Montauk Point. The Seashore sustains a white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) population that has expanded since the late 1960s to the extent that impacts from high densities of deer have been, and continue to be, a complex issue for National Park Service (NPS) managers. As a result, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Seashore prepared a Draft White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft Plan/EIS) to develop a deer management strategy that supports preservation of the natural and cultural landscape through population management and the protection of native vegetation. The Draft Plan/EIS was prepared in cooperation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS–DEC) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS).

The NPS released the Draft Plan/EIS for public and agency review and comment beginning July 31, 2014 and ending October 10, 2014. The Draft Plan/EIS evaluated a no action alternative (A) and three action alternatives (B, C, and D). Each action alternative presented a different strategy to protect native plant communities and cultural plantings, promote forest regeneration, further reduce undesirable human-deer interactions, and reduce the deer population in the Seashore.

Alternative A would continue existing deer management and monitoring efforts throughout the Seashore. These actions include continued public education/interpretation efforts, vegetation monitoring, and deer population and behavior surveys.

Alternative B provides a nonlethal deer reduction option to implement nonsurgical reproductive control of does when an acceptable reproductive control agent is available that meets NPS established criteria. Large fence exclosures would also protect forested areas and vegetation to allow restoration of the maritime holly forest, other natural vegetation and the culturally important vegetation at the William Floyd Estate.

Alternative C provides a lethal deer reduction option through the use of sharpshooting with firearms, and possible capture and euthanasia to reduce deer populations to the target density and maintain that level.

Alternative D, identified as the NPS preferred alternative, provides a combined lethal and nonlethal deer reduction option through the use of sharpshooting with firearms, and possible capture and euthanasia to reduce deer populations to a desirable level. Once the target density has been reached, use of nonsurgical reproductive control of does may be used to maintain that level when an acceptable reproductive control agent is available that meets NPS established criteria.

Comments were accepted on the Draft Plan/EIS during the 60-day public comment period. After reviewing and considering all comments received, the NPS has prepared this Final White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Final Plan/EIS). The Final Plan/EIS identifies Alternative D as the NPS preferred alternative with no changes from the Draft Plan/EIS and presents the likely environmental consequences of implementing the preferred alternative, as well as the other alternatives considered. The Final Plan/EIS also discusses the comments received on the Draft Plan/EIS and responds to substantive comments.

Dated: August 5, 2015.

Michael A. Caldwell,

Regional Director, Northeast Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–32970 Filed 12–30–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–WV–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure

AGENCY: Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Judicial Conference of the United States.

ACTION: Notice of cancellation of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure has been canceled: Bankruptcy Rules Hearing on January 22, 2016 in Washington, DC. Announcements for this meeting were previously published in 80 FR 48120, 80 FR 50324 and 80 FR 51604. The public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure scheduled for January 29, 2016, in Pasadena, California, remains scheduled, subject to sufficient expressions of interest.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca A. Womeldorf, Rules Committee Secretary, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502–1820.

Dated: December 28, 2015.

Rebecca A. Womeldorf,

Rules Committee Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–32923 Filed 12–30–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decrees Under the Clean Water Act

On December 23, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged two proposed consent decrees with the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico in the lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *The Municipality of San Juan, the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, the Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works, the Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,* Civil Action No. 3:14–cv–1476–CCC.

One proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims against the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (''DNER'') under the Clean Water Act (''CWA''), 33 U.S.C. 1251–1387, concerning CWA violations at three of its storm water pump stations located within San Juan. The proposed consent decree requires DNER to apply for a permit and implement a Storm Water Management Program, to undertake certain capital and operation improvements to its pump stations, and to provide financial support for investigations and work performed in the pump station service areas. The proposed consent decree resolves only the violations alleged against DNER in the Complaint through the date of lodging of the consent decree and does not resolve claims against the other Defendants. Due to financial challenges currently facing the Commonwealth, no civil penalties for past violations will be recovered under this consent decree.

