transmission owners, and certain
distribution providers). 56. Of the 1,100 affected entities
discussed above, we estimate that
approximately 857 or 78 percent70 of
the affected entities are small. As
discussed above, proposed Reliability
Standard CIP–003–7 enhances
reliability by providing criteria against
which NERC and the Commission can
evaluate the sufficiency of an entity’s
electronic access controls for low
impact BES Cyber systems, as well as
improved security controls for transient
electronic devices (e.g., thumb drives,
laptop computers, and other portable
devices frequently connected to and
disconnected from systems). We
estimate that each of the 857 small
entities to whom the proposed
modifications to Reliability Standard
CIP–003–7 applies will incur one-time
costs of approximately $3,360 per entity
to implement this standard, as well as
the ongoing paperwork burden reflected
in the Information Collection Statement
(approximately $39,480 per year per
entity). We do not consider the
estimated costs for these 857 small
entities to be a significant economic
impact.
57. Based on the above analysis, we
propose to certify that the proposed
Reliability Standard will not have a
significant economic impact on a
substantial number of small entities.

V. Environmental Analysis
58. The Commission is required to
prepare an Environmental Assessment
or an Environmental Impact Statement
for any action that may have a
significant adverse effect on the human
environment.71 The Commission has
categorically excluded certain actions
from this requirement as not having a
significant effect on the human
environment. Included in the exclusion
are rules that are clarifying, corrective,
or procedural or that do not
substantially change the effect of the
regulations being amended.72 The
actions proposed herein fall within this
categorical exclusion in the
Commission’s regulations.

VI. Comment Procedures
59. The Commission invites interested
persons to submit comments on the
matters and issues proposed in this
notice to be adopted, including any
related matters or alternative proposals
that commenters may wish to discuss.
Comments are due December 26, 2017.

60. The Commission encourages
comments to be filed electronically via
the eFiling link on the Commission’s
Web site at http://www.ferc.gov. The
Commission accepts most standard
word processing formats. Documents
created electronically using word
processing software should be filed in
native applications or print-to-PDF
format and not in a scanned format.
Commenters filing electronically do not
need to make a paper filing.
61. Commenters that are not able to
file comments electronically must send
an original of their comments to:
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
Secretary of the Commission, 888 First
Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.
62. All comments will be placed in
the Commission’s public files and may
be viewed, printed, or downloaded
remotely as described in the Document
Availability section below. Commenters
on this proposal are not required to
serve copies of their comments on other
commenters.

VII. Document Availability
63. In addition to publishing the full
text of this document in the Federal
Register, the Commission provides all
interested persons an opportunity to
view and/or print the contents of this
document via the Internet through the
Commission’s Home Page (http://
www.ferc.gov) and in the Commission’s
Public Reference Room during normal
business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE.,
Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

64. From the Commission’s Home
Page on the Internet, this information is
available on eLibrary. The full text of
this document is available on eLibrary in
PDF and Microsoft Word format for
viewing, printing, and/or downloading.
To access this document in eLibrary, type
the docket number of this
document, excluding the last three
digits, in the docket number field.

65. User assistance is available for
eLibrary and the Commission’s Web site
during normal business hours from the
Commission’s Online Support at 202–
502–6652 (toll free at 1–866–208–3676)
or email at fierconlinesupport@ferc.gov,
or the Public Reference Room at (202)
502–8371, TTY (202) 502–8659. Email
the Public Reference Room at
public.referenceroom@ferc.gov.

By direction of the Commission.

70 77.95 percent.
71 Regulations Implementing the National
Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Order No. 486,
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG–2016–0723]

RIN 1625–AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, St. Augustine, FL

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is withdrawing its advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) concerning the Bridge of Lions (SR A1A) across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 777.9, at St. Augustine, Florida. The City of St. Augustine proposed to modify the bridge operating schedule to alleviate vehicle traffic congestion. However, the Coast Guard has determined it would be inappropriate to move forward with a notice of proposed rulemaking. The Coast Guard believes placing additional restrictions to the bridge would add additional hazards to mariners and effect the safe navigation of vessels awaiting bridge openings.

DATES: The notice of proposed rulemaking published on March 15, 2017 (82 FR 13785), is withdrawn on October 26, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this document, USCG–2016–0723 is available at http://www.regulations.gov. Type the docket number in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this document, call or email LT Allan Storm, Sector Jacksonville, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; telephone 904–714–7616, email Allan.H.Storm@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background Information and Regulatory History

On March 15, 2017, the Coast Guard published an ANPRM entitled “Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, St. Augustine, FL,” in the Federal Register (82 FR 13785). The advance notice of proposed rulemaking sought comments and information concerning a request from the City of St. Augustine to change the operating schedule for the Bridge of Lions across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, St. Augustine, Florida amending the twice an hour operating schedule to a 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. period. The City of St. Augustine was concerned that vehicle traffic was becoming exponentially worse with each passing season and that the current operating schedule was contributing to vehicle traffic backups.

Withdrawal

The Coast Guard received 386 comments, of those, 62 comments were duplicate entries, 204 comments were in favor for the requested change and 120 were against the requested change. The comments in favor of the change generally felt the additional restrictions to the bridge would help alleviate vehicular traffic on or around the bridge and the surrounding area. For the comments that opposed the change, by and large, the main concern was safety of mariners due to strong tidal currents and the high level of vessel activities occurring in the waters near the bridge. Strong currents, the close proximity of mooring fields and marinas would hamper the ability to “keep on station” while waiting for a bridge opening. Also, sailing vessels waiting for bridge opening would be required to be moving constantly all the while avoiding other waiting vessel traffic. The requested change to the operating schedule would extend the twice an hour draw opening schedule by an additional three hours into the evening. Concern was expressed by having to wait for an opening in darkness, stating this would cause additional hazards due to vessels already underway, traffic lights against the city and vehicular lights adjacent to the waterway. The Coast Guard acknowledges all of the above safety concerns, and for that reason, we find any benefits of the possible additional restrictions to the Bridge of Lions do not outweigh the additional hazards to vessels and mariners transiting the area around the bridge. The current regulation as written in 33 CFR 117.261(d) will remain in effect.


Peter J. Brown,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.
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Copyright Office

37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. 2017–10]

Exemptions To Permit Circumvention of Access Controls on Copyrighted Works

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

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The United States Copyright Office (“Copyright Office” or “Office”) is conducting the seventh triennial rulemaking proceeding under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (“DMCA”), concerning possible temporary exemptions to the DMCA’s prohibition against circumvention of technological measures that control access to copyrighted works. In this proceeding, the Copyright Office has established a new, streamlined procedure for the renewal of exemptions that were granted during the sixth triennial rulemaking. It is also considering petitions for new exemptions to engage in activities not currently permitted by existing exemptions. On June 30, 2017, the Office published a Notice of Inquiry requesting petitions to renew existing exemptions and comments in response to those petitions, as well as petitions for new exemptions to engage in activities not currently permitted by existing exemptions. The Office has carefully considered the comments received in response to that Notice. With this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”), the Office intends to recommend each of the existing exemptions for readoption. This NPRM also initiates three rounds of public comment on the newly-proposed exemptions. Interested parties are invited to make full legal and evidentiary submissions in support of or in opposition to the proposed exemptions, in accordance with the requirements set forth below.

DATES: Initial written comments (including documentary evidence) and multimedia evidence from proponents and other members of the public supporting or opposing the adoption of a proposed exemption, as well as parties that...