PART 140—ORGANIZATION, FUNCTIONS, AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMISSION

6. The authority citation for part 140 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2a(12), 12a, 13(c), 13(d), 13(e), and 16(b).

7. Amend § 140.94 as follows:

a. Revise the introductory text of paragraph (c);

b. Redesignate paragraphs (c)(4) through (c)(13) as paragraphs (c)(5) through (c)(14); and

c. Add new paragraph (c)(4).

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 140.94 Delegation of authority to the Director of the Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight and the Director of the Division of Clearing and Risk.

(c) The Commission hereby delegates, until such time as the Commission orders otherwise, the following functions to the Director of the Division of Clearing and Risk and to such members of the Commission’s staff acting under his or her direction as he or she may designate from time to time:

(4) All functions reserved to the Commission in § 39.6 of this chapter, except for the authority to:

(i) Grant an exemption under § 39.6(a) of this chapter;

(ii) Prescribe conditions to an exemption under § 39.6(b) of this chapter;

(iii) Modify an exemption under § 39.6(f) of this chapter; and

(iv) Terminate an exemption under § 39.6(g)(3) of this chapter.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 8, 2018, by the Commission.

Christopher Kirkpatrick,
Secretary of the Commission.

Note: The following appendices will not appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Appendices to Exemption From Derivatives Clearing Organization Registration—Commission Voting Summary and Chairman’s Statement

Appendix 1—Commission Voting Summary

On this matter, Chairman Giancarlo and Commissioners Quintenz and Behnam voted in the affirmative. No Commissioner voted in the negative.

Appendix 2—Statement of Chairman J. Christopher Giancarlo

This proposal is part of Project KISS’s simple and straightforward efforts to make what has been an internal process public and transparent. Under the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA), the Commission may conditionally or unconditionally exempt a derivatives clearing organization (DCO) from registration for the clearing of swaps if the Commission determines that the clearing organization is subject to “comparable, comprehensive supervision and regulation” by appropriate government authorities in the clearing organization’s home country. Pursuant to this authority, the Commission has exempted four non-U.S. clearing organizations from DCO registration.

The Commission is proposing to adopt regulations that would codify the policies and procedures that the Commission is currently following with respect to granting exemptions from DCO registration. The proposed regulations are consistent with the policies and procedures that the Commission is currently following, and with the terms and conditions that the Commission has imposed on each of the clearing organizations to which it has previously issued orders of exemption.

The exempt DCO process applies a comparable, outcomes-based approach to reflect the Commission’s recognition that a foreign jurisdiction may have different regulations for its central counterparties (CCPs) but share the same regulatory goals. Under the proposal, for CCPs in foreign jurisdictions, a framework that conforms to the Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures (CPMI) and the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) Principles for Financial Market Infrastructures (PFMI) would be deemed comparable to the CFTC’s requirements for domestic CCPs.

The proposal is part of the Commission’s continued efforts to foster cross-border cooperation and show deference to home country regulation that is deemed comparable to the Commission’s regulations. As our regulatory counterparts continue to implement swaps reforms in their markets, it is critical that the Commission endeavor to ensure that its rules do not unnecessarily conflict and fragment the global marketplace. For this reason, the Commission should operate on the basis of comity, not uniformity, with non-U.S. regulators. This avoids the untenable state of overlapping and duplicative regulations. The current proposal reflects this vision.

I support this proposed rule from the Division of Clearing and Risk (DCR). I look forward to hearing comments on the proposal.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On July 18, 2018, the Mexican Cultural Society notified the Coast...
Guard that it will be conducting a fireworks display from 8 to 8:30 p.m. on September 16, 2018, to commemorate Mexican Independence Day. The fireworks are to be launched from a barge in the Delaware River adjacent to Penn’s Landing in Philadelphia, PA. Hazards from firework displays include accidental discharge of fireworks, dangerous projectiles, and falling hot embers or other debris. The Captain of the Port Delaware Bay (COTP) has determined that potential hazards associated with the fireworks to be used in this display would be a safety concern for anyone within a 500-yard radius of the barge.

The purpose of this rulemaking is to ensure the safety of vessels and the navigable waters within a 500-yard radius of the fireworks barge before, during, and after the scheduled event. The Coast Guard proposes this rulemaking under authority in 33 U.S.C. 1231.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP proposes to establish a safety zone from 7:30 p.m. through 8:45 p.m. on September 16, 2018. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters within 500 yards of a barge in the Delaware River adjacent to Penn’s Landing in Philadelphia, PA. The barge will be anchored in approximate position 39°56′50.35″ N Latitude 075°08′18.27″W Longitude. The duration of the zone is intended to ensure the safety of vessels and these navigable waters before, during, and after the scheduled 8 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. fireworks display. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter, transit, or remain within the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed 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 protesters.

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 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small designated area of the Delaware River for 1 hour and 15 minutes during the evening when vessel traffic is normally low. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zone.

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 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 proposed rule would 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 IV.A above, this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator. If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see ADDRESSES) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

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 proposed 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.

C. Collection of Information

This proposed rule would 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 proposed 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 proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would 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 proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

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 proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370), and have made a preliminary determination 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 proposed rule involves a safety zone lasting 1 hour 15 minutes that would prohibit entry within 500 yards of a fireworks barge. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph L60(a) of Appendix A, Table 1 of DHS Instruction Manual 023–01–001–01, Rev. 01. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESS. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed 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.

V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov. If your material cannot be submitted using http://www.regulations.gov, contact the person in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document for alternate instructions. We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit http://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at http://www.regulations.gov and can be viewed by following that website’s instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

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 proposes to amend 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:


2. Add § 165.T05–0723 to read as follows:

§ 165.T05–0723 Safety Zone; Safety Zone; Delaware River; Penn’s Landing; Philadelphia, PA; Fireworks Display.

(a) Location. The following area is a safety zone: All waters of the Delaware River within a 500-yard radius of the fireworks barge, which will be anchored in approximate position 39°56′50.35″ N Latitude 075°08′18.27″ W Longitude. All coordinates are based on Datum NAD 1983.

(b) Definitions. As used in this section, designated representative means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard petty officer, warrant or commissioned officer on board a Coast Guard vessel or on board a federal, state, or local law enforcement vessel assisting the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay in the enforcement of the safety zone.

(c) Regulations. (1) Under the general safety zone regulations in subpart C of this part—(a) 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; and (b) all persons and vessels in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP’s designated representative.

(2) To request permission to enter the safety zone, contact the COTP or the COTP’s representative on marine band radio VHF–FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz) or 215–271–4807.

(3) No vessel may take on bunkers or conduct lightering operations within the safety zone during its enforcement period(s).

(4) This section applies to all vessels except those engaged in law enforcement, aids to navigation servicing, and emergency response operations.

(d) Enforcement. The U.S. Coast Guard may be assisted in the patrol and enforcement of the safety zone by federal, state, and local agencies.

(e) Enforcement period. This zone will be enforced from 7:30 p.m. through 8:45 p.m. on September 16, 2018.

Dated: August 8, 2018.

S.E. Anderson.

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Delaware Bay.

[FR Doc. 2018–17333 Filed 8–10–18; 8:45 am]
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POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3015

[Docket No. RM2017–1; Order No. 4742]

Competitive Postal Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is revising its previously proposed rules related to the minimum amount that competitive products as a whole are required to contribute to institutional costs annually, based on comments received. The Commission invites public comment on the revised proposed rules.

DATES: Comments are due: September 12, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online System at http://www.prc.gov. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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I. Introduction

On February 8, 2018, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Order No. 4402) proposing that a formula be used to calculate the minimum amount that competitive products as a whole are required to