

### E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule would not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### F. Environment

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.ID, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule involves a safety zone which is limited in size and duration. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of Commandant Instruction M16475.ID. A preliminary Record of Environmental Consideration supporting this determination is available in the docket where indicated under **ADDRESSES**. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

### G. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places, or vessels.

### V. Public Participation and Request for Comments

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment

applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and the docket, visit <http://www.regulations.gov/privacyNotice>.

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in the docket, and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that Web site's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and record keeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

### PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

- 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

- 2. Add § 165.T05–0541 to read as follows:

#### § 165.T05–0541 Safety Zone; Nights in Venice Fireworks, Beach Thorofare, Ocean City, NJ.

(a) *Definitions.* As used in this section, *designated representative* means a Coast Guard Patrol Commander, including a Coast Guard petty officer, warrant or commissioned officer on board a Coast Guard vessel and or on board another Federal, State, or local law enforcement vessel assisting the Captain of the Port, Delaware Bay with enforcement of the safety zone.

(b) *Location.* The following area is a safety zone: All the waters of Beach Thorofare within a 600 foot radius of the fireworks launch platform in

approximate position 39°17'W23" N., 074°34'W31" W. near Ocean City, NJ.

#### (c) Regulations.

(1) The general safety zone regulations found in § 165.23 apply to the safety zone created by this temporary section.

(2) Under the general safety zone regulations in § 165.23, persons may not enter the safety zone described in paragraph (b) of this section unless authorized by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(3) To request permission to enter the safety zone, contact the COTP or the COTP's representative on marine band radio VHF–FM channel 16 (156.8 MHz). All persons and vessels in the safety zone must comply with all lawful orders or directions given to them by the COTP or the COTP's designated representative.

(d) *Effective and enforcement period:* This section will be enforced from 9:30 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. on July 22, 2017.

**Benjamin A. Cooper,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Delaware Bay.*

[FR Doc. 2017–13206 Filed 6–23–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

#### Copyright Royalty Board

#### 37 CFR Part 350

[Docket No. 17–CRB–0013 RM]

#### Proceedings of the Copyright Royalty Board; Violation of Standards of Conduct

**AGENCY:** Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Copyright Royalty Judges seek reply comments regarding a proposed new Copyright Royalty Board rule that would authorize the Judges to bar, either temporarily or permanently, certain individuals and entities from participating in proceedings before the Judges.

**DATES:** Comments are due no later than July 26, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** The proposed rule is posted on the agency's Web site ([www.loc.gov/crb](http://www.loc.gov/crb)) and at [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov) ([www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)). Interested parties may submit comments via the Copyright Royalty Board's electronic filing system, eCRB, at <https://app.crb.gov>. Commenters must register to use the system prior to filing comments. Those who choose not to submit comments electronically should see How to Submit Comments in the

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for online and physical addresses and further instructions.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anita Blaine, Program Specialist, at (202) 707-7658 or [crb@loc.gov](mailto:crb@loc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 20, 2017, the Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) published a notice in the *Federal Register* seeking comments on a proposed rule that would authorize the Judges to bar, either temporarily or permanently, certain individuals and entities from participating in proceedings before the Judges.<sup>1</sup> In response to the notice, the Judges received five comments, including two joint comments, from people and entities that regularly participate in proceedings before the Judges.<sup>2</sup> The comments and the proposal are available on the CRB Web site and in eCRB.

While some of the comments were supportive of the proposal or certain aspects of it, others were critical and raised a number of issues with the proposal, including the scope of the proposal, potential abuses of the proposed provisions, the Constitutionality of some of the proposed provisions, and whether the proposal is even necessary. The Judges seek reply comments responding directly to issues that commenters raised regarding the proposal. While the Judges will review and consider all comments they receive on the proposal, they request that commenters limit their comments at this point to issues that other commenters raised in the initial round of comments, including ways to address criticisms that some commenters raised with respect to the proposal. Some commenters that criticized the proposal suggested alternative language that might remedy perceived shortfalls in the Judges' proposal. The Judges request comments

on those proposals, or welcome alternative suggestions the Judges might adopt to address those perceived shortfalls, including the pros and cons of choosing any proposed alternative approach. In light of some of the negative comments, the Judges also seek comment on whether, on balance, the remedies currently available to the Judges for addressing ethical lapses of participants and counsel are adequate or preferable to the remedial rule the Judges proposed. In particular, the Judges seek detailed comments regarding the incidents to which the Judges referred in the notice proposing the provision (or others that commenters are aware of to which the Judges did not refer) and how remedies currently available were used to address those incidents and whether or not the extant remedies (e.g., discovery sanctions or loss of the presumption of validity regarding claims) adequately addressed those incidents or whether gaps in the current remedial framework might lead to future incidents that could compromise public confidence in the CRB ratemaking and royalty distribution system.

#### Solicitation of Comments

The Judges seek reply comments on the proposed new rule that respond to comments that the Judges received in response to the initial notice of proposed rulemaking.

#### How To Submit Comments

Interested members of the public must submit comments to only one of the following addresses. If not submitting online, commenters must submit an original of their comments, five paper copies, and an electronic version in searchable PDF format on a CD.

*Online:* <https://app.crb.gov> or <http://www.regulations.gov>; or

*U.S. mail:* Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024-0977; or Overnight service (only USPS Express Mail is acceptable): Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024-0977; or

*Commercial courier:* Address package to: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM-403, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559-6000. Deliver to: Congressional Courier Acceptance Site, 2nd Street NE., and D Street NE., Washington, DC; or

*Hand delivery:* Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM-401, 101 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20559-6000.

Dated: June 21, 2017.

**Suzanne M. Barnett,**

*Chief Copyright Royalty Judge.*

[FR Doc. 2017-13277 Filed 6-23-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1410-72-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0760; FRL-9963-69 Region 5]

### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a request submitted by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management on December 13, 2016, to revise the Indiana state implementation plan (SIP). The submission revises and updates the Indiana Administrative Code definition of "References," from the 2013 edition to the 2015 edition.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 26, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0760 at <https://www.regulations.gov> or via email to [blakley.pamela@epa.gov](mailto:blakley.pamela@epa.gov). For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (i.e. on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on

<sup>1</sup> 82 FR 18601.

<sup>2</sup> The Judges received a joint comment from a group referring to itself as "The Allocation Phase Parties," which are Program Suppliers, Joint Sports Claimants, Commercial Television Claimants, Public Broadcasting Service, Settling Devotional Claimants, Canadian Claimants Group, and National Public Radio. The Judges also received a joint comment from a group referring to itself as Music Community Participants, which are SoundExchange, Inc., the Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., the American Association of Independent Music, the American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada, the Screen Actors Guild—American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, the Alliance of Artists and Recording Companies, Inc., and the National Music Publishers' Association. The Judges also received comments from Raul Galaz and from Worldwide Subsidy Group, LLC, dba Independent Producers Group. The Judges also received a comment from David Powell.