The second proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims against the Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works (''DTPW'') and the Puerto Rico Highways and Transportation Authority (''HTA'') under the CWA, concerning CWA violations throughout their storm sewer systems located within San Juan. The proposed consent decree provides for injunctive relief to be implemented in a two-stage, multi-phased approach including the study and repair of their MS4s, in addition to other infrastructure and operational improvements. The proposed consent decree resolves only

the violations alleged against DTPW and HTA in the Complaint through the date of lodging of the consent decree and does not resolve claims against the other Defendants. Due to financial challenges currently facing the Commonwealth, no civil penalties for past violations will be recovered under this consent decree.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed consent decrees. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division and should refer to *United States* v. *The Municipality of San Juan,* D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–1–09551. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	*Send them to:*
By email	*pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov*
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611

During the public comment period, the proposed consent decrees may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: *http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.* We will provide a paper copy of the proposed consent decrees upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for $10.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) for a copy of the DTPW/HTA proposed consent decree and $9.25 for a copy of the DNER proposed consent decree (copies of the appendices attached to the consent decrees are not included in this amount) payable to the United States Treasury.

Maureen Katz,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

Appendix

DEPARTAMENTO DE JUSTICIA DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS

AVISO DE RADICACIÓN DE DOS DECRETOS POR CONSENTIMIENTO PROPUESTO BAJO LA LEY DE AGUA LIMPIA

El 23 de diciembre de 2015, el Departamento de Justicia de los Estados Unidos radicó dos propuestos decretos por consentimiento ante el Tribunal de Distrito de los Estados Unidos para el Distrito de Puerto Rico en una demanda judicial titulada *Los Estados Unidos contra el Municipio de San Juan, el Departamento de Recursos Naturales y Ambientales de Puerto Rico, el Departamento de Transportación y Obras Publicas de Puerto Rico, la Autoridad de Carreteras y Transportación de Puerto Rico, y el Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico*, Acción Civil Núm. 3:14-cv-1476-CCC.

Uno de los decretos por consentimiento propuestos resuelve las alegaciones de los Estados Unidos contra el Departamento de Recursos Naturales y Ambientales de Puerto Rico ("DRNA") bajo la Ley de Agua Limpia ("CWA" por sus siglas en inglés), 33 U.S.C. 1251-1387, en relación a violaciones al CWA en tres de sus estaciones de bombeo de aguas pluviales ubicadas dentro del municipio de San Juan. El decreto por consentimiento propuesto le requiere al DRNA solicitar un permiso e implementar un Programa de Manejo de Aguas Pluviales, para mejorar la operación de sus estaciones de bombas, llevar a cabo ciertas mejoras capitales y para separar parte de su presupuesto para realizar investigaciones y mejoras en las áreas de servicio de las estaciones de bombeo. El decreto por consentimiento propuesto resuelve solo las violaciones imputadas al DRNA en la demanda hasta la fecha de la presentación del decreto por consentimiento y no resuelve las alegaciones contra los otros demandados. Debido a los problemas financieros que enfrenta actualmente el Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico, el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos no le impuso sanciones civiles por las violaciones alegadas en virtud de este decreto por consentimiento.

El segundo de los decretos por consentimiento propuestos resuelve las alegaciones de los Estados Unidos contra Departamento de Transportación y Obras Publicas de Puerto Rico ("DTOP") y la Autoridad de Carreteras y Transportación de Puerto Rico ("ACT") bajo el CWA, en relación a violaciones al CWA a través de su sistemas de alcantarillado pluvial dentro del municipio de San Juan. El decreto de consentimiento propuesto provee medidas cautelares para ser implementadas en dos etapas para que se lleven a cabo estudios y reparaciones en parte de sus sistemas de drenaje pluvial separados dentro de los límites geográficos del municipio de San Juan, además de otras obras de infraestructura y mejoras operacionales. El decreto por consentimiento propuesto resuelve solo las violaciones imputadas al DTOP y la ACT en la demanda hasta la fecha de la presentación del decreto por consentimiento y no resuelve las alegaciones contra los otros demandados. Debido a los problemas financieros que enfrenta actualmente el Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico, el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos no le impuso sanciones civiles por las violaciones alegadas en virtud de este decreto por consentimiento.

