

**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 318**

Privacy.

■ Accordingly, 32 CFR part 318 is amended as follows:

**PART 318—DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY PRIVACY PROGRAM**

■ 1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 318 continues to read as follows:

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

■ 2. Section 318.16 is amended by adding paragraph (d) as follows:

**§ 318.16 Exemption rules.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) System identifier and name: HDTRA 021, Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Request Case Files.

(1) *Exemption:* During the processing of a Freedom of Information Act or Privacy 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 Threat Reduction 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.

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

(3) *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: October 30, 2006.

**C.R. Choate,**

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

[FR Doc. E6-18592 Filed 11-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE****Defense Logistics Agency**

[Docket: DoD-2006-OS-0022]

RIN 0790-A100

**32 CFR Part 323****Privacy Act; Implementation**

**AGENCY:** Defense Logistics Agency, DoD.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) is modifying its exemption rule for a system of records (S500.10, "Personnel Security Files," (August 11, 2006, 71 FR 46201)) 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. Jody Sinkler at (703) 767-5045.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed rule was published on August 11, 2006, at 71 FR 46180. 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 323**

Privacy.

■ Accordingly, 32 CFR part 323 is amended as follows:

**PART 323—DLA PRIVACY ACT 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. Appendix H to part 323 is amended by revising paragraphs a.1. through a.4. to read as follows:

## Appendix H to Part 323—DLA Exemption Rules

a. ID: S500.10 (Specific exemption).  
 1. *System name*: Personnel Security Files.  
 2. *Exemption*: Investigatory material compiled solely for the purpose of determining suitability, eligibility, or qualifications for Federal civilian employment, Federal contracts, or access to classified information may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5), but only to the extent that such material would reveal the identity of a confidential source. Therefore, portions of this system may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5) from the following subsections of 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (d), and (e)(1).

3. *Authority*: 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).  
 4. *Reasons*: (i) From subsection (c)(3) and (d) when access to accounting disclosures and access to or amendment of records would cause the identity of a confidential source to be revealed. Disclosure of the source's identity not only will result in the Department breaching the promise of confidentiality made to the source but it will impair the Department's future ability to compile investigatory material for the purpose of determining suitability, eligibility, or qualifications for Federal civilian employment, Federal contracts, or access to classified information. Unless sources can be assured that a promise of confidentiality will be honored, they will be less likely to provide information considered essential to the Department in making the required determinations.

(ii) From (e)(1) because in the collection of information for investigatory purposes, it is not always possible to determine the relevance and necessity of particular information in the early stages of the investigation. In some cases, it is only after the information is evaluated in light of other information that its relevance and necessity becomes clear. Such information permits more informed decision-making by the Department when making required suitability, eligibility, and qualification determinations.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: October 30, 2006.

**C.R. Choate,**

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

[FR Doc. E6-18593 Filed 11-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

### 33 CFR Part 165

[CGD05-06-092]

RIN 1625-AA00

### Safety Zone: Fireworks Display, Trent River, New Bern, NC

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes the establishment of a 1000 foot safety zone around a fireworks display for the North Carolina Parks and Recreation Conference occurring on November 12, 2006, on the Trent River, New Bern, NC. This action is intended to restrict vessel traffic on the Trent River. This safety zone is necessary to protect mariners from the hazards associated with fireworks displays.

**DATES:** This rule is effective from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on November 12, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket (CGD05-06-092) and are available for inspection or copying at Commander, Sector North Carolina, 2301 East Fort Macon Road, Atlantic Beach, NC 28512. Sector North Carolina maintains the public docket for this rulemaking. Comments and material received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at the Federal Building Fifth Coast Guard District between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** CWO Christopher Humphrey, Prevention Department, Coast Guard Sector North Carolina, at (252) 247-4525.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Regulatory Information

On September 12, 2006, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled *Safety Zone: Fireworks Display, Trent River, New Bern, NC* in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 53627). We received no letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public meeting was requested, and none was held.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Delaying the effective date would be contrary to the public interest since immediate action is needed to minimize danger to the public during the event. The potential danger posed by the pyrotechnic display, make special local regulations necessary to provide for the safety of the event participants, spectator craft and other vessels transiting the event area. However advance notifications will be made to users of Trent River via marine information broadcasts, local notice to

mariners, commercial radio stations and area newspapers.

### Background and Purpose

On November 12, 2006, the North Carolina Parks & Recreation Conference fireworks display will be held on the Trent River in New Bern, NC. Spectators will be observing from both the shore and from vessels. Due to the need of protection of mariners and spectators from the hazards associated with the fireworks display, vessel traffic will be temporarily restricted.

### Discussion of Comments and Changes

The Coast Guard did not receive comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published in the **Federal Register**. Accordingly, the Coast Guard is establishing temporary special local regulations on specified waters of Trent River, New Bern, North Carolina.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order. It is not "significant" under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under the regulatory policies and procedures of DHS is unnecessary. Although this regulation restricts access to the regulated area, the effect of this rule will not be significant because: (i) The COTP may authorize access to the safety zone; (ii) the safety zone will be in effect for a limited duration; and (iii) the Coast Guard will make notifications via maritime advisories so mariners can adjust their plans accordingly.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601-612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. 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 would not