collocating equipment on antennae structures owned by non-Federal entities, it can only implement BMPs for the structure in accordance with the owner’s willingness, structural capability, and zoning restrictions.

Additional Clarifications

In section V, “Implementation,” CBP made minor wording changes to further clarify that the selected alternative describes the lines of activity that CBP believes it would take in response to future changes in the threat environment and security priorities. Also, in section II, “Factors Considered in the Decision,” the ROD now reiterates the theme that partnerships and intelligence are a vital part of resolving emerging cross-border threats prior to them reaching the border.

Technical Corrections to the PEIS

During its deliberations, CBP found that certain technical corrections to the Final PEIS were needed. These technical corrections to the PEIS ensure that the PEIS accurately describes CBP activities and the preparation of the PEIS itself. The technical corrections are confined to: (1) The description of certain technologies used for inspecting vehicles and cargo, and (2) the list of government personnel involved in the preparation of the Final PEIS and Final ROD.

The technical corrections CBP is making to the Final PEIS do not change any impact determinations in the PEIS. Accordingly, CBP will not reissue the PEIS for public input. CBP has incorporated the technical corrections, as they are described below, into the online version of the PEIS.

Gamma imaging and X-ray Inspection Technologies

On page 2–11 and in the table on page 2–12 of the Final PEIS, the discussion of inspection technologies included in the Detection, Inspection, Surveillance, and Communications Technology Expansion Alternative was amended to better describe CBP’s use of gamma imaging inspection systems and X-ray technologies.

The bullet at the bottom of page 2–11 explains why CBP evaluates the usefulness of commercial off the shelf technologies. In order to reflect the proper application of X-ray scanners by CBP, the bullet at the bottom of page 2–11 was amended so it now reads as follows: “Performing inspections using more personal radiation detectors (PRD), RIDs, and NII tools, such as gamma imaging inspection systems, and low and high energy x-ray inspection systems (see box on page 2–12). (CBP completed Programmatic Environmental Assessments (EA) on the deployment of various types of NII technology in 2010 and recently published a programmatic EA for the use of low energy x-ray inspection systems to scan personally owned vehicles (POVs) with the driver/passenger in the vehicle.).”

Page 2–12 of the PEIS discusses gamma imaging inspection systems and uses Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System® (VACIS) as the operative example. “Gamma imaging inspection system” is the general description of the impacting technology. VACIS® is merely the proprietary name for a particular brand of gamma imaging inspection system. Therefore, the PEIS should have used the more general term “gamma imaging inspection system” throughout the discussion. Accordingly, the relevant passage on page 2–12 was amended so it now reads: “Gamma Imaging Inspection Systems—The gamma imaging inspection system is used to scan cargo. It can be delivered as a portal or on tracks for POEs, or mounted on a truck to be used at multiple, temporary, and/or remote locations as well as POEs. The truck-mounted system can be especially useful for those situations where the container itself is fixed.”

The discussion of X-Ray inspection technologies on page 2–12 of the PEIS incorrectly asserted that high energy X-Ray inspections systems (HEXRIS) were used by CBP to perform body scans. Neither high energy nor low-energy X-ray systems are used for body scan imaging. LEXRIS are used to scan personally owned vehicles at ports of entry while the drivers or passengers remain in their vehicles. Therefore, the discussion of HEXRIS was revised to state: “X-Ray Imaging Systems—High Energy X-Ray Inspection Systems (HEXRIS) is a non-intrusive inspection technology for use to aid in inspecting high-density cargo containers. Low Energy X-Ray Systems are utilized to scan personally owned vehicles (POVs).”

Also, on page 8–197, in the paragraph beginning, “Use NII Technology,” the phrase “high-energy X-ray imaging systems” should be “high-energy inspection systems.”

List of Preparers

A number of government personnel who contributed to the preparation of the Final PEIS were inadvertently omitted from the Chapter 11 List of Preparers in the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. This notice amends the Final PEIS Preparers table to add the following personnel according to their name and description of their associated professional experience:

- Paula Bienefeld (Parsons), Ph.D., Anthropology—32 years: archeology; NHPA Section 106 consultation, NEPA document preparation, analysis, and review;
- Jennifer Hass (CBP), M.S. Environmental Law; J.D.—6 years: environmental planning, environmental program management, environmental issue advocacy, NEPA document preparation, analysis, and review;
- John Petrilla (CBP), B.S. Environmental Economics and Policy, M.P.P. Policy Studies—5 years: environmental planning and compliance; NEPA document preparation, analysis, and review; and
- Joseph Zidron (CBP), Masters of Public Administration—5 years: environmental planning and compliance; NEPA document preparation, analysis, and review.

