

report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States. A major rule may take effect no earlier than 60 calendar days after Congress receives the rule report or the rule is published in the **Federal Register**, whichever is later. This rule is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

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

Section 202(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1532(a)) requires agencies to assess anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule whose mandates may result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector, in any one year of \$100 million in 1995 dollars, updated annually for inflation. This rule will not mandate any requirements for State, local, or Tribal governments, nor will it affect private sector costs.

*Public Law 96–354, “Regulatory  
Flexibility Act” (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)*

The Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency has certified that this rule is not subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) because it would not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the DoD. Therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended, does not require DoD to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis.

*Public Law 96–511, “Paperwork  
Reduction Act” (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.)*

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) was enacted to minimize the paperwork burden for individuals; small businesses; educational and nonprofit institutions; Federal contractors; State, local, and Tribal governments; and other persons resulting from the collection of information by or for the Federal Government. The Act requires agencies obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget before using identical questions to collect information from ten or more persons. This rule does not impose reporting or recordkeeping requirements on the public.

*Executive Order 13132, “Federalism”*

Executive Order 13132 establishes certain requirements that an agency

must meet when it promulgates a rule that imposes substantial direct requirement costs on State and local governments, preempts State law, or otherwise has federalism implications. This rule will not have a substantial effect on State and local governments.

*Executive Order 13175, “Consultation  
and Coordination With Indian Tribal  
Governments”*

Executive Order 13175 establishes certain requirements that an agency must meet when it promulgates a rule that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on one or more Indian Tribes, preempts Tribal law, or affects the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. This rule will not have a substantial effect on Indian Tribal governments.

**List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 310**

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 310 is amended as follows:

**PART 310—PROTECTION OF PRIVACY  
AND ACCESS TO AND AMENDMENT  
OF INDIVIDUAL RECORDS UNDER  
THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974**

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 310 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552a.

■ 2. Appendix A to 32 CFR part 310 is amended by adding blanket routine uses O, P, Q, and R to read as follows:

**Appendix A to Part 310—DOD Blanket  
Routine Uses**

\* \* \* \* \*

**O. Routine Use—Data Breach Response and  
Remediation**

A record from a system of records maintained by DoD or a Component may be disclosed to appropriate agencies, entities, and persons when (1) the Component suspects or has confirmed that there has been a breach of the system of records; (2) the Component has determined that as a result of the suspected or confirmed breach there is a risk of harm to individuals, DoD (including its information systems, programs, and operations), the Federal Government, or national security; and (3) the disclosure made to such agencies, entities, and persons is reasonably necessary to assist in connection with the Component's efforts to respond to the suspected or confirmed breach or to prevent, minimize, or remedy such harm.

**P. Routine Use—Data Breach Inter-Agency  
Assistance**

A record from a system of records maintained by DoD or a Component may be disclosed to another Federal agency or Federal entity, when DoD or the Component determines that information from this system

of records is reasonably necessary to assist the recipient agency or entity in (1) responding to a suspected or confirmed breach or (2) preventing, minimizing, or remedying the risk of harm to individuals, the recipient agency or entity (including its information systems, programs, and operations), the Federal Government, or national security, resulting from a suspected or confirmed breach.

**Q. Routine Use—Agency Sharing To Support  
Counterterrorism**

A record from a system of records maintained by a Component consisting of, or relating to, terrorism information (6 U.S.C. 485(a)(4)), homeland security information (6 U.S.C. 482(f)(1)), or law enforcement information (Guideline 2 Report attached to White House Memorandum, “Information Sharing Environment,” November 22, 2006) may be disclosed to a Federal, State, local, Tribal, territorial, foreign governmental and/or multinational agency, either in response to its request or upon the initiative of the Component, for purposes of sharing such information as is necessary and relevant for the agencies for the detection, prevention, disruption, preemption, and mitigation of the effects of terrorist activities against the territory, people, and interests of the United States of America as contemplated by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act of 2004 (Pub. L. 108–458) and Executive Order 13388 (October 25, 2005).

**R. Routine Use—Office of Inspector General**

A record from a system of records maintained by DoD or a Component may be disclosed to another Federal, State, or local agency for the purpose of comparing to the agency's system of records or to non-Federal records, in coordination with an Office of Inspector General, in conducting an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, or some other review as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

Dated: April 18, 2023.

