Issued in Washington, DC, on January 14, 2016.

Leslie M. Swann,

Acting Manager, Airspace Policy Group.

[FR Doc. 2016–01211 Filed 1–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 1231

[Docket No. CPSC–2015–0031]

Safety Standard for High Chairs; Correction

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; correction.

SUMMARY: The United States Consumer Product Safety Commission (''Commission'' or ''CPSC'') is correcting a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (''NPR'') that appeared in the **Federal Register** of November 9, 2015 (80 FR 69144). The document proposed a safety standard for high chairs. The Commission is correcting an error in the proposed regulatory text concerning rearward stability.

DATES: As established in the November 9, 2015 NPR, comments on the proposed rule are due by January 25, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stefanie C. Marques, Project Manager, Directorate for Health Sciences, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 5 Research Place, Rockville, MD 20850; telephone: 301–987–2581; email: *smarques@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of November 9, 2015 (80 FR 69144), the Commission published an NPR proposing to establish a safety standard for high chairs pursuant to section 104(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act of 2008 (''CPSIA''; Pub. L. 110–314, 122 Stat. 3016). The NPR proposed to incorporate by reference ASTM F404–15, *Standard Consumer Safety Specification for High Chairs* (''ASTM F404–15'') into 16 CFR part 1231 and proposed more stringent requirements than those specified in ASTM F404–15 for rearward stability and warnings on labels and in instructional literature. The NPR contained an error, which the Commission is now correcting.

The correction pertains to proposed 16 CFR 1231.2, paragraph (b)(2), regarding the rearward stability index (''SI'') the Commission proposed to require for high chairs. The preamble to the NPR (page 69151, section VIII.A., titled *Description of Proposed Changes to ASTM Standard, Rearward Stability*) and the briefing package available on the Commission's Web site correctly described and discussed the Commission's proposal to require high chairs to have an SI of 50 or more. However, the proposed regulatory text on page 69159 of the NPR misstated the proposed requirement as prohibiting high chairs from having an SI of 50 or more.

The Commission hereby makes the following correction to the NPR appearing on page 69144 in the **Federal Register** of November 9, 2015:

§ 1231.2 [Corrected]

■ On page 69159, in the third column, in § 1231.2, in paragraph (b)(2), ''6.5.2 *Rearward stability*—When tested in accordance with 7.7.2.6 (paragraph (c)(3) of this section), a high chair shall not have a Rearward Stability Index of 50 or more.'' is corrected to read ''6.5.2 *Rearward stability*—When tested in accordance with 7.7.2.6 (paragraph (c)(3) of this section), a high chair shall have a Rearward Stability Index of 50 or more.''

Dated: January 15, 2016.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2016–01133 Filed 1–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 240

[Release No. 34–76922; File No. S7–15–15]

RIN 3235–AL74

Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories and Exemption From Indemnification Requirement

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') is reopening the comment period for proposed amendments to rule 13n–4 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'') related to regulatory access to security-based swap data held by security-based swap data repositories. The proposed rule amendments would implement Exchange Act provisions that conditionally require that security-based swap data repositories make data available to certain regulators and other authorities. Recent legislation has modified certain underlying statutory provisions.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published September 14, 2015, at 80 FR 55182, is reopened. Submit comments on or before February 22, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/proposed.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number S7–15–15 on the subject line; or
- Use the Federal eRulemaking Portal (*http://www.regulations.gov*). Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number S7–15–15. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help us process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/proposed.shtml*). Comments are also available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly.

Studies, memoranda, or other substantive items may be added by the Commission or staff to the comment file during this rulemaking. A notification of the inclusion in the comment file of any such materials will be made available on the SEC's Web site. To ensure direct electronic receipt of such notifications, sign up through the ''Stay Connected'' option at *www.sec.gov* to receive notifications by email.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carol McGee, Assistant Director, Joshua Kans, Senior Special Counsel, or Kateryna P. Imus, Special Counsel, at (202) 551–5870; Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange

Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–7010.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

A. Proposed Rule

Exchange Act sections 13(n)(5)(G) and (H), which were added by Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, conditionally require security-based swap data repositories to make data available to certain regulators and other entities. The statute identifies certain entities as being eligible to access data, and states that the Commission may determine that other persons are appropriate to access such data. The statute further provides that the Commission must be notified of requests for access, and also conditions data access on the security-based swap data repository receiving certain confidentiality-related agreements. Moreover, under the statute as it was originally enacted in 2010, data access was conditional on the recipient entity agreeing to indemnify the repository and the Commission for expenses arising from litigation relating to the information provided.[1]

On September 14, 2015, the Commission proposed rules to implement those data access provisions.[2] Key features of the proposal included:

