

effect, in accordance with its own regulations on rulemaking at 24 CFR part 10. Part 10 provides for exceptions to the general rule if the agency finds good cause to omit advance notice and public participation. The good cause requirement is satisfied when prior public procedure is “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest” (24 CFR 10.1; *see also* 5 U.S.C. 553(b)). HUD finds that public notice and comment are unnecessary for this rulemaking because HUD’s EEO regulation is obsolete and unnecessary, and, as such, its removal does not establish or affect substantive policy. HUD’s EEO regulation was initially promulgated to mirror and conform to EEOC’s regulation, but was later effectively superseded as EEOC revised its regulations. For the sake of accuracy and flexibility, HUD will address in administrative guidance, rather than in the Code of Federal Regulations, any future changes to its internal EEO policy and procedures. Additionally, this will eliminate confusion resulting from having two regulations that address the same EEO laws yet differ in currency and scope.

For these reasons, HUD has determined that it is unnecessary to delay the effectiveness of this rule in order to solicit prior public comment.

### III. Findings and Certification

#### *Regulatory Review—Executive Orders 12866 and 13563*

Under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), a determination must be made whether a regulatory action is significant and therefore subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in accordance with the requirements of the order. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulations and Regulatory Review) directs executive agencies to analyze regulations that are “outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome, and to modify, streamline, expand, or repeal them in accordance with what has been learned. Executive Order 13563 also directs that, where relevant, feasible, and consistent with regulatory objectives, and to the extent permitted by law, agencies are to identify and consider regulatory approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public.

Since this final rule covers internal HUD operations and pertains only to current/former employees and applicants for employment at HUD, it is not subject to review under Executive Order 12866. As discussed in this preamble, the final rule would amend

HUD’s personnel regulations by removing HUD’s EEO regulation that, when issued, was established to conform to the EEOC’s regulation but is now outdated. HUD is consolidating its EEO policy and guidance in administrative guidance, allowing HUD more flexibility to effectively incorporate amendments to EEOC’s regulation and simplify procedures for parties seeking to exercise their EEO rights. This final rule is, nevertheless, consistent with the goals of Executive Order 13563, to reduce regulatory burdens and maintain maximum agency flexibility.

#### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements, unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Because HUD has determined that good cause exists to issue this rule without prior public comment, this rule is not subject to the requirement to publish an initial or final regulatory flexibility analysis under the RFA as part of such action.

#### *Unfunded Mandates Reform*

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA)<sup>1</sup> requires that an agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes 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 in any one year. If a budgetary impact statement is required, section 205 of UMRA also requires an agency to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule.<sup>2</sup> However, the UMRA applies only to rules for which an agency publishes a general notice of proposed rulemaking. As discussed above, HUD has determined, for good cause, that prior notice and public comment is not required on this rule and, therefore, the UMRA does not apply to this final rule.

#### *Executive Order 13132, Federalism*

Executive Order 13132 (entitled “Federalism”) prohibits an agency from publishing any rule that has federalism implications if the rule either imposes substantial direct compliance costs on State and local governments and is not

required by statute, or the rule preempts State law, unless the agency meets the consultation and funding requirements of section 6 of the Executive order. This rule will not have federalism implications and would not impose substantial direct compliance costs on State and local governments or preempt State law within the meaning of the Executive order.

#### *Environmental Review*

This final rule does not direct, provide for assistance or loan and mortgage insurance for, or otherwise govern or regulate, real property acquisition, disposition, leasing, rehabilitation, alteration, demolition, or new construction, or establish, revise or provide for standards for construction or construction materials, manufactured housing, or occupancy. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(1), this final rule is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

#### **List of Subjects in 24 CFR Part 7**

Administrative practice and procedure, Equal employment opportunity, Organization and functions (Government agencies).

#### **PART 7—[REMOVED]**

■ Accordingly, under 42 U.S.C. 3535(d) and as discussed in the preamble, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is amending 24 CFR by removing part 7.

Dated: May 12, 2016.

**Nani A. Coloretti,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2016–11806 Filed 5–18–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

#### **Coast Guard**

#### **33 CFR Part 165**

**[Docket Number USCG 2016–0321]**

**RIN 1625–AA00**

#### **Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, Texas**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for waters of the Sabine River, shoreline to shoreline, adjacent to the public boat ramp located in Orange, TX. This safety

<sup>1</sup> 2 U.S.C. 1532.