Date: May 6, 2013.

Karl H. Calvo,
Executive Director, Facilities Management and Engineering, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013–11115 Filed 5–9–13; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
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Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

This passage previously stated: “High-Energy X-Ray Imaging Scanners—High-energy imaging scanners scan a passenger by rastering or moving a single high-energy X-ray beam rapidly over the body. The signal strength of detected backscattered X-rays from a known position then allows a highly realistic image to be reconstructed (EPIC, 2010).”
SUMMARY: This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for use to assist the homeless.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Juanita Perry, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 7266, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 402–3970; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708–2565 (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 800–927–7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 24 CFR part 581 and section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), as amended, HUD is publishing this Notice to identify Federal buildings and other real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. The properties were reviewed using information provided to HUD by Federal landholding agencies regarding unutilized and underutilized buildings and real property controlled by such agencies or by GSA regarding its inventory of excess or surplus Federal property. This Notice is also published in order to comply with the December 12, 1988 Court Order in National Coalition for the Homeless v. Veterans Administration, No. 86–2563–OG (D.D.C.).

Properties reviewed are listed in this Notice according to the following categories: Suitable/available, suitable/unavailable, and suitable/to be excess, and unsuitable. The properties listed in the three suitable categories have been reviewed by the landholding agencies, and each agency has transmitted to HUD: (1) Its intention to make the property available for use to assist the homeless, (2) its intention to declare the property excess to the agency’s needs, or (3) a statement of the reasons that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use as facilities to assist the homeless.

Properties listed as suitable/available will be available exclusively for homeless use for a period of 60 days from the date of this Notice. Where property is described as for “off-site use only,” recipients of the property will be required to relocate the building to their own site at their own expense. Homeless assistance providers interested in any such property should send a written expression of interest to HHS, addressed to Theresa Ritta, Office of Enterprise Support Programs, Program Support Center, HHS, room 12–07, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857; (301) 443–2265. (This is not a toll-free number.) HHS will mail to the interested provider an application packet, which will include instructions for completing the application. In order to maximize the opportunity to utilize a suitable property, providers should submit their written expressions of interest as soon as possible. For complete details concerning the processing of applications, the reader is encouraged to refer to the interim rule governing this program, 24 CFR part 581.

For properties listed as suitable/to be excess, that property may, if subsequently accepted as excess by GSA, be made available for use by the homeless in accordance with applicable law, subject to screening for other Federal use. At the appropriate time, HUD will publish the property in a Notice showing it as either suitable/available or suitable/unavailable.

For properties listed as suitable/unavailable, the landholding agency has decided that the property cannot be declared excess or made available for use to assist the homeless, and the property will not be available.

Properties listed as unsuitable will not be made available for any other purpose for 20 days from the date of this Notice. Homeless assistance providers interested in a review by HUD of the determination of unsuitability should call the toll free information line at 1–800–927–7588 for detailed instructions or write a letter to Ann Marie Oliva at the address listed at the beginning of this Notice. Included in the request for review should be the property address (including zip code), the date of publication in the Federal Register, the landholding agency, and the property number.

For more information regarding particular properties identified in this Notice (i.e., acreage, floor plan, existing sanitary facilities, exact street address), providers should contact the appropriate landholding agencies at the following addresses: Agriculture: Ms. Brenda Carignan, Department of Agriculture, Reporters Building, 300 7th Street SW., Room 337, Washington, DC 20024, (202) 401–0787; Coast Guard: Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Attn: Jennifer Stomber, 2100 Second St. SW., Stup 7901, Washington, DC 20593–0001; (202) 475–5609; NASA: Mr. Frank T. Bellinger, Facilities Engineering Division, National Aeronautics & Space Administration, Code JX, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358–1124; (This is not a toll-free number).

Dated: May 2, 2013.

Mark Johnston,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs.

