

The Regulatory Amendment

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, TTB amends title 27, chapter I, part 9, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 9—AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 9 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 27 U.S.C. 205.

Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

■ 2. Subpart C is amended by adding § 9.262 to read as follows:

§ 9.262 Cape May Peninsula.

(a) *Name.* The name of the viticultural area described in this section is “Cape May Peninsula”. For purposes of part 4 of this chapter, “Cape May Peninsula” is a term of viticultural significance.

(b) *Approved maps.* The 11 United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:24,000 scale topographic maps used to determine the boundary of the Cape May Peninsula viticultural area are titled:

- (1) Ocean City, New Jersey, 1989;
- (2) Marmora, New Jersey, 1989;
- (3) Sea Isle City, New Jersey, 1952; photorevised, 1972;
- (4) Woodbine, New Jersey, 1958; photorevised, 1972;
- (5) Stone Harbor, New Jersey, 1955; photorevised, 1972;
- (6) Wildwood, New Jersey, 1955; photorevised, 1972;
- (7) Cape May, New Jersey, 1954; photorevised, 1972;
- (8) Rio Grande, New Jersey, 1956; photorevised, 1972;
- (9) Heislerville, New Jersey, 1957; photorevised, 1972;
- (10) Port Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1956; photorevised, 1972; and
- (11) Tuckahoe, New Jersey, 1956; photorevised, 1972.

(c) *Boundary.* The Cape May Peninsula viticultural area is located in Cape May and Cumberland Counties, New Jersey. The boundary of the Cape May Peninsula viticultural area is as described below:

(1) The beginning point is on the Ocean City quadrangle at the intersection of the 10-foot elevation contour and the Garden State Parkway, on the southern shore of Great Egg Harbor, northwest of Golders Point. Proceed southeast, then generally southwest along the meandering 10-foot elevation contour, crossing onto the Marmora quadrangle, then onto the Sea Isle City quadrangle, to the intersection of the 10-foot elevation contour with an

unnamed road known locally as Sea Isle Boulevard; then

(2) Proceed northwesterly along Sea Isle Boulevard to the intersection of the road with U.S. Highway 9; then

(3) Proceed southwest along U.S. Highway 9 to the intersection of the highway with the 10-foot elevation contour south of Magnolia Lake; then

(4) Proceed generally southwest along the meandering 10-foot elevation contour, crossing onto the Woodbine quadrangle, then briefly back onto the Sea Isle City quadrangle, then back onto the Woodbine quadrangle, to the intersection of the 10-foot elevation contour with the western span of the Garden State Parkway east of Clermont; then

(5) Proceed southwest along the Garden State Parkway to the intersection of the road with Uncle Aarons Creek; then

(6) Proceed westerly (upstream) along Uncle Aarons Creek to the intersection of the creek with the 10-foot elevation contour near the headwaters of the creek; then

(7) Proceed easterly, then southwest along the 10-foot elevation contour, crossing onto the Stone Harbor quadrangle, then onto the northwesternmost corner of the Wildwood quadrangle, then onto Cape May quadrangle, to the intersection of the 10-foot elevation contour with State Route 109 and Benchmark (BM) 8, east of Cold Spring; then

(8) Proceed southeast, then south, along State Route 109 to the intersection of the road with the north bank of the Cape May Canal; then

(9) Proceed northwest along the north bank of the Cape May Canal to the intersection of the canal with the railroad tracks (Pennsylvania Reading Seashore Lines); then

(10) Proceed south along the railroad tracks, crossing the canal, to the intersection of the railroad tracks with the south bank of the Cape May Canal; then

(11) Proceed east along the canal bank to the intersection of the canal with Cape Island Creek; then

(12) Proceed south, then northwest along the creek to the intersection of the creek with a tributary running north-south west of an unnamed road known locally as 1st Avenue; then

(13) Proceed north along the tributary to its intersection with Sunset Boulevard; then

(14) Proceed northwest along Sunset Boulevard to the intersection of the road with Benchmark (BM) 6; then

(15) Proceed south in a straight line to the shoreline; then

(16) Proceed west, then northwest, then northeast along the shoreline, rounding Cape May Point, and continuing northeasterly along the shoreline, crossing onto the Rio Grande quadrangle, then onto the Heislerville quadrangle, to the intersection of the shoreline with West Creek; then

(17) Proceed generally north along the meandering West Creek, passing through Pickle Factory Pond and Hands Millpond, and continuing along West Creek, crossing onto the Port Elizabeth quadrangle, and continuing along West Creek to the fork in the creek north of Wrights Crossway Road; then

(18) Proceed along the eastern fork of West Creek to the cranberry bog; then

(19) Proceed through the cranberry bog and continue northeasterly along the branch of West Creek that exits the cranberry bog to the creek's terminus south of an unnamed road known locally as Joe Mason Road; then

(20) Proceed northeast in a straight line to Tarkiln Brook Tributary; then

(21) Proceed easterly along Tarkiln Brook Tributary, passing through the cranberry bog, crossing onto the Tuckahoe quadrangle, and continuing along Tarkiln Brook tributary to its intersection with the Tuckahoe River and the Atlantic-Cape May County line; then

(22) Proceed easterly along the Atlantic-Cape May County line, crossing onto the Marmora and Cape May quadrangles, to the intersection of the Atlantic-Cape May County line with the Garden State Parkway on the Cape May quadrangle; then

(23) Proceed south along the Garden State Parkway, returning to the beginning point.

