investment in Burma.
- *Estimated Number of Respondents:* 30.
- *Estimated Number of Responses:* 30.
- *Average Time per Response:* 31 hours.
- *Total Estimated Burden Time:* 930 hours.
- *Frequency:* Within 180 days of new investment in Burma over $500,000, annually thereafter.
- *Obligation to Respond:* Mandatory.

We are soliciting public comments to permit the Department to:

- Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper functions of the Department.
- Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the time and cost burden for this proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.
- Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Please note that comments submitted in response to this Notice are public record. Before including any detailed personal information, you should be aware that your comments as submitted, including your personal information, will be available for public review.

Abstract of proposed collection:

Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) grants the President authority to, inter alia, prevent or prohibit any acquisition or transaction involving any property, in which a foreign country or a national thereof has any interest, by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, if the President declares a national emergency with respect to any unusual and extraordinary threat, which has its source in whole or substantial part outside the United States, to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States. See 50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*

In Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, the President determined that the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, including its large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, constituted an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, declared a national emergency to deal with that threat, and prohibited new investment in Burma. In subsequent Executive Orders, the President modified the scope of the national emergency to address additional concerns with the actions and policies of the Government of Burma. In Executive Order 13448 of October 18, 2007, the President modified the emergency to address the continued repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, manifested in part through the commission of human rights abuses and pervasive public corruption. In Executive Order 13619 of July 11, 2012, the President further modified the emergency to address, inter alia, human rights abuses particularly in ethnic areas.

In response to several political reforms by the Government of Burma and pursuant to authority granted by IEEPA, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued a general license (GL 17) on July 11, 2012 authorizing new investment in Burma, subject to certain restrictions and conditions.

In order to support the Department of State's efforts to assess the extent to which new U.S. investment authorized by GL 17 furthers U.S. foreign policy goals of, inter alia, improving human rights protections and facilitating political reform in Burma, GL 17 requires U.S. persons engaging in new investment in Burma to report to the Department of State information related to such investment, as laid out in the ''Reporting Requirements on Responsible Investment in Burma,'' (hereafter referred to as the ''collection''). This collection is authorized by section 203(a)(2) of

IEEPA, which grants the President authority to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in section *203(a)(1) of IEEPA.*

Methodology:

The Department of State will collect the information requested via electronic submission.

Additional Information:

It is the overarching policy goal of the U.S. Government to support political reform in Burma towards the establishment of a peaceful, prosperous, and democratic state that respects human rights and the rule of law. In the past, some foreign investment in Burma has been linked to human rights abuses, particularly in the area of natural resource development in ethnic minority regions. For example, some foreign investments have entailed acquisition and control of land in disputed ethnic minority territories exacerbating or contributing to both social unrest and armed conflict and leading to adverse community and/or environmental impacts. Increased military/security presence, particularly in disputed ethnic minority areas, to provide security for foreign investment projects is reported to have led to seizures of farm land, involuntary relocations, forced labor, torture, summary execution, and sexual violence.

The collection will help the Department of State, in consultation with other relevant government agencies, to evaluate whether easing the ban on investment by U.S. persons advances U.S. foreign policy goals to address the national emergency with respect to Burma. In addition, the Department of State will use the collection as a basis to conduct informed consultations with U.S. businesses to encourage and assist such businesses to develop robust policies and procedures to address any potential adverse human rights, worker rights, anti-corruption, environmental, or other impacts resulting from their investments and operations in Burma. The Department of State will use the collection of information about new investment with the Myanmar Oil and Gas Enterprise (MOGE) to track investment that involves MOGE and to identify investors with whom it may be beneficial to have targeted consultation on anti-corruption and human rights policies. The public, including civil society actors in Burma, may use publicly available information resulting from the collection to engage U.S. businesses on their responsible investment policies and procedures and to monitor the Burmese government's management of revenues from investment.

U.S. persons to whom this requirement applies will be required to submit a version of the report to the U.S. Government for public release, from which information considered in good faith to be exempt from disclosure under FOIA Exemption 4—*i.e.* trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential—may be withheld. The Department of State will make this version of the report publically available in order to promote transparency with respect to new U.S. investments in Burma. In the past, the absence of transparency or publicly available information with respect to foreign investment activities in Burma has contributed to corruption and misuse of public funds, the erosion of public trust, and social unrest in ethnic minority areas and has led to further human rights abuses and repression by the government and military. Public disclosure of certain aspects of the collection therefore will promote the policy of transparency through new U.S. investment, a key U.S. foreign policy objective in Burma.

Burmese civil society groups, particularly those representing ethnic minority communities, have requested that the Department of State make public certain information obtained through the collection on investments purportedly made for the benefit of the Burmese people, as a means of holding their own government accountable. Nobel Peace Prize laureate Aung San Suu Kyi underscored the importance of transparency in in Bangkok in 2012, noting that she did not want ''more investment to mean more possibilities for corruption.'' This was among the most specific of the recommendations she made to the international community, stressing that ''Transparency is very important if we are going to avoid problems in the future... So whatever investments, governmental agreements, whatever aid might be proposed, please make sure that it is transparent, that the people of Burma are in a position to understand what has been done, and how and for whom the benefits are intended.''

Therefore public release of portions of this collection is aimed at providing civil society this type of information to both ensure the transparency of U.S. investment in Burma and to encourage civil society to partner with their government and U.S. companies towards building responsible investment, which ultimately promotes U.S. foreign policy goals.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

Scott Busby,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 2015–30054 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–18–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Generalized System of Preferences (GSP): Notice of Acceptance of a Country Practices Petition on Thailand; Notice of Schedule for Public Comments and a Hearing on Certain Country Practice Reviews

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice and request for submissions.

SUMMARY: The GSP Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) announces that it has accepted for review a country practices petition regarding worker rights in Thailand submitted as part of the GSP Annual Review. This notice sets forth the schedule for public comments and a public hearing on the newly accepted petition on Thailand, as well as the ongoing GSP country practice reviews regarding Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Iraq, Niger, and Uzbekistan. This notice also announces the closure of the country practices review of worker rights in the Philippines without change to that country's GSP trade benefits.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Aimee Larsen, Director for GSP, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508. The telephone number is (202) 395–2974 and the email address is *ALarsen@ustr.eop.gov.*

DATES: The GSP regulations (15 CFR part 2007) provide the schedule of dates for conducting an annual review unless otherwise specified in a **Federal Register** notice. The schedule for the review of the country practices reviews cited above follows.

January 4, 2016: Deadline for submission of pre-hearing briefs and requests to appear at the January 14–15, 2016 public hearing; submissions must be received by 5:00 p.m.

January 14–15, 2016: The GSP Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) will convene a two-day public hearing on the country practices reviews cited above at 1724 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20508, beginning at 9:30 a.m. each day.

February 12, 2016: Deadline for submission of post-hearing briefs, which must be received by 5:00 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The GSP program provides for the duty-free importation of designated articles when imported from designated BDCs. The GSP program is authorized by Title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461, *et seq.*), as amended (the ''1974 Act''), and is implemented in accordance with Executive Order 11888 of November 24, 1975, as modified by subsequent Executive Orders and Presidential Proclamations.

Country Practices Reviews

The status of country practices reviews considered as part of the 2015/2016 GSP Annual Review is described in the list of Active and Closed Country Practices Reviews, which is available on the USTR GSP Web site at *https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/trade-development/preference-programs/generalized-system-preference-gsp/current-review-0.* This list includes previously accepted country practices petitions. Country practices petitions accepted for review in previous years that continue to be under review include those regarding Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Iraq, Niger, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

The U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), drawing on the advice of the TPSC, has accepted for review a country practices petition submitted as part of the 2015/2016 GSP Annual Review on Thailand regarding worker rights. In addition, the USTR, drawing on the advice of the TPSC, has decided to close the country practices review case *USTR–2013–0006* regarding worker rights in the Philippines in view of progress made by the government of the Philippines in addressing worker rights issues in that country.

Notice of Public Hearing

The GSP Subcommittee of the TPSC will hold a two-day hearing on Thursday, January 14 and Friday, January 15, 2016 beginning at 9:30 a.m. each day, for the newly accepted country practices petition regarding worker rights in Thailand, as well as to receive information regarding recent developments pertinent to the ongoing country practices reviews regarding worker rights and/or child labor in Fiji, Georgia, Iraq, Niger, and Uzbekistan, and arbitral awards in Ecuador.

The hearing will be held at 1724 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20508 and will be open to the public. A transcript of the hearing will be made available on *http://www.regulations.gov* within approximately two weeks of the hearing.

All interested parties wishing to make an oral presentation at the hearing must submit, following the ''Requirements for Submissions'' set out below, the name, address, telephone number, and email address, if available, of the witness(es) representing their organization by 5 p.m., January 4, 2016. Requests to present oral testimony must be accompanied by a written brief or summary statement, in English, and also must be received by 5 p.m., January 4, 2016. Oral testimony before the GSP Subcommittee will be limited to five-minute presentations that summarize or supplement information contained in briefs or statements submitted for the record. Post-hearing briefs or statements will be accepted if they conform with the regulations cited below and are submitted, in English, by 5 p.m., February 12, 2016. Parties not wishing to appear at the public hearing may submit pre-hearing and post-hearing briefs or comments by the aforementioned deadlines.

The GSP Subcommittee strongly encourages submission of all post-hearing briefs or statements by the February 12, 2016 deadline in order to receive timely consideration in the GSP Subcommittee's deliberation on the subject reviews. However, if there are new developments or information that parties wish to share with the GSP Subcommittee after this date, the regulations.gov dockets will remain open. Comments, letters, or other submissions related to the subject country practices reviews must be posted to the *http://regulations.gov* docket in order to be considered by the GSP Subcommittee.

Requirements for Submissions

All submissions in response to this notice must be submitted in English by the applicable deadlines set forth in this notice and conform to the GSP regulations set forth at 15 CFR part 2007, except as modified below. These regulations are available on the USTR Web site at *https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/USTR-Regulations-Pertaining-Eligibility-GSP-Program-15-CFR-Part-2007_0.pdf.* Any person or party making a submission is strongly advised to review the GSP regulations and the GSP Guidebook, available at: *https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/GSP%20Guidebook%20October%202015%20Final.pdf.*

To ensure their timely and expeditious receipt and consideration, submissions in response to this notice must be submitted electronically via *http://www.regulations.gov* using the appropriate country-specific docket number(s) listed below.

Fiji (worker rights): USTR–2013–0012;

Ecuador (arbitral awards): USTR–2013–0013;

Georgia (worker rights): USTR–2013–0009;

Iraq (worker rights): USTR–2013–0004;

Niger (worker rights and child labor): USTR–2013–0005;

Thailand (worker rights): USTR–2015–0018;

Uzbekistan (worker rights): USTR–2013–0007.

Hand-delivered submissions will not be accepted.

To make a submission using *http://www.regulations.gov,* enter the country-specific docket number in the ''Search for'' field on the home page and click ''Search.'' The site will provide a search-results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Find a reference to this notice by selecting ''Notice'' under ''Document Type'' in the ''Filter Results by'' section on the left side of the screen and click on the link entitled ''Comment Now.'' The *http://www.regulations.gov* Web site offers the option of providing comments by filling in a ''Type Comment'' field or by attaching a document using the ''Upload file(s)'' field. The GSP Subcommittee prefers that submissions be provided in an attached document. At the beginning of the submission, or on the first page (if an attachment), please note that the submission is in response to this **Federal Register** notice and provides comments on the GSP country practice review regarding [relevant country]. Submissions should not exceed 30 single-spaced, standard letter-size pages in 12-point type, including attachments. Any data attachments to the submission should be included in the same file as the submission itself, and not as separate files.

Each submitter will receive a submission tracking number upon completion of the submissions procedure at *http://www.regulations.gov.* The tracking number will be the submitter's confirmation that the submission was received into *http://www.regulations.gov.* The confirmation should be kept for the submitter's records. USTR is not able to provide technical assistance for the Web site. Documents not submitted in accordance with these instructions may not be considered in this review. If an interested party is unable to provide submissions as requested, please contact the GSP Program at USTR to arrange for an alternative method of transmission.

Business Confidential Submissions

An interested party requesting that information contained in a submission be treated as business confidential information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the submitter. Confidential business information must be clearly designated as such. The submission must be marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page, and the submission should indicate, via brackets, the specific information that is confidential. Additionally, ''Business Confidential'' must be included in the ''Type Comment'' field. For any submission containing business confidential information, a non-confidential version must be submitted separately (*i.e.,* not as part of the same submission with the confidential version), indicating where confidential information has been redacted. The non-confidential version will be placed in the docket and open to public inspection.

Public Viewing of Review Submissions

Submissions in response to this notice, except for information granted ''business confidential'' status under 15 CFR 2003.6, will be available for public viewing pursuant to 15 CFR 2007.6 at *http://www.regulations.gov* upon completion of processing, usually within two weeks of the relevant due date or date of the submission. Such submissions may be viewed by entering the country-specific docket number in the search field at: *http://www.regulations.gov.*

William D. Jackson,

Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for the Generalized System of Preferences, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 2015–30065 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3290–F6–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. 2015–065]

Petition for Exemption; Summary of Petition Received; Cape Productions, Inc.

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice contains a summary of a petition seeking relief from specified requirements of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, the FAA's exemption process. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of the petition or its final disposition.

DATES: Comments on this petition must identify the petition docket number and must be received on or before December 15, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Send comments identified by docket number FAA–2015–0223 using any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.
- Mail: Send comments to Docket Operations, M–30; U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W12–140, West Building Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590–0001.
- Hand Delivery or Courier: Take comments to Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.
- Fax: Fax comments to Docket Operations at 202–493–2251.

Privacy: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *http://www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *http://www.dot.gov/privacy.*

Docket: Background documents or comments received may be read at *http://www.regulations.gov* at any time. Follow the online instructions for accessing the docket or go to the Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Ngo, (202) 267–4264. 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR 11.85.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 19, 2015.

Lirio Liu,

Director, Office of Rulemaking.

Petition for Exemption

Docket No.: FAA–2015–0223.
Petitioner: Cape Productions, Inc.
Section(s) of 14 CFR Affected: § 91.119.

Description of Relief Sought: The petitioner has requested to operate their UAS closer than 500 feet of athletes (who will receive briefings and consent to UAS risks). In Exemption No. 11433, the petitioner was approved to use a UAS for aerial data collection. Their exemption requires them to comply with § 91.119 Minimum safe altitudes and prohibits operation closer than 500 feet from people except for essential flight personnel. Their petition for amendment requests exemption from that prohibition so that they may operate within 500 feet of participating athletes who have consented.

[FR Doc. 2015–29950 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of the ARAC.

DATES: The meeting will be held on December 17, 2015, starting at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time. Arrange oral presentations by December 10, 2015.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, 10th floor, MacCracken Conference Room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Renee Pocius, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267- 5093; fax (202) 267–5075; email *Renee.Pocius@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), we are giving notice of a meeting of the ARAC taking place on December 17, 2015, at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591.

The Agenda includes:

1. Request for Clarification
   a. Avionics Systems Harmonization Working Group—Phase 2 Low Airspeed Alerting
2. Materials Flammability Working Group Recommendation Report
3. Status Reports From Active Working Groups

a. Airman Certification Systems Working Group
b. Aircraft Systems Information Security/Protection Working Group
c. Air Traffic Controller Training Working Group
d. Rotorcraft Occupant Protection Working Group
e. Airworthiness Assurance Working Group
f. Engine Harmonization Working Group- Engine Endurance Testing Requirements—Revision of Section 33.87
g. Flight Test Harmonization Working Group—Phase 2 Tasking
h. Transport Airplane Metallic and Composite Structures Working Group—Transport Airplane Damage-Tolerance and Fatigue Evaluation
i. Transport Airplane Crashworthiness and Ditching Evaluation Working Group

4. New Tasks
a. Rotorcraft Bird Strike Working Group
b. Additional Tasking for the Airman Certification Systems Working Group
c. Load Master Certification Working Group

5. Status Report from the FAA

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. Please confirm your attendance with the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section no later than December 10, 2015. Please provide the following information: full legal name, country of citizenship, and name of your industry association, or applicable affiliation. If you are attending as a public citizen, please indicate so.

For persons participating by telephone, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by email or phone for the teleconference call-in number and passcode. Callers outside the Washington metropolitan area are responsible for paying long-distance charges.

The public must arrange by December 10, 2015 to present oral statements at the meeting. The public may present written statements to the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee by providing 25 copies to the Designated Federal Officer, or by bringing the copies to the meeting.

If you are in need of assistance or require a reasonable accommodation for this meeting, please contact the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** Sign and oral interpretation, as well as a listening device, can be made available if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 19, 2015.

Lirio Liu,

Designated Federal Officer, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 2015–29949 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Alexander, Pulaski, and Union Counties, Illinois

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for the Shawnee Parkway Project in Alexander, Pulaski, and Union Counties, Illinois.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine A. Batey, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, 3250 Executive Park Drive, Springfield, Illinois 62703. Phone: (217) 492–4600. Jeffrey L. Keirn, PE., Deputy Director of Highways, Region Five Engineer, Illinois Department of Transportation, State Transportation Building, 2801 W. Murphysboro, P.O. Box 100, Carbondale, Illinois 62903, (618) 549–2171.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with Illinois Department of Transportation, will prepare an EIS for the Shawnee Parkway project. The anticipated termini are the intersection of Illinois Route 3 with Illinois Route 146 and Interstate 57. The project study area includes portions of the following counties: Alexander, Pulaski, and Union in Illinois. The study area covers approximately 350 square miles.

The EIS for the Shawnee Parkway is being conducted to evaluate the need for improved transportation between the anticipated termini within the study area. The EIS will complete an analysis of transportation alternative(s) in the study area and evaluate environmental impacts based on field investigations, transportation studies, economic impact studies, and cost analysis.

Alternatives assessed will seek to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to resources in the project area. In accordance with IDOT policies, the project is being developed using Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) as a basis for a stakeholder outreach program. A scoping meeting will be held on December 3, 2015.

A range of alternatives will be developed and evaluated, including but not limited to: Taking no action, existing roadway improvements, and new roadways on new location. The Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP), which will satisfy the 23 U.S.C. Section 139 requirements for a coordination plan, will be developed to ensure that a full range of issues related to this proposed project are identified and addressed. The SIP provides meaningful opportunities for all stakeholders to participate in defining transportation issues and solutions for the study area.

Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS are invited from all interested parties and should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above or the following Web site: *www.shawneeparkway.org.*

A public hearing will be held after the Draft EIS is published and made available for public and agency review. Public notice will be given of the time and place of public meetings and hearings.

The EIS will conclude with a Record of Decision selecting either a no-build or a preferred alternative.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program)

Issued on: November 19, 2015.

Catherine A. Batey,

Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Springfield, Illinois.

[FR Doc. 2015–30003 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA–2015–0180]

Agency Information Collection Activities; New Information Collection Request: 391.41 CMV Driver Medication Form

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FMCSA announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR)

described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review and approval and invites public comment on the approval of a new ICR titled, *391.41 CMV Driver Medication Form.* This ICR is voluntary and may be utilized by medical examiners (MEs) responsible for issuing Medical Examiner's Certificates (MECs) to commercial motor vehicle (CMV) drivers. MEs that choose to use this ICR will do so in an effort to communicate with treating healthcare professionals who are responsible for prescribing certain medications, so that the ME fully understands the reasons the medications have been prescribed. The information obtained by the ME when utilizing this ICR will assist the ME in determining if the driver is medically qualified under 49 CFR 391.41 and to ensure that there are no disqualifying medical conditions or underlying medical conditions and prescribed medications that could adversely affect their safe driving ability or cause incapacitation constituting a risk to the public.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Docket Number FMCSA–2015–0180 using any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* 1–202–493–2251.
- *Mail:* Docket Services; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 20590–0001.
- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: All submissions must include the Agency name and docket number. For detailed instructions on submitting comments and additional information on the exemption process, see the Public Participation heading below. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *http://www.regulations.gov,* and follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets, or go to the street address listed above.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *www.dot.gov/privacy.*

Public Participation: The Federal eRulemaking Portal is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. You can obtain electronic submission and retrieval help and guidelines under the ''help'' section of the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site. If you want us to notify you that we received your comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope or postcard, or print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments online. Comments received after the comment closing date will be included in the docket and will be considered to the extent practicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles A. Horan III, Director, Office of Carrier, Driver, and Vehicle, Safety Standards, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, West Building 6th Floor, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202–366–2362; email *charles.horan@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The primary mission of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) is to reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving large trucks and buses. The Secretary of Transportation has delegated to FMCSA its responsibility under 49 U.S.C. 31136 and 31502 to prescribe regulations that ensure that CMVs are operated safely. As part of this mission, the Agency's Medical Programs Division works to ensure that CMV drivers engaged in interstate commerce are physically qualified and able to safely perform their work.

