

Planning Staff, Two Constitution Square, 145 N Street NE., Room 3E-405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 1, 2016.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2016-13305 Filed 6-6-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

[OMB Number 1140-0055]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Identification of Explosive Materials

AGENCY: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will submit 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 August 8, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially 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 Anita Scheddel, Program Analyst, Explosives Industry Programs Branch, 99 New York Ave. NE., Washington, DC 20226 at email: eipb-informationcollection@atf.gov. Written comments and/or suggestions can also be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov

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 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 technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

1. *Type of Information Collection* (check justification or form 83-I): Revision of a currently approved collection.

2. *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Identification of Explosive Materials.

3. *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:*

Form number (if applicable): None.

Component: Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice.

4. *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

Primary: Business or other for-profit.

Other (if applicable): None.
Abstract: Marking of explosives enables law enforcement entities to more effectively trace explosives from the manufacturer through the distribution chain to the end purchaser. This process is used as a tool in criminal enforcement activities.

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated 2,205 respondents will take 3 seconds to respond.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 956 hours.

If additional information is required 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., Room 3E-405B, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: June 1, 2016.

Jerri Murray,

Department Clearance Officer for PRA, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 2016-13349 Filed 6-6-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Modification to Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

On June 1, 2016, the United States Department of Justice filed, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency, a proposed Modification to the 2002 Consent Decree in *United States and the State of Maryland v. Mayor and the City Council of Baltimore, Maryland*, Civil Action No. 1:02-CV-01524-JFM, with the United States District Court for the District of Maryland (“proposed Modified Consent Decree.”)

On September 30, 2002, the Court entered the 2002 Consent Decree between the parties resolving Plaintiffs’ claims that the City of Baltimore violated the Clean Water Act (the “CWA”), 33 U.S.C. 1319(b) and (d), resulting from Baltimore’s operation of its sewer system and wastewater control plant. Under the 2002 Consent Decree, Baltimore was required to eliminate any remaining combined sewers in the collections system, eliminate structures for sanitary sewer overflows (SSO), conduct thorough evaluations of the City’s eight sewersheds, propose rehabilitation measures for each sewershed and implement such measures after approval. The 2002 Consent Decree provides for implementation completion by January 2016.

Baltimore did not meet the January 2016 deadline for all of the rehabilitation measures. This proposed Modified Consent Decree allows Baltimore more time to conduct the SSO work using a two-phased approach. Under the proposed Modified Consent Decree, the Phase I work is required to be completed by January 2021, and then Baltimore is required to submit a Phase II Plan for EPA approval by December 2022. The Phase II Plan must propose a schedule for work to be completed no later than December 2030. After the Phase II work Baltimore will conduct two years of post-implementation monitoring. If after the Phase II work is complete the Plaintiffs determine that additional work is necessary, they can require Baltimore to undertake additional remedial measures.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the