**Aaron T. Siegel,**

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

[FR Doc. 2023–08475 Filed 4–20–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001–06–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**Office of the Secretary**

**32 CFR Part 310**

[Docket ID: DoD–2022–OS–0066]

**RIN 0790–AL08**

**Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Department of Defense (DoD).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense (Department or DoD) is issuing a final rule to amend its regulations to exempt

portions of the system of records titled DoD-0010, "Counterintelligence Functional Services" from certain provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 because of national security, law enforcement, and employment suitability mission areas.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on May 22, 2023.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rahwa Keleta, Privacy and Civil Liberties Division, Directorate for Privacy, Civil Liberties and Freedom of Information, Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency, Department of Defense, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24, Suite 08D09, Alexandria, VA 22350-1700; [OSD.DPCLTD@mail.mil](mailto:OSD.DPCLTD@mail.mil); (703) 571-0070.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Discussion of Comments and Changes**

This proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** (87 FR 37774) on June 24, 2022. Comments were accepted for 60 days until August 23, 2022. No comments were received.

#### **I. Background**

In finalizing this rule, DoD is exempting portions of this system of records titled DoD-0010, "Counterintelligence Functional Services," from certain provisions of the Privacy Act. This system of records covers DoD's maintenance of records about individuals to protect against espionage, intelligence activities, sabotage, or assassinations conducted by foreign entities or international terrorists. Counterintelligence Functional Services (CIFS) activities support the following Counterintelligence (CI) missions: countering espionage; countering international terrorism; and providing support to force protection, research, development, and acquisition activities. CIFS also include assessments of CI incidents and DoD-required CI reporting conducted throughout the DoD enterprise. Not included in this system of records are records concerning CI investigations or CI collection activities.

#### **II. Privacy Exemption**

The Privacy Act permits Federal agencies to exempt eligible records in a system of records from certain provisions of the Act, including the provisions providing individuals with a right to request access to and amendment of their own records and accountings of disclosures of such records. If an agency intends to exempt a particular system of records, it must

first go through the rulemaking process to provide public notice and an opportunity to comment on the proposed exemption. The DoD is amending 32 CFR part 310 to add a new Privacy Act exemption rule for this system of records. The DoD is adding an exemption for this system of records because some of its records may contain investigatory material compiled for classified national security information; law enforcement purposes; and employment suitability determinations pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(5). The DoD is claiming an exemption from several provisions of the Privacy Act, including various access, amendment, disclosure of accounting, and certain recordkeeping and notice requirements, to avoid, among other harms, frustrating the underlying purposes for which the information was gathered.

#### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

Executive Orders 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, distribute impacts, and equity). Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. It has been determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action under these Executive Orders.

*Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 804(2))*

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. DoD will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States. A major rule may take effect no earlier than 60 calendar days after Congress receives the rule report or the rule is published in the **Federal Register**, whichever is later. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

*Section 202, Public Law 104-4, "Unfunded Mandates Reform Act"*

Section 202(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1532(a)) requires agencies to assess anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule whose mandates may result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector, in any one year of \$100 million in 1995 dollars, updated annually for inflation. This rule will not mandate any requirements for State, local, or Tribal governments, nor will it affect private sector costs.

*Public Law 96-354, "Regulatory Flexibility Act" (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*)*

The Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency has certified that this rule is not subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) because it would not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the DoD. Therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended, does not require DoD to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis.

*Public Law 96-511, "Paperwork Reduction Act" (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*)*

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) was enacted to minimize the paperwork burden for individuals; small businesses; educational and nonprofit institutions; Federal contractors; State, local, and Tribal governments; and other persons resulting from the collection of information by or for the Federal Government. The Act requires agencies obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget before using identical questions to collect information from ten or more persons. This rule does not impose reporting or recordkeeping requirements on the public.

*Executive Order 13132, "Federalism"*

Executive Order 13132 establishes certain requirements that an agency must meet when it promulgates a rule that imposes substantial direct requirement costs on State and local governments, preempts State law, or otherwise has federalism implications. This rule will not have a substantial effect on State and local governments.

*Executive Order 13175, “Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments”*

Executive Order 13175 establishes certain requirements that an agency must meet when it promulgates a rule that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on one or more Indian tribes, preempts Tribal law, or affects the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. This rule will not have a substantial effect on Indian Tribal governments.

**List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 310**

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 310 is amended as follows:

**PART 310—PROTECTION OF PRIVACY AND ACCESS TO AND AMENDMENT OF INDIVIDUAL RECORDS UNDER THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 310 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552a.