Information used to determine and certify driver medical fitness must be collected in order for our highways to be safe. FMCSA is the Federal government agency authorized to require the collection of this information and the authorizing regulations are located at 49 CFR 390–399. FMCSA is required by statute to establish standards for the physical qualifications of drivers who operate CMVs in interstate commerce for non-excepted industries [49 U.S.C. 31136(a)(3) and 31502(b)]. The regulations discussing this collection are outlined in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) at 49 CFR 390–399. FMCSRs at 49 CFR 391.41 set forth the physical qualification standards that interstate CMV drivers who are subject to part 391 must meet, with the exception of commercial driver's license/commercial learner's permit (CDL/CLP) drivers transporting migrant workers (who must meet the physical qualification standards set forth in 49 CFR 398.3). The FMCSRs covering driver physical qualification records are found at 49 CFR 391.43, which specify that a medical examination be performed on CMV drivers subject to part 391 who operate in interstate commerce. The results of the examination shall be recorded in accordance with the requirements set forth in that section.

49 CFR 391.41(12) states that a person is physically qualified to drive a CMV if that person does not use any drug or substance identified in 21 CFR 1308.11 Schedule I, an amphetamine, a narcotic, or other habit-forming drug and does not use any non-Schedule I drug or substance that is identified in the other Schedules in 21 part 1308 except when the use is prescribed by a licensed medical practitioner, as defined in § 382.107, who is familiar with the driver's medical history and has advised the driver that the substance will not adversely affect the driver's ability to safely operate a CMV.

In 2006, FMCSA's Medical Review Board (MRB) deliberated on the topic of the use of Schedule II medications. The MRB considered information provided in a 2006 FMCSA sponsored Evidence Report and a subsequent Medical Expert Panel (MEP) to examine the relationship between the licit use of a Schedule II drug and the risk for a motor vehicle crash. In 2013, FMCSA tasked the MRB with updating the opinions and recommendations of the 2006 Evidence Report and MEP.

On September 10, 2013, the MRB and Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee (MCSAC) met jointly to hear presentations on the licit use of Schedule II medications and their regulation, and on U.S. Department of Transportation drug and alcohol testing protocols. Subsequently, the committees engaged in a discussion on the issue as it applies to CMV drivers. On September 11, 2013, the MRB discussed the issue in greater detail as its task to present a letter report to the Agency relating to CMV drivers and Schedule II medication use and to develop a form for MEs on the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners (National Registry) to send to treating clinicians of CMV drivers to expound on the use of

these medications by driver applicants. On October 22, 2013, the MRB submitted their recommendations to FMCSA. A MEP convened to provide an updated opinion on *Schedule II Opioids and Stimulants & CMV Crash Risk and Driver Performance.* The FMCSA revised the task of the MRB instructing them to review an updated evidence report and the MEP opinion that was furnished subsequent to its deliberations on *Schedule II Opioids and Stimulants & CMV Crash Risk and Driver Performance: Evidence Report and Systematic Review.* FMCSA directed the MRB to consider this report's findings and confer with the MCSAC on this topic during a joint meeting in October 2014. The MRB met in public meetings on July 29–30, 2014, and developed Schedule II medication recommendations. The MRB presented these recommendations to the MCSAC in a joint public meeting on October 27, 2014, where they were deliberated by both committees. As a result, FMCSA's MRB and MCSAC provided joint recommendations related to the use of Schedule II medications by CMV drivers. Because there is moderate evidence to support the contention that the licit use of opioids increases the risk of motor vehicle crashes and impacts indirect measures of driver performance negatively, included was the recommendation that FMCSA develop a standardized medication questionnaire to assist the certified ME when reviewing prescription medications that have been disclosed during the history and physical examination for CMV driver certification. The two advisory groups recommended to FMCSA that the standardized CMV driver medication questionnaire be voluntary and include the following information and questions:

1. Questionnaire should be titled *391.41 CMV Driver Medication Questionnaire.*

2. Questionnaire should request the following information:

a. Identifying name and date of birth of the CMV driver.

b. Introductory paragraph stating purpose of the CMV Driver Medication Report.

c. Statements of 391.41(b)(12) (Physical Qualifications of Drivers relating to driver use of scheduled substances) and The Driver's Role, as found in the Medical Examination Report form found at the end of *49 CFR 391.43 (Medical Examination; Certificate of Physical Examination).*

d. Name, state of licensure, signature, address and contact information of the prescribing healthcare provider, as well as the date the form was completed.

e. Name, signature, date, address and contact information of the certified ME.

3. Report should include the following information:

a. 1—List all medications and dosages that you have prescribed to the above named individual.

b. 2—List any other medications and dosages that you are aware have been prescribed to the above named individual by another treating healthcare provider.

c. 3—What medical conditions are being treated with these medications?

d. 4—It is my medical opinion that, considering the mental and physical requirements of operating a CMV and with awareness of a CMV driver's role (consistent with *The Driver's Role* statement on page 2 of the form), I believe my patient: (a) has no medication side effects from medication(s) that I prescribe that would adversely affect the ability to operate a CMV safely; and (2) has no medical condition(s) that I am treating with the above medication(s) that would adversely affect the ability to operate a CMV safely.

The public interest in, and right to have, safe highways requires the assurance that drivers of CMVs can safely perform the increased physical and mental demands of their duties. FMCSA's medical standards provide this assurance by requiring drivers to be examined and medically certified as physically and mentally qualified to drive.

The purpose for collecting this information is to assist the ME in determining if the driver is medically qualified under 49 CFR 391.41 and to ensure that there are no disqualifying medical conditions that could adversely affect their safe driving ability or cause incapacitation constituting a risk to the public. 49 CFR 391.41(12) states that a person is physically qualified to drive a CMV if that person does not use any drug or substance identified in 21 CFR 1308.11 Schedule I, an amphetamine, a narcotic, or other habit-forming drug and does not use any non-Schedule I drug or substance that is identified in the other Schedules in 21 part 1308 except when the use is prescribed by a licensed medical practitioner, as defined in § 382.107, who is familiar with the driver's medical history and has advised the driver that the substance will not adversely affect the driver's ability to safely operate a CMV.

The use of this ICR is at the discretion of the ME to facilitate communication with treating healthcare professionals who are responsible for prescribing certain medications so that the ME fully understands the reasons the medications have been prescribed. This information will assist the ME in determining whether the underlying medical condition and the prescribed medication will impact the driver's safe operation of a CMV. Therefore, there is no required collection frequency.

The *391.41 CMV Driver Medication Form* will be available as a fillable pdf or may be downloaded from the FMCSA Web site. Prescribing healthcare providers will also be able to fax or scan and email the report to the certified ME. Consistent with the OMB's commitment to minimizing respondents' recordkeeping and paperwork burdens and the increased use of secure electronic modes of communication, the Agency anticipates that approximately 50 percent of the *391.41 CMV Driver Medication Forms* will be transmitted electronically.

The information collected from the *391.41 CMV Driver Medication Form,* will be used by the certified ME that requested the completion of the form and will become part of the CMV driver's record maintained by the certified ME. Therefore, the information will not be available to the public. The FMCSRs covering driver physical qualification records are found at 49 CFR 391.43, which specify that a medical examination be performed on CMV drivers subject to part 391 who operate in interstate commerce. The results of the examination shall be recorded in accordance with the requirements set forth in that section. MEs are required to maintain records of the CMV driver medical examinations they conduct.

Title: 391.41 CMV Driver Medication Form.

OMB Control Number: 2126–00XX.

Type of Request: New collection.

Respondents: Prescribing healthcare professionals.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,082,200 (total number of prescribing healthcare providers in the U.S.)

Estimated Time per Response: 8 minutes.

Expiration Date: N/A. This is a new ICR.

Frequency of Response: Voluntary.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 144,293 hours [1,082,200 responses × 8 minutes to complete response/60 minutes = 144,293].

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) whether the proposed collection is necessary for the performance of FMCSA's functions; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for FMCSA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected

information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Issued under the authority of 49 CFR 1.87 on: Nov 6, 2015.

G. Kelly Regal,

Associate Administrator for Office of Research and Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2015–30134 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket No. FRA 2015–0007–N–30]

Proposed Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and its implementing regulations, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) hereby announces that it is seeking renewal of the following currently approved information collection activities. Before submitting these information collection requests (ICRs) for clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), FRA is soliciting public comment on specific aspects of the activities identified below.

DATES: Comments must be received no later than January 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on any or all of the following proposed activities by mail to either: Mr. Robert Brogan, Office of Safety, Regulatory Safety Analysis Division, RRS–21, Federal Railroad Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., Mail Stop 25, Washington, DC 20590, or Ms. Kimberly Toone, Office of Information Technology, RAD–20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590. Commenters requesting FRA to acknowledge receipt of their respective comments must include a self-addressed stamped postcard stating, ''Comments on OMB control number 2130–0525''. Alternatively, comments may be transmitted via facsimile to (202) 493–6216 or (202) 493–6497, or via email to Mr. Brogan at *Robert.Brogan@dot.gov,* or to Ms. Toone at *Kim.Toone@dot.gov.* Please refer to the assigned OMB control number in any correspondence submitted. FRA will summarize comments received in response to this notice in a subsequent notice and include them in its information collection submission to OMB for approval.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Brogan, Regulatory Safety Analysis Division, RRS–21, Federal Railroad Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., Mail Stop 25, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493–6292) or Ms. Kimberly Toone, Office of Information Technology, RAD–20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493–6132). (These telephone numbers are not toll-free.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Public Law 104–13, sec. 2, 109 Stat. 163 (1995) (codified as revised at 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, require Federal agencies to provide 60-days notice to the public for comment on information collection activities before seeking approval for reinstatement or renewal by OMB. 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A); 5 CFR 1320.8(d)(1), 1320.10(e)(1), 1320.12(a). Specifically, FRA invites interested respondents to comment on the following summary of proposed information collection activities regarding (i) whether the information collection activities are necessary for FRA to properly execute its functions, including whether the activities will have practical utility; (ii) the accuracy of FRA's estimates of the burden of the information collection activities, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used to determine the estimates; (iii) ways for FRA to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information being collected; and (iv) ways for FRA to minimize the burden of information collection activities on the public by automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology (*e.g.,* permitting electronic submission of responses). *See* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)(I)–(iv); 5 CFR 1320.8(d)(1)(I)–(iv). FRA believes that soliciting public comment will promote its efforts to reduce the administrative and paperwork burdens associated with the collection of information mandated by Federal regulations. In summary, FRA reasons that comments received will advance three objectives: (i) Reduce reporting burdens; (ii) ensure that it organizes information collection requirements in a ''user friendly'' format to improve the use of such information; and (iii) accurately assess the resources expended to retrieve and produce information requested. *See* 44 U.S.C. 3501.

Below is a brief summary of the currently approved ICRs that FRA will submit for clearance by OMB as required under the PRA:

Title: Certification of Glazing Materials.

OMB Control Number: 2130–0525.

Abstract: The collection of information is set forth under 49 CFR part 223, which requires the certification and permanent marking of glazing materials by the manufacturer. The manufacturer is also responsible for making available test verification data to railroads and FRA upon request.

Form Number(s): N/A.

Affected Public: Businesses.

Respondent Universe: States and Railroads.

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

Respondent Universe: 5 Manufacturers.

CFR section	Respondent universe (manufacturers)	Total annual responses	Average time per response	Total annual burden hours
223.17—Identification of Equipped Locomotives, Passenger Cars, and Caboose.	4	200 stencilings or metal plates.	15 minutes	50
223.17—Appendix A:				
—Requests for Glazing Certification	5	10 requests	15 minutes	3
—Marking Individual Units of Glazing Material	5	25,000 pieces	480 pieces per hour	52
—Testing New Material and Providing Verification Data.	5	1 test	14 hours	14

Frequency of Submission: On occasion.

Total Estimated Responses: 25,211.

Total Estimated Total Annual Burden: 119 hours.

Type of Request: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3507(a) and 5 CFR 1320.5(b), 1320.8(b)(3)(vi), FRA informs all interested parties that it may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 19, 2015.

Corey Hill,

Acting Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–29974 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–2015 0126]

Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws: Vessel VAGO; Invitation for Public Comments

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As authorized by 46 U.S.C. 12121, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a brief description of the proposed service, is listed below.

DATES: Submit comments on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2015–0126. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at *http://www.regulations.gov.* All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Williams, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room W23–453, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–0903, Email *Linda.Williams@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

As described by the applicant the intended service of the vessel VAGO is:

Intended Commercial Use of Vessel: ''To provide recreational and alternative, substance abuse free, activities for patients under therapeutic clinical care at Comprehensive Human Services, Inc. and associated recovery/treatment facilities in the greater San Diego area. Vessel would be used for team building, meditation, problem-solving training and general recreation and mindfulness exercises for patients and their families only. No fishing or other commercial activities would be conducted. Cost would be minimal and not intended to generate profit, but rather to simply cover fuel, maintenance and operating/berthing expenses.''

Geographic Region: ''California''

The complete application is given in DOT docket MARAD–2015–0126 at *http://www.regulations.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines, in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 12121 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388, that the issuance of the waiver will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels in that business, a waiver will not be granted. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388.

Privacy Act

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78).

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.
Dated: November 10, 2015.

T. Mitchell Hudson, Jr.,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2015–30028 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Docket No. FD 35965 (Sub-No. 1)]

Indiana Southern Railroad, LLC—Temporary Trackage Rights Exemption—Norfolk Southern Railway Company

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board, DOT.

ACTION: Partial revocation of exemption.

SUMMARY: Under 49 U.S.C. 10502, the Board revokes the class exemption as it pertains to the trackage rights described in Docket No. FD 35965 [1] to permit the trackage rights to expire on January 1, 2020, as provided in the underlying temporary trackage rights agreement subject to the employee protective conditions set forth in *Oregon Short Line Railroad—Abandonment Portion Goshen Branch Between Firth & Ammon, in Bingham & Bonneville Counties, Idaho*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979).

[1] In that docket, on October 5, 2015, Indiana Southern Railroad, LLC (ISRR) filed a Verified Notice of Exemption under the Board's class exemption procedures at 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(7). The notice addressed an agreement between (ISRR) and Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NS) that is intended to grant ISRR limited overhead temporary trackage rights until January 1, 2020, to operate over and provide rail service to one customer on a portion of NS's rail line between milepost 0.8 EJ at Oakland City Junction, Ind., and milepost 4.8 EJ at Enosville, Ind. ISRR stated that because the temporary trackage rights are longer than a year in duration, its verified notice was not filed under the Board's class exemption for temporary trackage rights under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(8). Instead, ISRR concurrently filed a Petition for Partial Revocation in this sub-docket. Notice of the exemption was served and published in the **Federal Register** on October 21, 2015 (80 FR 63,871). That notice indicated that the Board would address the Petition for Partial Revocation in a subsequent decision, which it is doing here and in the Board's decision served today in this sub-docket.

DATES: The decision is effective on December 25, 2015. Petitions to stay must be filed by December 7, 2015. Petitions for reconsideration must be filed by December 15, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Send an original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 35965 (Sub-No. 1) to: Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Eric M. Hocky, Clark Hill, PLC, One Commerce Square, 2005 Market St., Suite 1000, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nathaniel Bawcombe (202) 245–0376. Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Additional information is contained in the Board's decision. Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at *WWW.STB.DOT.GOV.*

Decided: November 20, 2015.

By the Board, Chairman Elliott, Vice Chairman Begeman, and Commissioner Miller.

Kenyatta Clay,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2015–30037 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Central Federal Savings and Loan Association of Rolla, Rolla, Missouri; Approval of Conversion Application; OCC Charter Number 705710

Notice is hereby given that on November 12, 2015, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) approved the application of Central Federal Savings and Loan Association of Rolla, Rolla, Missouri, to convert to the stock form of organization. Copies of the application are available for inspection on the OCC Web site at the FOIA Electronic Reading Room *https://foia-pal.occ.gov/palMain.aspx.* If you have any questions, please call OCC Licensing Activities at (202) 649–6260.

Dated: November 17, 2015.

By the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Stephen A. Lybarger,

Deputy Comptroller for Licensing.

[FR Doc. 2015–30039 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–33–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 80 Wednesday,
No. 227 November 25, 2015

Part II

Department of State

Office of the Chief of Protocol; Gifts to Federal Employees From Foreign Government Sources Reported to Employing Agencies in Calendar Year 2014; Notice

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice: 9351]

Office of the Chief of Protocol; Gifts to Federal Employees From Foreign Government Sources Reported to Employing Agencies in Calendar Year 2014

The Department of State submits the following comprehensive listing of the statements which, as required by law, federal employees filed with their employing agencies during calendar year 2014 concerning gifts received from foreign government sources. The compilation includes reports of both tangible gifts and gifts of travel or travel expenses of more than minimal value, as defined by the statute. Also included are gifts received in previous years including one gift in 1985, one gift in 1995, one gift in 1997, one gift in 2001, two gifts in 2009, one gift in 2010, six gifts in 2011, five gifts in 2012, forty-nine gifts in 2013, and one gift with an unknown date. These latter gifts are being reported in 2014 as the Office of the Chief of Protocol, Department of State, did not receive the relevant information to include them in earlier reports.

Publication of this listing in the **Federal Register** is required by Section 7342(f) of Title 5, United States Code, as added by Section 515(a)(1) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Pub. L. 95–105, August 17, 1977, 91 Stat. 865).

Dated: November 12, 2015.

