

1864–1865 MPS), Address Restricted,
Roscoe, 16000776

NEW JERSEY

Sussex County

Evans—Waters Cottage, 11 Grandview Rd.,
Lake Wallkill, Vernon Township,
16000777

NEW YORK

Dutchess County

Poughkeepsie and Connecticut Stanfordville
Station, 5–15 Old Depot Way,
Stanfordville, 16000778

Monroe County

Maplewood Historic District (Boundary
Increase), 21–267 Alameda, 26–284
Albemarle, 21–148 Augustine, 36–68 Birr
Sts., 1–9, Burke Terrace, 1136–1212 Dewey
Ave., Rochester, 16000779

New York County

Hudson Theatre, 139–141 W. 44th St., New
York, 16000780

WYOMING

Washakie County

Saban, James T., Lookout,
Approx. .9 mi. SW. of US 16 & FS Rd. 429,
Ten Sleep, 16000781

A request for removal has been received for
the following resource:

NEBRASKA

Cedar County

Bow Valley Mills, N. of Wynot, Wynot,
78003402

Authority: 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60.

Dated: October 7, 2016.

Christopher Hetzel,

*Acting Chief, National Register of Historic
Places/National Historic Landmarks Program.*

[FR Doc. 2016–26056 Filed 10–27–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

[S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000
178S180110; S2D2S SS08011000
SX064A000 17XS501520]

North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area, Tennessee Lands Unsuitable for Mining Final Petition Evaluation Document and Environmental Impact Statement OSM– EIS–37

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement.

ACTION: Notice of availability; final
environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE)
announces that the final Petition
Evaluation Document and

Environmental Impact Statement (PED/
EIS) for the North Cumberland Wildlife
Management Area Petition to Find
Certain Lands Unsuitable for Surface
Coal Mining Operations is available for
public review and comment.

DATES: The OSMRE will not issue a final
decision of the proposal for a minimum
of 30 days after the date that the
Environmental Protection Agency
publishes the Notice of Availability in
the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Final PED/EIS
for the Project may be viewed online at
[http://www.osmre.gov/programs/rcm/
TNLUM.shtm](http://www.osmre.gov/programs/rcm/TNLUM.shtm). In addition, a limited
number of CD copies of the Final PED/
EIS are available upon request. You may
obtain a CD by contacting the person
identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
CONTACT**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Earl
D. Bandy Jr., Director-Knoxville Field
Office, Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement, John J.
Duncan Federal Building, 710 Locust
Street, 2nd Floor, Knoxville, Tennessee
37902. Telephone: 865–545–4103 ext.
186. Email: TNLUM@osmre.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 30, 2010, pursuant to
the Surface Mining Control and
Reclamation Act, 30 U.S.C. 1272 (c)
(SMCRA), the State of Tennessee filed a
petition with the Office of Surface
Mining and Reclamation and
Enforcement (OSMRE) to designate
certain lands in the state as unsuitable
for surface coal mining operations.
These lands include the area within 600
feet of all ridge lines (a 1,200 foot
corridor) lying within the North
Cumberland Wildlife Management Area
(NCWMA)—comprised of the Royal
Blue Wildlife Management Area, the
Sundquist Wildlife Management Area,
and the New River Wildlife
Management Area (also known as the
Brimstone Tract Conservation
Easement)—and the Emory River Tracts
Conservation Easement (ERTCE),
encompassing approximately 67,326
acres and 505 miles of ridgelines. In
Tennessee, OSMRE has operated a
Federal regulatory program as the
primary regulator under SMCRA since
October 1984, when the state repealed
its surface mining law; therefore, in
accordance with its responsibility in
administering the Federal program in
Tennessee, the OSMRE must process
and make decisions on all petitions
submitted to designate areas in the state
as unsuitable for surface coal mining
operations.

The petition includes two primary
allegations with numerous allegations of
fact and supporting statements. In
primary allegation 1, the petitioner
contends that the petition area should
be designated unsuitable for surface coal
mining operations because mining in
the area would be incompatible with
existing state or local land use plans or
programs. SMCRA 522(a)(3)(A), 30
U.S.C. 1272(a)(3)(A). In primary
allegation 2, the petitioner contends that
the OSMRE should designate the
petition area as unsuitable for surface
coal mining operations because such
operations would affect fragile or
historic lands, resulting in significant
damage to important historic, cultural,
scientific, and aesthetic values and
natural systems. SMCRA 522(a)(3)(B),
30 U.S.C. 1272(a)(3)(B).

The Director, OSMRE, is required to
make a decision on the petition. The
Final PED/EIS considers in detail the
following alternatives for action by the
Director:

- Alternative 1—do not designate any
of the petition area as unsuitable for
surface coal mining operations (no-
action). There would be no change in
types of permit applications accepted
for evaluation.

- Alternative 2—designate the entire
petition area (67,326 acres) as
unsuitable for all surface coal mining
operations (state's proposed action). No
types of surface mining permit
applications would be accepted for this
area.

- Alternative 3—designate the state
petition area (67,326 acres) as
unsuitable for surface coal mining
operations that are not remining. Under
this alternative, remining could
continue to be permitted on a case-by-
case basis. The only acceptable types of
permits would be permits for remining.

- Alternative 4—grant an expanded
corridor designation of independently
identified ridgelines within the petition
area (76,133 acres) as unsuitable for
surface coal mining operations that are
not remining (agency's preferred
alternative). Under this alternative,
remining could continue to be permitted
on a case-by-case basis. The only
acceptable types of permits would be
permits for remining.

