

from offerors in response to solicitation provision 252.247-7026, Evaluation Preference for Use of Domestic Shipyards—Applicable to Acquisition of Carriage by Vessel for DoD Cargo in the Coastwise of Noncontiguous Trade, are found at PGI 247.573(b)(3).

(4) Procedures are provided at PGI 247.573(b)(4) to accomplish security background checks pursuant to clause 252.247-7027, Riding Gang Member Requirements.

247.573-1, 247.573-2 and 247.573-3
[Removed]

■ 4. Remove sections 247.573-1, 247.573-2, and 247.573-3.

247.574 [Amended]

■ 5. Section 247.574 is amended by—
■ a. In paragraph (e), removing the last two sentences; and
■ b. In paragraph (f), removing the last sentence.

[FR Doc. 2014-24401 Filed 10-10-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

48 CFR Part 252

RIN 0750-AI30

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Flowdown of Specialty Metals Restrictions (DFARS Case 2014-D011)

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: DoD is issuing a final rule amending the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to clarify the flowdown requirements for the DFARS clause entitled “Restriction on Acquisition of Certain Articles Containing Specialty Metals.”

DATES: *Effective* October 14, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Amy G. Williams, telephone 571-372-6106.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

DoD published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** at 79 FR 35507 on June 23, 2014, to clarify the flowdown requirements for the DFARS clause entitled “Restriction on Acquisition of Certain Articles Containing Specialty

Metals.” In order to prevent misinterpretation of the current flowdown requirement to insert the “substance of the clause” in subcontracts, the flowdown requirement has been rewritten to specify that the only modifications allowed when flowing down the clause are as follows:

- Exclude and reserve paragraph (d) of the clause.
 - Modify paragraph (c)(6) of the clause only as necessary to facilitate management of the allowance for up to 2 percent otherwise noncompliant specialty metal content in the end product, while recognizing that the minimal content exception does not apply to specialty metals contained in high-performance magnets.
 - Not further alter the clause, other than to identify the appropriate parties.
- One respondent submitted public comments in response to the proposed rule.

II. Discussion and Analysis

DoD reviewed the public comments in the development of the final rule. No changes were made to the rule as a result of those comments.

Comment: The respondent noted that the proposed clarification may well be necessary and welcomed DoD’s willingness to minimize misinterpretations of laws and regulations.

Response: Noted.

Comment: The respondent expressed concern about the number of national security waivers issued to accept noncompliant specialty metals from China and other noncompliant sources.

Response: The granting of national security waivers is outside the scope of this case.

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 regulatory 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

A final regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared consistent with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 604, and is summarized as follows:

The reason for issuance of this rule is to clarify the flowdown requirements for DFARS clause 252.225-7009, Restriction on Acquisition of Certain Articles Containing Specialty Metals. The objective of the rule is to more fully implement the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 2533b, which restricts the acquisition of specialty metals not melted in the United States, its outlying areas, or a qualifying country, in order to strengthen the United States industrial base.

There were no significant issues raised by the public comments in response to the initial regulatory flexibility analysis.

This rule applies to DoD contractors and subcontractors that are providing aircraft, missile or space systems, ships, tank or automotive items, weapon systems, ammunition, or components thereof that contain specialty metals.

Based on Fiscal Year 2013 data in the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS), DoD awarded 1,566 contracts that exceeded the simplified acquisition threshold for aircraft, missile or space systems, ships, tank or automotive items, weapon systems, ammunition, or components thereof. Of those awards, 642 were to 533 unique small business entities (83%). FPDS does not contain data on subcontracts. If we estimate an average of 20 subcontracts per contract for items containing specialty metals, and that 35 percent of those subcontracts are awarded to small businesses, 2 second-tier subcontracts with small business entities per subcontract with a small business entity, then this rule may apply to approximately 27,828 small business entities subject to DFARS 52.225-7009.

$(1,566 \text{ contracts} \times 2031,320 \text{ subcontracts} \times .3510,962 \text{ 1st tier subcontracts with small entities} \times 2 = 21,924 \text{ second-tier subcontracts with small entities. Total small business entities} = .83(642 + 10,962 + 21,924) = 27,828)$

There are no reporting or recordkeeping requirements associated with this rule. With some exceptions, the rule requires contractors to provide certain end products containing specialty metals melted or produced in the United States, its outlying areas, or a qualifying country. However, end items may contain a minimal amount of otherwise noncompliant specialty metals, if the total weight of such noncompliant metals does not exceed 2 percent of the total of all specialty

metals in the end item. Therefore, the contractor has some discretion in flowing down the requirement to subcontractors to the extent necessary to ensure compliance of the end products the contractor will deliver to the Government.