■ 2. Section 310.13 is amended by adding paragraph (e)(8) to read as follows:

**§ 310.13 Exemptions for DoD-wide systems.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

(8) *System identifier and name.* DoD–0010, “Counterintelligence Functional Services”

(i) *Exemptions.* This system of records is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3); (d)(1), (2), (3), and (4); (e)(1); (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I); and (f) of the Privacy Act.

(ii) *Authority.* 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(5).

(iii) *Exemption from the particular subsections.* Exemption from the particular subsections is justified for the following reasons:

(A) *Subsections (c)(3), (d)(1), and (d)(2)—(1) Exemption (k)(1).* Records in this system of records may contain information concerning individuals that is properly classified pursuant to executive order. Application of exemption (k)(1) for such records may be necessary because access to and amendment of the records, or release of the accounting of disclosures for such records, could reveal classified information. Disclosure of classified records to an individual may cause damage to national security.

(2) *Exemption (k)(2).* Records in this system of records may contain investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes other than material within the scope of 5 U.S.C.

552a(j)(2). Application of exemption (k)(2) may be necessary because access to, amendment of, or release of the accounting of disclosures of such records could: inform the record subject of an investigation of the existence, nature, or scope of an actual or potential law enforcement or disciplinary investigation, and thereby seriously impede law enforcement or prosecutorial efforts by permitting the record subject and other persons to whom he might disclose the records or the accounting of records to avoid criminal penalties, civil remedies, or disciplinary measures; interfere with a civil or administrative action or investigation by allowing the subject to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension, which may undermine the entire investigatory process; reveal confidential sources who might not have otherwise come forward to assist in an investigation and thereby hinder DoD’s ability to obtain information from future confidential sources; and result in an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of others. Amendment of such records could also impose a highly impracticable administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated.

(3) *Exemption (k)(5).* Records in this system of records may contain information concerning investigatory material compiled solely for determining suitability, eligibility, and qualifications for Federal civilian employment, military service, Federal contracts, or access to classified information. In some cases, such records may contain information pertaining to the identity of a source who furnished information to the Government under an express promise the source’s identity would be held in confidence (or prior to the effective date of the Privacy Act, under an implied promise). Application of exemption (k)(5) may be necessary because access to, amendment of, or release of the accounting of disclosures of such records could identify these confidential sources who might not have otherwise come forward to assist the Government; hinder the Government’s ability to obtain information from future confidential sources; and result in an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of others. Amendment of such records could also impose a highly impracticable administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated.

(B) *Subsections (d)(3) and (4).* These subsections are inapplicable to the extent an exemption is claimed from subsections (d)(1) and (2).

(C) *Subsection (e)(1).* In the collection of information for investigatory or law enforcement purposes, it is not always possible to conclusively determine the relevance and necessity of particular information in the early stages of the investigation or adjudication. In some instances, it will be only after the collected information is evaluated in light of other information that its relevance and necessity for effective investigation and adjudication can be assessed. Collection of such information permits more informed decision-making by the Department when making required suitability, eligibility, fitness, and credentialing determinations. Accordingly, application of exemptions (k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(5) may be necessary.

(D) *Subsections (e)(4)(G) and (H).* These subsections are inapplicable to the extent exemption is claimed from subsections (d)(1) and (2). Because portions of this system are exempt from the individual access and amendment provisions of subsection (d) for the reasons noted above, DoD is not required to establish requirements, rules, or procedures with respect to such access or amendment provisions. Providing notice to individuals with respect to the existence of records pertaining to them in the system of records or otherwise setting up procedures pursuant to which individuals may access, view, and seek to amend records pertaining to themselves in the system would potentially reveal classified information, undermine investigative efforts, reveal the identities of witnesses, potential witnesses, and confidential informants, and impose an undue administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continually reinvestigated. Accordingly, application of exemptions (k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(5) may be necessary.

(E) *Subsection (e)(4)(I).* To the extent that this provision is construed to require more detailed disclosure than the broad, general information currently published in the system notice concerning the categories of sources of the records in the system, an exemption from this provision is necessary to protect classified information, other national security information, and the confidentiality of national security, law enforcement, and investigatory sources of information, and to protect the privacy and physical safety of witnesses and informants. Accordingly, application of exemptions (k)(1), (k)(2) and (k)(5) may be necessary.

(F) *Subsection (f).* The agency’s rules are inapplicable to those portions of the system that are exempt. Accordingly,

application of exemptions (k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(5) may be necessary.

