

b. How would this modification affect the costs the Rule imposes on businesses, including small businesses?

c. How would this modification affect the benefits to consumers?

2. Should the Rule be modified to delete any of the existing examples or include additional examples to illustrate proper methods for disposing of consumer information? Why or why not? If so, what examples should be included and what sources should they be drawn from?

a. What evidence supports such a modification?

b. How would this modification affect the costs the Rule imposes on businesses, including small businesses?

c. How would this modification affect the benefits to consumers?

3. Should the Rule be modified to reference or incorporate any other information destruction standards or frameworks? If so, which standards should be incorporated or referenced and how should they be referenced or incorporated by the Rule? Should such standards be considered safe harbors for compliance with the Rule?

a. What evidence supports such a modification?

b. How would this modification affect the costs the Rule imposes on businesses, including small businesses?

c. How would this modification affect the benefits to consumers?

4. Under the current Disposal Rule, "Consumer information does not include information that does not identify individuals, such as aggregate information or blind data." Should the Rule be modified to change the definition of "consumer information"? Should the definition of "consumer information" include information that can be reasonably linked to an individual in light of changes in relevant technology or market practices? Should the Rule be modified to define "aggregate information" or "blind data"?

a. What evidence supports such a modification?

b. How would this modification affect the costs the Rule imposes on businesses, including small businesses?

c. How would this modification affect the benefits to consumers?

#### IV. Instructions for Submitting Comments

You can file a comment online or on paper. For the Commission to consider your comment, we must receive it on or before November 21, 2016. Write "Disposal Rule, 16 CFR part 682, Project No. 165410" on the comment. Your comment, including your name and your state, will be placed on the public

record of this proceeding, including, to the extent practicable, on the public Commission Web site, at <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/public-comments>. As a matter of discretion, the Commission tries to remove individuals' home contact information from comments before placing them on the Commission Web site. Because your comment will be made public, you are solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive personal information, such as a Social Security number, date of birth, driver's license number or other state identification number or foreign country equivalent, passport number, financial account number, or payment card number. You are also solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive health information, such as medical records or other individually identifiable health information.

In addition, do not include any "[t]rade secret or any commercial or financial information which is . . . privileged or confidential," as discussed in Section 6(f) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and FTC Rule 4.10(a)(2), 16 CFR 4.10(a)(2). In particular, do not include competitively sensitive information such as costs, sales statistics, inventories, formulas, patterns, devices, manufacturing processes, or customer names.

If you want the Commission to give your comment confidential treatment, you must file it in paper form, with a request for confidential treatment, and you must follow the procedure explained in FTC Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c). In particular, the written request for confidential treatment that accompanies the comment must include the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comments to be withheld from the public record. Your comment will be kept confidential only if the FTC General Counsel grants your request in accordance with the law and the public interest.

Postal mail addressed to the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security screening. As a result, we encourage you to submit your comment online. To make sure that the Commission considers your online comment, you must file it at <https://ftcpublishcommentworks.com/ftc/disposalrule> by following the instructions on the web-based form. If this document appears at <http://www.regulations.gov>, you also may file a comment through that Web site.

If you file your comment on paper, write "Disposal Rule, 16 CFR part 682, Project No. 165410" on your comment

and on the envelope, and mail your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite CC-5610 (Annex H), Washington, DC 20580, or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Constitution Center, 400 7th Street SW., 5th Floor, Suite 5610 (Annex H), Washington, DC 20024.

Visit the Commission Web site at <https://www.ftc.gov> to read this document and the news release describing it. The FTC Act and other laws that the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives on or before November 21, 2016. For information on the Commission's privacy policy, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, see <https://www.ftc.gov/site-information/privacy-policy>.

By direction of the Commission.

**Donald S. Clark,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016-22198 Filed 9-14-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6750-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 100

[Docket No. USCG-2016-0777]

RIN 1625-AA08

#### Special Local Regulation; San Diego Sharkfest Swim; San Diego Bay, CA

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is temporarily changing the enforcement date and the location of the special local regulation for the annual San Diego Sharkfest Swim event held on the navigable waters of San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA. The change of enforcement date and the location for the special local regulation is necessary to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during the event. This action will restrict vessel traffic in the waters of the San Diego Bay, California, from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. on October 2, 2016, from Fifth Avenue Landing to Tidelands Park, Coronado, CA. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before September 22, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2016–0777 using the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for further instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this rule, call or email Lieutenant Robert Cole, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego, Coast Guard; telephone 619–278–7656, email [D11MarineEventsSD@uscg.mil](mailto:D11MarineEventsSD@uscg.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Table of Abbreviations**

DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking  
TFR Temporary Final Rule  
LNM Local Notice to Mariners  
COTP Captain of the Port  
SMIB Safety Marine Information Broadcast

**II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis**

The San Diego Sharkfest Swim race is an annual recurring event listed in Table 1, Item 10 of 33 CFR 100.1101, Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego COTP Zone. Special local regulations exist for the marine event to allow for special use of the San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA for this event. 33 U.S.C. 1233, authorizes the Coast Guard to establish and define special local regulations to promote the safety of life on the navigable waters during regattas or marine parades.

**III. Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The San Diego Sharkfest Swim race is an annual event normally held on a weekend day in September or October on the waters of San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA.

33 CFR 100.1101 lists the annual marine events and special local regulations in Southern California within the San Diego COTP Zone. The enforcement date and regulated location for this marine event are listed in Table 1, Item 10 of Section 100.1101.

The date listed in the Table indicates that the marine event will occur on a Saturday in September or October, on the waters of San Diego Bay, California, from Seaport Village to Coronado Ferry Landing. However, this proposed temporary rule will change the event date to Sunday, October 2, 2016, and the location from Fifth Avenue Landing to

Tidelands Park, to reflect the actual date and location of the event.

The regulations in 33 CFR 100.1101 will be temporarily suspended for Table 1, Item 10 of that section and a temporary regulation will be inserted as Table 1, Item 19 of that section in order to reflect that the special local regulation will be effective and enforced from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. on October 2, 2016. This change is needed to accommodate the sponsor's event plan and ensure that adequate regulations are in place to protect the safety of vessels and individuals that may be present in the regulated area. No other portion of Table 1 of § 100.1101 or other provisions in § 100.1101 shall be affected by this regulation.

The special local regulations are necessary to provide for the safety of the crew, spectators, participants, and other vessels and users of the San Diego Bay waterway. Persons and vessels will be prohibited from anchoring, blocking, loitering, or impeding within this regulated waterway unless authorized by the COTP, or his designated representative, during the proposed times. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish information on the event in the weekly LNM. The proposed regulatory text appears at the end of this document.

**IV. Regulatory Analysis**

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

*A. Regulatory Planning and Review*

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the special local regulation. Optional waterway routes exist to allow boaters to travel around the marine event area, without impacting the race, once the last swimmer has cleared the middle of the

channel. Moreover, the Coast Guard would publish a Local Notice to Mariners about the zone.

*B. Impact on Small Entities*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels intending to transit or anchor in the impacted portion of the San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA, from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. on October 2, 2016.

This proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: Traffic will be allowed to pass around the regulated area once the last swimmer has cleared the middle of the channel with the permission of the COTP, or his designated representative, and the special local regulation is limited in size and duration. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish event information on the Internet in the weekly LNM marine information report, as well as provide a SMIB via marine radio during the event. If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this rule. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

*C. Collection of Information*

This proposed rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

*D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Government*

A rule has implications for federalism under E.O. 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in E.O. 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. If you believe this proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section above.

*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 will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed 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 M16475.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined 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 establishment of marine event special local regulations on the navigable waters of the San Diego Bay. It is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(h) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination and a Categorical Exclusion Determination will be 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, you may review a Privacy Act notice regarding the Federal Docket Management System in the March 24, 2005, issue of the **Federal Register** (70 FR 15086).

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 100**

Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

**PART 100—SAFETY OF LIFE ON NAVIGABLE WATERS**

- 1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1233.

- 2. In § 100.1101, in Table 1 to § 100.1101, suspend item “10” and add temporary item “19” to read as follows:

**§ 100.1101 Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(5) \* \* \*

TABLE 1 TO § 100.1101

[\* \* \*]

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**19. San Diego Sharkfest Swim**

Sponsor .....	Enviro-Sports Productions, Inc.
Event Description .....	Swim Race.
Date .....	October 2, 2016.
Location .....	San Diego Bay, CA.

## TABLE 1 TO § 100.1101—Continued

[\* \* \*]

Regulated Area ..... The waters of San Diego Bay, CA from Fifth Avenue Landing to Tidelands Park, Coronado, CA.

Dated: September 1, 2016.