(i) *Designation of entities that may access data.* The proposal provided that, in addition to the entities identified by the statute, the Federal Reserve Banks and the Office of Financial Research (''OFR'') may access data.[3] The proposal also specified factors and conditions that the Commission would consider in making future determinations regarding entities eligible to access data and the scope of such entities' access to data. In that regard the Commission stated that it preliminarily expected that such determination orders ''typically would incorporate conditions that specify the scope of a relevant authority's access to data, and that limit this access in a manner that reflects the relevant authority's regulatory mandates or legal responsibility or authority.'' [4]

(ii) *Confidentiality condition to data access.* To implement the statutory confidentiality condition, the proposal provided that there must be a memorandum of understanding (''MOU'') or other arrangement between the Commission and the recipient of data to address the confidentiality of the data provided to the recipient.[5] The Commission stated that it expected this approach would help avoid the possibility of uneven and potentially inconsistent application of the confidentiality condition.[6]

(iii) *Notification requirement.* The proposal provided that a security-based swap data repository could satisfy the statutory notification requirement by notifying the Commission of the first data access request by an entity, and maintaining a record of subsequent requests.[7]

(iv) *Indemnification exemption.* The proposal included an exemption from the indemnification requirement. This exemption would have been conditioned, in part, on the information provided relating to ''persons or activities within the recipient entity's regulatory mandate, or legal responsibility or authority.'' [8]

B. Statutory Amendment

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law Public Law 114–94, the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015. This law, among other things, amended the statutory data access provisions by eliminating the indemnification requirement discussed above.[9] The law also revised the data access provisions in two other ways.[10]

The elimination of the indemnification requirement makes unnecessary paragraph (d) of proposed rule 13n–4, which would have implemented the conditional exemption from the indemnification requirement.[11] The statutory amendments, however, do not affect the proposed provisions: (i) Addressing the designation of additional entities as being eligible to access data (potentially including the Federal Reserve Banks and the OFR); (ii) implementing the confidentiality condition to data access; and (iii) implementing the statutory notification requirement.

II. Request for Comments

Commenters are invited to discuss the proposal in light of the recent statutory amendments. Commenters particularly are invited to address the impact, on the remaining aspects of the proposal, arising from the elimination of the proposed indemnification exemption, including the exemption's proposed condition limiting access to security-based swap data to persons or authorities within a relevant authority's regulatory mandate or legal responsibility or authority. For example, to what extent should those criteria related to an entity's regulatory mandate or legal responsibility and authority be used by the Commission as it implements the confidentiality condition and/or the Commission's determination authority?

Commenters further are invited to address whether the use of that limitation should vary depending on the type of recipient entity. For example, should those criteria be considered exclusively in conjunction with recipient authorities not specifically named in the statute, including the Federal Reserve Banks and the OFR, or should those criteria instead be considered in conjunction with access to data by all entities under these provisions? [12]

In addition, commenters are requested to address whether the proposal should be revised to address the other statutory changes to the data access provisions—such as addition of the term ''other

---

[1] *See generally* Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories and Exemption From Indemnification Requirement, Exchange Act Release No. 75845 (Sept. 14, 2015), 80 FR 55182 (Sept. 14, 2015) (''Data Access Proposing Release'').

[2] The proposal built upon two prior Commission proposals to implement the data access provisions and to provide an exemption from the indemnification requirement. *See id.* at 55182–84.

[3] *See* proposed Exchange Act rule 13n–4(b)(9)(ix).

[4] *See* Data Access Proposing Release, 80 FR 55187–88.

[5] *See* proposed Exchange Act rule 13n–4(b)(10).

[6] *See* Data Access Proposing Release, 80 FR 55190.

[7] *See id.* at 55188–89; proposed Exchange Act rule 13n–4(e).

[8] *See* proposed Exchange Act rule 13n-4(d). The proposal also would require the Commission and the recipient of data to enter into an MOU or other arrangement to specify the type of information that would fall within this regulatory mandate, or legal responsibility or authority. *See id.*

[9] *See* Public Law 114–94, sec. 86011(c)(2).

[10] In part, the statutory revision clarified that the scope of the data access provision applies to security-based swap data, not all data maintained by the repository. *See* Public Law 114–94, sec. 86011(c)(1)(A) (striking ''all'' and adding ''security-based swap'' in the introductory part of Exchange Act section 13(n)(5)(G)). That focus on security-based swaps already was incorporated into the proposal. *See* proposed Exchange Act rule 13n–4(b)(9).

The statutory revision also added the term ''other foreign authorities'' to the nonexclusive statutory list of entities that the Commission may determine appropriate to access data under these provisions. *See* Public Law 114–94, sec. 86011(c)(1)(B). That change is consistent with the proposal, which used the term ''including, but not limited to'' in the relevant portion of the rule text (preceding the specific references to foreign financial supervisors, foreign central banks, and foreign ministries). *See* proposed Exchange Act rule 13n–4(b)(9)(x).

[11] *See* Data Access Proposing Release, 80 FR at 55211.

