

telephone at (202) 707-7658 or e-mail at crb@loc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Each year cable systems must submit royalty payments to the Register of Copyrights as required by the statutory license set forth in section 111 of the Copyright Act for the retransmission to cable subscribers of over-the-air television and radio broadcast signals. See 17 U.S.C. 111(d). These royalties are then distributed to copyright owners whose works were included in a qualifying transmission and who timely filed a claim for royalties. Allocation of the royalties collected occurs in one of two ways. In the first instance, these funds will be distributed through a negotiated settlement among the parties. 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(4)(A). If the claimants do not reach an agreement with respect to the royalties, the Copyright Royalty Judges ("Judges") must conduct a proceeding to determine the distribution of any royalties that remain in controversy. 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(4)(B).

On September 22, 2010, representatives of the Phase I claimant categories (the "Phase I Parties")¹ filed with the Judges a motion requesting a partial distribution of 50% of the 2008 cable royalty funds pursuant to Section 801(b)(3)(C) of the Copyright Act. 17 U.S.C. 801(b)(3)(C). Under that section of the Copyright Act, before ruling on a partial distribution motion the Judges must publish a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking responses to the motion to ascertain whether any claimant entitled to receive such royalty fees has a reasonable objection to the proposed distribution. Consequently, this Notice seeks comments from interested claimants on whether any reasonable objection exists that would preclude the distribution of 50% of the 2008 cable royalty funds to the Phase I Parties. The Judges must be advised of the existence and extent of all such objections by the end of the comment period. The Judges will not consider any

¹ The "Phase I Parties" are the Program Suppliers, Joint Sports Claimants, Public Television Claimants, Commercial Television Claimants (represented by National Association of Broadcasters), Music Claimants (represented by American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, Broadcast Music, Inc., and SESAC, Inc.), Canadian Claimants, National Public Radio, and the Devotional Claimants. In Phase I of a cable royalty distribution proceeding, royalties are allocated among certain categories of broadcast programming that have been retransmitted by cable systems. The categories have traditionally been movies and syndicated television series, sports programming, commercial and noncommercial broadcaster-owned programming, religious programming, music, public radio programming, and Canadian programming. In Phase II of a cable royalty distribution proceeding, royalties are allocated among claimants within each of the Phase I categories.

objections with respect to the partial distribution motion that come to their attention after the close of that period.

The Judges also seek comment on the existence and extent of any controversies to the 2008 cable royalty funds at Phase I or Phase II with respect to those funds that would remain if the partial distribution is granted.

The Motion of Phase I Claimants for Partial Distribution is posted on the Copyright Royalty Board Web site at <http://www.loc.gov/crb>.

Dated: October 20, 2010.

James Scott Sledge,

Chief U.S. Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 2010-27332 Filed 10-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-72-P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

[Docket No. 2010-7 CRB SD 2008]

Distribution of the 2008 Satellite Royalty Funds

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice requesting comments.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges are soliciting comments on a motion of Phase I claimants for partial distribution in connection with the 2008 satellite royalty funds. The Judges are also requesting comments as to the existence of Phase I and Phase II controversies with respect to the distribution of 2008 satellite royalty funds.

DATES: Comments are due on or before November 29, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent electronically to crb@loc.gov. In the alternative, send an original, five copies, and an electronic copy on a CD either by mail or hand delivery. Please do not use multiple means of transmission. Comments may not be delivered by an overnight delivery service other than the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail. If by mail (including overnight delivery), comments must be addressed to: Copyright Royalty Board, P.O. Box 70977, Washington, DC 20024-0977. If hand delivered by a private party, comments must be brought to the Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM-401, 101 Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20559-6000. If delivered by a commercial courier, comments must be delivered to the Congressional Courier Acceptance Site located at 2nd and D Street, NE., Washington, DC. The envelope must be addressed to: Copyright Royalty Board,

Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, LM-403, 101 Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20559-6000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard Strasser, Senior Attorney, or Gina Giuffreda, Attorney Advisor, by telephone at (202) 707-7658 or e-mail at crb@loc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 6, 2010, representatives of the Phase I claimant categories (the "Phase I Claimants")¹ filed with the Judges a motion requesting a partial distribution of 50% of the 2008 satellite royalty funds pursuant to section 801(b)(3)(C) of the Copyright Act. 17 U.S.C. 801(b)(3)(C). That section requires that the Judges publish a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking responses to the motion for partial distribution to ascertain whether any claimant entitled to receive such fees has a reasonable objection to the requested distribution before ruling on the motion. Consequently, this Notice seeks comments from interested claimants on whether any reasonable objection exists that would preclude the distribution of 50% of the 2008 satellite royalty funds to the Phase I Claimants. The Judges must be advised of the existence and extent of all such objections by the end of the comment period. The Judges will not consider any objections with respect to the partial distribution motion that come to their attention after the close of that period.

