Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 71, No. 213
Friday, November 3, 2006

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 1290

[Docket No. FV06–1290–1 FR–C]

RIN 0581–AC59

Specialty Crop Block Grant Program

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the preamble of the final rule (Docket No. FV–06–1290–1 FR), published Monday, September 11, 2006 (71 FR 53303). These corrections clarify a response to comments concerning how the funds will be transferred to the States and the allocation of grant funds not distributed to a State.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 3, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Trista Etzig, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, AMS, USDA, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Stop 0243, Washington, DC 20250–0243; Telephone: (202) 690–4942; *Fax:* (202) 690–0102; or *E-mail: trista.etzig@usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Corrections

In the final rule published on September 11, 2006, beginning on page 53304, in the first column, change the sentence beginning with ''The AMS will provide the entire'' to the following:

''Each time AMS distributes funds to approved applicants it will be by an electronic transfer for the entire approved amount.''

In the final rule published on September 11, 2006, beginning on page 53305, in the third column, add after the sentence ending with ''requested for that application year'' in the first complete paragraph, the following:

''Funds not distributed will be allocated pro rata to the remaining States who applied during the specified grant application period to be solely expended on projects previously approved in their State plan.''

Dated: October 31, 2006.

Lloyd C. Day,

Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. E6–18563 Filed 11–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 58

Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV–1)

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document removes part 58, ''Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV–1)'' presently in Title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This part has served the purpose for which it was intended in the CFR and is no longer necessary.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 3, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: L. Pahland, 703–681–1703, extension 5213.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This part 58 is removed to as a part of a DoD exercise to remove CFR parts no longer required to be codified. The corresponding DoD Instruction 6485.01 is available at *http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/html/648501.htm.*

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 58

Foreign relations, Government employees, HIV/AIDS, Military personnel.

PART 58—[REMOVED]

■ Accordingly, by the authority of 10 U.S.C. 301, 32 CFR part 58 is removed.

Dated: October 30, 2006.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 06–9044 Filed 10–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

32 CFR Part 312

[Docket No. DOD–2006–OS–0168]

RIN 0790–AI01

Inspector General; Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Inspector General, DoD.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is exempting those records in a new system of records (CIG–23, ''Public Affairs Files,'' (August 7, 2006, 71 FR 44667)) in its inventory of systems of records pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), as amended.

DATES: *Effective Date:* December 4, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Darryl R. Aaron at (703) 604–9785.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed rule was published on August 7, 2006, at 71 FR 44602. No comments were received. The rule is therefore adopted as published below.

Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review''

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do 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 this Executive order.

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

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act

systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96–511, ''Paperwork Reduction Act'' (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense impose no information requirements beyond the Department of Defense and that the information collected within the Department of Defense is necessary and consistent with 5 U.S.C. 552a, known as the Privacy Act of 1974.

Section 202, Public Law 104–4, ''Unfunded Mandates Reform Act''

It has been determined that Privacy Act rulemaking for the Department of Defense 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 that such rulemaking will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Executive Order 13132, ''Federalism''

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have federalism implications. The rules do not have substantial direct effects 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.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 312

Privacy.

■ Accordingly, 32 CFR part 312 is amended as follows:

PART 312—OIG PRIVACY ACT PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 312 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Pub. L. 93–579, 88 Stat. 1896 (5 U.S.C. 552a).

■ 2. § 312.12, is amended by adding paragraph (j) to read as follows:

§ 312.12 Exemptions.

* * * * *

(j) *System identifier:* CIG 23

(1) *System name:* Public Affairs Files.

(2) *Exemption:* During the course of processing a General Counsel action, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case records in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those 'other' systems of records are entered into the Public Affairs Files, the Office of the Inspector General hereby claims the same exemptions for the records from those 'other' systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary systems of records which they are a part.

(3) *Authority:* 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (k)(1), (k)(2), (k)(3), (k)(4), (k)(5), (k)(6), and (k)(7).

(4) *Reasons:* Records are only exempt from pertinent provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a to the extent (1) such provisions have been identified and an exemption claimed for the original record and (2) the purposes underlying the exemption for the original record still pertain to the record which is now contained in this system of records. In general, the exemptions were claimed in order to protect properly classified information relating to national defense and foreign policy, to avoid interference during the conduct of criminal, civil, or administrative actions or investigations, to ensure protective services provided the President and others are not compromised, to protect the identity of confidential sources incident to Federal employment, military service, contract, and security clearance determinations, to preserve the confidentiality and integrity of Federal testing materials, and to safeguard evaluation materials used for military promotions when furnished by a confidential source. The exemption rule for the original records will identify the specific reasons why the records are exempt from specific provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a.

Dated: October 30, 2006.

C.R. Choate,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. E6–18588 Filed 11–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

32 CFR Part 318

[Docket No. DOD–2006–OS–0169]

RIN 0790–AI03

Defense Threat Reduction Agency; Privacy Act; Implementation

AGENCY: Defense Threat Reduction Agency, DoD.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Defense Threat Reduction Agency is exempting those records in a new system of records (HDTRA 021, ''Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Case Files'' (August 7, 2006, 71 FR 44668)) in its inventory of systems of records pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 4, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Brenda M. Carter at (703) 325–1205 or DSN 221–1205.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed rule was published on August 7, 2006, at 71 FR 44603. One public comment was received, but the comments did not impact the proposed rule. The rule is therefore adopted as published below.

Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review''

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense are not significant rules. The rules do 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 this Executive order.

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

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense do not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Public Law 96–511, ''Paperwork Reduction Act'' (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35)

It has been determined that Privacy Act rules for the Department of Defense impose no information requirements beyond the Department of Defense and that the information collected within the Department of Defense is necessary and consistent with 5 U.S.C. 552a, known as the Privacy Act of 1974.

Section 202, Public Law 104–4, ''Unfunded Mandates Reform Act''

It has been determined that Privacy Act rulemaking for the Department of Defense 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 that such rulemaking will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.