

that parties must have previously filed a petition with the EPA Environmental Appeals Board under 40 CFR 124.19(a). If the prerequisite has been met, review may be sought only by the filing of a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date on which the determination is published in the **Federal Register**. With respect to the PSD permit extensions, pursuant to section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, judicial review of this extension decision may be sought by filing a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date on which these determinations are published in the **Federal Register**. Under section 307(b)(2) of the Act, the determinations in this document shall not be subject to later judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

Dated: May 8, 2017.

**Walter Mugdan,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 2.*

[FR Doc. 2017-11704 Filed 6-5-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD

### Notice of Issuance of Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 52

**AGENCY:** Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** *Board Action:* Pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3511(d), the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, and the FASAB Rules of Procedure, as amended in October 2010, notice is hereby given that the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) has issued Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) 52, *Tax Expenditures*.

**ADDRESSES:** The Statement is available on the FASAB Web site at <http://www.fasab.gov/accounting-standards/>. Copies can be obtained by contacting FASAB at (202) 512-7350.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director, 441 G Street NW., Mailstop 6H19, Washington, DC 20548, or call (202) 512-7350.

**Authority:** Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463.

Dated: May 31, 2017.

**Wendy M. Payne,**

*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 2017-11689 Filed 6-5-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1610-02-P**

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[Docket No. 17-05]

### CMI Distribution Inc. v. Service by Air, Inc., Radiant Customs Services Inc. (Formerly Known as SBA Consolidators, Inc.) and Las Freight Systems Ltd.; Notice of Filing of Complaint and Assignment

Notice is given that a complaint has been filed with the Federal Maritime Commission (Commission) by CMI Distribution Inc., hereinafter “Complainant,” against Service by Air, Inc., Radiant Customs Services Inc., (formerly known as SBA Consolidators, Inc.), and Las Freight Systems Ltd., hereinafter “Respondents.” Complainant states it is a “corporation organized and existing under the laws of Illinois.” Complainant alleges that: Respondent Service by Air, Inc. is a “corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York” and was “an OTI . . . subject to regulation by the FMC”; Respondent Radiant Customs Services Inc. is a “corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York” and a Commission licensed non-vessel-operating common carrier (NVOCC); and Respondent Las Freight Systems Ltd. “is a Taiwanese private limited company” and a Commission registered NVOCC.

Complainant states that they “engaged Respondents to provide transportation of more than 60 shipments (the Shipments)” from China to Illinois between April 2014 and June 2015. Complainant alleges that they “assessed more than \$400,000 in demurrage or storage fees associated with the Shipments,” but the Respondents “have been unwilling to provide details regarding the amounts of demurrage or storage fees charged” regarding those shipments. Complainant states that while it “repeatedly questioned and challenged the level of demurrage charges on the Shipments, it was forced to pay those charges in order to gain release of the shipments.” Complainant alleges that the Respondents violated the Shipping Act by acting as an OTI without a license in the case of Respondent Service by Air in violation of 46 U.S.C. 40901, failure to observe just and reasonable practices in violation of 46 U.S.C. 41102 (c), failure to provide service in accordance with

rates, charges, and rules contained in a published tariff in violation of 46 U.S.C. 41102(2)(c), and failure to maintain a tariff in violation of 46 U.S.C. 40501.

Complainant seeks reparations and other relief. The full text of the complaint can be found in the Commission’s Electronic Reading Room at [www.fmc.gov/17-05/](http://www.fmc.gov/17-05/).

This proceeding has been assigned to the Office of Administrative Law Judges. The initial decision of the presiding officer in this proceeding shall be issued by May 31, 2018, and the final decision of the Commission shall be issued by December 14, 2018.

**Rachel E. Dickon,**

*Assistant Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2017-11626 Filed 6-5-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6731-AA-P**

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreement Filed

The Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement under the Shipping Act of 1984. Interested parties may submit comments on the agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within twelve days of the date this notice appears in the **Federal Register**. A copy of the agreement is available through the Commission’s Web site ([www.fmc.gov](http://www.fmc.gov)) or by contacting the Office of Agreements at (202)-523-5793 or [tradeanalysis@fmc.gov](mailto:tradeanalysis@fmc.gov).

*Agreement No.:* 011961-023.

*Title:* The Maritime Credit Agreement.

*Parties:* COSCO Container Lines Company, Ltd.; Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha, Ltd.; Maersk Line A/S; Willenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS; and Zim Integrated Shipping Services, Ltd.

*Filing Party:* Wayne Rohde, Esq.; Cozen O’Connor; 1627 I Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20006.

*Synopsis:* The amendment deletes United Arab Shipping Company (S.A.G.) as a party to the Agreement.

*Agreement No.:* 012485.

*Title:* CMA CGM/Marinex Cargo Line Puerto Rico—Saint Maarten Space Charter Agreement.