**J.R. Buzzella,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port San Diego.*

[FR Doc. 2016-22227 Filed 9-14-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

### U.S. Copyright Office

#### 37 CFR Parts 201 and 204

[Docket No. 2016-7]

#### Removal of Personally Identifiable Information From Registration Records

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Copyright Office (“Office”) is proposing new rules related to personally identifiable information (“PII”) that may be found in the Office’s registration records. First, the proposed rule will allow an author, claimant of record, or the authorized agent of the author or claimant of record, to request the removal of certain PII that is requested by the Office and collected on a registration application, such as home addresses or personal phone numbers, from the Office’s internet-accessible public catalog, while retaining it in the Office’s offline records as required by law. Second, the proposed rule will codify an existing practice regarding extraneous PII that applicants erroneously include on registration applications even though the Office has not requested it, such as driver’s license numbers, social security numbers, banking information, and credit card information. Under the proposed rule, the Office would, upon request, remove such extraneous PII both from the Office’s internet-accessible public catalog and its offline records.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on October 17, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** For reasons of government efficiency, the Copyright Office is using the regulations.gov system for the submission and posting of public comments in this proceeding. All comments are therefore to be submitted electronically through *regulations.gov*.

Specific instructions for submitting comments are available on the Copyright Office Web site at <http://copyright.gov/rulemaking/pii/>. If electronic submission of comments is not feasible due to lack of access to a computer and/or the internet, please contact the Office using the contact information below for special instructions.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cindy Abramson, Assistant General Counsel, by email at [ciab@loc.gov](mailto:ciab@loc.gov), or Abioye Mosheim, Attorney Advisor, by email at [abmo@loc.gov](mailto:abmo@loc.gov). Each can be contacted by telephone by calling 202-707-8350.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

This proposed rule would create procedures to request removal of certain “personally identifiable information” (“PII”) from the Office’s registration records. PII is generally considered to be any information that has the potential to identify a specific individual. The proposed rule concerns two distinct categories of PII as discussed below.

The Office requests and receives certain types of PII during the registration process (e.g., dates of birth, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses). The collection of some of that information is mandated by statute or regulation; other information is optional.<sup>1</sup> This information is referred to herein as “requested PII.”

The Office does not request, but sometimes receives, additional PII when applicants choose to include information such as driver’s license numbers, social security numbers, banking information, and credit card information on their registration applications. Such information is extraneous and unnecessary for the processing and maintenance of copyright registration records. This

<sup>1</sup> The Copyright Act requires the Office to gather the name and address of the copyright claimant; the name of the author(s), for works that are not anonymous or pseudonymous; the nationality or domicile of the author(s); and the date(s) of death for deceased author(s). See 17 U.S.C. 409. The Act also gives the Register of Copyrights the authority to require applicants to supply any other information “bearing upon the preparation or identification of the work or the existence, ownership, or duration of copyright.” *Id.*

information is referred to herein as “extraneous PII.”

As explained below, this proposed rule would treat these two categories of PII differently.

With respect to requested PII—information that the Copyright Office purposely collects as part of registration—the Copyright Act imposes certain obligations on the Office to preserve that information as part of the public record. The Act requires the Register to ensure that “records of . . . registrations . . . are maintained, and that indexes of such records are prepared,” and that “[s]uch records and indexes . . . be open to public inspection,” thus creating a public record. 17 U.S.C. 705(a), 705(b). The public record of copyright registrations serves several important functions. Chief among these is that the record provides essential facts relevant to the copyright claim and information that a potential user of a copyrighted work can use to locate the work’s owner. The registration record can also be a valuable aid for determining the term of copyright protection, by providing information such as the author’s date of death, the publication date for the work, or the year of creation of the work.

A separate provision of the Act requires the Register of Copyrights to “compile and publish . . . catalogs of all copyright registrations.” 17 U.S.C. 707(a). For most of the Office’s history, this catalog was maintained in paper form as the Catalog of Copyright Entries (“CCE”). Starting in 1994, however, the Office began providing the public with access to a computerized database of post-1977 copyright registration and recordation catalog entries via the internet. Then, in 1996, the Office decided to end publication of the printed CCE and publish copyright registration information solely via an online public catalog. See 61 FR 52465 (Oct. 7, 1996).

Initially, the PII revealed in the online public catalog was limited to names and, when volunteered, the author’s year of birth. By 2007, however, with the advent of the Copyright Office’s online registration system (“eCO”), a broader range of PII was pushed from the Office’s registration records into the online public catalog, including the postal address of the claimant, and the name, postal address, email address and