Patrick F. Kennedy,

Under Secretary for Management, Department of State.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Six boxes of dates. Twelve bottles of wine. Rec'd—12/20/2013. Est. Value—$509.94. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	His Excellency Abdallah Baali, Ambassador of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Gold and silver men's wristwatch with leather band. Rec'd—1/14/2014. Est. Value—$18,240.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Metallic gold-tone vase with red gemstones. Rec'd—1/22/2014. Est. Value—$430.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Usama Al-Nujaifi, Speaker of the Council of Representatives of the Republic of Iraq.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Mahogany sculpture, title: *Le Negre Marron* depicting a man drinking from a water jug. Rec'd—2/6/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Michel Joseph Martelly, President of the Republic of Haiti.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Green fountain pen with gold floral accents with an ink cartridge. Rec'd—2/7/2014. Est. Value—$1,614.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Fumio Kishida, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Three bottles of wine. Special-edition six-book set, title: *Memoires du Generale Lafayette*. Rec'd—2/9/2014. Est. Value—$2,906.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Wine handled pursuant to United States Secret Service Policy.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Book, title: *Haciendas of the State of Mexico.* Photo album of the North American Leaders' Summit (NALS). Framed and signed photograph of President Obama, the President of the United Mexican States, and the Prime Minister of Canada at NALS. One kilogram pure silver coin engraved with image of Frida Kahlo. Silver cufflinks with the Great Seal of the United States. 1′ x 2′ wool rug in an American Flag pattern. Sculpture of brightly colored flowers, animals, and people attached to clay base. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$3,290.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Enrique Peña Nieto, President of the United Mexican States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Framed black and white photograph of the first American consulate in Jerusalem circa 1888. Rec'd—3/3/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Benjamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of the State of Israel.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Bottle of cognac. Rec'd—3/3/2014. Est. Value—$615.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	His Excellency Iurie Leancă, Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Scalloped rim crystal bowl in the shape of Ireland's Croagh Patrick Peak. DVD, title: *Sustainability Starts Here.* Book, title: *My Irish Table.* Silverware knife. Rec'd—3/13/2014. Est. Value—$1,512.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Enda Kenny, TD, Prime Minister of Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Framed metallic disc plaque decorated with beads and stones. Framed tile art featuring red, purple, yellow, and white flowers on green vines. Rec'd—3/16/2014. Est. Value—$625.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Adminsitration.	His Excellency Dr. Mahmoud Abbas, President of the Palestinian Authority.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Two white tulip vases. Blue and white double gourd vase. Rec'd—3/24/2014. Est. Value—$730.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Mark Rutte, Prime Minister and Minister of General Affairs of the Netherlands.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Silver box inscribed with the signature of President Giorgio Napolitano. Speech by President Giorgio Napolitano, title: *Messaggio Al Parlamento*. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$985.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Giorgio Napolitano, President of the Italian Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	6″ cast bronze medal depicting vines on ceramic stoneware with a Roman travertine finish. 8″ cast bronze medal depicting the Angel of Solidarity and Peace. Book, title: *Miserando Atque Eligando*. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$1,015.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Holiness Pope Francis, Holy See.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	29″ x 21″ folio of lithographs, title: *Fontane Del Vaticano.* Leather-bound book, title: *Annuario Pontificio 2014*. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$1,707.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Adminstration.	His Eminence Cardinal Pietro Parolin, Secretary of State of the Holy See.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	48″ gold-plated brass replica of the Makkah Clock Tower on marble base. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$57,000.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	White gold men's wristwatch with leather band. Rec'd—4/15/2014. Est. Value—$67,000.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Flower pot painted with scene of dark gray mountain terrain. Signed framed photograph of the Emperor and Empress of Japan. Rec'd—4/24/2014. Est. Value—$2,540.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Sake handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	Their Majesties the Emperor and Empress of Japan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Painting on paper in colored powder and gold, title: ''Harmonious and Peaceful World'' depicting the sun, moon, and five mountain peaks representing the king. Rec'd—4/25/2014. Est. Value—$2,200.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Three coin set, one silver with the face of the King, one silver with the face of the Queen, and one gold with the King and Queen together. Signed and framed photograph of the King and Queen of Malaysia. 10″ plate with images of the King and Queen of Malaysia. Book, title: *The Return.* 20″ sword with steel blade and grip of polished wood carved in the shape of water fowl, held in a sheath of gold and silver with encrusted gemstones. Rec'd—4/26/2014. Est. Value—$8,117.00. Disposition—National Achives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Badlishah Almu'tasimu Billahi Muhibbuddin Tunaku Ahaj Abdul Halim Mu'adzam Shah Ibni Almarhum, Yang di-Pertuan Agong XIV of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Framed portrait of President Obama woven in songket fabric. Stamp collection in a metal-covered book including stamps to commemorate President Obama's visit to Malaysia. Six booklets about Islam. Book, title: *Ziarah Masjid di Malaysia*. Rec'd—4/27/2014. Est. Value—$810.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	YAB Dato' Sri Mohd Najib, Prime Minister of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Bronze-tone covered photo album containing photographs of President Obama's visit to Malaysia. Silk batik fabric in silver, blue, and teal. Book, title: *Malacanan Palace*. Rec'd—4/28/2014. Est. Value—$441.75. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	YB Encik Khairy Jamaluddin Abu Bakar, Minister of Youth and Sports of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	37″ x 37″ black, white, and gray toned painting, title: *Boliche* depicting a table and four chairs on a tiled floor, plus drinkware. Cable-knit tan wool shawl with brown leather and suede accents. 25″ x 35″ print on canvas featuring pastoral scene of men with swords looking off into the distance. Rec'd—5/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,681.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency José Mujica Cordano, President of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Three bottles of wine. Rec'd—6/5/2014. Est. Value—$537.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	24″ x 36″ framed and matted photograph of Winston Churchill and Dwight Eisenhower reviewing American paratroopers and a two-page facsimile telegram from Prime Minister Churchill to President Truman. Rec'd—6/6/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	The Right Honorable David Cameron, MP, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	9.5′ white and blue longboard with friendship flags and the Presidential Seal. Black leather boots. Rec'd—6/11/2014. Est. Value—$2,371.21. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	The Honorable Tony Abbott, MP, Prime Minister of Australia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	72″ x 32″ painting on canvas of four people in a beach setting listening to a guitar player. Autographed book, title: *Kiki Lima*. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$1,055.87. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Jorge Carlos Fonseca, President of the Republic of Cabo Verde.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Framed painting, title: *Le Joueur de Cara* depicting a man playing a stringed instrument and singing composed in multiple colors and patterns. Bronze staff simulating woven thread set on a six-inch piece of tapered wood. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$1,035.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Daniel Kablan Duncan, Prime Minister of the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Lacquer-ware box with mother of pearl design. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$490.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Ahn Ho-Young, Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Chess set of a mirrored board and silver pieces with felt bottoms. Rec'd—8/6/2014. Est. Value—$445.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Mswati III, King of the Kingdom of Swaziland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	16″ brass and copper statue of a man playing stringed instrument. 37″ x 30″ framed copper relief of a family village scene. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$880.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Blaise Compaoré, President of Burkina Faso.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	8′ x 4′ carpet with multi-colored stripes, patterns, camels, and white fringe. 20.5″ silver circular platter engraved with building and text ''Interim Government of Libya''. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Abdalla Alteni, Prime Minister of the State of Libya.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	39″ x 39″ two panel painting of abstract human figures and symbols in earth tones and white. Three pieces of traditional clothing, one piece gray, black, and white, one piece blue and yellow, and one piece red and gold. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$1,940.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Faure Gnassingbé, President of the Republic of Togo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	34″ x 26″ framed black and white painting, comprised of abstract forms of faces and nature. Rec'd—8/8/2014. Est. Value—$550.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Joseph Kabila Kabange, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Book, title: *Goodluck Jonathan—Champion for Women.* Two framed and matted pencil drawings of President Obama, one as a Senator and one as President. 40″ x 14″ relief art, title: *Ijaw Fisherman* with bronze paint. Rec'd—8/8/2014. Est. Value—$630.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Goodluck Jonathan, President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	31″ x 31″ yellow and orange painting with a metal rod attached to top with spear heads on each end. 56″ Kora stringed instrument. Rec'd—8/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,380.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Alhaji Dr. Yahya A.J.J. Jammeh, President of the Republic of The Gambia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Ceremonial dagger decorated with detailed silver work and coral stones. Rec'd—8/21/2014. Est. Value—$885.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Abdelmalek Sellal, Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	19.5″ x 21″ photograph, title: *Waterway Weaves 2* printed on glass showing a map of the Republic of Estonia outlined in blue over a textured surface. Rec'd—9/2–3/2014. Est. Value—$885.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Toomas Hendrick Ilves, President of the Republic of Estonia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Limited-edition print, title: *Celtic Approach.* Cufflinks of the Celtic Manor Resort. 9″ x 14″ x 14″ basket of woven wood. Book, title: ''Collected Poems 1934–1953'' by Dylan Thomas. Package of sea salt. 8″ x 6″ fabric personal journal. Computer USB accessory. 88″ x 68″ blanket with red and black peony pattern. Four coasters, black with four gray symbols. Rec'd—9/5/2014. Est. Value—$736.31. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Olive green ceramic vase with a crisscross floral pattern and matching lid set on a varnished brown wooden stand. Rec'd—9/22/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Zhang Gaoli, Executive Vice Premier of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Octagonal box of polished silver featuring a floral pattern and the Emblem of Brunei Darussalam set on a pedestal under glass. Rec'd—9/25/2015 Est. Value—$1,400.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah ibni Al-Marhum Sultan Haji Omar Ali Saifuddien Sa'adul Khairi Waddien, Sultan and Yang Di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Porcelain vase with a blue and white floral pattern set on a dark brown wooden base. CD collection, title: *Elegant Sound of China*. Rec'd—10/7/2014. Est. Value—$565.58. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Wang Yi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Two 34″ x 34″ x 17″ half tables, painted black and gold, with images of pheasants in a natural setting. 49″ x 61″ framed painting in black, white, and gray of a mountain scene and small structures. Commemorative stamp set mounted on eight screen panels, wrapped in silk-floss sheets, and held in a dark wooden case. 83″ x 83″ x 150″ cloisonne pot themed ''Peace Across Four Seas,'' set on a wood base. Navy blue silk robe with fuchsia lining and floral embroidery inscribed with the APEC logo and includes pockets and a belt. Painting on a scroll depicting scenes of Beijing past and present set on a stand. Two tablet computers, each with case. Red and white cloisonne style fountain pen and signing pen. Black leather computer bag stamped with APEC logo. Teal and black silk jacket with simulated inner jacket and four buttons. Maroon and black silk jacket with simulated inner jacket and four buttons. Cream color silk Nehru shirt. Rec'd—11/7/2014. Est. Value—$8,105.96. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Xi Jinping, President of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Black velvet flip flop sandals. Infinity scarf with burgundy, gray, and white stripes. Infinity scarf with silver and light blue stripes. Two white dress shirts with pocket. Off-white tunic with long sleeves, pockets, and knotted straps in front. Black tunic with long sleeves, pockets, and knotted straps in front. Two-toned blue cashmere shawl with teal embroidery. Dress shirt in shades of purple silk. Teal dress shirt with fuchsia embroidery striping. Rec'd—11/8/2014. Est. Value—$2,168.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Government of the Republic of Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	30″ x 40″ painting on fiber board, facsimile of a mural in Myinkaba Kubyauk-gyi Temple. 29″ x 35″ framed painting of the head and shoulders of President Obama, wearing a suit and gazing upward. 12″ x 8″ model of a Burmese harp made of silver. Brown leatherette briefcase with zippered top, stamped ''Myanmar 2014.'' Book, title: *Bamar Snacks Volumes 1 and 2.* Booklet, title: *ASEAN Summit Leaders.* Book, title: *Friendly Myanmar.* 2014 calendar. Black ballpoint pen. Silver-tone keychain. Business card case. Notebook. Fountain pen with white gold and snowflake emblem. Rec'd—11/9/2014. Est. Value—$2,925.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency U Thein Sein, President of the Republic of Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	3″ x 6.5″ x 4.5″ silver box with hinged lid depicting a royal figure surrounded by five attendants. Rec'd—11/14/2014. Est. Value—$465.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Chair of the National League for Democracy and Chairperson of the Phithu Hluttaw Committee for Rule of Law and Tranquility of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	27″ x 30″ framed photograph of former Czech President Vaclav Havel. Rec'd—11/18/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Bohuslav Sobotka, Prime Minister of the Czech Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Silver bowl set on a wooden pedestal. White pashmina scarf with pink and purple flowers. Rec'd—11/19/2014. Est. Value—$495.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	General Raheel Sharif, Chief of Army Staff of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Three 4″ 5″ and 6″ in diameter nesting bowls of clear glass crystal shaped like a spinning top. Four 4″ height x 3″ in diameter rocks glasses shaped like a spinning top. 10″ x 10″ x 15″ cheese tray made of walnut. Book, title: *In Color,* by Ansel Adams. Book, title: *People You'd Like to Know.* Book, title: *Unlikely Heroes.* Automatic tea infuser in penguin shape with timer. Chess set of wooden board and pieces. Twelve scented votive candles. Botanic candle of Saffron de Bois. Scented oil diffuser. 24″ x 15″ x 10″ deep purple snakeskin design storage trunk with silver-tone fastener and handles. Rec'd—12/1/2014. Est. Value—$1,277.89. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah ibni Al-Marhum Sultan Haji Omar Ali Saifuddien Sa'adul Khairi Waddien, Sultan and Yang Di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	13″ wood box decorated with mosaic pattern of gray and beige tiles and gold-tone crown. Rec'd—12/4/2014. Est. Value—$490.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Framed, matted, and signed photographic portrait of Prince William. Rec'd—12/8/2014. Est. Value—$888.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince William, Duke of Cambridge.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Two 20″ x 15.5″ and 18″ x 30″ wooden trays coated with green and white resin in a floral pattern. Rec'd—12/22/2014. Est. Value—$1,205.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah ibni Al-Marhum Sultan Haji Omar Ali Saifuddien Sa'adul Khairi Waddien, Sultan and Yang Di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States.	Box of dates. Twelve bottles of wine. Rec'd—12/23/2014. Est. Value—$475.78. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Abdelaziz Bouteflika, President of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	6″ amber glass sculpture of a fish splashing out of water. Rec'd—10/6/2013. Est. Value—$590.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mr. Vincent Siew, Leader's Representative to APEC of Chinese Taipei (Taiwan).	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Gold pin in the shape of a bull's head with three eyes made of gemstones. 8′ black scarf with gold thread embroidery. Gold tie pin with rectangular sapphire gem. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$696.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Hery Rajaonarimapianina, President of the Republic of Madagascar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Two 14″ x 18″ paintings of a beach scene in vivid color. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$900.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	The Right Honorable Dr. Navinchandra Ramgoolam, GCSK, FRCP, Prime Minister of the Republic of Mauritius.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Two 10″ x 5″ x 3″ boxes of carved wood, one with red velvet lining, one with purple velvet lining. Various whole spices and oils. Black scarf with white and golden printed design. Framed painting of the islands of the Union of Comoros with individual cities and a wooden fish attached. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$475.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	His Excellency Ikililou Dhoinine, President of the Union of the Comoros.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Two chiwara (male and female) mounted on patterned black fabric background. Two black masks mounted on painting of tan and orange landscape and black fabric. Rec'd—8/9/2014. Est. Value—$515.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Ibrahim Boubacar Keïta, President of the Republic of Mali.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Wood statue of a man and woman dancing in jewel-ornamented formal wear. Wood statue with gold inlay and metal decoration. Rec'd—9/23/2014. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Ollanta Humala Tasso, President of the Republic of Peru.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	Digital recordings, titles: ''Visit of Reverend Martin Luther King to India,'' ''Visit of Mrs. Coretta Scott King to Accept Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding to Reverend Martin Luther King (Posthumously) for the Year 1966 in January, 1969,'' and ''The Spirit of Mahatma Gandhi.'' Pink-red tablecloth, fabric with flower designs. Sheer tan tablecloth fabric with gold thread embroidery border. Book, title: *Srimad Bhagavad Gita.* Special-edition book, title: *Bhagavad Gita According to Gandhi.* Golden fabric bag covered in floral white lace, closed by triangular flap with a gold and diamond pendant at the point. Short tan kurta with golden thread trim and concealed buttons. Tan vest with golden thread trim and concealed buttons. Tan pants with drawstring. 10″ x 12″ framed photograph of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. setting flowers at Mahatma Gandhi's Memorial at Rajghat in 1959. 24″ x 32″ framed Rogan Art painting, mostly red with green and golden detail, featuring a central spiral object. 24″ x 32″ framed Rogan Art painting; mostly green with golden detail, featuring a central object resembling a peacock. Purple dress with small gems and multi-colored embroidery of peacocks, flowers, and vines, sleeveless. Blue mid-length dress with sleeves with red and golden embroidery and gems in stripe and leaf pattern. Cream colored pashmina shawl with light orange and green stitching. Cream colored pashmina shawl with light gray stitching. Tan tunic with gray thread embroidery around the collar, sleeves, and bottom. Tan pants with drawstring. Rec'd—9/29/2014. Est. Value—$7,385.93. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, and Mrs. Michelle Obama.	6″ x 4″ x 5″ limited-edition sculpture with 3,000 pieces of amber lead crystal, title: ''Harmonious Beauty''. Rec'd—11/9/2014. Est. Value—$470.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mr. Vincent Siew, Leader's Representative to APEC of Chinese Taipei (Taiwan).	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Diamond and emerald jewelry set including necklace, earrings, ring, and bracelet. Rec'd—1/14/2014. Est. Value—$560,000.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Six-tier vase of multi-colored crystal. Rec'd—2/9/2014. Est. Value—$4,900.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Wine handled pursuant to United States Secret Service Policy.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Purple and orange silk shawl with embroidered clouds and waves. Purple and orange silk purse with embroidered clouds and waves. Set of audio and video recordings of Madame Peng Liyuan performing folk songs. Book, title *A Dream of Red Mansions,* by Sun Wen of the Qing Dynasty. Rec'd—3/21/2014. Est. Value—$1,287.99. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Peng Liyuan, First Lady of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Diamond and pearl jewelry set including necklace, earrings, ring, and bracelet. Rec'd—4/15/2014. Est. Value—$570,000.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Three-tier silver tiffin carrier with rubies. Silver colored wrap with green, orange, and blue detail. Rec'd—4/26/2014. Est. Value—$2,115.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Her Majesty Tuanku Sultanah Hajah Haminah binti Hamidun, Raja Permaisuri Agong of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Black silk dress with pink and white pattern. Gray-black dress with white and beige pattern and gemstones. Black kaftan with colorful sequins. Pink-red songket fabric. Rec'd—4/27/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Datin Seri Hajah Rosmah binti Mansor, First Lady of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Necklace made of silver with lapis beads. Book, title: *Chile*. Rec'd—6/29/2014. Est. Value—$478.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Her Excellency Michelle Bachelet, President of the Republic of Chile.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Embroidered black, red, pink, and tan bag with leather bottom. Rec'd—7/24/2014. Est. Value—$620.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Otto Pérez Molina, President of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Apple carved from light-colored wood. Brown, white, and gray scarf. Book, title: *Visions of Africa: KOTA*. Book, title: *A Vision for Gabon*. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$664.95. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Sylvia Bongo Ondimba, First Lady of the Gabonese Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	11″ bowl on pedestal made of recycled glass, decorated with heads of a rhino, elephant, hippo, and water buffalo with a 6″ pedestal in the shape of a hippo. Two customized glass mugs with silver jaguar-shaped handles. Clear glass and metal drink ware set consisting of 8.5″ ice bucket with jaguar heads applied over glass knob handles, six 9.25″ goblets, each featuring silver-tone head of an animal, and set of six bottle stoppers of blown glass in the shape of an animal. Small silver round jewelry box with golden seal of the Kingdom of Swaziland on lid. Rec'd—8/6/2014. Est. Value—$2,761.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Mswati III, King of the Kingdom of Swaziland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Cream color fabric table linen set including 24 napkins with embroidery of plants and animals and two tablecloths with embroidery matching the napkins. Beige rug with black and red pattern. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$980.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Blaise Compaoré, President of Burkina Faso.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Kente cloth, two pieces woven with multi-colored pattern. Book, title: *The Humanitarian, The Philanthropist*. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$540.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Lordina Mahama, First Lady of the Republic of Ghana.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Dining linen set including eight napkins and one tablecloth, white with patterns of leaves or flowers and gray and golden stitching. Rec'd—8/7/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Marième Faye Sall, First Lady of the Republic of Senegal.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Gold pin in the shape of a flower. Woven rug with black and tan pattern. Rec'd—8/9/2014. Est. Value—$605.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Keïta Aminata Maïga, First Lady of the Republic of Mali.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	35″ x 35″ mostly red and black painting with a metal rod attached to the top with spear heads on each end. 56″ Kora stringed instrument. Rec'd—8/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,830.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Alhaji Dr. Yahya A.J.J. Jammeh, President of the Republic of The Gambia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Jewelry set made of gold with emeralds and diamonds including a bracelet, ring, and two earrings. Rec'd—9/25/2014. Est. Value—$27,300.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Her Majesty Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Hajah Saleha of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	Gilded copper Tombak urn with an etched floral pattern. Rec'd—9/30/2014. Est. Value—$504.20. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Emine Erdoğan, First Lady of the Republic of Turkey.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	5″ x 4.5″ gold filigree handbag lined with white cloth. Gold brooch in the shape of rose petals and leaves. 13.5″ x 13.5″ white silk cloth embroidered with one golden rose and other golden flowers. Purple and tan shawl embroidered with botanical designs from the Qing Dynasty. 12″ x 11″ serving tray on four legs with two handles made of mostly gold with silver adornment on top resting on a flat, oval wooden serving tray on four short legs. Brown and tan leather briefcase with APEC logo lined with purple satin and closed by two gold-tone clasps. Scroll of tan cloth with corresponding Chinese and English script. Rec'd—11/11/2014. Est. Value—$5,420.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Peng Liyuan, First Lady of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Michelle Obama, First Lady of the United States.	13mm in diameter champagne pearl mounted to six-petal rosette backing with gold leaves and diamonds surrounding a pink stone. 13.8mm in diameter white pearl mounted to silver-tone parachute pendant with diamonds. Silver purse in coffer shape with curved handle. Rec'd—11/13/2013. Est. Value—$26,220.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency U Thein Sein, President of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
First Family	22″ x 10″ sculpture carved in pink Qingtian stone of 16 galloping horses set on dark wooden base. 6″ x 10″ x 10″ jewelry box made of rosewood with phoenix and peony design. Rec'd—3/21/2014. Est. Value—$3,225.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Peng Liyuan, First Lady of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
First Family	10″ model palm tree made of silver and gold set on a green marble base. Kalakas Agarwood with diffuser. Two bottles of perfume named for the King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Four bottles of perfume. Black and red robe with white trim and intricate beading along the neckline and down the front. Brown and blue paisley robe, with satin purple lining and tassels. Pink-purple sleeveless satin blouse. Pink-purple satin pants. Dark gray sleeveless robe. Robe of sheer white fabric with a beaded flower pattern and pink-purple trim. Orange sheer fabric floor-length cape. Blue fabric Muumuu with multi-colored detail. Pink-purple Muumuu and golden sheer fabric. Purple fabric cape with dot and floral pattern. Gray fabric cape with red lining and green, red, and silver detail. Dark blue velvet floor-length gown. Red and blue velvet robe with red and white beaded tassels. Cream and golden fabric robe. Taupe fabric robe with golden clusters. Crimson and golden fabric robe. Four storage boxes, two decorated with red and golden foil undercut Lucite and two decorated with green and golden foil undercut Lucite. Rec'd—11/19/2014. Est. Value—$39,915.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration. Perfume handled pursuant to the United States Secret Service policy.	His Royal Highness Prince Miteb bin Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of the National Guard of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
First Family Children	Diamond and emerald jewelry set including earrings, necklace, ring, brooch, and wristwatch. Diamond and ruby jewelry set including earrings, necklace, ring, brooch, and wristwatch. Rec'd—1/14/2014. Est. Value—$80,000.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
First Family Children	Four clothing sets of knit gloves, felted hat, and scarf in dark gray, light gray, purple, and magenta. Rec'd—6/19/2014. Est. Value—$801.36. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	The Right Honorable John Key, MP, Prime Minister of New Zealand.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Jane Rhee.	12″ Khanjar knife and sheath with detailed silverwork. Metal plate engraved with the image of the Sultan Qaboos Grand Mosque. Rec'd—3/1/2013. Est. Value—$1,400.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Mr. Salem al-Ismaily, Special Envoy for the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Puneet Talwar.	Two 14″ and 12″ Khanjar knives with sheath and detailed silver work. Metal plate engraved with the image of the Muscat gate, Oman, and the Coastal Road. Rec'd—3/3/2013. Est. Value—$960.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Mr. Salem al-Ismaily, Special Envoy for the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Puneet Talwar.	14″ Khanjar knife, sheath, and belt with detailed silver work. Framed photograph of President Obama in the Oval Office. Wood chess and backgammon board in a leather case. Silver bracelet with green stone. Rec'd—3/3/2013. Est. Value—$7,890.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Qaboos bin Said al Said, Sultan of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Caroline Atkinson.	Two-piece rolling computer case business set. Leather tablet computer case with pen and notepad. Crystal icon of Sydney's Opera House containing an ingot cut from the outer wall of the opera house. Rec'd—12/12/2013. Est. Value—$753.16. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Dr. Heather Smith, PSM, Deputy Secretary and G20 Sherpa, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet of Australia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Colin Willett.	Necklace of cultured pearls with silver clasp. Rec'd—12/19/2013. Est. Value—$1,600.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Nguyen Quoc Cuong, Ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Prem Kumar.	Silver wristwatch with leather band. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$19,628.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	Fountain pen, green with gold floral accents, includes ink cartridge. Rec'd—2/7/2014. Est. Value—$1,614.40. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Fumio Kishida, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Caroline Coscia.	Black and silver wristwatch with leather band. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$1,900.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	White gold wristwatch with link bracelet. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$5,370.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Rob Malley.	White gold wristwatch with link bracelet. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$8,170.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Philip Gordon.	White gold wristwatch with link bracelet. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$8,170.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Ben Rhodes.	White gold wristwatch with link bracelet. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$8,170.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Lisa Monaco.	Gold medal display, title: ''The Golden Medal of the 50th Anniversary of 26 September and 14 October.'' Ceremonial Jambiyyah dagger. Silver jewelry set including a necklace, bracelet, and earrings. Rec'd—3/30/2014. Est. Value—$1,075.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi, President of the Republic of Yemen.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Gayle Smith.	77″ x 50″ blue silk Persian carpet with light-colored flowers. Model ship of gold-tone metal. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$5,125.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	41″ x 29″ framed painting of African savannah scene featuring elephants, zebras, water buffalo, a watering hole, trees, and a mountain range in the background. Rec'd—8/9/2014. Est. Value—$800.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	The Honorable Amina Mohamed, Cabinet Secretary for Foreign Affairs and International Trade of the Republic of Kenya.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	Red ceramic vase with floral pattern set on wooden base. Rec'd—9/7/2014. Est. Value—$480.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Yang Jiechi, State Councilor of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	Black vinyl briefcase with zippered pockets. 2014 calendar for ASEAN Summit. Silver-tone ballpoint pen. Black ballpoint pen with Myanmar emblem. Business card case. Black keychain. USB thumb drive. Notebook with tan leather case. Rec'd—11/11/2014. Est. Value—$496.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency U Thein Sein, President of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Executive Office of the President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
White House Staff Member Lisa Monaco.	12″ polished silver shallow bowl with images of Saudi Arabia around a wide brim and a seal of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the center. Rec'd—12/10/2014. Est. Value—$3,780.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Highness Muhammed bin Nayef bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of Interior of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	Cream color wool and silk scarf checkered with blue, red, brown, and golden floral designs. Rec'd—12/11/2014. Est. Value—$395.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Paolo Gentiloni, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Italian Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
