consolidate or group related and/or overlapping proposed exemptions where possible to simplify the rulemaking process and encourage joint participation among parties with common interests (though such collaboration is not required). As in previous rulemakings, the exemptions as described in the NPRM will represent only a starting point for further consideration in the rulemaking proceeding, and will be subject to further refinement based on the record. The NPRM will provide guidance regarding specific areas of legal and factual interest for the Office with respect to each proposed exemption, and suggest particular types of evidence that participants may wish to submit for the record. It will also contain additional instructions and requirements for submitting comments and will detail the later phases of the rulemaking proceeding—i.e., public hearings, post-hearing questions, recommendation, and final rule—which will be similar to those of the sixth rulemaking.

As noted in the Office’s study, however, the Office intends to issue the NPRM at an earlier point than during the sixth rulemaking proceeding, to give all parties sufficient time to participate in the process. Publishing the NPRM earlier should better accommodate the academic calendar and allow for greater law student participation during the more substantive comment and public hearing phases of the proceeding—something many commenters suggested during the study.27 In addition, the Office will look for opportunities to preview regulatory language or ask additional post-hearing questions, where necessary to ensure sufficient stakeholder participation.28

27 See, e.g., Section 1201 Study Initial Reply Comments of International Documentary Association et al. at 3–4 (Apr. 1, 2016); Section 1201 Study Hearing Tr. at 132:10–133:17 (May 25, 2016) (McCleary, American Foundation for the Blind); Section 1201 Study Hearing Tr. at 133:16–135:02 [May 19, 2016] (Decherney, University of Pennsylvania); Section 1201 Study Hearing Tr. at 108:13–109:05 [May 25, 2016] (Metalitz, Association of American Publishers, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., & Recording Industry Association of America); Section 1201 Study Additional Comments of American Association of Law Libraries at 3 [Oct. 27, 2016]. Given the statutory deadline, it was necessary to also move up the petition phase to align the written comment and hearing phases with the academic calendar. The Office determined this to be the most optimal choice, particularly given that the petitions are meant to be simple and short filings, as discussed above. Nevertheless, after discussing the schedule with a number of academic clinics, we selected a longer period for the filing of initial petitions to better accommodate academic schedules.

28 Section 1201 Study at 150–51.

Dated: June 27, 2017.

Sarang V. Damle,
General Counsel and Associate Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 2017–13815 Filed 6–29–17; 8:45 am]
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[Docket No. RM2017–7; Order No. 3982]

Periodic Reporting

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent filing requesting that the Commission initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to an analytical method for use in periodic reporting (Proposal Three). This document informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: Comments are due: August 16, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at http://www.prc.gov. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
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I. Introduction

On June 22, 2017, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting the Commission to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider proposed changes to an analytical method related to periodic reports.1 The Petition identifies the proposed analytical method changes filed in this docket as Proposal Three.

II. Proposal Three

Background. The Postal Service currently uses statistical estimates in the Revenue, Pieces, and Weight (RPW) Report for mailpieces reported in the Retail Systems Software Business Partners (RSS BP) application and bearing contract postal unit metered postage. Petition at 1. The RSS BP is the electronic point-of-sale management system that the Postal Service provides to contract postal units. Id. at 4. The statistical estimates used in the RSS BP management system are produced by the Postal Service’s Origin-Destination Information System—Revenue, Pieces, and Weight (ODIS–RPW) probability-based sampling system. Id. at 4, 5. Proposal Three would change the methodology for measuring the national totals of revenue, pieces, and weight in the RPW Report for RSS BP mailpieces by replacing ODIS–RPW statistical sampling estimates with corresponding census data reported in the Postal Service’s Retail Data Mart reporting system. Id. at 6. In support of Proposal Three, the Postal Service cites other proposals approved by the Commission which have replaced statistical estimates with census data. See id. at 3.

Rationale and impact. The Postal Service states that the proposed change in methodology “provides a complete census source of transactional-level data of all RSS BP mailpieces and extra services.” Id. at 6. The Postal Service asserts that the use of census data would lead one to expect equal or improved data quality because census data, unlike ODIS–RPW statistical sampling data, does not have sampling error. Id. at 5. To illustrate the potential impact of switching from ODIS–RPW statistical estimates to census data, the Postal Service provides a comparison of results for the FY 2016 time period. Id. at 6–9.

III. Notice and Comment


IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and Town of Mammoth Lakes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD) and the Town of Mammoth Lakes portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern particulate matter (PM) emissions from wood burning devices and road dust in the Town of Mammoth Lakes. We are proposing to approve local rules to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act (CAA or the Act).

DATES: Any comments on this proposal must arrive by July 31, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R90–OAR–2016–0409 at http://www.regulations.gov, or via email to Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief at Steckel.Andrew@epa.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be removed or edited from Regulations.gov. For either manner of submission, the 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. The 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, see the Federal Register.

For further information contact: Christine Vineyard, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4125, vineyard.christine@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to the EPA. This proposal addresses the following local rules:

• GBUAPCD Rule 431, Particulate Matter (except paragraphs M and N).
• Town of Mammoth Lakes Municipal Code Chapter 8.30, Particulate Emissions Regulations (except paragraphs 8.30.110 and 8.30.120).

In the Rules and Regulations section of this Federal Register, we are approving these local rules in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe these SIP revisions are not controversial. If we receive adverse comments, however, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule. Please note that if we receive adverse comment on a particular rule, we may adopt as final the rule that is not the subject of an adverse comment.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: November 14, 2016.

Alexis Strauss, Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Environmental Protection Agency

40 CFR Part 300

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Mystery Bridge Road/U.S. Highway 20 Superfund Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8 is issuing a notice of Intent to Partially Delete the property currently owned by Tallgrass Energy Partners, LP (formerly owned by KM Upstream LLC and hereinafter referred to as the former KMI Property), on the Mystery Bridge Road/U.S. Highway 20 Site (Site) from the National Priorities List (NPL). The Site is located in Natrona County, northeast of Casper, Wyoming. EPA requests public comment on this proposed action. The NPL, promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, is an appendix of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution and Contingency Plan (NCP). The EPA and the State of Wyoming, through the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ), have determined that all appropriate response actions, other than maintenance of institutional controls and five-year reviews, have been completed for the former KMI source area and the resultant groundwater contamination. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

This partial deletion pertains to the former KMI Property of OU1 and OU2 formerly containing the benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes (collectively known as BTEX) groundwater plume and source soils, respectively. The remaining area and media of both OU1 and OU2 containing the volatile halogenated organic chemicals (VHOs) source soils and...