

information collection renewal, which helps the USPTO assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the reporting burden to the public. Public comments were previously requested via the **Federal Register** on March 11, 2025, during a 60-day comment period. This notice allows for an additional 30 days for public comments.

DATES: To ensure consideration, you must submit comments regarding this information collection on or before July 7, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for this information collection should be submitted within 30 days of the publication of this notice on the following website, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function and entering either the title of the information collection or the OMB Control Number, 0651–0017. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

- This information collection request may be viewed at <http://www.reginfo.gov>. Follow the instructions to view the Department of Commerce, USPTO information collections currently under review by OMB.

- *Email:* InformationCollection@uspto.gov. Include “0651–0017 information request” in the subject line of the message.

- *Mail:* Justin Isaac, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.

- *Telephone:* Dahlia Girgis, Office of Enrollment and Discipline, 571–272–4097.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Practitioner Conduct and Discipline.

OMB Control Number: 0651–0017.

Needs and Uses: The Director of the USPTO has the authority to establish regulations governing the conduct and discipline of agents, attorneys, or other persons representing applicants and other parties before the USPTO (35 U.S.C. 2, 32–33). The USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, set forth in 37 CFR part 11, subpart D, prescribe the manner in which agents, attorneys, and other persons (collectively, “practitioners”) representing applicants and other parties before the USPTO should conduct themselves

professionally. Part 11 outlines practitioners’ responsibilities for recordkeeping and reporting violations or complaints of misconduct to the USPTO. Part 11, subpart C, sets forth the manner by which the USPTO investigates misconduct and imposes discipline.

The USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct require all practitioners to maintain complete records of all funds, securities, and other properties of clients coming into their possession, and to render appropriate accounts to the client regarding the funds, securities, and other properties of clients coming into the practitioner’s possession, collectively known as “client property.” These recordkeeping requirements are necessary to maintain the integrity of client property. State bars require attorneys to perform similar recordkeeping.

Part 11 also requires a practitioner to report knowledge of certain violations of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct to the USPTO. The Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (OED) may, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, suspend, exclude, or disqualify any practitioner from further practice before the USPTO based on non-compliance with the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct. Practitioners who have been excluded or suspended from practice before the USPTO, and practitioners transferred to disability inactive status, must maintain records of their compliance with the suspension or exclusion order, or the transfer to disability inactive status. These records are necessary to demonstrate eligibility for reinstatement. Reports of alleged violations of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct are used by the Director of OED to conduct investigations and disciplinary hearings, as appropriate.

This information collection covers the various reporting and recordkeeping requirements set forth in part 11 for practitioners representing applicants and other parties before the USPTO. Also covered are petitions for reinstatement for suspended or excluded practitioners and the means for reporting violations or complaints of misconduct to the USPTO.

Forms:

- PTO–107R (Reinstatement—Data Sheet—Register of Patent Attorneys and Agents). PTO–107R is also approved for use under USPTO information collection 0651–0012.

Type of Review: Extension and revision of a currently approved information collection.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Respondent’s Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

Frequency: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 52,411 respondents.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 52,411 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: The USPTO estimates that the responses in this information collection that require reporting to the USPTO will take the public approximately 1 to 3 hours to complete. This includes the time to gather the necessary information, create the document, and submit the completed item to the USPTO. The USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct also require practitioners to maintain various records to maintain the integrity of client property and meet other requirements. Additional recordkeeping requirements are applicable to practitioners under suspension or exclusion. The USPTO estimates it will take a practitioner approximately 1 to 20 hours to perform these recordkeeping actions.

Estimated Total Annual Respondent Burden Hours: 58,187 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Respondent Non-Hourly Cost Burden: \$5,439.

Changes from the 60-Day Federal Register Notice: Since the 60-day **Federal Register** notice was published, the estimated postage costs have decreased from \$10.75 to \$10.40 per mailed item. This lowers the estimated total postage costs from \$22 to \$21. This results in the total annual respondent non-hourly cost decreasing from \$5,440 to \$5,439.