White House Staff Member Dr. Susan Rice.	Figurine painted in silver and gold of a soldier on horseback aiming a rifle set on green marble base. Rec'd—12/22/2014. Est. Value—$970.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Adel Al-Jubeir, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Office of the Vice President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Bottle of Massandra White Port Crimea 1945 Harvest wine. Rec'd—7/21/2009 Est. Value—$445.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to United States Secret Service policy.	His Excellency Viktor Yushchenko, President of Ukraine.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Baccarat American eagle crystal statue. Rec'd—2/4/2013. Est. Value—$1,415.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Silver canister inlaid with tile mosaic of a tree, said to contain holy water from the River Jordan, in custom box. Rec'd—9/19/2013. Est. Value—$1,950.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Large porcelain vase with painting of birds and grass. Rec'd—12/4/2013. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Xi Jinping, President of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Icon depicting Jesus Christ the Pantocrator on wood. Rec'd—2/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,800.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Office of the Vice President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Plaque with United States eagle emblem. Rec'd—2/25/2014. Est. Value—$550.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Irakli Garibashvili, Prime Minister of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Silver idol of the Virgin of Guadalupe. Rec'd—2/26/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mr. Miguel Alemán Velasco, Former Governor of the Free and Sovereign State of Veracruz de Ignacio de la Llave of Mexico and President of the Board of Grupo Alemán.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Sterling silver vase. Rec'd—3/11/2014. Est. Value—$780.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Ollanta Humala Tasso, President of the Republic of Peru.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Metal platter inset with amber stones. Rec'd—3/18/2014. Est. Value—$390.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Donald Tusk, Prime Minister of the Republic of Poland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Traditional Roman Orthodox icon painting. Rec'd—5/21/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Traian Băsescu and Mrs. Maria Băsescu, President and First Lady of Romania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Traditional Romanian glaze vase in red box. Rec'd—5/21/2014. Est. Value—$780.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Victor Ponta, Prime Minister of Romania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Sterling silver inkstand. Rec'd—5/22/2014. Est. Value—$1,275.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	The Honorable Derviş Eroğlu, Leader of the Turkish Cypriots.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Hand-painted dishware set. Rec'd—6/16/2014. Est. Value—$390.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Juan Manuel Santos Calderón, President of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Painting by Canindé Soares. Rec'd—6/16/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Dr. Rosalba Scotia Ciarlini Rosado, Governor of the State of Rio Grande do Norte of the Federal Republic of Brazil.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Silver-plated wooden box with the King's insignia etched on the lid. Rec'd—7/10/2014. Est. Value—$480.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Oil painting on canvas of exotic bird. Rec'd—7/24/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Otto Pérez Molina, President of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Knife with coral stones in leather box. Rec'd—8/21/2014. Est. Value—$880.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Abdelmalek Sellal, Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Sandalwood carved screen with paintings. Rec'd—9/29/2014. Est. Value—$780.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Office of the Vice President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Mounier & Bouvard blue and white vase with gold trim decorated with gem stones. Rec'd—11/19/2014. Est. Value—$1,200.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Majesty Mohammed VI, King of the Kingdom of Morocco.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Woven tapestry. Leather embossed book, title: *The Haydamarks* by Taras Shevchenko with gold detailing and an etching of the author. Rec'd—11/21/2014. Est. Value—$840.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Wooden religious wall hanging. Hand-embroidered scarf. Two copies of book, title: *Ukraine Incognita*. Rec'd—11/21/2014. Est. Value—$555.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Ms. Hanna Hopko, Member of Parliament of Ukraine.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Hand-painted porcelain vase. Dark green glass carafe with gold painted design around spout. Rec'd—11/22/2014. Est. Value—$2,160.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, President of the Republic of Turkey.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	Signed photo of His Royal Highness The Duke of Cambridge in Ettinger leather frame. Rec'd—12/8/2014. Est. Value—$888.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince William, Duke of Cambridge.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Jill Biden, Second Lady of the United States.	Painting of Zambian street scene in wooden frame. Rec'd—7/2/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—On display for official use.	Dr. Charlotte Scott, Second Lady of the Republic of Zambia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Jill Biden, Second Lady of the United States.	Carved ebony female bust. Rec'd—7/4/2014. Est. Value—$560.00. Disposition—On display for official use.	Her Excellency Jaynet Kabila, Member of Parliament of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Jill Biden, Second Lady of the United States.	Brass statue of human figure. Rec'd—7/4/2014. Est. Value—$490.00. Disposition—On display for official use.	Her Excellency Geneviève Inagosi Bulo Imbambi Kassongo, Minister of Gender, Family, and Children of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Jill Biden, Second Lady of the United States.	Book, title: *Visions of Africa.* Hermes scarf. Rec'd—8/4/2014. Est. Value—$375.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Sylvia Bongo Ondimba, First Lady of the Gabonese Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Jill Biden, Second Lady of the United States.	Hand-painted porcelain tea set. Rec'd—11/22/2014. Est. Value—$760.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mrs. Emine Erdoğan, First Lady of the Republic of Turkey.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Family of The Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States.	White porcelain vase with panda motif. Rec'd—12/4/2013. Est. Value—$485.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	His Excellency Xi Jinping, President of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: THE WHITE HOUSE—OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the White House—Office of the Vice President]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Jacob Sullivan, Deputy Assistant to the President and National Security Advisor to the Vice President of the United States.	Wooden backgammon and hess board with inlays of abalone, mother of pearl, and brass. Two bottles of Amouage cologne. Silver sword with silver and gold trim. Rec'd—2/28/2013. Est. Value—$1,705.00. Disposition—National Archives and Records Administration.	Mr. Salem al-Ismaily, Special Envoy of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Palm tree statue encrusted with various gemstones. Rolex men's Yacht Master II watch. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$36,900.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Blue glass worry beads with diamonds and a gold tassel in a blue presentation box. Rec'd—1/9/2014. Est. Value—$3,200.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Adel Al-Jubeir, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Haddad cutlery set. Rec'd—1/23/2014. Est. Value—$390.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Najib Mikati, Caretaker Prime Minister of the Lebanese Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Montblanc calligraphy pen with "Minister of Foreign Affairs" inscription. Rec'd—2/1/2014. Est. Value—$620.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Sailor pen with gold inlay and floral design. Rec'd—2/7/2014. Est. Value—$620.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Fumio Kishida, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Baccarat crystal eagle perched on a rock. Rec'd—2/9/2014. Est. Value—$2,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Amber and blue colored glass sculpture of Pegasus. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$570.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Wang Yi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Ziess black binoculars. Rec'd—2/27/2014. Est. Value—$825.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeir, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Rolex Oyster Perpetual men's silver watch with black face. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$5,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Historical Treaty of Peace Day of Algier in Arabic. Three framed ceramic tiles. Green leather document folio with gold detailing. Framed graphite portrait of Secretary Kerry by local artist. Book, title: *Le Tassili Des Ajjer*. Rec'd—4/3/2014. Est. Value—$785.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Ramtane Lamamra, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Limited-edition Piri Reis pen with sterling silver piston filling. Rec'd—4/4/2014. Est. Value—$3,880.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Mohammed VI, King of Morocco.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Metal double gourd musical instrument on a brass stand in a leather box embossed with the royal seal. Rec'd—4/4/2014. Est. Value—$420.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Salaheddine Mezouar, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of the Kingdom of Morocco.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Gold scallop shell with a Qatari pearl inside a red leather presentation case. Rec'd—4/14/2014. Est. Value—$445.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Khalid Bin Mohammed Al-Attiyah, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Small Asfour Crystal gold statue of an ancient Egyptian fishing from a crystal boat. Rec'd—4/23/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohamed El-Tohamy, Director of Egyptian General Intelligence Services.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	24″ traditional carved ebony sculpture of a man carrying fruit over his head. Rec'd—5/5/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency José Eduardo dos Santos, President of the Republic of Angola.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	11″ x 8″ x 2″ large quasi-triangular amethyst geode. Book, title: *Torres-Garcia* by Mario H. Gradowczyk. Rec'd—5/12/2014. Est. Value—$390.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency José Mujica Cordano, President of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Personalized navy sailing Nautica jacket with the Mexican flag on the back. Sabido and Basteris Mexican flag sterling silver cufflinks. Esperato Selection tequila with two glasses. Rec'd—5/21/2014. Est. Value—$578.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency José Antonio Mead Kuribeña, Secretary of Foreign Relations of Mexico.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Large gold and silver desert scene with palm trees and a camel caravan. Rec'd—6/27/2014. Est. Value—$34,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Gold-plated copper replica of the Horus collar inlaid with semi-precious stones. Rec'd—7/11/2014. Est. Value—$2,300.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Professor Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim Ali Sayed, Minister of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Framed shadowbox of a traditional flywhisk, hat, staff, and stool crafted in leather. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Daniel Kablan Duncan, Prime Minister of the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Framed acrylic painting on canvas depicting four children. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$560.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Robert Dussey, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Togo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	8″ lapis lazuli bowl. Rec'd—8/8/2014. Est. Value—$385.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamid Karzai, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Traditional dagger with ornate silver-tone handle and coral stones and a silver-tone filigree sheath. Rec'd—8/21/2014. Est. Value—$410.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Abdelmalek Sellal, Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Gold Cartier men's watch with white face and black Roman numerals. Rec'd—9/11/2014. Est. Value—$17,400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosque, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Tea set in a wooden box with four boxes of tea. Framed woodcut painting of three elephants with personalized plaque. Rec'd—9/26/2014. Est. Value—$411.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mahinda Rajapaksa, President of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	12.5″ white porcelain vase, title: *Prosperity Coming with Blooming Flowers.* Double-sided embroidery table screen depicting an orchid. Rec'd—10/17/2014. Est. Value—$560.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Yang Jiechi, State Councilor of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	12.5″ x 12″ hand-made sterling silver Omani ship on a wooden stand. Rec'd—11/16/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Yousuf bin Alawi bin Abdallah, Minister Responsible for Foreign Affairs of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Lacquerware art. Rec'd—11/19/2014. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency U Thein Sein, President of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Personalized honorary storage cubby at Cricova Winery. Rec'd—12/4/2014. Est. Value—$621.55. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Valentin Bodiul, Director of Cricova Winery of the Republic of Moldova.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Warrior chess set. Rec'd—12/10/2014. Est. Value—$520.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Kairat Umarov, Ambassador of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Silver handicraft with inscription, "Jose Manuel Santos—Presidente de Colombia: 2014–2018". Rec'd—12/11/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—Pending tansfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Juan Manuel Santos Calderón, President of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Set of four scarves made of Andean fiber in a wooden box. Rec'd—12/11/2014. Est. Value—$1,100.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Ollanta Humala Tasso and Mrs. Nadine Heredia Alarcón, President and First Lady of the Republic of Peru.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Yvan Valentin Artisan Chocolatier truffles. Fanciful chocolates. Seabear smoked oysters. Beachers hand-made cheese. John Kelly truffle fudge bites. Royalty cookies. Champagne Bollinger RD 2012. Shafer 2012 Nappa merlot. Grace & I fruit nut press. Harney & Son black tea. Sicilian Village green and black olives. Sempli Cup-A-Lift flight tray. Sempli monti-flute glasses. Sempli nesting bowl. Brown and mother of pearl rectangular tray. Roma Living picture frame. Twelve Days of Christmas votive candle set. Rec'd—12/18/2014. Est. Value—$957.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration. Perishable items handled pursuant to the guidelines set forth by General Services Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah ibni Al-Marhum Sultan Haji Omar Ali Saifuddien Sa'adul Khairi Waddien, Sultan and Yang Di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John Kerry, Secretary of State of the United States.	Silver and gold-plated statue depicting a falcon sitting on a gloved hand. Rec'd—12/23/2014. Est. Value—$1,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Adel Al-Jubeir, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Teresa Heinz Kerry, Spouse of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Emerald and diamond jewelry set containing a ring, earrings, bracelet, and necklace. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$780,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Teresa Heinz Kerry, Spouse of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Pearl worry beads with diamonds and a tassel in a pink presentation box. Rec'd—1/9/2014. Est. Value—$3,200.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Abel Al-Jubeir, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Teresa Heinz Kerry, Spouse of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Baccarat crystal votive lamp. Rec'd—2/11/2014. Est. Value—$925.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency François Hollande, President of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Teresa Heinz Kerry, Spouse of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Sapphire and diamond 18k white gold jewelry set containing earrings and a ring. Rec'd—6/27/2014. Est. Value—$84,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Teresa Heinz Kerry, Spouse of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Bvlgari ladies' watch with a black satin band and a mother of pearl face. Rec'd—9/11/2014. Est. Value—$71,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Alex Kerry, Daughter of the Secretary of State of the United States.	Adult orange and blue kaftan. Children's pink and silver kaftan. Rec'd—5/13/2014. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Highness Sheikh Abdullah bin Zayed Al Nahyan and Sheikha Alyazia bint Saif Al Nahyan, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Spouse of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Maureen Reagan, Head of Delegation of the United States to the Republic of Kenya.	Elephant tusk gong. Rec'd—7/1/1985 Est. Value—$9,700.00. Disposition—Transferred to the Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service for proper handling.	His Excellency Daniel Arap Moi, President of the Republic of Kenya.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable David Dunford, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	Framed 18k gold military-style medals. Rec'd—6/21/1995 Est. Value—$8,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Qaboos bin Said bin al Said, Sultan of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Frances D. Cook, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	Gold and silver *Sultanah* commemorative coins. Rec'd—1/1/1997 Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Qaboos bin Said bin al Said, Sultan of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John B. Craig, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	Framed military-style medals on a yellow background. Rec'd—9/26/2001 Est. Value—$8,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Qaboos bin Said bin al Said, Sultan of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Farid Abbas Mohamed, Political Officer.	Olive green fur coat. Rec'd—2/18/2012 Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Hamden bin Mohamed al-Motery, Deputy President of the Administrative Council of the Arab Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable James B. Smith, Ambassador of the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Crystal Saudi Arabian door with gold filigree and a verse from the Qur'an. Rec'd—2012 Est. Value—$430.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable James B. Smith, Ambassador of the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Two traditional Saudi Arabian winter robes. Rec'd—2012 Est. Value—$740.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Stephanie T. Williams, Deputy Chief of Mission.	Pearl earrings. Rec'd—1/16/2013. Est. Value—$1,000.00. Disposition—Purchased by the recipient from General Services Administration.	His Excellency Sheikh Rashid bin Abdullah Al Khalifa, Minister of Interior of the Kingdom of Bahrain.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. James Plasman, Political Officer.	Montblanc Timewalker GMT desk clock. Rec'd—6/20/2013. Est. Value—$930.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Krishna Mohan, Member of the Congress Party of the Republic of India.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Richard Morningstar, Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Carpet. Rec'd—10/4/2013. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Purchased by recipient from General Services Administration.	His Excellency Ziya Mammadov, Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Timothy A. Lenderking, Charge d'Affaires.	Bvlgari Diagono professional watch. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$3,800.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Michael Spring, Deputy Political Counselor.	Bvlgari men's watch. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$4,450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Reem Nuseibeh, Interpreter ...	Bvlgari ladies' automatic watch. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$1,995.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Jonathan Finer, Deputy Chief of Staff to the Secretary of State.	Bvlgari men's watch. Rec'd—1/5/2014. Est. Value—$19,440.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
United States Embassy	Six bottles of 2009 Château Haut Brion wine. Rec'd—1/7/2014. Est. Value—$3,600.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to the guidelines set forth by General Services Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince Robert Louis François Marie of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable William J. Burns, Deputy Secretary of State.	33″ x 12″ wooden filigree wall shelf with inlay. Rec'd—1/29/2014. Est. Value—$740.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Foreign Government Official	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable David Hale, Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Lebanon.	Two Hermès ties. Rec'd—2/11/2014. Est. Value—$535.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Najib Mikati, Caretaker Prime Minister of the Republic of Lebanon.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Mark Walsh, Deputy Chief of Protocol.	Black Traser men's watch with compass on band. Rec'd—2/14/2014. Est. Value—$510.00. Disposition—Purchased by recipient from General Services Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Samantha Tubman, Assistant Chief of Protocol.	Longines ladies' silver-tone watch. Rec'd—2/18/2014. Est. Value—$1,200.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State.	Paperweight etched with St. Basil's Cathedral. Two large G–8 Summit notebooks. Two small G–8 Summit notebooks. Keychain. Two pens. Red planner. Brown leather briefcase. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$435.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Sergey Ryabkov, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Trina Seha, Department of State Employee.	Glass paperweight. Three G–8 Summit notebooks. Lanyard. Red leather planner. Black leather briefcase. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$735.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Sergey Ryabkov, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Penny Price, Senior Protocol Officer.	Purse. Rec'd—2/24/2014. Est. Value—$1,125.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Zhang Kunsheng, Director General of the Protocol Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Deborah K. Jones, Ambassador of the United States to the State of Libya.	Gold necklace and earring set with white stones. Rec'd—3/11/2014. Est. Value—$3,200.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Highness Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al Nahyan, President of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Russell D. Feingold, Special Envoy for the Great Lakes and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Green stone elephant sculpture. Collector's box containing various stones. Rec'd—3/21/2014. Est. Value—$910.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	The Honorable Moise Katumbi, Governor of the Province of Katanga of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Nina Behrens, Interpreter	Rolex Oyster Perpetual ladies' silver watch with silver face. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$5,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Natalie Jones, Deputy Chief of Protocol.	Rolex Oyster Perpetual ladies' silver watch with black face. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$6,900.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. John Rath, Political Counselor	Hamilton men's rose gold watch with brown leather band and silver face. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$645.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Joseph Westphal, Ambassador of the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Rolex men's steel watch with white gold fluted bezel. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$9,050.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Timothy Lederking, Deputy Chief of Mission.	Rolex men's steel watch with white gold fluted bezel. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$9,050.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. David Solomon, Protocol Officer.	Hamilton men's watch with a silver face, bronze accents, and a black leather band. Rec'd—3/28/2014. Est. Value—$1,495.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Thomas Kelly, Acting Assistant Secretary of State.	Traditional sword with belt. Rec'd—3/31/2014. Est. Value—$580.00. Disposition—Purchased by recipient from General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohammed Nasser Ahmed, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Yemen.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Chantal Schmonsees, Protocol Assistant.	White Samsung Galaxy Note 3. Rec'd—4/1/2014. Est. Value—$490.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince Sattam Al-Saud of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable William J. Burns, Deputy Secretary of State.	Traditions monogrammed leather briefcase. Rec'd—4/9/2014. Est. Value—$535.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohammad Ishaq Dar, Minister of Finance of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. David Gilmour, Deputy Asssistant Secretary of State.	Gold coin. Rec'd—4/21/2014. Est. Value—$4,800.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Paul Biya, President of the Republic of Cameroon.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Carl Gray, Protocol Officer	Victorinox men's silver watch with a black face and a black leather band. Rec'd—5/1/2014. Est. Value—$816.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, Kng of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Rachel Smith-Levy, Desk Officer.	Chanel gold brooch. Rec'd—5/12/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending Transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohammed Kuwari, Ambassador of the State of Qatar to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable James H. Thessin, Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Paraguay.	Acoustic guitar. Rec'd—5/25/2014. Est. Value—$1,000.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	The Honorable Blas Lanzoni, Governor of the Central Department of the Republic of Paraguay.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Richard B. Norland, Ambassador of the United States to Georgia.	Sarajishvili 20th century brandy. Two boxes of regular brandy. Rec'd—5/30/2014. Est. Value—$1,512.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to the guidelines set forth by General Services Administration.	Mr. Giorgi Atashvili, Deputy Chairman of the Mtskheta Municipal Council of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Tony Franco, Protocol Officer	Victorinox men's watch with leather band. Rec'd—6/5/2014. Est. Value—$383.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Embassy of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Tony Franco, Protocol Officer	Light blue Hermès tie. Rec'd—6/5/2014. Est. Value—$455.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Ziad Soubra, Protocol Director at the Embassy of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Greta C. Holtz, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	100ml bottle of Amouage Dea ladies' eau de parfum spray. 100ml bottle of Amouage Ciel ladies' eau de parfum spray. Rec'd—6/18/2014. Est. Value—$528.99. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Juma Darwish Al Bulushi, Honorary Counsel at the Consulate of the Republic of Croatia to the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Greta C. Holtz, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	100ml bottle of Amouage Gold Pour Homme. Pair of Khanjar silver cufflinks. Khanjar brooch made of yellow gold, diamonds, rubies, and emeralds. Rec'd—6/24/2014. Est. Value—$1,939.02. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency General Sultan al-Numani, Minister of the Royal Office of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Laurel Rapp, Desk Officer	Mors et Gourmettes Hermès scarf. Rec'd—6/27/2014. Est. Value—$435.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Sheikh Abdullah bin Mohammed bin Rashid Al Khalifa, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Bridget Brink, Deputy Chief of Mission.	Photo art. Rec'd—7/2/2014. Est. Value—$428.77. Disposition—Retained for official use.	Her Excellency Tea Tsulukiani, Minister of Justice of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Erin Kotheimer, Senior Economic Officer.	Belle gold bracelet. Rec'd—7/6/2014. Est. Value—$3,900.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Mustafa R. Ahmed Zengene, Kirkuk Branch Manager of the Oil Product and Distribution Company of the Republic of Iraq.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Tony Franco, Protocol Officer	$1,500 United States dollars. Rec'd—8/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Delivered to the Department of State Cashier's Office to be deposited to the Department of Treasury.	Embassy of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Christine Ferdinand, Wife of The Honorable Russell Feingold, Special Envoy for the Great Lakes and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.	Dark gold beaded necklace. Gold beaded necklace. Black and gold beaded necklace. Yellow beaded necklace. Purple glass beaded necklace. Multi-colored woven necklace wih four ring pendants. Purple glass beaded bracelet. Black and gold fabric-woven bracelet. Blue, turquoise lime, and dark green woven bracelet. Two multicolored weave bracelets. Red and gold fabric-woven earrings. Blue multicolored fabric woven earrings. Two linen tablecloths with matching napkins. Rec'd—8/16/2014. Est. Value—$1,160.00. Disposition—Earring sets purchased by recipient. All other items pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Ms. Ange Kagame, Daugther of President Paul Kagame of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Joseph Semrad, Protocol Assistant.	Montblanc Meisterstuck pen. Rec'd—8/21/2014. Est. Value—$480.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Mohammed Al-Attiyah, Embassy of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Chad Kreikemeier, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.	Gift set that includes a men's watch, ladies' watch, JBR pen, Pierre Cardin pen, set of cufflinks, and a Pierre Cardin keychain. Rec'd—9/10/2014. Est. Value—$610.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable J. Rufus Gifford, Ambassador of the United States of the Kingdom of Denmark.	PP Moisler chair. Rec'd—8/25/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	Municipality of Tønder of the Kingdom of Denmark.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary of the State.	3″ commemorative gold coin. Framed bronze art depicting a mother and child. Rec'd—9/6/2014. Est. Value—$15,245.00. Disposition—Coin pending transfer to General Services Administration. Artwork retained for official use.	His Excellency Paul Biya, President of the Republic of Cameroon.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Charles Rivkin, Assistant Secretary of State.	White box containing perfume and incense wood chips. Red box containing perfume and incense wood chips. Rec'd—9/2014. Est. Value—$900.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Khaled Al Sayed, CEO of Qatari Diar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Anne Patterson, Assistant Secretary of State.	Two bottles of Amouage Journey eau de parfum for ladies and men. Rec'd—10/1/2014. Est. Value—$665.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. al-Ismaili, Chairman of the Public Authority for Investment, Promotion, and Export Development of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Sangeeta Shields, Wife of The Honorable Daniel L. Shields III, Ambassador of the United States to Brunei Darussalam.	Prada handbag. Rec'd—10/7/2014. Est. Value—$2,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Her Majesty Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Hajah Saleha of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary of State.	Wooden carving of a fertility goddess. Tie-dye tablecloth and twelve napkins. Two sets of shirts and pants and a wrap dress made of blue embroidered fabrics. Rec'd—10/10/2014. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—Pending tranfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Alpha Condé, President of the Republic of Guinea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Deborah K. Jones, Ambassador of the United States to Libya.	Concord men's and ladies' silver watches with white faces and gold roman numerals. Rec'd—11/14/2014. Est. Value—$4,930.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of State]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Ms. Elizabeth Litchfield, Staff Assistant.	Box set including black and gold cufflinks, a JBR pen, a Pierre Cardin keychain, a Pierre Cardin pen, a JBR men's black and gold watch, and JBR ladies' black, gold, and silver watch. Rec'd—11/14/2014. Est. Value—$1,755.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Daniel Shields III, Ambassador of the United States to Brunei Darussalam.	Chopard watch. Framed photo of the Sultan of Brunei Darussalam. Rec'd—12/2/2014. Est. Value—$6,670.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Majesty Sultan Haji Hassanal Bolkiah Mu'izzaddin Waddaulah ibni Al-Marhum Sultan Haj Omar Ali Saifuddien Sa'adul Khairi Waddien, Sultan and Yang Di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Sangeeta Shields, Wife of The Honorable Daniel L. Shields III, Ambassador of the United States to Brunei Darussalam.	Dior ladies' jeweled watch. Ornament with rose quartz. Rec'd—12/2/2014. Est. Value—$8,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Her Majesty Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Hajah Saleha of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Sangeeta Shields, Wife of The Honorable Daniel L. Shields III, Ambassador of the United States to Brunei Darussalam.	Sari purple and gold material. Heart shaped pendant. Floral brooch. Rec'd—12/4/2014. Est. Value—$13,225.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Her Majesty Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Hajah Saleha of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Nisha Biswal, Assistant Secretary of State.	Robe. Gold-plated serving set. Rec'd—12/9/2014. Est. Value—$1,150.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Islam Karimov, President of the Republic of Uzbekistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Daniel L. Shields III, Ambassador of the United States to Brunei Darussalam.	Mahkota Crystal hand-blown glass vase. Rec'd—12/16/2014. Est. Value—$1,125.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Her Royal Highness Princess Masna, Ambassador-at-Large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Brunei Darussalam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State.	Purple Gucci scarf with horse bridle bit pattern. Rec'd—12/22/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Embassy of the State of Qatar	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Greta C. Holtz, Ambassador of the United States to the Sultanate of Oman.	Tag Heuer ladies' watch. Aigner ladies' watch. Rec'd—12/29/2014. Est. Value—$2,524.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Sayyid Badr bin Saud bin Harib Al Busaidi, Minister Responsible for Defense Affairs of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Julissa Reynoso, Ambassador of the United States to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.	Framed painting in greens and blues depicting boats on a shoreline. Rec'd—12/2014. Est. Value—$430.00. Disposition—Pending purchase from General Services Administration.	His Excellency Luis Almagro, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Robert O. Blake, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State.	Rado Swiss men's watch. Rec'd—Unknown Est. Value—$1,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Foreign Government Official	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Duane C. Butcher, Chargé d'Affaires.	TRAVEL: Paid expenses to travel with the Minister of Defense to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Rec'd—6/28/2014. Est. Value—$1,780.00.	His Excellency Mircea Duşa, Minister of Defense of Romania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