This rule does not impose any significant new burdens on small entities, because it only clarifies what was intended by the conventional statement to insert “the substance of the clause” in subcontracts for items containing specialty metals.

V. Paperwork Reduction Act

The rule does not contain any 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).

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 252

Government procurement.

Manuel Quinones,

Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations System.

Therefore, 48 CFR part 252 is amended as follows:

PART 252—SOLICITATION PROVISIONS AND CONTACT CLAUSES

■ 1. The authority citation for 48 CFR part 252 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 41 U.S.C. 1303 and 48 CFR chapter 1.

■ 2. Amend section 252.225–7009 by—

■ a. Removing the clause date “(JUN 2013)” and adding “(OCT 2014)” in its place; and

■ b. Revising paragraph (e) to read as follows:

252.225–7009 Restriction on Acquisition of Certain Articles Containing Specialty Metals.

* * * * *

(e) *Subcontracts.* (1) The Contractor shall exclude and reserve paragraph (d) and this paragraph (e)(1) when flowing down this clause to subcontracts.

(2) The Contractor shall insert paragraphs (a) through (c) and this paragraph (e)(2) of this clause in subcontracts, including subcontracts for commercial items, that are for items containing specialty metals to ensure compliance of the end products that the Contractor will deliver to the Government. When inserting this clause in subcontracts, the Contractor shall—

(i) Modify paragraph (c)(6) of this clause only as necessary to facilitate management of the minimal content

exception at the prime contract level. The minimal content exception does not apply to specialty metals contained in high-performance magnets; and

(ii) Not further alter the clause other than to identify the appropriate parties.

[FR Doc. 2014–24402 Filed 10–10–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 622

[Docket No. 101206604–1758–02]

RIN 0648–X100714b

Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Temporary rule; trip limit reduction.

SUMMARY: NMFS reduces the trip limit for the commercial sector of king mackerel in the eastern zone of the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) in the Florida west coast northern subzone to 500 lb (227 kg) of king mackerel per day in or from the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). This trip limit reduction is necessary to protect the Gulf king mackerel resource.

DATES: This rule is effective 12:01 a.m., local time, October 13, 2014, through June 30, 2015, unless changed by further notice in the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Gerhart, telephone: 727–824–5305, email: susan.gerhart@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The fishery for coastal migratory pelagic fish (king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, and cobia) is managed under the Fishery Management Plan for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic (FMP). The FMP was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils (Councils) and is implemented under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) by regulations at 50 CFR part 622.

The Gulf migratory group king mackerel is divided into western and eastern zones. On April 27, 2000, NMFS implemented the final rule (65 FR

16336, March 28, 2000) that further divided the Gulf eastern zone’s Florida west coast subzone into northern and southern subzones, and established their separate quotas. The December 29, 2011 (76 FR 82058), final rule specified the quota for the Florida west coast northern subzone at 178,848 lb (81,124 kg) (50 CFR 622.384(b)(1)(i)(B)(2)).

The regulations at 50 CFR 622.385(a)(2)(ii)(B)(2), provide that when 75 percent of the Florida west coast northern subzone’s quota has been harvested until a closure of the subzone has been effected or the fishing year ends, king mackerel in or from the EEZ may be possessed on board or landed from a permitted vessel in amounts not exceeding 500 lb (227 kg) per day.

NMFS has projected that 75 percent of the quota for Gulf migratory group king mackerel from the Florida west coast northern subzone has been reached. Accordingly, a 500-lb (227-kg) trip limit applies to vessels with a commercial permit for king mackerel that possess or land king mackerel in or from the EEZ in the Florida west coast northern subzone effective 12:01 a.m., local time, October 13, 2014. The 500-lb (227-kg) trip limit will remain in effect until the subzone closes or until the end of the current fishing year (June 30, 2015), whichever occurs first.

The Florida west coast northern subzone is that part of the EEZ between 26°19.8’ N. latitude (a line directly west from the boundary between Lee and Collier Counties, FL) and 87°31.1’ W. longitude (a line directly south from the state boundary of Alabama and Florida).

Classification

The Regional Administrator, Southeast Region, NMFS, has determined this temporary rule is necessary for the conservation and management of Gulf migratory group king mackerel and is consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable laws.

This action is taken under 50 CFR 622.385(a)(2)(ii)(B) and is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866.

These measures are exempt from the procedures of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because the temporary rule is issued without opportunity for prior notice and comment.

This action responds to the best scientific information available. The Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA, (AA), finds good cause to waive the requirements to provide prior notice and opportunity for public comment pursuant to the authority set forth at 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) as such prior notice and opportunity for public comment is unnecessary and contrary to the public