*Parties:* CMA CGM S.A. and Marinex Cargo Line Inc.

*Filing Party:* Draughn Arbona, Senior Counsel; CMA CGM (America) LLC; 5701 Lake Wright Drive; Norfolk, VA 23502.

*Synopsis:* The Agreement authorizes CMA CGM S.A. to charter space to Marinex Container Line on certain vessels CMA CGM operates in the trade between Puerto Rico and Saint Maarten.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: June 1, 2017.

**Rachel E. Dickon,**  
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017-11658 Filed 6-5-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6731-AA-P

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission").

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The FTC intends to ask the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") to extend for an additional three years the current Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA") clearance for information collection requirements contained in its Trade Regulation Rule on Disclosure Requirements and Prohibitions Concerning Franchising ("Franchise Rule" or "Rule"). That clearance expires on November 30, 2017.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted by August 7, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested parties may file a comment online or on paper, by following the instructions in the Request for Comment part of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below. Write "Franchise Rule, PRA Comment, FTC File No. P094400" on your comment, and file your comment online at <https://ftcpublic.commentworks.com/ftc/franchiserulePRA> by following the instructions on the web-based form. If you prefer to file your comment on paper, mail your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite CC-5610 (Annex J), Washington, DC 20580, or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Constitution Center, 400 7th Street SW., 5th Floor, Suite 5610 (Annex J), Washington, DC 20024.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information should be addressed to Craig Tregillus, Attorney, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 8607, Washington, DC 20580, (202) 326-2970.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the PRA, 44 U.S.C. 3501-3521, federal

agencies must obtain approval from OMB for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. "Collection of information" means agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. 44 U.S.C. 3502(3); 5 CFR 1320.3(c). As required by section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA, the FTC is providing this opportunity for public comment before requesting that OMB extend the existing clearance for the information collection requirements contained in the Franchise Rule, 16 CFR part 436 (OMB Control No. 3084-0107).

The FTC invites comments on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

The Franchise Rule ensures that consumers who are considering a franchise investment have access to the material information they need to make an informed investment decision provided in a format that facilitates comparisons of different franchise offerings. The Rule requires that franchisors disclose this information to consumers and maintain records to facilitate enforcement of the Rule.

Amendments to the Rule promulgated on March 30, 2007, which took effect after a one-year phase-in on July 1, 2008, merged the Rule's disclosure requirements with the disclosure format accepted by 15 states that have franchise registration or disclosure laws.<sup>1</sup> The amended Rule has significantly minimized any compliance burden beyond what is already required by state law.

The amended Rule requires franchisors to furnish prospective purchasers with a Franchise Disclosure Document ("FDD") that provides information relating to the franchisor, its business, the nature of the proposed franchise, and any representations by the franchisor about financial performance regarding actual or

potential sales, income, or profits made to a prospective franchise purchaser. The franchisor must preserve materially different copies of its FDD for 3 years, as well as information that provides a reasonable basis for any financial performance representation it elects to make. These requirements are subject to the PRA and underlie the Commission's pursuit of renewed OMB clearance.

*Estimated annual hours burden:*  
16,750 hours.

Based on a review of trade publications and information from state regulatory authorities, staff believes that, on average, from year to year, there are approximately 2,500 sellers of franchises covered by the Rule, with perhaps about 10% of that total reflecting an equal amount of new and departing business entrants.<sup>2</sup> Commission staff's burden hour estimate reflects the incremental tasks that the Rule may impose beyond the information and recordkeeping requirements imposed by state law and/or followed by franchisors who have been using the FDD disclosure format nationwide. This estimate likely overstates the actual incremental burden because some franchisors, for various reasons, may not be covered by the Rule (e.g., they sell only franchises that qualify for the Rule's large franchise investment exemption of at least \$1 million).

Staff estimates that the average annual disclosure burden to update existing disclosure documents will be three hours each for the 2,250 established franchisors, or 6,750 hours cumulatively for them, and 30 hours apiece each year for the 250 or so new-entrant franchisors to prepare their initial disclosure documents, or 7,500 hours, cumulatively, for the latter group. These estimates parallel staff's 2014 estimates for the amended Rule.<sup>3</sup> No public comments were received on those prior estimates. Accordingly, the FTC retains them for this analysis subject to further opportunity for public comment.

Under the Rule, a franchisor is required to retain copies of receipts of disclosure documents, as well as materially different versions of its disclosure documents. Such recordkeeping requirements, however, are consistent with, or less burdensome than, those imposed by the states that have franchise registration and disclosure laws. Accordingly, staff

<sup>2</sup> This number, which was also used in the FTC's 2014 clearance request, appears to be consistent with the number of business format franchise offerings registered in compliance with state franchise laws, and listed in franchise directories.

<sup>3</sup> See 79 FR 41284 (Jul. 15, 2014); 79 FR 59771 (Oct. 3, 2014) ("2014 Notices").