

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 3535(d) and 4321–4335; and Executive Order 11991, 3 CFR, 1977 Comp., p. 123.

■ 2. In § 50.18, designate the undesignated paragraph as paragraph (b) and add new paragraph (a) to read as follows:

**§ 50.18 General.**

(a) The Departmental Environmental Clearance Officer (DECO) shall establish a prescribed format to be used to document compliance with NEPA and the Federal laws and authorities cited in § 50.4 where their applicability is indicated below. The DECO may prescribe alternative formats as necessary to meet specific program needs.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 3. Revise § 50.20(a) to read as follows:

**§ 50.20 Categorical exclusions subject to the Federal laws and authorities cited in § 50.4.**

(a) The following actions, activities, and programs are categorically excluded from the NEPA requirements for further review in an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement as set forth in this part. They are not excluded from individual compliance requirements of other environmental statutes, Executive orders, and HUD standards cited in § 50.4, where appropriate. Where the responsible official determines that any proposed action identified below may have an environmental effect because of extraordinary circumstances (40 CFR 1508.4), the requirements for further review under NEPA shall apply (see paragraph (b) of this section).

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 4. Revise § 50.31(a) to read as follows:

**§ 50.31 The EA.**

(a) The Departmental Environmental Clearance Officer (DECO) shall establish a prescribed format used for the environmental analysis and documentation of projects and activities under subpart E. The DECO may prescribe alternative formats as is necessary to meet specific program needs.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PART 58—ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR ENTITIES ASSUMING HUD ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

■ 5. The authority citation for part 58 is revised to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1707 note, 1715z–13a(k); 25 U.S.C. 4115 and 4226; 42 U.S.C. 1437x, 3535(d), 3547, 4321–4335, 4852, 5304(g), 12838, and 12905(h); title II of Pub.

L. 105–276; E.O. 11514 as amended by E.O. 11991, 3 CFR, 1977 Comp., p. 123.

■ 6. In § 58.38, revise the introductory text to read as follows:

**§ 58.38 Environmental review record.**

The responsible entity must maintain a written record of the environmental review undertaken under this part for each project. This document will be designated the “Environmental Review Record” (ERR) and shall be available for public review. The Departmental Environmental Clearance Officer (DECO) shall establish a prescribed format that the responsible entity shall use to prepare the ERR. The DECO may prescribe alternative formats as is necessary to meet specific program needs.

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 7. In § 58.40, revise the introductory text and paragraph (e) to read as follows:

**§ 58.40 Preparing the environmental assessment.**

The DECO shall establish a prescribed format that the responsible entity shall use to prepare the EA. The DECO may prescribe alternative formats as is necessary to meet specific program needs. In preparing an EA for a particular proposed project or other action, the responsible entity must:

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) Discuss the need for the proposal, appropriate alternatives where the proposal involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: January 31, 2014.

**Shaun Donovan,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2014–04206 Filed 2–26–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210–67–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**Office of the Secretary**

[Docket ID: DoD–2014–OS–0024]

**32 CFR Part 311**

**Privacy Act; Implementation**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, DoD.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) is amending its regulations to exempt portions of a new system of records from certain provisions of the Privacy Act.

Specifically, the Department proposes to exempt portions of DMDC 16 DoD, entitled “Interoperability Layer Service (IoLS)” from one or more provisions of the Privacy Act because of criminal, civil, and administrative enforcement requirements. In 2008, the U.S. Congress passed legislation that obligated the Secretary of Defense to develop access standards for visitors applicable to all military installations in the U.S. The Department of Defense (DoD) developed a visitor system to manage multiple databases that are capable of identifying individuals seeking access to DoD installations who may be criminal and/or security threats. The purpose of the vetting system is to screen individuals wishing to enter a DoD facility, to include those who have been previously given authority to access DoD installations, against the FBI National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Wanted Person File. The NCIC has a properly documented exemption rule and to the extent that portions of these exempt records may become part of IoLS, OSD hereby claims the same exemptions for the records as claimed at their source (JUSTICE/FBI–001, National Crime Information Center (NCIC)).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 28, 2014 to be considered by this agency.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by docket number and/or RIN number and title, by any of the following methods:

• *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

• *Mail:* Federal Docket Management System Office, 4800 Mark Center Drive, 2nd floor, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350–3100.

