

1610.1(d). If the adult wearing apparel is not exempt from testing under 16 CFR 1610.1(d), none of this policy, the enforcement discretion described in this policy nor the implications of such enforcement discretion shall apply. In addition, any misrepresentation or omission regarding the applicable facts or application of 16 CFR 1610.1(d) under the circumstances could subject the applicable firm to applicable compliance or enforcement action and potential civil and/or criminal penalties.

The Commission's exercise of the enforcement discretion described in this policy is not intended to, does not and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party against the CPSC or otherwise against the United States government.

Dated: February 26, 2016.

**Todd A. Stevenson,**  
*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2016-04533 Filed 3-9-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2016-0155]

RIN 1625-AA00

#### Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River 321.4 to 321.6; Quincy, IL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone for all waters of the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) from mile 321.4 to mile 321.6. The safety zone is needed to protect persons, property, and infrastructure from potential damage and safety hazards associated with work being completed on new power lines across the river. Entry of vessels or persons into this zone is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Captain of the Port (COTP). Deviation from the safety zone may be requested and will be considered on a case-by-case basis as specifically authorized by the COTP or a designated representative.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 7:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. daily beginning on March 21, 2016 through April 1, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type USCG-2016-0155 in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

[www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), type USCG-2016-0155 in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rule.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email LCDR Sean Peterson, Chief of Prevention, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 314-269-2332, email [Sean.M.Peterson@uscg.mil](mailto:Sean.M.Peterson@uscg.mil).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Table of Abbreviations

BNM Broadcast Notice to Mariners  
CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
COTP Captain of the Port  
DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
§ Section  
UMR Upper Mississippi River  
U.S.C. United States Code

##### II. Background Information and Regulatory History

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency finds good cause that those procedures are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because Ameren notified the Coast Guard on February 17, 2016, that this work will require helicopters to stretch the power lines across the river. Due to the risks associated with this work crossing the navigable channel, a closure is needed. It would be impracticable to publish a NPRM because the safety zone must be established beginning March 21, 2016. Broadcast Notices to Mariners (BNM) and information sharing with waterway users will update mariners of the safety zone and enforcement times during the operations.

We are issuing this rule, and under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Providing 30 days notice would be impracticable because immediate action is needed to protect vessels from the hazards associated with the rope crossing the navigable channel.

##### III. Legal Authority and Need for Rule

The Coast Guard is issuing this rule under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231. The

COTP UMR has determined that potential hazards associated with using helicopters to stretch power lines across the navigational channel presents safety concerns for anyone within this limited area of the UMR. This rule provides additional safety measures, to protect persons and vessels, in the form of a safety zone from mile 321.4 to mile 321.6 on the UMR to protect those in the area and for the Coast Guard to maintain navigational safety.

##### IV. Discussion of the Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone prohibiting access to the UMR from mile 321.4 to mile 321.6, extending the entire width of the river from 7:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. daily beginning on March 21, 2016 and scheduled to end on April 1, 2016, or until conditions allow for safe navigation, whichever occurs earlier. Deviation from the safety zone may be requested and will be considered on a case-by-case basis as specifically authorized by the COTP or a designated representative. The COTP may be contacted by telephone at 314-269-2332 or can be reached by VHF-FM channel 16.

##### V. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive Orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

###### A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This rule has not been designated a "significant regulatory action," under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, it has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. This rule establishes a temporary safety zone limiting access to the UMR from mile 321.4 to mile 321.6. Notifications of enforcement times will be communicated to the marine community via BNM. The impacts on navigation will be limited to ensure the safety of mariners and vessels during the period that the helicopters will be pulling the power lines across the navigational channel. Deviation requests

will be reviewed and considered on a case-by-case basis.

#### B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the safety zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section V.A. above, this rule will not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency’s responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

#### C. Collection of Information

This rule will not call for a new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

#### D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Governments

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect 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. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, this rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. If you believe this rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section above.

#### E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### F. Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule involves a safety zone on the UMR from mile 321.4 to mile 321.6. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this rule.

#### G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

### PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Add § 165.T08–0155 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T08–0155 Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River 321.4 to 321.6; Quincy, IL.

(a) *Location*. The following area is a safety zone: All waters of the Upper Mississippi River mile 321.4 to 321.6, extending the entire width of the river.

(b) *Definitions*. As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard coxswain, petty officer, or other officer operating a Coast Guard vessel and a Federal, State, and local officer designated by or assisting the Captain of the Port Upper Mississippi River (COTP) in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) *Regulations*. (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part, you may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (a) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(2) To seek permission to enter, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative via VHF–FM channel 16, or through Coast Guard Sector Upper Mississippi River at 314–269–2332. Those in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(d) *Effective and enforcement period*. This rule is effective and will be enforced from 7:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. daily beginning on March 21, 2016 through April 1, 2016.

Dated: March 3, 2016.

