

Security Service Privacy Program rules. These changes will allow the Department to transfer this system to another organization within the Department. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of DoD's program by preserving the exempt status of the records when the purposes underlying the exemption are valid and necessary to protect the contents of the records.

This rule is being published as a direct final rule as the Department of Defense does not expect to receive any adverse comments, and so a proposed rule is unnecessary.

DATES: The rule will be effective on July 5, 2011 unless comments are received that would result in a contrary determination. Comments will be accepted on or before June 24, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal Rulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail:* Federal Docket Management System Office, Room 3C843, 1160 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1160.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Leslie Blake at (703) 325-9450.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Direct Final Rule and Significant Adverse Comments

DoD has determined this rulemaking meets the criteria for a direct final rule because it involves nonsubstantive changes dealing with DoD's management of its Privacy Programs. DoD expects no opposition to the changes and no significant adverse comments. However, if DoD receives a significant adverse comment, the Department will withdraw this direct final rule by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**. A significant adverse comment is one that explains: (1) Why the direct final rule is inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or (2) why the direct final rule will be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a

comment necessitates withdrawal of this direct final rule, DoD will consider whether it warrants a substantive response in a notice and comment process.

Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" and Executive Order 13563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory 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 these Executive orders.

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 additional information collection requirements on the public under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

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 321

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR 321 is amended as follows:

PART 321—DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE PRIVACY PROGRAM

- 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 321 continues to read as follows:

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

- 2. In § 321.13, remove and reserve paragraph (h) to read as follows:

§ 321.13 Exemptions.

* * * * *

(h) [Reserved].

Dated: April 8, 2011.

Patricia Topping,

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

[FR Doc. 2011-9747 Filed 4-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DoD-2011-OS-0009]

32 CFR Part 323

Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

AGENCY: Defense Logistics Agency, DoD.

ACTION: Direct final rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is updating the Defense Logistics Agency Privacy Act Program Rules, by adding the exemption rules (j)(2), (k)(2), (k)(3), (k)(4), (k)(5), (k)(6), and (k)(7) for S510.30, Freedom of Information Act/Privacy Act Requests and Administrative Appeal Records to accurately describe the basis for exempting the records. The S510.30 system of records notice was printed on January 22, 2009 in the **Federal Register**.

This direct final rule makes nonsubstantive changes to the Defense Logistics Agency Privacy Program rules. These changes will allow the Department to exempt records from certain portions of the Privacy Act. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of DoD's program by preserving the exempt status of the

records when the purposes underlying the exemption are valid and necessary to protect the contents of the records.

This rule is being published as a direct final rule as the Department of Defense does not expect to receive any adverse comments, and so a proposed rule is unnecessary.

DATES: The rule will be effective on July 5, 2011 unless comments are received that would result in a contrary determination. Comments will be accepted on or before June 24, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jody Sinkler at (703) 767-5045.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Direct Final Rule and Significant Adverse Comments

DoD has determined this rulemaking meets the criteria for a direct final rule because it involves nonsubstantive changes dealing with DoD's management of its Privacy Programs. DoD expects no opposition to the changes and no significant adverse comments. However, if DoD receives a significant adverse comment, the Department will withdraw this direct final rule by publishing a notice in the Federal Register. A significant adverse comment is one that explains: (1) Why the direct final rule is inappropriate, including challenges to the rule's underlying premise or approach; or (2) why the direct final rule will be ineffective or unacceptable without a change. In determining whether a comment necessitates withdrawal of this direct final rule, DoD will consider whether it warrants a substantive response in a notice and comment process.

Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" and Executive Order 13563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory 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 these Executive orders.

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 additional information collection requirements on the public under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

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 323

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 323 is amended as follows:

PART 323—DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY PRIVACY PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 323 continues to read as follows:

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

■ 2. In Appendix H to part 323, add paragraph (g) to read as follows:

Appendix H to Part 323—DLA Exemption Rules

* * * * *

g. ID: S510.30

1. *System name:* Freedom of Information Act/Privacy Act Requests and Administrative Appeal Records.

2. *Exemption:* During the processing of a Freedom of Information Act request, exempt materials from other systems of records may in turn become part of the case record in this system. To the extent that copies of exempt records from those "other" systems of records are entered into this system, the Defense Logistics Agency claims the same exemptions for the records from those "other" systems that are entered into this system, as claimed for the original primary system of which they are a part.

3. *Authority:* 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2), (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 such provisions have been identified and an exemption claimed for the original record and 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: April 8, 2011.

Patricia L. Toppings,
OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2011-9748 Filed 4-22-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG-2011-0196]

RIN 1625-AA00

Safety Zone; Bay Ferry II Maritime Security Exercise; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the San Francisco Bay in support of the Bay Ferry II Maritime Security Exercise, a multi-agency exercise that tests the proficiency of teams called upon in real