

date of the transmittal of the report to OMB and Congress.

The matching program will continue for 18 months after the effective date and may be extended for an additional 12 months thereafter, if the conditions specified in 5 U.S.C. 552a(o)(2)(D) have been met.

6. Address for Receipt of Public Comments or Inquiries.

Individuals wishing to comment on this matching program, or to obtain additional information about the program, including requesting a copy of the computer matching agreement between ED and SSA, should contact Marya Dennis, Management and Program Analyst, U.S. Department of Education, Union Center Plaza, 830 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20202-5454. Telephone: (202) 377-3385. If you use a telecommunications device (TDD) for the deaf or text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service, toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Accessible Format: Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) by contacting the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: www.gpo.gov/fdsys. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at: www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Dated: February 16, 2016.

James W. Runcie,
Chief Operating Officer Federal Student Aid.
[FR Doc. 2016-04465 Filed 2-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of 229 Boundary for the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (Also Known as Jefferson Lab)

AGENCY: Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of 229 Boundary for the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (also known as Jefferson Lab).

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Department of Energy, pursuant to Section 229 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, as implemented by 10 CFR part 860 published in the **Federal Register** on August 26, 1963 (28 FR 8400), prohibits the unauthorized entry, as provided in 10 CFR 860.3 and the unauthorized introduction of weapons or dangerous materials, as provided in 10 CFR 860.4, into or upon the following described facilities of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility of the United States Department of Energy. The following amendments are made:

The U.S. Department of Energy installation known as the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility is located in the Second Civil District of Newport News, Virginia, within the corporate limits of the City of Newport News. The facility is located on a 169 acre federal reservation. North of the DOE-owned land is an eight acre parcel referred to as the Virginia Associated Research Campus (VARC) which is owned and operated by the Commonwealth of Virginia and leased to Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) which, in turn, subleases five acres of this property to DOE for use in support of the Laboratory. The facility is located on the east side of State Route 143 (Jefferson Avenue), between the intersections of City Center Boulevard and Hogan Drive. The 229 Boundary of this facility is indicated by a combination of main entry signage, chain link fence, and guardrails which surround the facility.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Tracye M. Baber; Real Estate Contracting Officer; DOE Oak Ridge Office; Post Office Box 2001; Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831; Telephone: (865) 241-5627.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This security boundary is designated pursuant to Section 229 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Issued in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, on February 22, 2016.

Tracye M. Baber,

Real Estate Contracting Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016-04432 Filed 2-29-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EL16-6-001; ER16-121-000]

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.; Notice Inviting Post-Technical Conference Comments

On February 4, 2016, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) staff conducted a technical conference concerning PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.'s (PJM) existing and proposed Auction Revenue Rights (ARR) and Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) tariff provisions. All interested persons are invited to file post-technical conference comments on PJM's filings and the topics discussed during the technical conference, including those indicated below.

Regarding PJM's filing and proposed changes, specifically:

- Whether PJM's conservative modeling of outages that limited the allocation of Stage 1B ARRs have resulted in an inequitable cost shift, and please explain why.

- PJM proposes to eliminate portfolio netting. Comment on the current practice of netting positively valued FTRs against negatively valued FTRs within an FTR holder's portfolio. Do the current tariff provisions on netting work to protect the markets against the potential exercise of manipulation, and if so, how? If netting is eliminated and causes the potential for the exercise of manipulation, what measures would need to be put into place to prevent potential market manipulation? Would allocating surplus funds to load rather than to FTR holders, or carrying surplus funds forward to fund any future revenue inadequacy be ways of addressing potential manipulation?

- The appropriateness of using the 1.5 percent adder for all zones, regardless of the actual zonal load growth rate and negative load growth projections for some areas; and the appropriateness of conducting the 10-year study with different growth rates as a sensitivity study, as is done for other RTEP studies. Is the cost of building transmission as a result of the 1.5 percent adder justified by the benefit of being able to accommodate the current allocations in Stage 1A?

Regarding PJM's proposed solutions in the context of its current tariff, please discuss if there are other solutions to consider. Specifically, please comment on:

- If infeasible Stage 1A ARRs should continue to be awarded and treated as they are today.