Signed: October 30, 2017.

John J. Manfreda,
Administrator.

Approved: March 30, 2018

Timothy E. Skud,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Tax, Trade, and Tariff Policy).

[FR Doc. 2018-07094 Filed 4-5-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

28 CFR Part 16

[CPCLO Order No. 001-2018]

Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), a component of the

United States Department of Justice (DOJ or Department), is finalizing without change its Privacy Act exemption regulations for the system of records titled, “FBI Online Collaboration Systems,” JUSTICE/FBI–004, which were published as Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on December 4, 2017. Specifically, the FBI exempts the records maintained in JUSTICE/FBI–004 from one or more provisions of the Privacy Act. The exemptions are necessary to avoid interference with the FBI’s law enforcement and national security functions and responsibilities. The Department received only one substantive comment on the proposed rule.

DATES: This final rule is effective May 7, 2018.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katherine M. Bond, Assistant General Counsel, Privacy and Civil Liberties Unit, Office of the General Counsel, FBI, Washington DC, telephone 202–324–3000.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 4, 2017, the FBI published in the **Federal Register** a System of Records Notice (SORN) for an FBI system of records titled, “FBI Online Collaboration Systems,” JUSTICE/FBI–004, 82 FR 57291. On the same day, the FBI published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) proposing to exempt records maintained in JUSTICE/FBI–004 from certain provisions of the Privacy Act pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j) and (k), and inviting public comment on the proposed exemptions. 82 FR 57181. The comment period was open through January 3, 2018. DOJ received only one substantive comment responsive to the proposed exemptions. That comment supported the proposed exemptions in order to protect the safety of law enforcement officers and better enable them to conduct their investigations. After consideration of this public comment, exemptions necessary to protect the ability of the FBI properly to engage in its law enforcement and national security functions have been codified in this final rule as proposed in the NPRM.

Response to Public Comments

In its Online Collaboration Systems NPRM and SORN, both published on December 4, 2017, the Department invited public comment. The comment periods for both documents closed January 3, 2018. The Department received six total comments, only one of which contained any substance related

to the SORN or NPRM. The one responsive comment received stated that the submitter agreed the exemptions proposed in the NPRM are needed for effective law enforcement. The FBI has considered, and agrees with, this comment. Because no other responsive comments were submitted, and because the FBI continues to assert the rationales in support of the exemptions as stated in the NPRM, the FBI adopts in this final rule the exemptions and rationales proposed in the NPRM.

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563—Regulatory Review

This regulation has been drafted and reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review” section 1(b), Principles of Regulation, and Executive Order 13563 “Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review” section 1(b), General Principles of Regulation.

The Department of Justice has determined that this rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866, section 3(f), and accordingly this rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to Executive Order 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule will only impact Privacy Act-protected records, which are personal and generally do not apply to an individual’s entrepreneurial capacity, subject to limited exceptions. Accordingly, the Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this regulation and by approving it certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 13132—Federalism

This regulation will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 13132, it is determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Executive Order 12988—Civil Justice Reform

This regulation meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 to

eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize litigation, provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct, and promote simplification and burden reduction..

Executive Order 13175—Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This rule will have no implications for Indian Tribal governments. More specifically, it does not have substantial direct effects 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. Therefore, the consultation requirements of Executive Order 13175 do not apply.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000, as adjusted for inflation, or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Congressional Review Act

This rule is not a major rule as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804 of the Congressional Review Act.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule imposes no information collection or recordkeeping requirements.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 16

Administrative practice and procedure, Courts, Freedom of information, Privacy Act.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Attorney General by 5 U.S.C. 552a and delegated to me by Attorney General Order 2940–2008, 28 CFR part 16 is amended as follows:

PART 16—PRODUCTION OR DISCLOSURE OF MATERIAL OR INFORMATION

■ 1. The authority citation for part 16 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 552, 552a, 553; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 534; 31 U.S.C. 3717.

Subpart E—Exemption of Records Systems Under the Privacy Act

■ 2. Amend § 16.96 by adding paragraphs (x) and (y) to read as follows:

§ 16.96 Exemption of Federal Bureau of Investigation Systems-limited access.

* * * * *

(x) The following system of records is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3) and (4); (d)(1), (2), (3), and (4); (e)(1), (2), (3), (4)(G), (H), and (I), (5), and (8); (f); and (g):

(1) The FBI Online Collaboration Systems (JUSTICE/FBI-004).

