

*U.S. Copyright Office Practices, Third Edition.*

(5) The appropriate filing fee, as required by § 201.3(c) of this chapter, must be included with the application or charged to an active deposit account. At the Office's discretion, the applicant may be required to pay an additional fee to make a copy of the certificate of registration for the basic registration that will be corrected or amplified by the supplementary registration.

(6) Copies, phonorecords, or supporting documents cannot be made part of the record for a supplementary registration and should not be submitted with the application.

(7) In an exceptional case, the Copyright Office may waive the requirements set forth in paragraph (e)(1) of this section, subject to such conditions as the Associate Register and Director of the Office of Registration Policy and Practice may impose on the applicant.

(f) *Effect of supplementary registration.* (1) When the Copyright Office completes a supplementary registration, it will issue a certificate of supplementary registration bearing a new registration number in the appropriate class. The Office will cross-reference the records for the basic registration and the supplementary registration by placing a note in each record that identifies the registration number and effective date of registration for the related registration.

(2) As provided in section 408(d) of title 17 of the United States Code, the information contained in a supplementary registration augments but does not supersede that contained in the basic registration. The basic registration will not be expunged or cancelled.

Dated: May 31, 2017.

**Karyn Temple Claggett,**

*Acting Register of Copyrights and Director of the U.S. Copyright Office.*

Approved by:

**Carla D. Hayden,**

*Librarian of Congress.*

[FR Doc. 2017-12453 Filed 6-14-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1410-30-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0748; FRL-9963-48-Region 4]

#### Air Plan Approvals; TN; Prong 4-2010 NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is conditionally approving the visibility transport (prong 4) portions of revisions to the Tennessee State Implementation Plan (SIP), submitted by the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), addressing the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) infrastructure SIP requirements for the 2010 1-hour Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), 2010 1-hour Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and 2012 annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The CAA requires that each state adopt and submit a SIP for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of each NAAQS promulgated by EPA, commonly referred to as an "infrastructure SIP." Specifically, EPA is conditionally approving the prong 4 portions of Tennessee's March 13, 2014, 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> and 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> infrastructure SIP submission and December 16, 2015, 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> infrastructure SIP submission. All other applicable infrastructure requirements for these SIP submissions have been or will be addressed in separate rulemakings.

**DATES:** This rule is effective July 17, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket Identification No. EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0748. All documents in the docket are listed on the [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) Web site. Although listed in the index, some information may not be publicly available, *i.e.*, Confidential Business Information or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or in hard copy at the Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. EPA requests that if at all possible, you contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to schedule your inspection. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding federal holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean Lakeman of the Air Regulatory Management Section, Air Planning and Implementation Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Mr. Lakeman can be reached by telephone at (404) 562-9043 or via electronic mail at [lakeman.sean@epa.gov](mailto:lakeman.sean@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

By statute, SIPs meeting the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and (2) of the CAA are to be submitted by states within three years after promulgation of a new or revised NAAQS to provide for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of the new or revised NAAQS. EPA has historically referred to these SIP submissions made for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of sections 110(a)(1) and 110(a)(2) as "infrastructure SIP" submissions. Sections 110(a)(1) and (2) require states to address basic SIP elements such as for monitoring, basic program requirements, and legal authority that are designed to assure attainment and maintenance of the newly established or revised NAAQS. More specifically, section 110(a)(1) provides the procedural and timing requirements for infrastructure SIPs. Section 110(a)(2) lists specific elements that states must meet for the infrastructure SIP requirements related to a newly established or revised NAAQS. The contents of an infrastructure SIP submission may vary depending upon the data and analytical tools available to the state, as well as the provisions already contained in the state's implementation plan at the time in which the state develops and submits the submission for a new or revised NAAQS.