[Report of Travel Furnished by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Peter J. Messitte, U.S. District Court Judge, District of Maryland.	TRAVEL: Airfare, ground transportation, and hotel expenses for two days. Rec'd—4/2014. Est. Value—$1,000.00.	Consulate General of the Federative Republic of Brazil.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Richard Linn, Judge for the United State Circuit Courts.	TRAVEL: Two airfare tickets, hotel accomodations at the Grand Hotel in St. Petersburg, Russia for five nights, two waived registration fees for the St. Petersburg International Legal Forum. Rec'd—6/18–20/2014. Est. Value—$19,004.58.	Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Peter J. Messitte, U.S. District Court Judge, District of Maryland.	TRAVEL: Airfare, ground transportation, hotel, and miscellaneous expenses. Rec'd—9/2014. Est. Value—$3.540.00.	Federal Judiciary of the Federative Republic of Brazil.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Bruce McGiverin, U.S. Magistrate Judge, District of Puerto Rico.	TRAVEL: English-language teaching assistant stipend for 22-year old son of recipient. Rec'd—10–11/2014. Est. Value—$2,510.00.	Ministry of Education, Higher Education and Research of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Ernie Dubester, Spouse of Ms. Karen Kreme, Office of Legislative Affairs.	TRAVEL: Airfare, transportation, meals, hotels, and other fees. Rec'd—11/7–16/2014. Est. Value—$10,500.00.	Ministry of Labor of Taiwan and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Taiwan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Small decorative sword. Rec'd—11/10/2013. Est. Value—$800.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Small crystal and gold chariot statue. Rec'd—12/18/2013. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Silver jewelry set. Rec'd—12/19/2013. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Retained in Director's office for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Omega men's watch. Rec'd—12/19/2013. Est. Value—$10,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Crystal tea pot. Pyramid. Statue. Rec'd—12/23/2013. Est. Value—$700.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Wooden tea table and bar. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—$700.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Bronze animal statue. Rec'd—2/22/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Framed map. Rec'd—4/13/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Small glass boat sculpture. Rec'd—4/23/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Decorative Rug. Rec'd—5/31/2014. Est. Value—$7,500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Leather briefcase. Rec'd—6/1/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Painting of Divan Fort. Rec'd—6/1/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Wooden table. Rec'd—6/10/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Sterling silver decorative box. Rec'd—10/1/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Decorative vase. Rec'd—10/1/2014. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Decorative silver bowl. Rec'd—10/28/2014. Est. Value—$2,500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Small decorative silver sword. Rec'd—12/1/2014. Est. Value—$2,500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Framed wood carving. Rec'd—12/21/2014. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John O. Brennan, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.	Silver eagle statue. Rec'd—12/24/2014. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Director's office.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Victorinox Swiss men's watch. Rec'd—11/20/2011 Est. Value—$1,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Watch. Decorative clock. Rec'd—5/10/2013. Est. Value—$625.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Men's watch. Rec'd—7/27/2013. Est. Value—$554.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
An Agency Employee	Men's watch. Rec'd—7/27/2013. Est. Value—$554.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Ladies' watch. Rec'd—7/27/2013. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	3′ x 5′ carpet. Rec'd—9/30/2013. Est. Value—$3,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Delma watch. Rec'd—12/19/2013. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Maurice Lacriox ladies' watch. Rec'd—5/1/2014. Est. Value—$1,410.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Omega men's watch. Rec'd—6/1/2014. Est. Value—$8,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Victorinox Swiss men's watch. Rec'd—6/22/2014. Est. Value—$1,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Healey men's watch. Rec'd—6/23/2014. Est. Value—$3,150.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Longines Prima Luna ladies' watch. Rec'd—6/24/2014. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Swarovski ladies' watch. Rec'd—6/26/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Four watches. Rec'd—7/5/2014. Est. Value—$3,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Watch. iPad Air. Rec'd—7/7/2014. Est. Value—$2,000.00. Disposition—Pending purchase from General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Chopard ladies' watch. Rec'd—7/12/2014. Est. Value—$3,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Chopard Mille Miglia men's watch. Rec'd—7/12/2014. Est. Value—$5,600.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	6′ x 9′ carpet. Rec'd—7/14/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
An Agency Employee	Ladies' makeup mirror. Cologne. Watches. Pens. Neckties. Wallet. Rec'd—7/15/2014. Est. Value—$5,444.30. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Men's watch. Ladies' watch. Rec'd—7/17/2014. Est. Value—$14,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Leather overnight bag. Rec'd—7/29/2014. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Gucci men's watch. Rec'd—8/18/2014. Est. Value—$594.50. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Raymond Weil ladies' watch. Rec'd—8/19/2014. Est. Value—$2,800.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Baume and Mercie ladies' watch. Rec'd—8/25/2014. Est. Value—$800.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Case of wine. Rec'd—8/26/2014. Est. Value—$1,200.00. Disposition—Perishable items handled pursuant to General Service Administration policy.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Samsung cellphone. Rec'd—8/31/2014. Est. Value—$576.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Ladies' necklace. Scarf. Rec'd—9/1/2014. Est. Value—$1,625.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Decorative pen. Watches. Rec'd—9/9/2014. Est. Value—$2,350.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Ladies' gold bracelet. Rec'd—9/9/2014. Est. Value—$1,035.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Children's book series. Rec'd—10/20/2014. Est. Value—$832.13. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	Maurice Lacroix men's watch. Rec'd—11/13/2014. Est. Value—$1,200.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
An Agency Employee	iPhone. Rec'd—11/19/2014. Est. Value—$649.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	5 U.S.C. 7342(f)(4)	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[Report of Tangible Gift Furnished by the Department of Agriculture]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Thomas Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.	Watercolor painting, title: *Indigena* with gold rustic frame. Rec'd—11/16/2014. Est. Value—$570.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Secretary's office. Pending purchase from General Services Administration.	His Excellency Enrique Martínez y Martínez, Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries, and Food of Mexico.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Commerce]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Penny Pritzker, Secretary of Commerce of the United States.	Red and orange Hermes silk scarf. Rec'd—2/10/2014. Est. Value—$435.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Pierre Muscovici, Former Minister of Finance of the French Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Penny Pritzker, Secretary of Commerce of the United States.	Hand-painted decorative box with snowscape design. Rec'd—2/27/2014. Est. Value—$495.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Aleksey Ulyukayev, Minister of Economic Development of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Defense]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Oil painting of the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Dabrowka Koscielna, Poland. Rec'd—1/31/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Tomasz Siemoniak, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defense of the Republic of Poland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	34.5″ steel Yemeni curved sword with curved scabbard. Rec'd—3/31/2014. Est. Value—-$540.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohammed Nasser Ahmed, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Yemen.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Wall hanging tapestry (kalagas) made of black velveteen-like fabric with trapunto scene of two kneeling people. Rec'd—4/2/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Lieutenant General Wai Lwin, Minister of Defense of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, and Daw Swe Swe Oo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Defense]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	3.25″ diameter Minh Long ceramic pink, gold, and green vase with raised outlines and dots forming water lilies and leaves. Rec'd—4/2/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Phung Quang Thanh, Minister of National Defense of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and Mrs. Nguyen Thi Loc.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Sculpted flowers carved from porcelain. Rec'd—4/14/2014. Est. Value—$1.400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Chang Wanquan, State Councilor and Minister of National Defense of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Basel wristwatch with Mexican national emblem engraved in wooden box. Rec'd—5/1/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Salvador Cienfuegos Zepeda, Secretary of National Defense Mexico.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Sword encased in glass display. Rec'd—6/25/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Admiral Vidal Francisco Soberón Sanz, Secretary of the Navy of Mexico.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Perfume set including four bottles with two atomizer balls, two sprayer caps, and two caps without sprayers. Rec'd—11/21/2014. Est. Value—$1,450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince Mitib bin Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of the National Guard of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Bottle of Oudh oil (agar wood perfume oil). Bottle of Oudh cologne. Decorative marble plate with three silver Arabian Oryxes. Incense holder with aged agar wood pieces in alligator skin case. Blue wool robe. Yellow silk robe with pink rosettes. Rec'd—12/1/2014. Est. Value—$5,420.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince Mitib bin Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of the National Guard of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Large wool rug with maroon floral pattern. Rec'd—12/6/2014. Est. Value—$3,880.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Royal Highness Prince Mitib bin Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of the National Guard of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Lillibet Hagel, Spouse of the Secretary of Defense of the United States.	Necklace consisting of 40 13–13.5 mm gray beads with lavender and green tones strung on a white cord. Rec'd—4/2/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Lieutenant General Wai Lwin, Minister of Defense of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, and Daw Swe Swe Oo.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Silver sword on a wooden and plastic display case. Rec'd—12/8/2013. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Michalis Kostarakos, Chief of Defense of the Hellenic Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Defense]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Coin set. Book, title: *Malaysian Armed Forces—The Nation's Shield 80th Anniversary*. Rec'd—1/9/2014. Est. Value—$735.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Tan Sri Dato Zulkfeli, Chief Defense of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Knife in wooden box. Rec'd—1/21/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Colonel Valeriy Gerasimov, Chief of General Staff and First Deputy Defense Minister of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Marble keepsake box. Rec'd—1/22/2014. Est. Value—$550.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Colonel Valeriy Gerasimov, Chief of General Staff and First Deputy Defense Minister of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Silver model boat of an Omani Dhow in a cardboard display case. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$420.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Sultan bin Muhammed Al-Namani, Minister of the Royal Office of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Red floral vase. Two book set, title: *The Analects of Confucius.* Paperback book, title: *Deciphering Sun Tzu's The Art of War.* Hanging scroll. Drum. Model wood toy structure of the Great Wall of China. Stuffed panda bear. Stuffed horse. Rec'd—5/15/2014. Est. Value—$490.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Fang Fenghui, Chief of Defense of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Silver sword in wooden case. Rec'd—5/28/2014. Est. Value—$1.650.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Lieutenant General Hamad Mohammed Thani Al Ruamithi, Chief of Staff of the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Miniature crystal fortress. Rec'd—6/2/2014. Est. Value—$900.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Abdulrahman Al-Baniyan, Chief of Staff of the Ministry of Defense of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Silver keepsake box. Coat. Shawl. Rec'd—6/19/2014. Est. Value—$690.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Rashad Mahmood, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Drinking glass set. Framed lithograph. Rec'd—6/24/2014. Est. Value—$815.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Admiral Luigi Binelli Mantelli, Chief of Defense of the Italian Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	White vase with blue floral design. Framed photograph. Jewelry box. Rec'd—8/14/2014. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Chairman's office.	His Excellency Lieutenant General Do Ba Ty, Chief of the General Staff of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Defense]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Black suitcase. Black Helveco wallet. Charriol pen. Samsung Galaxy S5 cellphone. 2.7 oz. of Guerlain Homme perfume. 3.0 oz. Lacoste perfume. 3.4 oz. Ralph Lauren perfume. Movado men's wristwatch. Movado ladies' wristwatch. Rec'd—10/22/2014. Est. Value—$2,460.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.	Knife in a cedar box. Red trunk. Silver samovar. Rose water set. Rec'd—12/14/2014. Est. Value—$1,105.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Bouchaib Arroub, Chief of Defense and Inspector General of the Royal Armed Forces of the Kingdom of Morocco.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mrs. Deanie Dempsey, Spouse of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.	Serving dish and spoon. Rec'd—9/25/2014. Est. Value—$455.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Ms. Patricia Calderón de Rodríguez, Spouse of the Chief of Defense of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. James Hursch, Director of Defense Technology Security Administration.	Romanson Men's wristwatch. Romanson Ladies' wristwatch. Rec'd—7/30/2013. Est. Value—$715.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Colonel Choi Sunyup of the Republic of Korea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Eric Rosenbach, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy.	Eagle clock statue. Rec'd—11/22/2013. Est. Value—$540.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major Colonel Vladimir Zarundnitskiy, Commander of the Central Military District of the Russian Federation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. David Helvey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asia.	Large white vase with multi-colored designs. Rec'd—12/26/2013. Est. Value—$390.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Rear Admiral Li Ji, Deputy Chief of the Foreign Affairs, Office of the Ministry of National Defense of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Caryn Hollis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Counternarcotics and Global Threats.	Floral urn with gold trimming. Rec'd—3/18/2014. Est. Value—$385.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the OSD Policy Office.	Government of the Kingdom of Thailand.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Jennifer Thaxton, Action Officer for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Policy.	Pierre Cardin pen. Black Pierre Cardin wallet. Silver and gold wristwatch. 4GB USB flash drive. Rec'd—3/31/2014. Est. Value—$621.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Michael Lumpkin, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict.	Jambiya knife. Wood plaque on a gold metallic background. Rec'd—3/31/2014. Est. Value—$540.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Mohammed Nasser Ahmed, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Yemen.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Stephen W. Preston, General Counsel of the Department of Defense.	14″ x 10″ x 6″ white leather Gentili humidor. Rec'd—4/10/2014. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the General Counsel's office.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Defense]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. David Helvey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asia.	Porcelain dish. Rec'd—5/9/2014. Est. Value—$385.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Ting Shih, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Taiwan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Stephen W. Preston, General Counsel of the Department of Defense.	4′ x 6′ Persian multi-colored rug. Two boxes of Habanos and Cohiba cigars. Rec'd—5/12/2014. Est. Value—$7,360.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Andrew C. Weber, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs.	Award certificate in brown leather case. Blue and gold medal in red leather case. Rec'd—6/2/2014. Est. Value—$970.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Giorgi Margvelashvili, President of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Andrew C. Weber, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs and Colonel Clark, Military Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs.	Cloth artwork scroll with a wooden stick. Gold colored horse sculpture in a wooden box. Small gold colored horse sculpture in black box. Rec'd—6/3/2014. Est. Value—$520.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Her Excellency Maia Panjikidze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	33″ silver blade sword engraved "Stephen the Great" in a gold decorative handle in black box. Rec'd—7/30/2014. Est. Value—$420.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	His Excellency Mircea Duşa, Minister of National Defense of Romania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	Metallic world globe. Decorative plate in blue pox. White print. Mini statue of soldier. Rec'd—7/31/2014. Est. Value—$1,645.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	Lieutenant General Marian Hăpău, Director General of Defense Intelligence General Directorate of Romania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	Tittot glass ornament. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$465.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hsiao-Jung Lu, Deputy Secretary General of the National Security Council of Taiwan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	Censer with crown trophy on forest green marble in green box. Rec'd—9/27/2014. Est. Value—$440.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Youssef al-Idrissi, Deputy GIP Director of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	10″ x 6″ x 6″ bronze statue. Rec'd—9/27/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Admiral Sun Jianguo, Deputy Chief of the General Staff, Department of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Michael G. Vickers, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.	Mother of pearl document box. Rec'd—11/5/2014. Est. Value—$680.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Government of the Republic of Korea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of the Air Force]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Deborah James, Secretary of the Air Force of the United States.	Korloff men's watch. 32GB iPhone 5s. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$7,600.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant General David Goldfein, USAFCENT Commander.	United Arab Emirates Special Operations Command ceremonial knife in wood box. Rec'd—6/11/2013. Est. Value—$700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Lieutenant Colonel Azzen Al Numimi, Squadron Commander, Shaheen 1 Squadron, Al Dhafra Air Base of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Gilmary Hostage, ACC Commander.	Mercury Switzerland set containing men's and ladies' watches, pens, cufflinks, and a key chain in a wooden box. Rec'd—11/4/2013. Est. Value—$2,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Captain Lisa Resch, USAFCENT Protocol.	Frederique Constant set containing a ladies' watch, wallet, pen, and charm bracelet. Rec'd—11/10/2013. Est. Value—$2,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Senior Master Sergeant Shae Alamo, USAFCENT Protocol.	JBR set containing a ladies' watch, wallet, pen, and charm bracelet set. Rec'd—11/10/2013. Est. Value—$1,500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Special Agent Nicole MacGregor, Office of Special Investigation.	Glamrock set containing a ladies' watch, wallet, pen, and charm bracelet set. Rec'd—11/10/2013. Est. Value—$2,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Colonel James Brandenburg, 738 AEAG Commander.	4″ x 6″ Afghan style rug. Rec'd—12/23/2013. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major Geneneral Abdul Raziq Sherzai, Wing Commander of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General John Hesterman III, USAFCENT Commander.	JBR men's watch in wood box. Rec'd—1/1/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Heidi Grant, SAF/IA	32GB iPhone 5. Dior men's and ladies' watch set with a Dior pen in a wooden box. Rec'd—1/15/2014. Est. Value—$8,025.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant General David Goldfein, USAFCENT Commander.	Afghan style rug. Rec'd—2/4/2014. Est. Value—$509.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	Major Geneneral Abdul Raziq Sherzai, Wing Commander of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General John Hesterman III, USAFCENT Commander.	Hellveco men's and ladies' watch set. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$979.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of the Air Force]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
General John Hesterman III, USAFCENT Commander.	Lamborghini set containing men's and ladies' watches and two pens in a wooden box. Rec'd—3/19/2014. Est. Value—$3,000.00. Disposition—Transferred to General Services Administration.	General Ghanim Bin Shaheen Al-Ghanim, Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
United States Air Force Employee	3′ x 4′ "Magic Knots" hand-knotted Azerbaijani rug. Rec'd—4/23/2014. Est. Value—$1,250.00. Disposition—Retained for official use only.	His Excellency Elin Suleymanov, Ambassador of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Colonel David Hornyak, Commander of the 377th Air Base Wing.	Gold bracelet. Rec'd—6/1/2014. Est. Value—$973.00. Disposition—Purchased from the General Services Administration.	His Excellency Dr. Saadon Al Dlimi, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Iraq.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Randy Kee, US European Command.	Polish calvary sabre. Rec'd—7/1/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Purchased from the General Services Administration.	His Excellency Robert Kupiecki, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Poland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
United States Air Force Employee	37″ Shashka sword and sheath. Rec'd—7/9/2014. Est. Value—$1,250.00. Disposition—Retained for official use only.	His Excellency Irakli Alasania, Minister of Defense of Georgia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Colonel Joseph Messer, Liaison Officer.	Samsung Galaxy S4 phone. Rec'd—8/5/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Colonel Alnaqbi, Deputy Commander for the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Colonel Joseph Messer, Liaison Officer.	iPhone 5s. Samsung Galaxy S5 phone. Rec'd—9/14/2014. Est. Value—$600.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Colonel Khamis Alamazrouei, Commander for the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Captain David Wright, US Air Force.	Certina men's watch. Rec'd—10/1/2014. Est. Value—$840.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Air Vice Marshall Abdullah bin Mohammed Al-Qarni Ali, Commander of King Faisal Air College of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Colonel John Barlett, US Air Force	Certina men's watch. Rec'd—10/1/2014. Est. Value—$780.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Air Vice Marshall Abdullah bin Mohammed Al-Qarni Ali, Commander of King Faisal Air College of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General John Hesterman III, USAFCENT Commander.	Techno Marine men's and ladies' watch set. Rec'd—10/29/2014. Est. Value—$1,200.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General John Hesterman III, USAFCENT Commander.	Armand Nicolet men's watch. JBR ladies' watch. Rec'd—12/2/2014. Est. Value—$8,700.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Hamad bin Ali al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of the Army]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Major General Patrick J. Donahue II, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Africa/Southern European Task Force.	Portfolio size hand-stitched crocodile skin leather attaché briefcase with single clasp metal enclosure. Rec'd—10/11/2012. Est. Value—$549.00. Disposition—Retained for official use at Headquarters, U.S. Army Africa/Southern European Task Force.	Admiral Os Ibrahim, Commander of Defense Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Colonel Scott C. Greenblatt, Director of the Host Nation Affairs Area Support Group in the State of Kuwait.	16GB Apple iPad2 with Wi-Fi capability. Rec'd—9/23/2013. Est. Value—$389.00. Disposition—Retained in the Army Gift Program Office pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Abdulrazaq Al Awadhi, Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans for the Ministry of Defense of the State of Kuwait.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Major General Patrick J. Donahue II, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Africa/Southern European Task Force.	Portfolio size hand-stitched, crocodile skin leather attaché briefcase with double leather strap enclosure. Rec'd—12/4/2013. Est. Value—$549.00. Disposition—Retained for official use at Headquarters, U.S. Army Africa/Southern European Task Force.	Admiral Os Ibrahim, Commander of Defense Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant General Charles T. Cleveland, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Special Operations Command.	Sterling silver rose. Extreme Ratio Pugio S.E. fixed blade knife. Wooden plaque. Rec'd—1/22/2014. Est. Value—$599.00. Disposition—Retained for official use at Headquarters, U.S. Army Special Operations Command.	Lieutenant General Claudio Graziano, Chief of Staff of the Army of the Italian Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General Dennis L. Via, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Materiel Command.	State of Qatar gold statue with red box. Charmex of Switzerland watch, wallet, cufflinks and pen set in box. GlamRock watch, wallet and pen set in box. Two sets of Murex watches, pens, pairs of cufflinks and key chain in box. Delsey rollerboard suitcase. Murex watch, wallet, pen and USB set in box. Joseph H. Clissold wool throw blanket. Aigner men's necktie. Rec'd—3/20/2014. Est. Value—$12,432.80. Disposition—State of Qatar gold statue retained for official use at Headquarters, U.S. Army Materiel Command. Remaining items retained in the Army Gift Program Office pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Atiyah, Minister of State for Defense Affairs of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Brigadier General John C. Thomson III, Commandant of Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy.	22k yellow gold jewelry set containing a necklace and matching pair of earrings. Rec'd—8/1/2014. Est. Value—$3,895.00. Disposition—Retained in the Army Gift Program Office pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Ahmad Malgarai, Defense Official of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of the Army]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Major General Scott D. Berrier, Director of Intelligence for the U.S. Forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	3 square meter Khuwaja Eushna hand-made wool rug. Rec'd—10/2/2014. Est. Value—$750.00. Disposition—Retained for official use only at Headquarters, International Security Assistance Force/U.S. Forces-Afghanistan CJ2 (Intelligence).	Major General Asadullah Sherzad, General Commander of the Police Special Units, Afghan National Police of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of the Navy]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Vice Admiral John Bird, Commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet.	Two 16.5″ elephant statues. Rec'd—2/16/2009. Est. Value—$300.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Admiral Somded Tongpiam, Former Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Royal Navy of the Kingdom of Thailand and President of the Amateur Fencing Association.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General James Mattis, Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	1″ diameter gold coin. Rec'd—11/15/2010. Est. Value—$1,067.13. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Colonel General Sherali Khairullavich Khayrulloev, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Tajikistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General James Mattis, Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Invicta watch. Rec'd—1/17/2011. Est. Value—$495.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant General John Allen, Aide to the Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Gift set containing JBR watch, pen, cufflinks, and cologne. Rec'd—1/17/2011. Est. Value—$795.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Major Todd Manyx, Aide to the Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Gift set containing JBR pen, cufflinks, wallet, and Cyma watch. Rec'd—1/17/2011. Est. Value—$559.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant General John Allen, Aide to the Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Longines ladies' watch. Longines men's watch. Rec'd—1/17/2011. Est. Value—$4,975.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Colonel Stephen Shore, Personal Staff to the Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Gift set containing a Giovanni men's watch, JBR Cologne, pen, and cuffliks. Rec'd—1/17/2011. Est. Value—$997.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
General James Mattis, Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Louis Vuitton lingot men's belt. Red Louis Vuitton necktie. Blue Louis Vuitton necktie. Louis Vuitton silver motif cufflinks. Rec'd—4/24/2012. Est. Value—$724.54. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	General Rashid Mohsin Abdullah Fetais, Senior National Representative to Central Command of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of the Navy]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
General James Mattis, Commander of the U.S. Central Command for the U.S. Marine Corps.	Men's cashmere coat. Rec'd—2/2/2013. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Sheikh Sami Abdul-Amir al-Jamaili, City Council Chairman of the Republic of Iraq.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Admiral Cecil Haney, Commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.	Riyta men's watch. Rec'd—8/20/2013. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Rear Admiral Han Xiaohu, Assistant Chief of Navy Staff of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Admiral Jonathan Grennert, Chief of Naval Operations.	Blue crystal chalice. Rec'd—11/26/2013. Est. Value—$880.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Rear Admiral Abdullah Al-Raisi, Commander of the Royal Navy of the Sultanate of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Vice Admiral John Miller, Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command, Fifth Fleet and Commander of the Combined Maritime Forces.	Concord men's watch. Rec'd—1/12/2014. Est. Value—$3,000.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Special Agent Troy Willism, Personal Security Advisor to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command.	Alpina men's watch. Rec'd—1/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,495.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Commander Kelly Holmes, U.S. Naval Central Engagement Officer for the State of Qatar.	Techno Marine men's watch. Rec'd—1/12/2014. Est. Value—$575.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Kale Streeter, Flag Aide to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command.	Alpina men's watch. Rec'd—1/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,695.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Hamad bin Ali Al-Attiyah, Minister of State for Defense of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Rear Admiral Russell Allen, Commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet.	Greenstone mere. Rec'd—3/7/2014. Est. Value—$599.00. Disposition—Retained for official use.	Rear Admiral Jack Steer, Chief of the Royal New Zealand Navy.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Admiral Bruce Clingan, Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Den Helder, Kingdom of the Netherlands. Rec'd—6/18–20/2013. Est. Value—$614.24.	Vice Admiral Mattieu J. M. Borsboom, Commander of the Royal Netherlands Navy.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Commander Glenn Todd, Aide-de-Camp to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Den Helder, Kingdom of the Netherlands. Rec'd—6/18–20/2013. Est. Value—$346.60.	Vice Admiral Mattieu J. M. Borsboom, Commander of the Royal Netherlands Navy.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Jack Hurley, Personal Security to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Den Helder, Kingdom of the Netherlands. Rec'd—6/18–20/2013. Est. Value—$346.60.	Vice Admiral Mattieu J. M. Borsboom, Commander of the Royal Netherlands Navy.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Admiral Bruce Clingan, Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa and Spouse.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa. Rec'd—10/29–11/1/2013. Est. Value—$1,552.02.	Vice Admiral Refiloe Johannes Mudimu, Chief of the Navy of the Republic of South Africa.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Commander Glenn Todd, Aide-de-Camp to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa. Rec'd—10/29–11/1/2013. Est. Value—$606.74.	Vice Admiral Refiloe Johannes Mudimu, Chief of the Navy of the Republic of South Africa.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. James Smith, Foreign Policy Advisor to the Commander of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Naval Forces Africa.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in Pretoria, Republic of South Africa. Rec'd—10/29–11/1/2013. Est. Value—$606.74.	Vice Admiral Refiloe Johannes Mudimu, Chief of the Navy of the Republic of South Africa.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of the Navy]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Rear Admiral James J. Shannon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy and Director of the Navy International Programs Office.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings and travel in the Republic of Singapore. Rec'd—2/9–13/2014. Est. Value—$1,689.00.	Brigadier General Tan Meng Dui, Deputy Secretary of Technology and Industries of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Singapore.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Dennis Gossett, Director of Command, Control, Communications, and Computers/Expeditionary Warfare of the Navy International Programs Office.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings and travel in the Republic of Singapore. Rec'd—2/9–13/2014. Est. Value—$1,689.00.	Brigadier General Tan Meng Dui, Deputy Secretary of Technology and Industries of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Singapore.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Captain Jim Kim, Director of the Pacific Division of the Navy International Programs Office.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings and travel in the Republic of Singapore. Rec'd—2/9–13/2014. Est. Value—$1,689.00.	Brigadier General Tan Meng Dui, Deputy Secretary of Technology and Industries of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Singapore.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Lieutenant Brandr W. Beekman-Ellner, Aide to the Director of the Navy International Programs Office.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings and travel in the Republic of Singapore. Rec'd—2/9–13/2014. Est. Value—$1,689.00.	Brigadier General Tan Meng Dui, Deputy Secretary of Technology and Industries of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Singapore.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Commander Paul Gomes, Assigned to the 513th Reserve Detachment of the Maritime Partnership Program of the U.S. Sixth Fleet of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in the Republic of Latvia. Rec'd—2/23–3/1/2014. Est. Value—$390.00.	Lieutenant Commander Igors Korolovs, Senior Officer for the Naval Intermediate Command Staff Course at the National Defense Academy of the Republic of Latvia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Commander James Wainwright, Assigned to the 513th Reserve Detachment of the Maritime Partnership Program of the U.S. Sixth Fleet of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in the Republic of Latvia. Rec'd—2/23–3/1/2014. Est. Value—$390.00.	Lieutenant Commander Igors Korolovs, Senior Officer for the Naval Intermediate Command Staff Course at the National Defense Academy of the Republic of Latvia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Master Chief Legalman Julie Tessmer, Assigned to the 513th Reserve Detachment of the Maritime Partnership Program of the U.S. Sixth Fleet of the U.S. Naval Forces Europe.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in the Republic of Latvia. Rec'd—2/23–3/1/2014. Est. Value—$390.00.	Lieutenant Commander Igors Korolovs, Senior Officer for the Naval Intermediate Command Staff Course at the National Defense Academy of the Republic of Latvia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Captain Richard O'Connell, Director of the Northern Command/Southern Command Division of the Security Cooperation Directorate of the Navy International Programs Office.	TRAVEL: Expended for lodgings in the Republic of Chile. Rec'd—12/1–4/2014. Est. Value—$570.00.	Almirante Enrique Larranaga Martin, Commander in Chief of the Navy of the Republic of Chile.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