(2) These exemptions apply only to the extent that information in this system is subject to exemption pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j) or (k). Where the FBI determines compliance with an exempted provision would not appear to interfere with or adversely affect interests of the United States or other system stakeholders, the FBI in its sole discretion may waive an exemption in whole or in part; exercise of this discretionary waiver prerogative in a particular matter shall not create any entitlement to or expectation of waiver in that matter or any other matter. As a condition of discretionary waiver, the FBI in its sole discretion may impose any restrictions deemed advisable by the FBI (including, but not limited to, restrictions on the location, manner, or scope of notice, access or amendment).

(y) Exemptions from the particular subsections are justified for the following reasons:

(1) From subsection (c)(3), the requirement that an accounting be made available to the named subject of a record, because this system is exempt from the access provisions of subsection (d). Also, because making available to a record subject the accounting of disclosures from records concerning him/her would specifically reveal any law enforcement or national security investigative interest in the individual by the FBI or agencies that are recipients of the disclosures. Revealing this information could compromise ongoing, authorized law enforcement and intelligence efforts, particularly efforts to identify and defuse any potential acts of terrorism or other potential violations of criminal law. Revealing this information could also permit the record subject to obtain valuable insight concerning the information obtained during any investigation and to take measures to circumvent the investigation (e.g. destroy evidence or flee the area to avoid investigation).

(2) From subsection (c)(4) notification requirements because this system is exempt from the access and amendment provisions of subsection (d) as well as the accounting disclosures provision of subsection (c)(3). The FBI takes seriously its obligation to maintain accurate records despite its assertion of this exemption, and to the extent it, in

its sole discretion, agrees to permit amendment or correction of FBI records, it will share that information in appropriate cases.

(3) From subsections (d)(1), (2), (3), and (4); (e)(4)(G) and (H); (e)(8); (f); and (g) because these provisions concern individual access to and amendment of law enforcement and intelligence records and compliance with such provisions could alert the subject of an authorized law enforcement or intelligence activity about that particular activity and the investigative interest of the FBI and/or other law enforcement or intelligence agencies. Providing access rights could compromise sensitive law enforcement information, disclose information that could constitute an unwarranted invasion of another's personal privacy; reveal a sensitive investigative or intelligence technique; provide information that would allow a subject to avoid detection or apprehension; or constitute a potential danger to the health or safety of law enforcement personnel, confidential sources, and witnesses. The FBI takes seriously its obligation to maintain accurate records despite its assertion of this exemption, and to the extent it, in its sole discretion, agrees to permit amendment or correction of FBI records, it will share that information in appropriate cases with subjects of the information.

(4) From subsection (e)(1) because it is not always possible to know in advance what information is relevant and necessary for law enforcement and intelligence purposes. Relevance and necessity are questions of judgment and timing. For example, what appears relevant and necessary when collected ultimately may be deemed unnecessary. It is only after information has been fully assessed that its relevancy and necessity in a specific investigative activity can be determined.

(5) From subsections (e)(2) and (3) because application of these provisions requiring collection directly from the subject individuals and informing individuals regarding information to be collected about them could present a serious impediment to efforts to solve crimes and improve national security. Application of these provisions could put the subject of an investigation on notice of the existence of the investigation and allow the subject an opportunity to engage in conduct intended to obstruct or otherwise impede that activity or take steps to avoid apprehension.

(6) From subsection (e)(4)(I), to the extent that this subsection is interpreted to require more detail regarding the record sources in this system than has

already been published in the **Federal Register** through the SORN documentation. Should the subsection be so interpreted, exemption from this provision is necessary to protect the sources of law enforcement and intelligence information and to protect the privacy and safety of witnesses and informants and others who provide information to the FBI.

(7) From subsection (e)(5) because in the collection of information for authorized law enforcement and intelligence purposes it is often impossible to determine in advance what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. With time, additional facts, or analysis, information may acquire new significance. The restrictions imposed by subsection (e)(5) would thus limit the ability of trained investigators and intelligence analysts to exercise their judgment in reporting on investigations and impede the development of criminal intelligence necessary for effective law enforcement. Although the FBI has claimed this exemption, it continuously works with its federal, state, local, tribal, and international partners to maintain the accuracy of records to the greatest extent practicable. The FBI does so with established policies and practices. The criminal justice and national security communities have a strong operational interest in using up-to-date and accurate records and will apply their own procedures and foster relationships with their partners to further this interest.

Dated: April 2, 2018.

Peter A. Winn,

Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer.

[FR Doc. 2018-07056 Filed 4-5-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG-2018-0156]

Special Local Regulation; California Half Ironman Triathlon, Oceanside, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of enforcement of regulation.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard will enforce the special local regulations on the waters offshore Oceanside and within Oceanside Harbor, California during the California Half Ironman Triathlon from 6:30 a.m. to 8:40 a.m. on April 7, 2018.