Section 110(a)(2)(D) has two components: 110(a)(2)(D)(i) and 110(a)(2)(D)(ii). Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) includes four distinct components, commonly referred to as "prongs," that must be addressed in infrastructure SIP submissions. The first two prongs, which are codified in section

110(a)(2)(D)(i)(I), are provisions that prohibit any source or other type of emissions activity in one state from contributing significantly to nonattainment of the NAAQS in another state (prong 1) and from interfering with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state (prong 2). The third and fourth prongs, which are codified in section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), are provisions that prohibit emissions activity in one state from interfering with measures required to prevent significant deterioration of air quality in another state (prong 3) or from interfering with measures to protect visibility in another state (prong 4). Section 110(a)(2)(D)(ii) requires SIPs to include provisions insuring compliance with sections 115 and 126 of the Act, relating to interstate and international pollution abatement.

Tennessee's March 13, 2014, 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> and 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> submission cites to the State's regional haze SIP and Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) SIP as satisfying prong 4 requirements.<sup>1</sup> In its December 16, 2015, 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> submission, the State notes that it is developing a regional haze SIP revision with the intent to obtain a fully-approved regional haze SIP and that Tennessee's SIP will be adequate with regard to prong 4 if EPA approves that revision. As explained in a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) published on March 2, 2017 (82 FR 12328), EPA has not yet fully approved Tennessee's existing regional haze SIP because the SIP relies on CAIR to satisfy the nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and SO<sub>2</sub> Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) requirements for the CAIR-subject electric generating units (EGUs) in the State and the requirement for a long-term strategy sufficient to achieve the state-adopted reasonable progress goals.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, on December 7, 2016, Tennessee submitted a commitment letter to EPA requesting conditional approval of the prong 4 portions of the

<sup>1</sup> In its March 13, 2014, submission, Tennessee states that its regional haze SIP and its "CAIR SIP are sufficient to ensure emissions within its jurisdiction do not interfere with other agencies' plans to protect visibility." However, as Tennessee notes in its submittal, a state's infrastructure SIP submission can satisfy prong 4 solely through confirmation that the state has a fully approved regional haze SIP.

<sup>2</sup> CAIR, promulgated in 2005, required 27 states and the District of Columbia to reduce emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> that significantly contribute to, or interfere with maintenance of, the 1997 NAAQS for fine particulates and/or ozone in any downwind state. CAIR imposed specified emissions reduction requirements on each affected State, and established several EPA-administered cap and trade programs for EGUs that States could join as a means to meet these requirements.

aforementioned infrastructure SIP revisions.

In its commitment letter, Tennessee commits to submit an infrastructure SIP revision, within one year of final conditional approval, that will satisfy the prong 4 requirements for the 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, and 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS through reliance on a fully-approved regional haze SIP or through an analysis showing that emissions from sources in Tennessee will not interfere with the attainment of the reasonable progress goals of other states. If the revised infrastructure SIP revision relies on a fully-approved regional haze SIP revision to satisfy prong 4 requirements, Tennessee also commits to providing the necessary regional haze SIP revision to EPA within one year of EPA's final conditional approval.

If Tennessee meets its commitment within one year of final conditional approval, the prong 4 portions of the conditionally approved infrastructure SIP submissions will remain a part of the SIP until EPA takes final action approving or disapproving the new SIP revision(s). However, if the State fails to submit these revisions within the one-year timeframe, the conditional approval will automatically become a disapproval one year from EPA's final conditional approval and EPA will issue a finding of disapproval. EPA is not required to propose the finding of disapproval. If the conditional approval is converted to a disapproval, the final disapproval triggers the FIP requirement under CAA section 110(c).

In the March 2, 2017, NPRM, EPA proposed to conditionally approve the prong 4 portions of the aforementioned infrastructure SIP submissions. The NPRM provides additional detail regarding the rationale for EPA's action, including further discussion of the prong 4 requirements and the basis for Tennessee's commitment letter. Comments on the proposed rulemaking were due on or before April 3, 2017. EPA received no adverse comments on the proposed action.

## II. Final Action

As described above, EPA is conditionally approving the prong 4 portions of Tennessee's March 13, 2014, 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> and 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> infrastructure SIP submission and December 16, 2015, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> infrastructure SIP submission. All other outstanding applicable infrastructure requirements for these SIP submissions have been or will be addressed in separate rulemakings.