TITLE V, FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM FEDERAL REGISTER REPORT FOR 05/10/2013

Suitable/Available Properties

Building
California
Laufman Wildlife Office
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320003
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Off-site removal; 1,285 sf.; office; 60 months vacant; very poor conditions; repairs a must; rodents w/Hanta virus presence

Water Treatment Building
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320005
Status: Excess
Comments: Off-site removal; 216 sf.; utility water treatment; 240 months vacant; very poor conditions; major repairs needed; Hanta virus presence

Laufman Paper Storage
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320006
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Off-site removal; 85 sf.; storage; 240 months vacant; very poor conditions; rodents w/Hanta virus presence

Office
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320009
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Off-site removal; 2,057 sf.; office; 36 months vacant; very poor conditions; repairs a must; rodents w/Hanta virus presence

Laufman Engine Bay Warehouse
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320010
Status: Excess
Comments: Off-site removal; 8,801 sf.; storage; 60 months vacant; very poor conditions; repairs a must; rodents w/Hanta virus presence

Laufman Flammable Storage
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201320011
Status: Excess
Comments: Off-site removal; 36 months vacant; fire station; very poor conditions; major repairs needed; rodents w/Hanta virus presence

Laufman Barracks
446525 Milford Grade Rd.
Milford CA 96121
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Unsuitable Properties

Building
Ohio
2 Buildings
Glenn Research Center
Rye Beach Island OH 44839
Landholding Agency: NASA
Property Number: 71201320001
Status: Unutilized

Directions: Facilities 8132 and 8170
Comments: w/in secured area; public access denied & no alternative method to gain access without compromising nat’l security
Reasons: Secured Area

Tennessee
U.S. Coast Guard Paris Landing
700 Coast Guard Rd.
Buchanan TN 38222
Landholding Agency: Coast Guard
Property Number: 88201320003
Status: Excess

Comments: Public access denied & no alternative method to gain access w/out compromising nat’l security
Reasons: Secured Area

[FR Doc. 2013–10865 Filed 5–9–13; 8:45 am]
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Final Safety Culture Policy Statement

AGENCY: Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE), Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) issues this Final Statement of Policy to announce its expectation that individuals and organizations performing or overseeing activities regulated by BSEE establish and maintain a positive safety culture commensurate with the significance of their activities and the nature and complexity of their organizations and functions. The BSEE defines safety culture as the core values and behaviors of all members of an organization that reflect a commitment to conducting business in a safe and environmentally responsible manner. Further, it is important for all lessees, the owners or holders of operating rights, designated operators or agents of the lessee(s), pipeline right-of-way holders, State lessees granted a right-of-use and easement, and contractors to foster in personnel and for the importance of safety and environmental stewardship, emphasizing the need for their integration into performance objectives to achieve optimal protection and production.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Keith Petka, Safety and Environmental Management Systems Branch at (703) 787–1736, or by email at SEMS@bsee.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On December 20, 2012, BSEE published a Notice in the Federal Register requesting comments on its Draft Statement of Policy announcing the expectation that individuals and organizations performing or overseeing activities regulated by BSEE establish and maintain a positive safety culture commensurate with the significance of their activities and the nature and complexity of their organizations and functions [77 FR 75443]. The comment period for this notice closed on March 20, 2013.

II. Summary of Comments on Draft Safety Culture Policy Statement

In response to the Federal Register notice, BSEE received 32 sets of comments from oil and gas companies (operators and contractors), industry associations, environmental organizations, and individuals. In the following section, we address the general comments by topic and discuss any changes made to the Policy Statement based on these comments. Comments that are not related to the notice or that are outside the scope of the policy statement are not addressed. All of the comments BSEE received are posted on www.regulations.gov, under docket number BSEE–2012–0017.

Comments by Topic

Support for BSEE’s Issuance of Draft Safety Culture Policy Statement

A majority of commenters approved of BSEE’s publication of the draft safety culture policy statement and identified it as an important starting point to initiate substantial discussions focused on improving the safety culture on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS).

Nine Safety Culture Characteristics

The majority of commenters expressed agreement with the nine characteristics of safety culture that BSEE listed in the policy statement. Some commenters recommended modifications to the safety culture characteristics, such as the need for equipment control and integrity. In response to these comments, BSEE has altered the title of characteristic two from “Problem Identification and