*Instructions:* All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) 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.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Cindy Allard at (571) 372–0461.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Executive Order 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review” and Executive Order 13563, “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review”**

It has been determined that this rule is not a significant rule. This rule does not (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy; a sector of the economy; productivity; competition; jobs; the environment; public health or safety; or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another Agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in these Executive orders.

**Public Law 96–354, “Regulatory Flexibility Act” (5 U.S.C. Chapter 6)**

It has been determined that this rule for does not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense. A Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required.

**Public Law 95–511, “Paperwork Reduction Act” (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)**

This rule does not contain any information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

**Section 202, Public Law 104–4, “Unfunded Mandates Reform Act”**

It has been determined that this rule does not involve a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more and will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

**Executive Order 13132, “Federalism”**

Executive Order 13132 requires regulations be reviewed for Federalism effects on the institutional interest of states and local governments, and if the effects are sufficiently substantial, preparation of the Federal assessment is required to assist senior policy makers. The amendments will not have any substantial direct effects on state and local governments within the meaning of the EO. Therefore, no Federalism assessment is required.

**List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 311**

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 311 is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

**PART 311—[AMENDED]**

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 311 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Pub. L. 93–579, 88 Stat. 1986 (5 U.S.C. 522a).

■ 2. Section 311.8 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(21) as follows:

**§ 311.8 Procedures for exemptions.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(21) System identifier and name: DMDC 16 DoD, Interoperability Layer Service (IoLS).

(i) Exemption: To the extent that copies of exempt records from JUSTICE/FBI–001, National Crime Information Center (NCIC) are entered into the Interoperability Layer Systems records, the OSD hereby claims the same exemptions, (j)(2) and (k)(3), for the records as claimed in JUSTICE/FBI–001, National Crime Information Center (NCIC). Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a portions of this system that fall within (j)(2) and (k)(3) are exempt from the following provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a, section (c)(3) and (4); (d); (e)(1) through (3); (e)(4)(G) through (I); (e)(5) and (8); (f); and (g) (as applicable) of the Act.

(ii) Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) and (k)(3).

(iii) Reasons: (A) From subsection (c)(3) because making available to a record subject the accounting of disclosure from records concerning him or her would specifically reveal any investigative interest in the individual. Revealing this information could reasonably be expected to compromise ongoing efforts to investigate a known or suspected terrorist by notifying the record subject that he or she is under investigation. This information could also permit the record subject to take measures to impede the investigation, e.g., destroy evidence, intimidate potential witnesses, or flee the area to avoid or impede the investigation.

(B) From subsection (c)(4) because portions of this system are exempt from the access and amendment provisions of subsection (d).

(C) From subsection (d) because these provisions concern individual access to and amendment of certain records contained in this system, including law enforcement, counterterrorism, investigatory, and intelligence records. Compliance with these provisions could alert the subject of an investigation of

the fact and nature of the investigation, and/or the investigative interest of intelligence or law enforcement agencies; compromise sensitive information related to national security; interfere with the overall law enforcement process by leading to the destruction of evidence, improper influencing of witnesses, fabrication of testimony, and/or flight of the subject; could identify a confidential source or disclose information which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of another’s personal privacy; reveal a sensitive investigative or intelligence technique; or constitute a potential danger to the health or safety of law enforcement personnel, confidential informants, and witnesses. Amendment of these records would interfere with ongoing counterterrorism, law enforcement, or intelligence investigations and analysis activities and impose an impossible administrative burden by requiring investigations, analyses, and reports to be continuously reinvestigated and revised.