[Report of Tangible Gift Furnished by the United States Marine Corps]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Lieutenant General John A. Toolan, COMMARFORPAC.	13.5 mm cultured white south sea pearl necklace and bracelet set. Rec'd—9/2/2014. Est. Value—$1,150.00. Disposition—Forwarded to CMC(JA) and pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Lieutenant General Datuk Mohd Zaki Bin HJ Mokhtar, Eastern Region Commander of the Armed Forces of Malaysia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States.	49″ x 76″ nylon & wool carpet with a gold center, rectangular floral design, maroon rectangular border, and continued floral designs. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—$500.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States.	Cartier platinum bracelet engraved with ''Jeh Charles Johnson'' on the interior and an exterior engraved decoration in circles with a line through each circle center. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$15,700.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States.	Rolex Oyster Perpetual watch with superlative chronometer and sterling silver band (client #535, ref #116300, series #1R179201, model: Oyster Perpetual). Rec'd—6/2/2014. Est. Value—$6,595.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States.	Model of a steam train class 375 ''Hrbata'' with 2 passenger cars and a service wagon with different inventory numbers. Hardcover book, title: *Lord Dun's Friendly and Familiar Advices, Adapted to the Various Stations and Conditions of Life, and the Mutual Relations to be Observed Amongst Them* by Lord David Erskine Dun, first print of the manuscript printed in Edinburgh in 1754. Rec'd—6/16/2014. Est. Value—$993.11. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Robert Kalinak, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of the Slovak Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States.	Black leather large gloves with grey cashmere lining by Portolano. Light grey cashmere scarf with dark grey trim by Amicale. Light grey cashmere hat by Loro Piana. Style FAA1752. By Berretto M.. Rec'd—12/18/2014. Est. Value—$611.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Abdullah Bin Nasser Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Susan DiMarco, Spouse of the Secretary of Homeland Security.	Gold Cartier necklace with pendant containing initials ''S.D.'' and the word ''LOVE'' engraved on the back of the open circle pendant and engraved circles with a line through each circle's center on the front. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$3,200.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Dr. Susan DiMarco, Spouse of the Secretary of Homeland Security.	Rolex Oyster Perpetual women's watch with superlative chronometer, sterling silver band, and interior silver base with alternating pink flowers (client #535, ref #116234, series #222DP187, model: Oyster Perpetual). Rec'd—6/2/2014. Est. Value—$6,917.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Susan DiMarco, Spouse of the Secretary of Homeland Security.	Purple cashmere Loro Piana scarf/muffler. Rec'd—12/18/2014. Est. Value—$425.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Abdullah Bin Nasser Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Jeh Johnson, Jr., Son of the Secretary of Homeland Security.	Cartier gold bracelet engraved with "Jeh Charles Johnson, Jr." on the interior and an exterior engraving of circles with a line through each circle's center. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$6,600.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Miss Natalie Johnson, Daughter of the Secretary of Homeland Security.	Gold Cartier necklace with pendant containing initials "N.J." and the word "LOVE" engraved on the back of the open circle pendant and engraved circles with a line through each circle's center on the front. Rec'd—5/14/2014. Est. Value—$3,200.00. Disposition—Currently stored in NAC05–01–111–F suite.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Dan von Geijer, Office of Global Strategies, International Analyst Capacity Development Delivery International Aviation Development Integrated Plans and Support of the Transportation Security Administration.	Baume and Mercier watch. Rec'd—9/11/2014. Est. Value—$1,150.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Major General Al-Sugaeebi, Assistant Under Secretary of the Ministry of Interior for Port Security Affairs and Brigadier General Al-Haddad of the State of Kuwait.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Alan Bersin, Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy and Chief Diplomatic Officer of the Office of Policy.	Claudia Patrick men's linked watch with stones. Louis Erard ladies' Heritage automatic mother of pearl dial steel and rose gold watch. Rec'd—9/21/2014. Est. Value—$4,200.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Assistant Secretary's office.	His Excellency Abdullah Bin Nasser Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister and Minister of Interior, State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Alan Bersin, Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy and Chief Diplomatic Officer, Office of Policy.	Rose colored Sciarpa Grande cashmere ladies' scarf with fringe by Loro Piana. Heather gray cashmere men's hat by Sophia Cashmere. Dark brown leather gloves with feathered beige cashmere lining by Loro Piana. Men's grey Grande Unita cashmere scarf by Loro Piana. Rec'd—12/12/2014. Est. Value—$1,645.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Abdullah Bin Nasser Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Jeh Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security of the United States, and Traveling Delegation: Patrick Barry, Alan Bersin, Lyndsey Toeppen, Tanya Bradsher, Jim Estramonte, and Marcus Richardson.	TRAVEL: Hotel room accommodation to members of the delegation which includes one suite and six standard rooms at the Intercontinental Jeddah. Rec'd—6/1/2014. Est. Value—$2,077.31.	His Royal Highness Muhammed bin Nayef bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud, Minister of the Interior of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Domingo Gonzalez, Special Agent, ICE HQ.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—1/26/2014. Est. Value—$6872.11.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Domiciano Rodriguez, ICE HQ	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—1/26/2014. Est. Value—$6872.11.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Roger Osborn, Special Agent, ICE HQ.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—1/26/2014. Est. Value—$6872.11.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Brian Ramsey, Special Agent, ICE SAC Atlanta.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—1/26/2014. Est. Value—$6872.11.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Gregory Mandoli, Assistant Attaché, ICE Attaché London.	TRAVEL: HSI speaker at the Government of Ireland Financial Seminar. Rec'd—2/12/2014. Est. Value—$549.00.	Northern Ireland Environment Agency.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Timothy Bradley, ICE Representative, ICE Attaché Caribbean.	TRAVEL: Airfare and hotels to Australia for cruise ship investigative and targeting training to include enforcement operations. Rec'd—2/22/2014. Est. Value—$5691.01.	Mr. Boyd Doherty, Australian Customs and Border Protection.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Erik Barnett, ICE Attaché to the European Union.	TRAVEL: HSI representative for a presentation at IPR conference for judges and law enforcement, sponsored by the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market. Rec'd—3/4/2014. Est. Value—$872.00.	Mr. Eric Gastinel, Head of IP Education Programs of the European Union Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Kim Wong, Special Agent, ICE Stockton.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/5/2014. Est. Value—$7,078.91.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Tom Wynn, Special Agent, ICE OFTP Fort Benning.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/5/2014. Est. Value—$6,727.89.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Matthew Shook, Special Agent, ICE SAC NY.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/6/2014. Est. Value—$6,093.88.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Michael Paquin, Special Agent, ICE SAC Tampa.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/6/2014. Est. Value—$6,360.54.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Garth Werner, Special Agent, ICE OFTP Fort Benning.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/6/2014. Est. Value—$6,357.82.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Willlie Womack, Special Agent, ICE OFTP Ft. Benning.	TRAVEL: Instructor for VIP protection and firearms training to the Abu Dhabi Police. Rec'd—3/6/2014. Est. Value—$6,357.82.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Luis Rodriguez, ICE UC OPS	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$6,365.99.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Roger Osborn, Special Agent, ICE HQ.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$5,955.10.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Christopher Malone, ICE UC OPS.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$5955.00.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Domiciano Martinez, ICE UC OPS.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$5955.10.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Maria Manzo, ICE UC OPS	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$6,744.21.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Domingo Gonzalez, ICE UC OPS.	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$6,872.11.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Jay Ingersoll, ICE UC OPS	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$5,955.10.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Luis Garcia, ICE UC OPS	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$7,136.05.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Tino Gonzalez, ICE UC OPS ..	TRAVEL: Collaboration with the Abu Dhabi Police Training Department. Rec'd—3/27/2014. Est. Value—$6,659.86.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Timothy Bradley, ICE Representative ICE Attaché for the Caribbean.	TRAVEL: Airfare and hotels for cruise ship investigative and targeting training to include enforcement operations. Rec'd—4/28/2014. Est. Value—$4,262.67.	Mr. Glen Pounder, National Crime Agency of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Neveine Habeeb, Special Agent, ICE Attaché for Dubai.	TRAVEL: Escort Dubai police delegation for training related to mass transit and counterterrorism programs. Rec'd—5/5/2014. Est. Value—$12,000.00.	Colonel Mohammad Al-Bastaki of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Majdi Haddad, FSN–I, ICE Attaché for Dubai.	TRAVEL: Escort delegation of Abu Dhabi Police to SAC/NY for training. Rec'd—5/9/2014. Est. Value—$5,662.59.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Charles Baxter, Assistant Attaché, ICE Attaché for Dubai.	TRAVEL: Escort delegation of Abu Dhabi Police to SAC/NY for training. Rec'd—5/10/2014. Est. Value—$5,662.59.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Alan Bersin, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Chief Diplomatic Officer of the Office of International Affairs.	TRAVEL: Presented keynote remarks at the Inaugural International Network of Customs Universities Global Conference. Attended meetings with His Excellency Kamaladdin Heydarov, Minister for Emergency Situations of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Deputy Border Service Chief Farhad Taghizada, and Deputy Minister of Interior Oruj Zalov to discuss DHS-Azeri cooperation on traveler screening, border security, law enforcement, and nonproliferation. Rec'd—5/19–24/2014. Est. Value—$6,766.00.	Mr. Aydin Aliyev, Chairman of the State Customs Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Nathan Peeters, Confidential Assistant of the Office of International Affairs.	TRAVEL: Staffed Acting Assistant Secretary Alan D. Bersin who presented keynote remarks at the Inaugural International Network of Customs Universities Global Conference. Attended meetings with His Excellency Kamaladdin Heydarov, Minister for Emergency Situations of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Deputy Border Service Chief Farhad Taghizada, and Deputy Minister of Interior Oruj Zalov to discuss DHS-Azeri cooperation on traveler screening, border security, law enforcement, and nonproliferation. Rec'd—5/19–24/2014. Est. Value—$6,766.00.	Mr. Aydin Aliyev, Chairman of the State Customs Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Man F. Tse, Program Manager of the ICE National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.	TRAVEL: Participation in a meeting to discuss ways to collaborate with EUROPOL and industry to combat illicit cyber commerce. Rec'd—8/26/2014. Est. Value—$2,550.33.	Mr. Chris Vansteenkiste, Europol Intellectual Property Crime Team Project Manager for the European Union.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Majdi Haddad, FSN–I, ICE Attaché for Abu Dhabi.	TRAVEL: Escort delegation of the United Arab Emirates law enforcement officials to view DHS facilities and operations. Rec'd—9/19/2014. Est. Value—$5,662.59.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Charles Baxter, Assistant Attaché, ICE Attaché for Abu Dhabi.	TRAVEL: Escort delegation of the United Arab Emirates law enforcement officials to view DHS facilities and operations. Rec'd—9/19/2014. Est. Value—$5,662.59.	Lieutenant Colonel Saleh Saeed Al Amoodi, Manager of the International Training Department of the Abu Dhabi Police of the United Arab Emirates.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Homeland Security]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Mr. Stephen Carruth, Civil Emergency Planning Officer of the U.S. Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.	TRAVEL: Attend an international meeting in Kiev, Ukraine as FEMA's representative at the U.S. Mission to NATO and Vice Chair of the NATO Civil Protection Group, to review the Ukraine State Emergency Services contribution to their 2015 NATO Partnership Plan. Rec'd—10/13–15/2014. Est. Value—$737.00.	North Atlantic Treaty Organization	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Erik Barnett, ICE Attaché to the European Union.	TRAVEL: HSI representative conducted cyber threats workshop sponsored by the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. Rec'd—10/21/2014. Est. Value—$1,586.50.	Ms. Marina Mazzini, Public Information Officer of the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Leo Lin, ADAD, ICE International Operations.	TRAVEL: Delivered key note remarks/speech to KNPA CT conference. Rec'd—10/26/2014. Est. Value—$7,977.00.	National Police Agency of the Republic of Korea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Lucy Escamilla, Program Manager, ICE Cultural Property Art Antiquities Program.	TRAVEL: Seminar to combat the illicit trafficking of cultural property. Rec'd—12/1/2014. Est. Value—$2,000.00.	Guardia Civil Foundation of the Kingdom of Spain.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Mike Hatfield, Operations Manager, ICE International Operations.	TRAVEL: ICE HSI representative to speak on interagency cooperation at a training session entitled ''Program Chemical Explosives Counter-Smuggling Investigations Training''. Rec'd—12/6/2014. Est. Value—$2,318.00.	INTERPOL	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Timothy Bradley and Mr. Eric Stowers, ICE Representatives, ICE Attaché to the Caribbean.	TRAVEL: Airfare and hotels. Provide training/presentations to various units within the Martinique French Customs/Navy. Rec'd—12/16/2014. Est. Value—$2,869.28.	Mr. Rodolphe Gautreau, Deputy Customs Attaché of the French Republic to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Report of Tangible Gift Furnished by the Department of Housing and Urban Development]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Julián Castro, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development of the United States.	Kutani Yaki vase with cranes. Rec'd—10/27/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Secretary's office.	His Excellency Kenichiro Sasae, Ambassador of Japan to the United States.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Report of Tangible Gifts Furnished by the Department of Justice]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Eric Holder, Attorney General of the United States.	Rug with case. Gold and silver ship depicting United States and the State of Qatar flags in case. Cartier bracelet with engraving. Rec'd—5/12/2014. Est. Value—$24,150.00. Disposition—Accepted on behalf of the Department of Justice and forwarded to JMD/Property.	The Honorable Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Eric Holder, Attorney General of the United States.	Men's hat. Men's gloves. Men's scarf. Rec'd—12/15/2014. Est. Value—$1,265.00. Disposition—Accepted on behalf of the Department of Justice and forwarded to JMD/Property.	His Excellency Abdullah Bin Nasser Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister and Minister of Interior of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Report of Travel Furnished by the Department of Transportation]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Dr. John Tunna, Director of FRA's Research and Development Division.	TRAVEL: 2014 Rail safety conference in Australia. Rec'd—3/24–27/2014. Est. Value—$4,970.50.	Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board of Australia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Dr. Patricia S. Hu, Director of the Bureau of Transportation Research.	TRAVEL: Invited speaker at the 11th meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Committee on Statistics and Statistical Policy. Rec'd—4/2014. Est. Value—$832.50.	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Thomas Littleton, Associate Administrator of Transit Safety and Oversight.	TRAVEL: Invitation payment of airfare and lodging. Rec'd—9/23/2014. Est. Value—$1,700.00.	Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport of the Republic of Korea.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Mathew Lesh, Transportation Program Specialist.	TRAVEL: Invitation payment of airfare and lodging. Rec'd—10/14/2014. Est. Value—$1,840.00.	CIVITAS	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Treasury]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Jacob Lew, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.	Encased sterling silver John Barry silver Riyal commemorative coin with book and DVD. Rec'd—6/17/2014. Est. Value—$700.00. Disposition—Retained for official use in the Secretary's office.	His Excellency Dr. Ibrahim Al-Assaf, Minister of Finance of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Marisa Lago, Assistant Secretary of Internal Affairs.	Hand-crafted buisness card holder. Rec'd—9/17/2013. Est. Value—$385.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	His Excellency Cesar V. Purisima, Secretary of the Philippine Department of Finance.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the Department of Treasury]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Ms. Marisa Lago, Assistant Secretary of Internal Affairs.	Three piece Taihwa rich porcelain set. Rec'd—11/21/2013. Est. Value—$1,800.00. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Vincent Siew, Leader's Representative to APEC of Chinese Taipei (Taiwan).	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Phillip Morris, Advisor of the Office of Technical Assistance and Banking Advisor.	TRAVEL: Lodging cost. Rec'd—7/13–18/2014. Est. Value—$1,880.00.	Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corportation.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Adam Szubin, Director of TFI, OFAC.	TRAVEL: Lodging cost. Rec'd—11/6–11/2014. Est. Value—$2,641.08.	Government of the Sultanante of Oman.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report of Travel Furnished by the Federal Communications Commission]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Ajit V. Pai, Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.	TRAVEL: Hotel expenses in Cartagena, Colombia to speak at the IX International Regulatory Workshop. Rec'd—8/29–9/2/2014. Est. Value—$1,083.00.	Ms. Mariana Sarmiento Argüello, International Relations and Communications Coordinator of the Commission for Communications Regulations of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