(iv) *Exempt records from other systems.* In the course of carrying out the overall purpose for this system, exempt records from other systems of records may in turn become part of the records maintained in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those other systems of records are maintained in this system, the DoD claims the same exemptions for the records from those other systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the prior system(s) of which they are a part, provided the reason for the exemption remains valid and necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: April 18, 2023.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison  
Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2023-08468 Filed 4-20-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

#### 32 CFR Part 555

[Docket ID: COE-2022-0001]

RIN 0710-AB43

#### Corps of Engineers, Research and Development, Laboratory Research and Development and Tests, Work for Others

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule removes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' part titled, "Corps of Engineers, Research and Development, Laboratory Research and Development and Tests, Work for Others." This part is redundant with existing internal agency guidance and otherwise covers internal agency operations that have no public compliance component or adverse public impact. Therefore, this part can be removed from the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

**DATES:** This rule is effective on April 21, 2023.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Anthony Niles at (202) 761-1849 or by email at [Anthony.R.Niles@usace.army.mil](mailto:Anthony.R.Niles@usace.army.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This final rule removes the Corps' regulation at 32 CFR part 555, titled "Corps of Engineers, Research and Development,

Laboratory Research and Development and Tests, Work for Others." Part 555 defines and establishes policies and procedures applicable to the performance of research, development, and tests at the Corps' laboratory installations for other governmental and private agencies and organizations. Removing this part reduces confusion for the public as well as for the Corps regarding the current policies that govern performance of research, development, and tests at Corps facilities for other governmental and private agencies and organizations. Part 555 refers to an old structure of independent laboratories within the Corps and to facilities that no longer exist. The new updated internal agency policy refers to the more recent organization of the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) and new laboratories and centers since publication of Part 555.

For public accessibility purposes, the updated internal agency policy on this topic may be found in various sources. The applicability content covering the organizational elements and description of services that apply to research and developments and tests to be performed for other organizations are included in the strategy document providing the Corps' overarching approach to research and development, titled "USACE Research and Development Strategy" (Strategy), which published in November 2021 (available at <https://www.erd.c.usace.army.mil/About/USACE-Research-and-Development-Strategy-2022/>); in Engineer Circular 70-2-38, "Civil Works Research, Development, and Technology Process," which published on May 31, 2021 (available at [https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=eyI9\\_Sz-9Ng%3d&tabid=16426&portalid=76&mid=31387](https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=eyI9_Sz-9Ng%3d&tabid=16426&portalid=76&mid=31387)); and in the Engineer Regulation 1140-1-211 (ER 1140-1-211), "Reimbursable Services," which published on September 10, 2020 (available at <https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=DKAjxGGNI5w%3d&tabid=16441&portalid=76&mid=43546>). The policy content covering the terms and conditions of services, agreements, and funds for services are covered in ER 1140-1-211, and the policies, procedures and responsibilities for support agreements are covered in the DoD Instruction 4000.19, "Support Agreements," which published on December 16, 2020 (available at <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/>

[400019p.pdf?ver=AgPBMZwTey4t8dkHdRM4ng%3D%3D](https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/400019p.pdf?ver=AgPBMZwTey4t8dkHdRM4ng%3D%3D)). The terms of providing reimbursement for services content are discussed in ER 1140-1-211. Additional content on this topic can be found in the Engineer Regulation 70-1-5, "Corps of Engineers Research and Development Program," which published on December 31, 1989 (available at [https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/EngineerRegulations/ER\\_70-1-5.pdf](https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/EngineerRegulations/ER_70-1-5.pdf)).

The solicitation of public comment for this removal is unnecessary because the rule is out-of-date and has no public compliance component or adverse public impact. Because the regulation does not place a burden on the public, its removal does not provide a reduction in public burden or costs. This rule is not significant under Executive Order 12866, titled "Regulatory Planning and Review."

#### List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 555

Engineers Corps, Intergovernmental relations, Laboratories, Research.

#### PART 555—[REMOVED]

■ Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the preamble and under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301, the Corps removes 32 CFR part 555.

Approved by:

Michael L. Connor,

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)

[FR Doc. 2023-08399 Filed 4-20-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720-58-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG-2023-0338]

RIN 1625-AA08

#### Special Local Regulation; Marine Events; Annual Bayview Mackinac Race, Lake Huron, MI

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of enforcement of regulation.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard will enforce the special local regulations for the annual Bayview Yacht Club Port Huron to Mackinac Race. This special local regulation is necessary to safely control vessel movements in the vicinity of the race and provide for the safety of the general boating public and commercial shipping. During this enforcement