**M.L. Malloy,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Upper Mississippi River.*

[FR Doc. 2016-05388 Filed 3-9-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

### **Forest Service**

#### **36 CFR Part 242**

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

### **Fish and Wildlife Service**

#### **50 CFR Part 100**

[Docket No. FWS-R7-SM-2015-0156; FXRS12610700000-156-FF07J00000; FBMS #4500087231]

**RIN 1018-BA82**

### **Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska; Rural Determinations, Nonrural List**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, Agriculture; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Affirmation of direct final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Subsistence Board is adopting, without change, a direct final rule that revised the list of areas in Alaska determined to be nonrural for purposes of the Federal Subsistence Program to the list that existed prior to 2007. Accordingly, the community of Saxman and the area of Prudhoe Bay were removed from the nonrural list. The following areas continue to be nonrural, but their boundaries returned to their previous borders: The Kenai Area; the Wasilla/Palmer area; the Homer area; and the Ketchikan area. Because we received no substantive adverse comments on the direct final rule, it is now effective.

**DATES:** The direct final rule published at 80 FR 68245 on November 4, 2015, was effective December 21, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** The direct final rule may be found online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) in Docket No. FWS-R7-SM-2015-0156.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, c/o U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention: Eugene R. Peltola, Jr., Office of Subsistence Management; (907) 786-3888 or [subsistence@fws.gov](mailto:subsistence@fws.gov). For questions specific to National Forest System lands, contact Thomas Whitford, Regional Subsistence Program Leader, USDA, Forest Service, Alaska Region; (907) 743-9461 or [twhitford@fs.fed.us](mailto:twhitford@fs.fed.us).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **Background**

Under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) jointly implement the Federal Subsistence Management Program (Program). This program provides a preference for take of fish and wildlife resources for subsistence uses on Federal public lands and waters in Alaska. Only residents of areas identified as rural are eligible to participate in the Program on Federal public lands in Alaska. Because this program is a joint effort between Interior and Agriculture, these regulations are located in two titles of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): Title 36, "Parks, Forests, and Public Property," and Title 50, "Wildlife and Fisheries," at 36 CFR 242.1-242.28 and 50 CFR 100.1-100.28, respectively.

Consistent with these regulations, the Secretaries established a Federal Subsistence Board (Board) comprising Federal officials and public members to administer the Program. One of the Board's responsibilities is to determine which communities or areas of the State are nonrural. The Secretaries also divided Alaska into 10 subsistence resource regions, each of which is represented by a Regional Advisory Council (Council). The Council members represent varied geographical, cultural, and user interests within each region. The Councils provide a forum for rural residents with personal knowledge of local conditions and resource requirements to have a meaningful role in the subsistence management of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands in Alaska.

### **Related Rulemaking**

The Secretaries published a final rule (80 FR 68249; November 4, 2015) that sets forth a new process by which the Board will make rural determinations ("Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska; Rural Determination Process").

Until promulgation of the rule mentioned above, Federal subsistence regulations at 36 CFR 242.15 and 50 CFR 100.15 had required that the rural or nonrural status of communities or areas be reviewed every 10 years, beginning with the availability of the 2000 census data. In addition, criteria for aggregation of communities and population thresholds were listed. On May 7, 2007, the Board published a final rule that revised the list of nonrural areas (72 FR 25688), and the rule

included a compliance date of May 7, 2012.

On October 23, 2009, Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar announced the initiation of a Departmental review of the Federal Subsistence Management Program in Alaska; Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack later concurred with this course of action. The Secretaries announced the findings of the review, which included several proposed administrative and regulatory reviews and/or revisions to strengthen the Program and make it more responsive to those who rely on it for their subsistence uses. One proposal called for a review, with Council input, of the rural determination process and, if needed, recommendations for regulatory changes.

The Board met on January 20, 2012, and, among other things, decided to extend the compliance date of its 2007 final rule on rural determinations. A final rule published March 1, 2012 (77 FR 12477), that extended the compliance date until either the rural determination process and findings review were completed or 5 years, whichever came first. The 2007 regulations have remained in titles 36 and 50 of the CFR unchanged since their effective date.

The Board followed that action with a request for comments and announcement of public meetings (77 FR 77005; December 31, 2012) to receive public, Tribal, and Alaska Native Corporation input on the rural determination process. At their fall 2013 meetings, the Councils provided a public forum to hear from residents of their regions, deliberate on the rural determination process, and provide recommendations for changes to the Board. The Board also held hearings in Barrow, Ketchikan, Sitka, Kodiak, Bethel, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Kotzebue, Nome, and Dillingham to solicit comments on the rural determination process, and public testimony was recorded. Government-to-government tribal consultations on the rural determination process were held between members of the Board and Federally recognized Tribes of Alaska. Additional consultations were held between members of the Board and Alaska Native Corporations.

Altogether, the Board received 475 substantive comments from various sources, including individuals, members of the Councils, and other entities or organizations, such as Alaska Native Corporations and borough governments. In general, this information indicated a broad dissatisfaction with the current rural determination process.