

(vii) Neither ask for nor receive any fee or compensation of any kind for legal services from a clinic client on whose behalf service is rendered;

(viii) Have proved to the satisfaction of the OED Director that he or she possesses the scientific and technical qualifications necessary for him or her to render patent applicants valuable service; and

(ix) Comply with all additional criteria established by the OED Director.

(3) In order to be granted limited recognition to practice before the Office in trademark matters under the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program, a law student must:

(i) Be enrolled in a law school that is an active participant in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program;

(ii) Be enrolled in the trademark practice area of a clinic of the participating law school;

(iii) Have successfully completed at least one year of law school or the equivalent;

(iv) Have read the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct and the relevant USPTO rules of practice and procedure for trademark matters;

(v) Be supervised by an approved Faculty Clinic Supervisor pursuant to paragraph (c)(2) of this section;

(vi) Be certified by the dean of the participating law school, or one authorized to act for the dean, as: having completed the first year of law school or the equivalent, being in compliance with the law school's ethics code, and being of good moral character and reputation;

(vii) Neither ask for nor receive any fee or compensation of any kind for legal services from a clinic client on whose behalf service is rendered; and

(viii) Comply with all additional criteria established by the OED Director.

(4) Students registered to practice before the Office in patent matters as a patent agent, or authorized to practice before the Office in trademark matters under § 11.14, must complete and submit a student application pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) of this section and meet the criteria of paragraph (d)(2) or (3) of this section, as applicable, in order to participate in the program.

■ 4. Add § 11.17 to read as follows:

§ 11.17 Requirements for participation in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.

(a) Each law school participating in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program must provide its patent and/or trademark services on a pro bono basis for clients that qualify for assistance from the law school's clinic.

(b) Each law school participating in the USPTO Law School Clinic

Certification Program shall, on a quarterly basis, provide the Office of Enrollment and Discipline with a report regarding its clinic activity, which shall include:

(1) The number of law students participating in each of the patent and trademark practice areas of the school's clinic in the preceding quarter;

(2) The number of faculty participating in each of the patent and trademark practice areas of the school's clinic in the preceding quarter;

(3) The number of consultations provided to persons who requested assistance from the law school clinic in the preceding quarter;

(4) The number of client representations undertaken for each of the patent and trademark practice areas of the school's clinic in the preceding quarter;

(5) The identity and number of applications and responses filed in each of the patent and/or trademark practice areas of the school's clinic in the preceding quarter;

(6) The number of patents issued, or trademarks registered, to clients of the clinic in the preceding quarter; and

(7) All other information specified by the OED Director.

(c) Inactivation of law schools participating in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.

(1) The OED Director may inactivate a patent and/or trademark practice area of a participating law school:

(i) If the participating law school does not have an approved Faculty Clinic Supervisor for the relevant practice area, as described in § 11.16(c);

(ii) If the participating law school does not meet each of the requirements and criteria for participation in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program as set forth in § 11.16, this section, or as otherwise established by the OED Director; or

(iii) For other good cause as determined by the OED Director.

(2) In the event that a practice area of a participating school is inactivated, the participating law school students must:

(i) Immediately cease all student practice before the Office in the relevant practice area and notify each client of such; and

(ii) Disassociate themselves from all client matters relating to practice before the Office in the relevant practice area, including complying with Office and State rules for withdrawal from representation.

(3) A patent or trademark practice area of a law school clinic that has been inactivated may be restored to active status, upon application to and approval by the OED Director.

(d) *Removal of law schools participating in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.* (1) The OED Director may remove a patent and/or trademark practice area of the clinic of a law school participating in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program:

(i) Upon request from the law school;

(ii) If the participating law school does not meet each of the requirements and criteria for participation in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program as set forth in § 11.16, this section, or as otherwise established by the OED Director; or

(iii) For other good cause as determined by the OED Director.

(2) In the event that a practice area of a participating school is removed by the OED Director, the participating law school students must:

(i) Immediately cease all student practice before the Office in the relevant practice area and notify the client of such; and

(ii) Disassociate themselves from all client matters relating to practice before the Office in the relevant practice area, including complying with Office and State rules for withdrawal from representation.

(3) A school that has been removed from participation in the USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program under this section may reapply to the program in compliance with § 11.16.

Dated: December 8, 2015.

Michelle K. Lee,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 2015-31627 Filed 12-15-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0196; FRL-9940-11-Region 5]

Air Plan Approval; Minnesota and Michigan; Revision to Taconite Federal Implementation Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of public comment period.

SUMMARY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is reopening the public comment period for a proposed rule published October 22, 2015. On November 23, 2015, EPA received a request from the National Tribal Air

Association to extend the public comment period an additional 120 days from the closing date of November 23, 2015 and from the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa for an unspecified period of time. EPA is, therefore, reopening the comment period for an additional 30 days after November 23, 2015.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published on October 22, 2015 (80 FR 64160), is reopened. Comments must be received on or before December 23, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0196, to: Douglas Aburano, Chief, Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6960, aburano.douglas@epa.gov. Additional instructions on how to comment can be found in the notice of proposed rulemaking published October 22, 2015 (80 FR 64160).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Rosenthal, Environmental Engineer, Attainment Planning & Maintenance Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6052, rosenthal.steven@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 22, 2015, EPA proposed revisions to a Federal implementation plan (FIP) addressing the requirement for best available retrofit technology (BART) for taconite plants in Minnesota

and Michigan. In response to petitions for reconsideration, we proposed to revise the nitrogen oxides (NO_x) limits for taconite furnaces at facilities owned and operated by Cliffs Natural Resources (Cliffs) and ArcelorMittal USA LLC (ArcelorMittal). We also proposed to revise the sulfur dioxide (SO₂) requirements at two of Cliffs' facilities. We proposed these changes because new information had come to light that was not available when we originally promulgated the FIP on February 6, 2013.

Dated: December 4, 2015.

Susan Hedman,

Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 2015-31523 Filed 12-15-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 12

[PS Docket No. 14-174; Report No. 3034]

Petition for Reconsideration of Action in a Rulemaking Proceeding

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: In this document, a Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission's Rulemaking Proceeding by David C. Bergmann, on behalf of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates.

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before December 31, 2015.

Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before January 11, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Pintro, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, 202-418-7490, linda.pintro@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of Commission's document, Report No. 3034, released December 2, 2015. The full text of Report No. 3034 is available for viewing and copying at the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY-A257 Washington, DC 20554, or may be accessed online via the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System at <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>. The Commission will not send a copy of the *document* pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A), because this document does not have an impact on any rules of particular applicability.

Subject: Ensuring Continuity of 911 Communications Report and Order, published at 80 FR 62470, October 16, 2015, in PS Docket No. 14-174. This *document* is published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). *See also* 47 CFR 1.4(b)(1).

Number of Petitions Filed: 1

Federal Communications Commission.

Gloria J. Miles,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015-31574 Filed 12-15-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P