(D) From subsection (e)(1) because it is not always possible to determine what information is relevant and necessary to complete an identity comparison between the individual seeking access and a known or suspected terrorist. Also, because DoD and other agencies may not always know what information about an encounter with a known or suspected terrorist will be relevant to law enforcement for the purpose of conducting an operational response.

(E) From subsection (e)(2) because application of this provision could present a serious impediment to counterterrorism, law enforcement, or intelligence efforts in that it would put the subject of an investigation, study, or analysis on notice of that fact, thereby permitting the subject to engage in conduct designed to frustrate or impede that activity. The nature of counterterrorism, law enforcement, or intelligence investigations is such that vital information about an individual frequently can be obtained only from other persons who are familiar with such individual and his/her activities. In such investigations, it is not feasible to rely upon information furnished by the individual concerning his own activities.

(F) From subsection (e)(3) to the extent that this subsection is interpreted to require DoD to provide notice to an individual if DoD or another agency receives or collects information about that individual during an investigation or from a third party. Should this subsection be so interpreted, exemption

from this provision is necessary to avoid impeding counterterrorism, law enforcement, or intelligence efforts by putting the subject of an investigation, study, or analysis on notice of that fact, thereby permitting the subject to engage in conduct intended to frustrate or impede the activity.

(G) From subsection (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), and (e)(4)(I) (Agency Requirements) because portions of this system are exempt from the access and amendment provisions of subsection (d).

(H) From subsection (e)(5) because the requirement that records be maintained with attention to accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness could unfairly hamper law enforcement processes. It is the nature of law enforcement to uncover the commission of illegal acts at diverse stages. It is often impossible to determine initially what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and least of all complete. With the passage of time, seemingly irrelevant or untimely information may acquire new significance as further details are brought to light.

(I) From subsection (e)(8) because the requirement to serve notice on an individual when a record is disclosed under compulsory legal process could unfairly hamper law enforcement processes. It is the nature of law enforcement that there are instances where compliance with these provisions could alert the subject of an investigation of the fact and nature of the investigation, and/or the investigative interest of intelligence or law enforcement agencies; compromise sensitive information related to national security; interfere with the overall law enforcement process by leading to the destruction of evidence, improper influencing of witnesses, fabrication of testimony, and/or flight of the subject; reveal a sensitive investigative or intelligence technique; or constitute a potential danger to the health or safety of law enforcement personnel, confidential informants, and witnesses.

(J) From subsection (f) because requiring the Agency to grant access to records and establishing agency rules for amendment of records would unfairly impede the agency's law enforcement mission. To require the confirmation or denial of the existence of a record pertaining to a requesting individual may in itself provide an answer to that individual relating to the existence of an on-going investigation. The investigation of possible unlawful activities would be jeopardized by agency rules requiring verification of the record, disclosure of the record to the

subject, and record amendment procedures.

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

Dated: February 21, 2014.

**Aaron Siegel,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 2014-04273 Filed 2-26-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-06-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0645; FRL-9907-07-Region 5]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Transportation Conformity Procedures

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision submitted by the State of Wisconsin on August 1, 2013, for the purpose of establishing transportation conformity (conformity) criteria and procedures related to interagency consultation, and the enforceability of certain transportation related control and mitigation measures. This revision replaces Wisconsin's conformity State Implementation Plan (SIP) that was approved on August 27, 1996.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 31, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0645, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email*: [blakley.pamela@epa.gov](mailto:blakley.pamela@epa.gov).
3. *Fax*: (312) 692-2450.
4. *Mail*: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.
5. *Hand Delivery*: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The

Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Leslie, Environmental Engineer, Control Strategies Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6680, [leslie.michael@epa.gov](mailto:leslie.michael@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving Wisconsin's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: February 10, 2014.

**Susan Hedman,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 2014-04167 Filed 2-26-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**