The Judges also seek comment on the existence and extent of any controversies to the 2008 satellite royalty funds at Phase I or Phase II with respect to those funds that would remain if the motion for partial distribution is granted.

The Motion of the Phase I Claimants for Partial Distribution is posted on the Copyright Royalty Board Web site at <http://www.loc.gov/crb>.

¹ The "Phase I Claimants" are the Program Suppliers, Joint Sports Claimants, Broadcaster Claimants Group, Music Claimants (American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, Broadcast Music, Inc., and SESAC, Inc.), and Devotional Claimants. In Phase I of a satellite royalty distribution proceeding, royalties are allocated among certain categories of broadcast programming that have been retransmitted by satellite systems. The categories have traditionally been movies and syndicated television series, sports programming, commercial broadcaster-owned programming, religious programming, and music. Public Television Claimants, Canadian Claimants, and National Public Radio, which traditionally have received Phase I shares of cable royalties, do not claim Phase I shares of the satellite royalty funds. In Phase II of a satellite royalty distribution proceeding, royalties are allocated among claimants within each of the Phase I categories.

Dated: October 25, 2010.

James Scott Sledge,

Chief U.S. Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 2010-27333 Filed 10-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-72-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[NOTICE: (10-143)]

Notice of Information Collection

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of information collection.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: All comments should be submitted within 60 calendar days from the date of this publication.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to Lori Parker, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Lori Parker, NASA PRA Officer, NASA Headquarters, 300 E Street, SW., JF0000, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358-1351, Lori.Parker@nasa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

As required in Section 305(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 and the NASA Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, NASA R&D contracts require contractor/recipient reporting of new technologies to NASA using NASA eNTRe system for electronic submissions and NASA Form 1679 for paper submissions.

II. Method of Collection

NASA will utilize a Web-based on-line form to collect this information. Approximately 65 per cent of the responses will be collected electronically.

III. Data

Title: AST-Technology Utilization.

OMB Number: 2700-0009.

Type of Review: Regular.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit and not-for profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,283.

Estimated Time per Response: 1 hour for manual responses and 0.75 hour for electronic responses.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,075.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: \$0.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NASA, including whether the information collected has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of NASA's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (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 respondents, including automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection. They will also become a matter of public record.

Lori Parker,

NASA PRA Clearance Officer

[FR Doc. 2010-27447 Filed 10-28-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (10-142)]

National Environmental Policy Act; Wallops Flight Facility Shoreline Restoration and Infrastructure Protection Program

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Wallops Flight Facility (WFF) Shoreline Restoration and Infrastructure Protection Program (SRIPP).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended, (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and NASA's NEPA policy and procedures (14 CFR Part 1216, subpart 1216.3), NASA has prepared and issued the Final PEIS for

the proposed SRIPP at WFF. The U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement (BOEMRE), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have served as Cooperating Agencies in preparing the Final PEIS.

NASA is proposing to implement a fifty-year design-life storm damage reduction project at its WFF on Wallops Island, Virginia. WFF is continuously faced with storm damage resulting in the implementation of emergency repairs. The project would be conducted to reduce the need for these emergency repairs and the potential for storm-induced physical damage to the over \$1 billion in Federal and State assets on Wallops Island. The Final PEIS examines in detail three project action alternatives, each expected to provide substantial damage reduction from storms with intensities ranging up to approximately the 100-year return interval storm. Although some reduction in flooding can be expected under each alternative, the primary purpose of the proposal is not flood protection, rather it is moving destructive wave energy further away from the Wallops Island shoreline and the infrastructure behind it.

Alternative One, NASA's preferred alternative, would include extending the existing Wallops Island seawall up to a maximum of 1,400 meters (m) (4,600 feet [ft]) south and placing an estimated 2.5 million cubic meters (MCM) (3.2 million cubic yards [MCY]) along the shoreline. Alternative Two would include the same seawall extension as Alternative One; however the sand placed along the shoreline would be less at approximately 2.2 MCM (2.9 MCY). Under this alternative, NASA would also construct a groin perpendicular to the shoreline at the south end of the project site to limit the volume of nearshore sand being transported from the restored Wallops Island beach to the south. Alternative Three would entail the same seawall extension as in Alternatives One and Two; however sand placement would be the least of the Alternatives at approximately 2.1 MCM (2.8 MCY). NASA would construct a single detached breakwater parallel to the shoreline at the south end of the project site to retain sand under Alternative Three. Under all three project alternatives, NASA would obtain the sand required for its initial beach nourishment from an unnamed shoal (referred to as Shoal A) located in Federal waters approximately 23 kilometers (km) (14 miles [mi]) east of Wallops Island. Sand for an expected nine future renourishment cycles could