- Alternative 5—designate lands as
unsuitable for surface coal mining based
on the presence of certain sensitive
resources (12,331 acres). No types of
surface mining permits would be
accepted for this area.

- Alternative 6—designate a reduced
corridor of 600 feet (39,106 acres). No
types of surface mining permits would
be accepted for this area.

In accordance with the applicable regulations under 30 CFR parts 762 and 764 and the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, OSMRE evaluated the merits of the unsuitability petition and analyzed the impacts of these alternatives. This analysis is reflected in the Final PED/EIS, which notes the potential impacts of the project and alternatives on earth resources (geology, topography and physiography), air quality and greenhouse gases, groundwater, surface water, wetlands, vegetation, fish and wildlife including special status species, land use, aesthetics including visual resources and soundscapes, socioeconomic and environmental justice, cultural resources including archaeological, historic and ethnographic resources, and public health and safety. Mitigation measures to be included as part of project implementation will be noted in the final decision.

In accordance with Department of the Interior regulations (43 CFR 46.425), OSMRE identified Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative in the Draft EIS. However, based on public and agency comments, as well as the state's input, OSMRE has now identified alternative 4 as the preferred alternative because it is the most consistent with the state's request. OSMRE reached that decision based on its analysis and conclusion that the "agency's preferred alternative" is the alternative the agency believes would best accomplish the purpose of and need for action, and fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, while still giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical, and other factors. Alternative 4 is also the environmentally preferred alternative because of its long-term environmental benefits.

The OSMRE will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) for the proposed petition after a 30-day period following publication of the NOA.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.1.

Dated: October 7, 2016.

Thomas D. Shope,

Regional Director, Appalachian Region.

[FR Doc. 2016-25868 Filed 10-27-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

Exemptions From Certain Prohibited Transaction Restrictions

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Grant of individual exemptions.

SUMMARY: This document contains exemptions issued by the Department of Labor (the Department) from certain of the prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA or the Act) and/or the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the Code). This notice includes the following: 2016–10, Royal Bank of Canada, D–11868; 2016–11, Northern Trust Corporation, D–11875; and, 2016–12, Extension of PTE 2015–15 involving Deutsche Bank AG, D–11879.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice was published in the **Federal Register** of the pendency before the Department of a proposal to grant such exemption. The notice set forth a summary of facts and representations contained in the application for exemption and referred interested persons to the application for a complete statement of the facts and representations. The application has been available for public inspection at the Department in Washington, DC. The notice also invited interested persons to submit comments on the requested exemption to the Department. In addition the notice stated that any interested person might submit a written request that a public hearing be held (where appropriate). The applicant has represented that it has complied with the requirements of the notification to interested persons. No requests for a hearing were received by the Department. Public comments were received by the Department as described in the granted exemption.

The notice of proposed exemption was issued and the exemption is being granted solely by the Department because, effective December 31, 1978, section 102 of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1978, 5 U.S.C. App. 1 (1996), transferred the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue exemptions of the type proposed to the Secretary of Labor.

Statutory Findings

In accordance with section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code and the procedures set forth in 29 CFR part 2570, subpart B (76 FR 66637,

66644, October 27, 2011)¹ and based upon the entire record, the Department makes the following findings:

(a) The exemption is administratively feasible;

(b) The exemption is in the interests of the plan and its participants and beneficiaries; and

(c) The exemption is protective of the rights of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan.

Royal Bank of Canada (Together With Its Current and Future Affiliates, RBC or the Applicant), Located in Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2016–10; Exemption Application No. D–11868]

Temporary Exemption

Section I—Covered Transactions

Certain entities with specified relationships to Royal Bank of Canada Trust Company (Bahamas) Limited (RBCTC Bahamas) (hereinafter, the RBC QPAMs, as further defined in Section II(b)) will not be precluded from relying on the exemptive relief provided by Prohibited Transaction Exemption (PTE) 84–14,² notwithstanding a judgment of conviction against RBCTC Bahamas for aiding and abetting tax fraud, to be entered in France in the District Court of Paris (the Conviction, as further defined in Section II(a)),³ for a period of up to twelve months beginning on the date of the Conviction (the Conviction Date), provided that the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The RBC QPAMs (including their officers, directors, agents other than RBC, and employees of such RBC QPAMs) did not know of, have reason to know of, or participate in the criminal conduct of RBCTC Bahamas that is the subject of the Conviction (for purposes of this paragraph (a), "participate in" includes the knowing or tacit approval of the misconduct underlying the Conviction);

(b) The RBC QPAMs (including their officers, directors, agents other than RBC, and employees of such RBC

¹ The Department has considered exemption applications received prior to December 27, 2011 under the exemption procedures set forth in 29 CFR part 2570, subpart B (55 FR 32836, 32847, August 10, 1990).

² 49 FR 9494 (March 13, 1984), as corrected at 50 FR 41430 (October 10, 1985), as amended at 70 FR 49305 (August 23, 2005), and as amended at 75 FR 38837 (July 6, 2010).

³ Section I(g) of PTE 84–14 generally provides that "[n]either the QPAM nor any affiliate thereof . . . nor any owner . . . of a 5 percent or more interest in the QPAM is a person who within the 10 years immediately preceding the transaction has been either convicted or released from imprisonment, whichever is later, as a result of" certain felonies including income tax evasion, and aiding and abetting tax evasion.