<sup>2</sup> 2 U.S.C. 1534.

zone is necessary to protect persons and vessels from hazards associated with a high speed boat race competition. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 8:30 a.m. on May 21, 2016, through 6 p.m. on May 22, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG–2016–0321 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email Mr. Scott Whalen, Marine Safety Unit Port Arthur, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 409–719–5086, email [Scott.K.Whalen@uscg.mil](mailto:Scott.K.Whalen@uscg.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Table of Abbreviations**

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
 DHS Department of Homeland Security  
 FR Federal Register  
 NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
 § Section  
 U.S.C. United States Code

**II. Background Information and Regulatory History**

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.” Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule. The Coast Guard received notice on March 30, 2016 that this boat racing event is scheduled to take place on May 21 and 22, 2016. Upon full review of the event details, the Coast Guard determined that additional safety measures are necessary due to potential navigational hazards present during the high speed boat race. It is impractical to publish a NPRM because a safety zone needs to be established by May 21, 2016.

We are issuing this rule, and under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**.

Delaying the effective date of this rule would be contrary to public interest because regulatory action is necessary to limit access to the area of the high speed boat races, protect participants, spectators, and other persons and vessels from the potential hazards during a high speed boat race on a navigable waterway. The Coast Guard will notify the public and maritime community that the safety zone will be in effect and of its enforcement periods via broadcast notices to mariners (BNM) and the event will advertised in the Local Notice to Mariners (LNM).

**III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule**

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The Captain of the Port, Port Arthur (COTP) has determined that the potential hazards associated with high speed boat races are a safety concern for vessels operating on the Sabine River. This rule is needed to protect participants, spectators, and other persons and vessels in the navigable waters within the safety zone during the scheduled races.

**IV. Discussion of the Rule**

This rule establishes a temporary safety zone from 8:30 a.m. on May 21, 2016 through 6:00 p.m. on May 22, 2016. The safety zone covers all navigable waters of the Sabine River, shoreline to shoreline, adjacent to the public boat ramp located in Orange, TX. The northern boundary is from the end of Navy Pier One then easterly to the river’s eastern shore. The southern boundary is a line shoreline to shoreline. The duration of the safety zone is intended to protect participants, spectators, and other persons and vessels, in the navigable waters of the Sabine River during the high speed boat races. No vessel or person will be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative.

**V. Regulatory Analyses**

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive Orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

**A. Regulatory Planning and Review**

Executive Orders 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. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the

importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This rule has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, it has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, and duration of the safety zone. This safety zone is over a 2-day period and enforcement during the effective times, enforcement periods will include scheduled breaks, providing opportunity for vessels to transit through the affected area. Moreover, the Coast Guard will issue Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone and the rule allows vessel to seek permission to enter the zone.

**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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the safety zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section V.A above, this rule will not have a significant economic impact on vessel owners or operators.

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 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.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s

responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

### C. Collection of Information

This rule will 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 Executive Order, 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 rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, this rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does 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 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 rule will not result in such expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f), and have determined 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 rule involves a safety zone during a 2-day period that will prohibit entry within the zone without permission of the Captain of the Port. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2-1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are 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 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.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, and Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

## PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05-1, 6.04-1, 6.04-6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add temporary § 165.T08-0321 to read as follows:

### § 165.T08-0321 Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, Texas.

**Location.** The following area is a safety zone: Waters of the Sabine River, shoreline to shoreline, adjacent to the Orange public boat ramps located in Orange, TX. The northern boundary is from the end of old Navy Pier One at 30°05'50" N. 93°43'15" W. then easterly to the river's eastern shore. The southern boundary is a line shoreline to shoreline at latitude 30°05'33" N. (NAD83).

(a) **Effective Periods.** This rule is effective from 8:30 a.m. on May 21, 2016

through 6:00 p.m. on May 22, 2016. Enforcement during the effective periods will allow for scheduled breaks allowing vessels to pass through the safety zone. Notice of scheduled breaks will be provided as indicated under (d) Informational broadcasts.

(b) **Regulations.** (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in § 165.23 of this part, entry into this zone is prohibited to all persons and vessels except those vessels specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur or a designated representative.

(2) Persons or vessels requiring entry into or passage through must request permission from the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur, or a designated representative. They may be contacted on VHF-FM channel 13 or 16, or by phone at by telephone at 409-719-5070.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the lawful orders or directions given to them by the Captain of the Port, Port Arthur or the Captain of the Port's designated representative. On-scene U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel include commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the U.S. Coast Guard.

(c) **Information broadcasts.** The Coast Guard will inform the public through broadcast notices to mariners of channel restrictions and Vessel Traffic Service advisories on VHF-FM channel 65A.

Dated: April 15, 2016.

**R.S. Ogrydziak,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port, Port Arthur, Texas.*

[FR Doc. 2016-11821 Filed 5-18-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

### Copyright Royalty Board

#### 37 CFR Part 370

[Docket No. RM 2008-7]

### Notice and Recordkeeping for Use of Sound Recordings Under Statutory License

**AGENCY:** Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Copyright Royalty Judges are amending a Copyright Royalty Board rule regarding reporting requirements for certain Educational Stations that pay no more than the minimum fee for their use of sound recordings under the applicable statutory licenses.

**DATES:** Effective May 19, 2016.