La publicación de este aviso inicia un período para recibir comentarios del público sobre los decretos por consentimiento propuestos. Los comentarios deben dirigirse al Fiscal Auxiliar General, División de Recursos Naturales y Medioambiente, y deben mencionar el caso titulado *Los Estados Unidos contra el Municipio de San Juan,* D. J. Ref. Núm. 90-5-1-1-09551. Todos los comentarios deben enviarse antes de que transcurran treinta (30) días de la fecha de publicación de este aviso. Los comentarios pueden enviarse por correo electrónico o por correo regular:

Para enviar comentarios:	*Envíelos a:*
Por correo electrónico	Pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov
Por correo regular	Assistant Attorney General U.S. DOJ - ENRD P.O. Box 7611 Washington, D.C. 20044-7611

Durante el período de comentarios públicos, los decretos por consentimiento propuestos pueden examinarse y descargarse en la siguiente página web del Departamento de Justicia de los Estados Unidos: http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees. Se proporcionará una copia impresa de los decretos por consentimiento propuestos luego de recibir una petición por escrito y pago por los costos de reproducción. Debe enviar su solicitud escrita y pago a:

Consent Decree Library
U.S. DOJ – ENRD
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, D.C. 20044-7611

Adjunte un cheque o giro postal pagadero al *United States Treasury* por la cantidad de $10.25 (el costo de reproducción es de 25 centavos por página) si desea una copia del decreto por consentimiento propuesto del DRNA y de $9.25 si desea una copia del decreto por consentimiento propuesto del DTOP/HTA (las copias de los apéndices adjuntos a los decretos por consentimiento no están incluidos en estas cantidades).

Maureen Katz,
Asistente de Jefe Sección,
Sección de Cumplimiento Medioambiental,
División de Recursos Naturales y Medioambiente.

[FR Doc. 2015–32908 Filed 12–30–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410–15–C

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

U.S. Copyright Office

[Docket No. 2015–7]

Section 512 Study: Notice and Request for Public Comment

AGENCY: U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice of inquiry.

SUMMARY: The United States Copyright Office is undertaking a public study to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the DMCA safe harbor provisions contained in 17 U.S.C. 512. Among other issues, the Office will consider the costs and burdens of the notice-and-takedown process on large- and small-scale copyright owners, online service providers, and the general public. The Office will also review how successfully section 512 addresses online infringement and protects against improper takedown notices. To aid in this effort, and to provide thorough assistance to Congress, the Office is seeking public input on a number of key questions.

DATES: Written comments must be received no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on March 21, 2016. The Office will be announcing one or more public meetings to discuss issues related to this study, to take place after initial written comments are received, by separate notice in the future.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be submitted electronically. Specific instructions for the submission of comments will be posted on the Copyright Office Web site at *http://www.copyright.gov/policy/section512* on or before February 1, 2016. To meet accessibility standards, all comments must be provided in a single file not to exceed six megabytes (MB) in one of the following formats: Portable Document File (PDF) format containing searchable, accessible text (not an image); Microsoft Word; WordPerfect; Rich Text Format (RTF); or ASCII text file format (not a scanned document). The form and face of the comments must include the name of the submitter and any organization the submitter represents. The Office will post all comments publicly in the form that they are received. If electronic submission of comments is not feasible, please contact the Office using the contact information below for special instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jacqueline C. Charlesworth, General Counsel and Associate Register of Copyrights, by email at *jcharlesworth@loc.gov* or by telephone at 202–707–8350; or Karyn Temple Claggett, Director of the Office of Policy and International Affairs and Associate Register of Copyrights, by email at *kacl@loc.gov* or by telephone at 202–707–8350.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Congress enacted section 512 in 1998 as part of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (''DMCA'').[1] At that time, less than 5% of the world's population used the internet,[2] and bulletin board services were the popular online platforms.[3] Even then, however, Congress recognized that ''the [i]nternet . . . made it possible for information—including valuable American copyrighted works—to flow around the globe in a matter of hours,'' and, as a consequence, copyright law needed to be ''set . . . up to meet the promise and the challenge of the digital world.'' [4]