[Report of Tangible Gift Furnished by the Federal Reserve Board]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Janet Yellen, Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.	Boxed set of seven coins commemorating the 15th anniversary of the Central Bank of Luxembourg, one from each year starting with 2009 and ending with 2013 including an additional coin from 2012 and a gold anniversary coin for 2013. Rec'd—3/11/2014. Est. Value—$480.55. Disposition—Pending transfer to General Services Administration.	Mr. Gaston Reinesch, Governor of the Central Bank of Luxembourg.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Report of Travel Furnished by the U.S. House of Representatives]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Ander Crenshaw, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Expenses to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—$750.00.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Ann Kirkpatrick, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Expenses to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—$750.00.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Continued

[Report of Travel Furnished by the U.S. House of Representatives]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government, estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Erik Paulsen, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Expenses to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—$750.00.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Loretta Sanchez, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Airfare, lodging, and meals. Rec'd—2/18–20/2014. Est. Value—$1,823.00.	Ms. Angela Tumini, Associate Professor of the Diplomatic Academy University of the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Mike Rogers, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Dinner and lodging were provided following a national security discussion. Rec'd—10/23/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Dr. Roderick Munday, Director of Studies in Law of the Peterhouse College of Cambridge University, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Mike Rogers, Member of Congress of the United States.	TRAVEL: Dinner and lodging were provided following a national security discussion. Rec'd—10/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Professor Keith Gull, Principal of St. Edmund Hall of Oxford University, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: UNITED STATES SENATE

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the United States Senate]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Tim Kaine, Senator of the United States.	Painting, title: *The Divian Fort as seen in the 1930s* in a blue leather box. Rec'd—1/28/2014. Est. Value—$530.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Sheikh Rashid bin Abdullah Al Khalifa, Minister of the Interior of the Kingdom of Bahrain.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John McCain, Senator of the United States.	4′ x 6′ rug. Rec'd—1/2014. Est. Value—$4,000.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Lindsey Graham, Senator of the United States.	4′ x 6′ rug. Rec'd—1/2014. Est. Value—$4,000.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Angus S. King Jr., Senator of the United States.	98 million-year-old fish fossil. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	The Honorable Ziad Hawat, Mayor of Byblos of the Lebanese Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Tim Kaine, Senator of the United States.	98 million-year-old fish fossil. Rec'd—2/19/2014. Est. Value—$400.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	The Honorable Ziad Hawat, Mayor of Byblos of the Lebanese Republic.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. James A. Wolfe, Security Director of the Select Committee on Intelligence.	Swiss Army watch. Rec'd—4/25/2014. Est. Value—$450.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John McCain, Senator of the United States.	4′ x 6′ rug. Rec'd—5/13/2014. Est. Value—$4,000.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Lindsey Graham, Senator of the United States.	Silk rug. Rec'd—5/13/2014. Est. Value—$4,000.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Dr. Ali Bin Fetais Al-Marri, Attorney General of the State of Qatar.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: UNITED STATES SENATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the United States Senate]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Robert Menendez, Senator of the United States.	Portrait of Bernardo de Galvez. Rec'd—6/5/2014. Est. Value—$2,720.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	Mr. Elias Bendodo Benasayag, President of the Provincial Deputation of Málaga of the Kingdom of Spain.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Mitch McConnell, Senator of the United States.	Blue and white procelain vase. Rec'd—6/19/2014. Est. Value—$399.94. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	His Excellency Hsiao-Jung Lu, Deputy Secretary General of the National Security Council of Taiwan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John McCain, Senator of the United States.	Rotisserie grill. Prime rib beef. Rec'd—12/30/2014. Est. Value—$650.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate. Perishable items handled pursuant to guidelines set forth by General Services Administration.	His Majesty Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John McCain, Senator of the United States.	6′ x 4′ Afghan rug. Rec'd—12/2014. Est. Value—$700.00. Disposition—Deposited with the Secretary of the Senate.	General Sher Mohammad Karimi, Chief of Army Staff of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable James Inhofe, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable John Boozman, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Anthony Lazarski, Professional Staff Member of the Committee on Armed Services.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Mark Powers, Professional Staff Member of the Office of Senator James Inhofe.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Luke Holland, Professional Staff Member of the Office of Senator James Inhofe.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Joel Starr, Professional Staff Member of the Office of Senator James Inhofe.	TRAVEL: Permit to visit Volcanoes National Park and mountain gorillas. Rec'd—1/24/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	His Excellency Paul Kagame, President of the Republic of Rwanda.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Robert Menendez, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via government-provided military aircraft and government-provided automobile and boat. Rec'd—2/20/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Brandon Yoder, Senior Professional Staff Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via government-provided military aircraft and government-provided automobile and boat. Rec'd—2/20/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Daniel O'Brien, Staff Director of the Committee on Foreign Relations.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via government-provided military aircraft and government-provided automobile and boat. Rec'd—2/20/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: UNITED STATES SENATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the United States Senate]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
The Honorable Rand Paul, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Government provided lodging and transportation via patrolled SUV. Rec'd—8/16–21/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Duncan Paul, Son of Senator Rand Paul.	TRAVEL: Government provided lodging and transportation via patrolled SUV. Rec'd—8/16–21/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Sergio Gor, Communications Advisor of the Office of Senator Rand Paul.	TRAVEL: Government provided lodging and transportation via patrolled SUV. Rec'd—8/16–21/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Eleanor May, Press Secretary of the Office of Senator Rand Paul.	TRAVEL: Government provided lodging and transportation via patrolled SUV. Rec'd—8/16–21/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Doug Stafford, Senior Advisor of the Office of Senator Rand Paul.	TRAVEL: Government provided lodging and transportation via patrolled SUV. Rec'd—8/16–21/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Guatemala.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Bill Nelson, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Kingdom of Norway via government-provided military aircraft. Rec'd—8/25/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Kingdom of Norway.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Debbie Stabenow, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the United Republic of Tanzania via small charter plane and ground transportation. Rec'd—8/31–9/1/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Anne Brewster-Stanski, Scheduler of the Office of Senator Debbie Stabenow.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the United Republic of Tanzania via small charter plane and ground transportation. Rec'd—8/31–9/1/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Christopher Adamo, Staff Director of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the United Republic of Tanzania via small charter plane and ground transportation. Rec'd—8/31–9/1/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Ms. Jacqlyn Schneider, Senior Professional Staff of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the United Republic of Tanzania via small charter plane and ground transportation. Rec'd—8/31–9/1/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Joseph Shultz, Senior Professional Staff of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the United Republic of Tanzania via small charter plane and ground transportation. Rec'd—8/31–9/1/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Marco Rubio, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via National Guard helicopter. Rec'd—11/6/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Brian Walsh, Professional Staff Member of the Office of Senator Marco Rubio.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via National Guard helicopter. Rec'd—11/6/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