## III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. See 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a "significant regulatory action" subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
  - Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
  - Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
  - Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);
  - Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
  - Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
  - Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
  - Is not subject to requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the CAA; and
  - Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).
- The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9,

2000), nor will it impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 14, 2017. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. *See* section 307(b)(2).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 25, 2017.

**V. Anne Heard,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.*

40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

#### Subpart RR—Tennessee

■ 2. Add § 52.2219 to read as follows:

##### § 52.2219 Conditional approval.

Tennessee submitted a letter to EPA on December 7, 2016, with a commitment to address the State

Implementation Plan deficiencies regarding requirements of Clean Air Act section 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) related to interference with measures to protect visibility in another state (prong 4) for the 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub>, 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub>, and 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. EPA conditionally approved the prong 4 portions of Tennessee’s March 13, 2014, 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> and 2010 1-hour SO<sub>2</sub> infrastructure SIP submission and December 16, 2015, 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> infrastructure SIP submission in an action published in the **Federal Register** on June 15, 2017. If Tennessee fails to meet its commitment by June 15, 2018, the conditional approval will automatically become a disapproval on that date and EPA will issue a finding of disapproval.

[FR Doc. 2017–12342 Filed 6–14–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

#### 43 CFR Part 3170

[17X.LLWO310000.L13100000.PP0000]

RIN 1004–AE14

#### Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation; Postponement of Certain Compliance Dates

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notification; postponement of compliance dates.

**SUMMARY:** On November 18, 2016, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) issued a final rule entitled, “Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation” (the “Waste Prevention Rule” or “Rule”). Immediately after the Waste Prevention Rule was issued, petitions for judicial review of the Rule were filed by industry groups and States with significant BLM-managed Federal and Indian minerals. This litigation has been consolidated and is now pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming. In light of the existence and potential consequences of the pending litigation, the BLM has concluded that justice requires it to postpone the compliance dates for certain sections of the Rule pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, pending judicial review.

**DATES:** June 15, 2017.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Timothy Spisak at the BLM Washington Office, 20 M Street SE., Room 2134 LM,

Washington, DC 20003, or by telephone at 202–912–7311. For questions relating to regulatory process issues, contact Faith Bremner at 202–912–7441.

Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact these individuals during normal business hours. FRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to leave a message or question with these individuals. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

On November 18, 2016, the BLM published the Waste Prevention Rule. (81 FR 83008) The Rule addresses, among other things, the loss of natural gas through venting, flaring, and leaks during the production of Federal and Indian oil and gas. The Rule replaced Notice to Lessees and Operators of Onshore Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases, Royalty or Compensation for Oil and Gas Lost (1980) (“NTL–4A”), which governed the venting and flaring of Federal and Indian gas for more than three decades. In addition to updating and revising the requirements of NTL–4A, the Rule contained new requirements that operators capture a certain percentage of the gas they produce (43 CFR 3179.7), measure flared volumes (43 CFR 3179.9), upgrade or replace pneumatic equipment (43 CFR 3179.201–179.202), capture or combust storage tank vapors (43 CFR 3179.203), and implement leak detection and repair (LDAR) programs (43 CFR 3179.301–.305). The Rule did not obligate operators to comply with these new requirements until January 17, 2018. Compliance with certain other provisions of the Rule is already mandatory, including the requirement that operators submit a “waste minimization plan” with applications for permits to drill (43 CFR 3162.3–1), new regulations for the royalty-free use of production (43 CFR subpart 3178), new regulatory definitions of “unavoidably lost” and “avoidably lost” oil and gas (43 CFR 3179.4), limits on venting and flaring during drilling and production operations (43 CFR 3179.101–179.105), and requirements for downhole well maintenance and liquids unloading (43 CFR 3179.204).

Immediately after the Rule was issued, petitions for judicial review of the Rule were filed by industry groups and States with significant BLM-managed Federal and Indian minerals. The petitioners in this litigation are the Western Energy Alliance (WEA), the Independent Petroleum Association of