[12] As noted above, the Commission stated that it preliminarily expected that subsequent determination orders under the statute and proposed rule ''typically would incorporate conditions that specify the scope of a relevant authority's access to data, and that limit this access in a manner that reflects the relevant authority's regulatory mandates or legal responsibility or authority.''

foreign authorities'' to the list of entities that the Commission may determine appropriate to access data. For example, should the Commission revise proposed paragraph (b)(9)(x) of rule 13n–4 to specifically note that it may determine that ''other foreign authorities'' also may access data pursuant to these provisions?

Commenters are also invited to address the impact of the statutory amendments on the Commission's economic analysis.

By the Commission.

Dated: January 15, 2016.

Brent J. Fields,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–01148 Filed 1–20–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

27 CFR Part 9

[Docket No. TTB–2016–0002; Notice No. 157]

RIN 1513–AC23

Proposed Establishment of the Willcox Viticultural Area

AGENCY: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) proposes to establish the approximately 526,000-acre ''Willcox'' viticultural area in portions of Cochise and Graham Counties in southeastern Arizona. The proposed viticultural area does not lie within, nor does it contain, any other established viticultural area. TTB designates viticultural areas to allow vintners to better describe the origin of their wines and to allow consumers to better identify wines they may purchase. TTB invites comments on this proposed addition to its regulations.

DATES: Comments must be received by March 21, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Please send your comments on this proposed rule to one of the following addresses (please note that TTB has a new address for comments submitted by U.S. mail):

- *Internet: http://www.regulations.gov* (via the online comment form for this proposed rule as posted within Docket No. TTB–2016–0002 at ''Regulations.gov,'' the Federal e-rulemaking portal);
- *U.S. Mail:* Director, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Box 12, Washington, DC 20005; or
- *Hand delivery/courier in lieu of mail:* Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005.

See the Public Participation section of this notice for specific instructions and requirements for submitting comments, and for information on how to request a public hearing or view or obtain copies of the petition and supporting materials.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen A. Thornton, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Box 12, Washington, DC 20005; phone 202–453–1039, ext. 175.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background on Viticultural Areas

TTB Authority

Section 105(e) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (FAA Act), 27 U.S.C. 205(e), authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations for the labeling of wine, distilled spirits, and malt beverages. The FAA Act provides that these regulations should, among other things, prohibit consumer deception and the use of misleading statements on labels and ensure that labels provide the consumer with adequate information as to the identity and quality of the product. The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) administers the FAA Act pursuant to section 1111(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, codified at 6 U.S.C. 531(d). The Secretary has delegated various authorities through Treasury Department Order 120–01 (dated December 10, 2013, superseding Treasury Order 120–01 (Revised), ''Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau,'' dated January 24, 2003), to the TTB Administrator to perform the functions and duties in the administration and enforcement of this law.

Part 4 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR part 4) authorizes TTB to establish definitive viticultural areas and regulate the use of their names as appellations of origin on wine labels and in wine advertisements. Part 9 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR part 9) sets forth standards for the preparation and submission of petitions for the establishment or modification of American viticultural areas (AVAs) and lists the approved AVAs.

Definition

Section 4.25(e)(1)(i) of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 4.25(e)(1)(i)) defines a viticultural area for American wine as a delimited grape-growing region having distinguishing features, as described in part 9 of the regulations, and a name and a delineated boundary, as established in part 9 of the regulations. These designations allow vintners and consumers to attribute a given quality, reputation, or other characteristic of a wine made from grapes grown in an area to the wine's geographic origin. The establishment of AVAs allows vintners to describe more accurately the origin of their wines to consumers and helps consumers to identify wines they may purchase. Establishment of an AVA is neither an approval nor an endorsement by TTB of the wine produced in that area.

Requirements

Section 4.25(e)(2) of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 4.25(e)(2)) outlines the procedure for proposing an AVA and provides that any interested party may petition TTB to establish a grape-growing region as an AVA. Section 9.12 of the TTB regulations (27 CFR 9.12) prescribes the standards for petitions for the establishment or modification of AVAs. Petitions to establish an AVA must include the following:

- Evidence that the area within the proposed AVA boundary is nationally or locally known by the AVA name specified in the petition;
- An explanation of the basis for defining the boundary of the proposed AVA;
- A narrative description of the features of the proposed AVA affecting viticulture, such as climate, geology, soils, physical features, and elevation, that make the proposed AVA distinctive and distinguish it from adjacent areas outside the proposed AVA boundary;
- The appropriate United States Geological Survey (USGS) map(s) showing the location of the proposed AVA, with the boundary of the proposed AVA clearly drawn thereon; and
- A detailed narrative description of the proposed AVA boundary based on USGS map markings.

Willcox Petition

TTB received a petition from Paul S. Hagar, the special projects manager of Dragoon Mountain Vineyard, on behalf of Dragoon Mountain Vineyard and other vineyard and winery owners in Willcox, Arizona, proposing the establishment of the ''Willcox'' AVA in southeastern Arizona. The proposed AVA contains approximately 526,000 acres and has 21 commercial vineyards, covering approximately 454 acres, distributed across the proposed AVA.