In enacting section 512, Congress created a system for copyright owners and online entities to address online infringement, including limitations on liability for compliant service providers to help foster the growth of internet-based services.[5] The system reflected Congress' recognition that the same innovative advances in technology that would expand opportunities to reproduce and disseminate content could also facilitate exponential growth in copyright infringement. Accordingly, section 512 was intended by Congress to provide strong incentives for service providers and copyright owners to ''cooperate to detect and deal with copyright infringements that take place in the digital networked environment,'' as well as to offer ''greater certainty to service providers concerning their legal exposure for infringements that may occur in the course of their activities.'' [6]

Congress was especially concerned about the liability of online service providers for infringing activities of third parties occurring on or through their services. To address this issue, Congress created a set of ''safe harbors''—*i.e.,* limitations on copyright infringement liability—''for certain common activities of service providers.'' [7] But the safe harbors are not automatic. To qualify for protection from infringement liability, a service provider must fulfill certain requirements, generally consisting of implementing measures to expeditiously address online copyright infringement.

Recent research suggests that the volume of infringing material accessed via the internet more than doubled from 2010 to 2012, and that nearly one-quarter of all internet bandwidth in North America, Europe, and Asia is devoted to hosting, sharing, and acquiring infringing material.[8] While Congress clearly understood that it would be essential to address online infringement as the internet continued to grow, it was likely difficult to anticipate the online world as we now know it—where, each day, users post hundreds of millions of photos, videos and other items, and service providers receive over a million notices of alleged infringement.

As observed by the House Judiciary Committee's Ranking Member in the course of the Committee's ongoing multi-year review of the Copyright Act, and consistent with the testimony of the Register of Copyrights in that hearing, the operation of section 512 poses policy issues that warrant study and analysis.[9] Section 512 has also been a focus of the U.S. Department of Commerce in recent years, which has noted ambiguities in the application of

[1] Pub. L. 105–304, 112 Stat. 2860 (1998).

[2] *See Internet Users,* Internet Live Stats (Dec. 1, 2015), *http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/#trend* (In 1998, there were only 188 million internet users; today, there are over 3.25 billion.).

[3] *See The History of Social Networking,* Digital Trends (Aug. 5, 2014), *http://www.digitaltrends.com/features/the-history-of-social-networking/* (providing a timeline for the development of social networks).

[4] 144 Cong. Rec. S11,889 (daily ed. Oct. 8, 1998) (statement of Sen. Orrin Hatch).

[5] *See* H.R. Rep. No. 105–551, pt. 2, at 21 (1998) (noting that the DMCA, including section 512 of title 17, ''balance[s] the interests of content owners, on-line and other service providers, and information users in a way that will foster the continued development of electronic commerce and the growth of the [i]nternet'').

[6] *Id.* at 49–50.

[7] S. Rep. No. 105–190, at 19 (1998).

[8] *See* David Price, Sizing the Piracy Universe 3 (2013), *http://www.netnames.com/digital-piracy-sizing-piracy-universe* (infringing bandwidth use increased by 159% between 2010 to 2012 in North America, Europe, and [the] Asia-Pacific, which account for more than 95% of global bandwidth use).

[9] *Register's Perspective on Copyright Review: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on the Judiciary,* 114th Cong. 6 (2015) (statement of Maria A. Pallante, Register of Copyrights and Director, U.S. Copyright Office) (''We are . . . recommending appropriate study of section 512 of the DMCA . . . . [T]here are challenges now that warrant a granular review.''); *id.* at 49 (statement of Rep. John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member, H. Comm. on the Judiciary) (''[T]here are policy issues that warrant studies and analysis, including section 512, section 1201, mass digitization, and moral rights. I would like the Copyright Office to conduct and complete reports on those policy issues . . . .'').