AGENCY: UNITED STATES SENATE—Continued

[Report of Tangible Gifts and Travel Furnished by the United States Senate]

Name and title of person accepting the gift on behalf of the U.S. Government	Gift, date of acceptance on behalf of the U.S. Government estimated value, and current disposition or location	Identity of foreign donor and government	Circumstances justifying acceptance
Ms. Viviana Bovo, Policy Advisor of the Office of Senator Marco Rubio.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the Republic of Colombia via National Guard helicopter. Rec'd—11/6/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the Republic of Colombia.	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
The Honorable Elizabeth Warren, Senator of the United States.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the State of Israel via small aircraft. Rec'd—11/28/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the State of Israel	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.
Mr. Bruce Mann, Husband of Senator Elizabeth Warren.	TRAVEL: Transportation within the State of Israel via small aircraft. Rec'd—11/28/2014. Est. Value—Unknown.	Government of the State of Israel	Non-acceptance would cause embarrassment to donor and U.S. Government.

[FR Doc. 2015–29897 Filed 11–24–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–20–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 80 Wednesday,
No. 227 November 25, 2015

Part III

The President

Proclamation 9371—National Family Week, 2015
Proclamation 9372—Thanksgiving Day, 2015

Federal Register
Vol. 80, No. 227
Wednesday, November 25, 2015

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Proclamation 9371 of November 20, 2015

National Family Week, 2015

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Across the range of diverse experiences and traditions that have been written into our Nation's story, family has remained a steadfast and common foundation. Every day, families offer comfort and support to one another with enduring and unconditional love and they contribute to their communities and our country. During National Family Week, we uplift and honor the families that give so much to forge a brighter future for themselves and for America.

All families deserve every opportunity to thrive, and the Affordable Care Act has given millions of American families the peace of mind that comes with health insurance. My Administration is dedicated to helping working families feel more secure in a constantly changing economy, and I have pushed to make paid family leave available for all, so that new parents can spend time with their newborns and still support their families. And because too many hardworking people are still forced to choose between a paycheck and caring for a sick child or an elderly relative at home, I have taken action to help States enact paid leave and paid sick leave laws of their own. Additionally, I continue to call on the Congress to pass the Healthy Families Act, which would allow working women and men to earn up to one week of paid sick leave per year—precious time that could be used to care for themselves and their families.

Raising the minimum wage is one of the best ways to give a well-earned boost to working families. Benefiting employees, businesses, and our whole economy, raising the wage will help Americans from all walks of life breathe easier knowing they can pay their bills and provide for their loved ones at the same time. Moreover, to secure the promise of happy and healthy golden years for our Nation's seniors, we will continue working to provide more Americans with access to strong and flexible retirement plans that are stable and affordable. And because we have a sacred obligation to the men and women who give so much to defend our country and our freedom, my Administration has taken action to improve mental health care and education services for veterans, service members, and their families. Joining Forces, an initiative launched by First Lady Michelle Obama and Dr. Jill Biden, is also working to support our selfless military families by connecting them with the resources and services they deserve.

It is the responsibility of all Americans to build a country future generations will be proud of and inspired by. This week, let us reflect on and applaud the hard work, resilience, and dedication of our families. As we reminisce on warm memories and share in the joy and love family can provide, let us also pledge to lift up our loved ones and recommit to the family bonds that have strengthened the fabric of our Nation.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 22 through November 28, 2015, as National Family Week. I invite all States, communities, and individuals to join in observing this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities to honor our Nation's families.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of November, in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fortieth.

[FR Doc. 2015–30251
Filed 11–24–15; 11:15 am]
Billing code 3295–F6–P

Presidential Documents

Proclamation 9372 of November 20, 2015

Thanksgiving Day, 2015

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Rooted in a story of generosity and partnership, Thanksgiving offers an opportunity for us to express our gratitude for the gifts we have and to show our appreciation for all we hold dear. Today, as we give of ourselves in service to others and spend cherished time with family and friends, we give thanks for the many blessings bestowed upon us. We also honor the men and women in uniform who fight to safeguard our country and our freedoms so we can share occasions like this with loved ones, and we thank our selfless military families who stand beside and support them each and every day.

Our modern celebration of Thanksgiving can be traced back to the early 17th century. Upon arriving in Plymouth, at the culmination of months of testing travel that resulted in death and disease, the Pilgrims continued to face great challenges. An indigenous people, the Wampanoag, helped them adjust to their new home, teaching them critical survival techniques and important crop cultivation methods. After securing a bountiful harvest, the settlers and Wampanoag joined in fellowship for a shared dinner to celebrate powerful traditions that are still observed at Thanksgiving today: lifting one another up, enjoying time with those around us, and appreciating all that we have.

Carrying us through trial and triumph, this sense of decency and compassion has defined our Nation. President George Washington proclaimed the first Thanksgiving in our country's nascence, calling on the citizens of our fledgling democracy to place their faith in ''the providence of Almighty God,'' and to be thankful for what is bequeathed to us. In the midst of bitter division at a critical juncture for America, President Abraham Lincoln acknowledged the plight of the most vulnerable, declaring a ''day of thanksgiving,'' on which all citizens would ''commend to [God's] tender care'' those most affected by the violence of the time—widows, orphans, mourners, and sufferers of the Civil War. A tradition of giving continues to inspire this holiday, and at shelters and food centers, on battlefields and city streets, and through generous donations and silent prayers, the inherent selflessness and common goodness of the American people endures.

In the same spirit of togetherness and thanksgiving that inspired the Pilgrims and the Wampanoag, we pay tribute to people of every background and belief who contribute in their own unique ways to our country's story. Each of us brings our own traditions, cultures, and recipes to this quintessential American holiday—whether around dinner tables, in soup kitchens, or at home cheering on our favorite sports teams—but we are all united in appreciation of the bounty of our Nation. Let us express our gratitude by welcoming others to our celebrations and recognize those who volunteer today to ensure a dinner is possible for those who might have gone without. Together, we can secure our founding ideals as the birthright of all future generations of Americans.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, BARACK OBAMA, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 26, 2015,

as a National Day of Thanksgiving. I encourage the people of the United States to join together—whether in our homes, places of worship, community centers, or any place of fellowship for friends and neighbors—and give thanks for all we have received in the past year, express appreciation to those whose lives enrich our own, and share our bounty with others.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of November, in the year of our Lord two thousand fifteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fortieth.

[FR Doc. 2015–30252
Filed 11–24–15; 11:15 am]
Billing code 3295–F6–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 80, No. 227

Wednesday, November 25, 2015

CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations	
General Information, indexes and other finding aids	**202–741–6000**
Laws	**741–6000**
Presidential Documents	
Executive orders and proclamations	**741–6000**
The United States Government Manual	**741–6000**
Other Services	
Electronic and on-line services (voice)	**741–6020**
Privacy Act Compilation	**741–6064**
Public Laws Update Service (numbers, dates, etc.)	**741–6043**

ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **www.fdsys.gov.**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List, indexes, and Code of Federal Regulations are located at: **www.ofr.gov.**

E-mail

FEDREGTOC-L (Federal Register Table of Contents LISTSERV) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **http://listserv.access.gpo.gov** and select *Online mailing list archives, FEDREGTOC-L, Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

PENS (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html** and select *Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

FEDREGTOC-L and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

Reference questions. Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

CFR Checklist. Effective January 1, 2009, the CFR Checklist no longer appears in the Federal Register. This information can be found online at **http://bookstore.gpo.gov/.**

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, NOVEMBER

67261–67620 2
67621–68242 3
68243–68420 4
68421–68742 5
68743–69110 6
69111–69562 9
69563–69836 10
69837–70148 12
70149–70668 13
70669–71680 16
71681–71926 17
71927–72326 18
72327–72554 19
72555–72898 20
72899–73086 23
73087–73630 24
73631–73942 25

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING NOVEMBER

At the end of each month the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

2 CFR

200 69111
2205 71681
2300 69563
3474 67261

Proposed Rules:
3474 67672

3 CFR

Proclamations:
9354 67615
9355 67617
9356 67619
9357 68237
9358 68239
9359 68241
9360 68413
9361 68415
9362 68417
9363 68419
9364 69835
9365 70147
9366 72321
9367 72323
9368 72325
9369 72552
9370 73631
9371 73939
9372 73941

Administrative Orders:
Memorandums:
Memorandum of November 3, 2015 68743
Notices:
Notice of November 5, 2015 69561
Notice of November 10, 2015 70663
Notice of November 12, 2015 70667
Presidential Determinations:
No. 2016-02 of November 13, 2015 71927

Executive Orders:
13348 (Revoked by EO 13710) 71679
13710 71679
13711 71923
13712 73633

5 CFR

Proposed Rules:
870 69623

6 CFR

Proposed Rules:
46 73679

7 CFR

301 72327
407 73637
906 70669
925 68421
930 68424
944 68421
959 73640
966 73642
989 73644
1956 73647

Proposed Rules:
1c 73679
920 68473

9 CFR

Proposed Rules:
54 70718
79 70718

10 CFR

72 71929
73 67264
431 69837
433 68749
851 69564

Proposed Rules:
26 72358
50 ..... 70610, 72358
52 ..... 70610, 72358
72 71982
73 72358
140 72358
170 68268
171 68268
429 ..... 68274, 69278, 69888, 71984, 72373, 72608
430 ..... 68274, 69278, 71984, 72373
431 ..... 69888, 72608
745 73679

11 CFR

Proposed Rules:
110 72616

12 CFR

204 71681
208 70671
217 70671
225 70671
252 70671
360 73087
Ch. VI 67277
600 68427
606 68427
611 67277
914 72327
917 72327
1003 69567
1236 72327
1238 73090
1239 72327
1710 72327
1720 72327

Proposed Rules:
327.....68780
360.....73680

14 CFR

25 .....67621, 67623, 69567, 72555, 72561
33.....72561
35.....72561
39 .....68429, 68432, 68434, 68437, 69111, 69113, 69569, 69571, 69573, 69838, 69839, 69846, 71684, 72563, 72565, 73569, 72573, 73576, 72579, 73092, 73096, 73099
71 .....68440, 68442, 70149, 70150, 73103
95.....70674
97 .....68758, 68759, 68761, 68763, 69578
1204.....70151

Proposed Rules:
23.....68281
25.....72618
39 .....67348, 68284, 68475, 68477, 69623, 69625, 69896, 69898, 69899, 69903, 71745, 71747, 71749, 71751, 73390, 73393, 73395, 73398, 73401, 72621, 73147, 73148, 73681
71 .....70176, 70177, 73150, 73152
147.....72404
1230.....73679

15 CFR

4.....68442, 70153
301.....68765
303.....68765
730.....69588, 70675
734.....69588
744.....69852, 70678

Proposed Rules:
27.....73679

16 CFR

305.....67285
500.....71686
502.....71686
1109.....72342
1500.....72342

Proposed Rules:
305.....67351
1109.....72405
1112.....69144
1231.....69144
1500.....72405

17 CFR

200.....71388
227.....71388
232.....71388
239.....71388
240.....71388
249.....71388
269.....71388
270.....71388

Proposed Rules:
230.....69786
300.....68286

18 CFR

40.....73647
157.....67302
260.....67302
284.....67302

Proposed Rules:
35.....71755, 73683

19 CFR

101.....70154
103.....71690
113.....70154
133.....70154
161.....71690
175.....71690

20 CFR

435.....69563
437.....69563

Proposed Rules:
30.....72296
431.....73679

21 CFR

1.....71934
11.....71934
16.....71934
25.....70679
106.....71934
110.....71934
114.....71934
117.....71934
120.....71934
123.....71934
129.....71934
150.....72581
179.....71934
211.....71934
510.....73104
528.....73104
866.....67313
872.....72585
876.....72899
880.....72587
890.....72589
1308 .....69861, 70658, 70680

Proposed Rules:
101.....69905, 71990
573.....73153
866.....71756
1308.....70650

22 CFR

22.....72591
41.....67315, 69588
51.....72591

Proposed Rules:
225.....73679

23 CFR

Proposed Rules:
771.....72624
774.....72624

24 CFR

91.....69864
570 .....67626, 67634, 69864, 71936

Proposed Rules:
5.....72642
965.....71762
966.....71762

25 CFR

169.....72492
256.....69589

Proposed Rules:
30.....69161

26 CFR

1 .....68243, 68244, 70680
54.....72192
602.....68244

Proposed Rules:
1 .....68288, 68794, 71769, 72649

27 CFR

9.....73658

28 CFR

Proposed Rules:
46.....73679
549.....73153

29 CFR

1982.....69115
2509.....71936
2590.....72192
4022.....70170

Proposed Rules:
21.....73679
29.....68908
30.....68908
2510.....72006
2560.....72014

30 CFR

Proposed Rules:
7.....72028
75.....72028

32 CFR

273.....68158
776.....68388

Proposed Rules:
208.....69166
219.....73679

33 CFR

100.....67635, 69873
117 .....67316, 68444, 69602, 72592
138.....72342
147.....71940, 71942
151.....73105
165 .....67317, 67638, 68445, 70687, 71693, 72356, 73115

Proposed Rules:
110.....73689, 73692
117.....67677
165.....72663, 73156

34 CFR

74.....67261
75.....67261
76.....67261
77.....67261
80.....67261
101.....67261
206.....67261
222.....67261
225.....67261
226.....67261
270.....67261
280.....67261
299.....67261
300.....67261
303.....67261
350.....67261
361.....67261
363.....67261
364.....67261
365.....67261
367.....67261
369.....67261
370.....67261
373.....67261
377.....67261
380.....67261
381.....67261
385.....67261
396.....67261
400.....67261
426.....67261
460.....67261
491.....67261
535.....67261
606.....67261
607.....67261
608.....67261
609.....67261
611.....67261
614.....67261
628.....67261
636.....67261
637.....67261
642.....67261
643.....67261
644.....67261
645.....67261
646.....67261
647.....67261
648.....67261
650.....67261
654.....67261
655.....67261
661.....67261
662.....67261
663.....67261
664.....67261
682.....67261
692.....67261
694.....67261
1100.....67261

Proposed Rules:
97.....73679

36 CFR

242.....68245, 68249

Proposed Rules:
294.....72665

37 CFR

381.....73117
386.....73118

Proposed Rules:
42.....67680

38 CFR

17.....68447

Proposed Rules:
16.....73679
17.....68479, 69909
74.....68795

39 CFR

20.....72901

Proposed Rules:
3050.....68480

40 CFR

9.....72592
52 .....67319, 67335, 67642, 67645, 67647, 67652, 68253, 68448, 68451, 68453, 68458, 68766, 68768, 69602, 69604, 69874, 69876, 69880, 70689, 71695, 72903, 73119
62.....70694
63.....72790

81.....67652, 68253
97.....69883
170.....67496
180 .....68257, 68261, 68772, 70697, 71944, 71947, 72593, 73661, 73663
372.....72906
423.....67838
721.....70171, 72592

Proposed Rules:
26.....73679
49.....70179
50.....72840
51.....70179
52 .....67681, 67682, 68481, 68484, 68486, 68807, 69172, 69627, 69915, 69925, 70179, 70718, 70721, 72406, 72937, 73156, 73160
60.....68808, 70179
62.....70727
70.....70179
71.....70179
81.....69173
82.....69458
147.....69629
171.....72029
180 .....68289, 69080, 72941, 73695
258.....70180
260.....68490
261.....68490, 68491
262.....68490, 68491
263.....68490
264.....68490
265.....68490
266.....68491
268.....68490, 68491
270.....68490
273.....68490, 68491
279.....68490

42 CFR

80.....73667
405.....70298, 71388
409.....68624
410.....70298, 71388
411.....71388
412.....70298
413.....68968, 70298
414.....71388
416.....70298
419.....70298
424.....68624
425.....71388
447.....67576
484.....68624
495.....71388
510.....73274

Proposed Rules:
447.....67377
482.....68126
484.....68126
485.....68126

43 CFR

10.....68465

Proposed Rules:
3160.....72943
3170.....72943

44 CFR

64.....73669, 73670

Proposed Rules:
206.....70116

45 CFR

144.....72192
146.....72192
147.....72192
1235.....71681
2510.....71681
2520.....71681
2541.....71681
2543.....71681
2551.....71681
2552.....71681
2553.....71681

Proposed Rules:
46.....73679
95.....68290
690.....73679
1329.....70728
1355.....68290
1356.....68290

46 CFR

515.....68722

Proposed Rules:
401.....69179
403.....69179
404.....69179

47 CFR

1.....67337
2 .....68471, 71702, 73044
15.....71702, 73044
27.....71731, 73044
73 .....67337, 67344, 71731
74.....71702, 73044
87.....71702
90.....71702
95.....73044
96.....73674

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....69630
1 .....67689, 68815, 69630
4.....67689
25.....68815
27.....69630
64.....72029
69.....73161
73.....68815
74.....68815
90.....73696

48 CFR

212.....72599
216.....72606
217.....72607
225.....72599, 72607
252.....72357, 72599
Ch. 3.....72150
1817.....68778
1823.....73675
1845.....73678
1852 .....68778, 73675, 73678

Proposed Rules:
2.....72035
4.....72035
9.....72035
12.....72035
19.....72035
52.....72035
215.....72669
217.....72671
225.....72672, 72673
234.....72671
239.....72674
241.....72675
252.....72673
722.....69930
729.....69930
731.....69930
752.....69930

49 CFR

171.....71952, 72914
172.....71952, 72914
173.....71952, 72914
174.....71952
175.....72914
176.....72914
177.....72914
178.....72914
179.....71952
180.....72914
240.....73122
242.....73122
541.....72929

Proposed Rules:
11.....73679
622.....72624

50 CFR

17.....70700
100.....68245, 68249
218.....73556
300.....69884
622.....71973
635 .....68265, 71974, 73128
648.....67664
660 .....67664, 69138, 69885, 71975
665.....68778
679 .....67346, 68267, 70717
697.....69619

Proposed Rules:
648.....69179
660.....72676
679.....71650, 72408

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

Note: No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's **List of Public Laws**.

Last List November 24, 2015

Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

PENS is a free electronic mail notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html*

Note: This service is strictly for E-mail notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.