Justin Isaac,

Information Collections Officer, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 2025–10202 Filed 6–4–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Performance Review Board Membership

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is given of the names of members of a newly established Performance Review Board for the Department of the Army. These members are fully committed to full enforcement of SES performance evaluations that promote and assure an SES of the highest caliber. This notice

supersedes all previous notices of the PRB membership.

DATES: Applicable May 29, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Smith, Civilian Senior Leader Management Office, 111 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0111, email: Barbara.M.Smith.civ@army.mil; (703) 693-1126.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 4314(c)(1) through (5) of title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations, one or more Senior Executive Service performance review boards. The boards shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of senior executives' performance by supervisors and make recommendations to the appointing authority or rating official relative to the performance of these executives.

The Department of the Army Performance Review Board will be composed of a subset of the following individuals:

1. Mr. Derrick Anderson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
2. Mr. Stephen Austin, Assistant Chief of the Army Reserve, Office of the Chief of the Army Reserve
3. Mr. Peter Bechtel, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7
4. Ms. Karen Durham-Aguilera, Executive Director, U.S. Army National Cemeteries
5. Mr. Richard De Fatta, Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command
6. Mr. Michael Formica, Executive Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
7. Mr. D. Lee Forsgren, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)
8. Mr. Leonel Garciga, Chief Information Officer, CIO
9. Ms. Candice Kinn, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller), Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
10. Mr. Daniel Klippstein, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-9, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-9
11. Mr. David Markowitz, Chief Data Officer and Analytics Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer
12. Mr. Bruce B Miller, The Auditor General, U.S. Army Audit Agency
13. Mr. J. Randall Robinson, Executive Deputy to the Commanding

General, U.S. Army Installations Management Command

14. Mr. Matthew Sannito, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4
15. Mr. Bryan Shone, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-8
16. Mr. Jesse Tolleson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisitions, Logistics and Technology), Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisitions, Logistics and Technology)
17. Dr. Jeff Waksman, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Energy and Environment), Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Energy and Environment)
18. Mr. Roy Wallace, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1
19. Ms. Angel Wolfrey, Director, Civilian Senior Leader Management Office, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army

James W. Satterwhite Jr.,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025-10260 Filed 6-4-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3711-CC-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Arkansas Red River Navigation Channel Extension

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Mississippi Valley Division, Vicksburg District (CEMVK) is announcing its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate extending shallow-draft navigation up to 135 miles on the Red River from its present terminus at Shreveport, Louisiana into Southwest Arkansas. Under the authority of Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986 (Section 203), as amended, the non-Federal Interest, Arkansas Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Division will perform the investigation to determine the feasibility of a proposed Southwest Arkansas Red River Navigation (SWARRN) channel.

DATES: All comments and suggestions must be submitted by July 7, 2025

ADDRESSES: To ensure the USACE has sufficient time to consider public input in the preparation of the Draft EIS, scoping comments should be submitted by email at CEMVK-PPMD-Civil-Works@usace.army.mil, by surface mail to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District, Attn: CEMVK-PMP, 4155 Clay St., Vicksburg, MS 39183.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Questions regarding the proposed action should be directed to Mr. Dan Moore, by phone (601) 631-5008, or by email at daniel.r.moore@usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: The existing Red River waterway, known as the J. Bennett Johnston (JB) Waterway, is a navigation system that commences at the confluence of Old and Red Rivers and proceeds upstream for 236 miles to the Shreveport-Bossier City area. The JB Waterway project consists of a shallow draft navigation channel with five navigation locks. The portion of the Red River above Shreveport, Louisiana is presently unsuitable for commercial navigation. In 2005, USACE completed a draft Feasibility Report for the proposed SWARRN system. At the time of the report, USACE concluded there were not sufficient National Economic Development (NED) benefits to warrant recommending a project plan to authorize and extend shallow-draft navigation upstream of Shreveport, Louisiana. A recent market analysis and economic update completed by USACE showed the potential for improved NED benefits. In addition, USACE guidance allows the consideration of Regional Economic Development, Environmental Quality and other benefits to be applied when evaluating the feasibility of proposed water resources projects. Because of the improved economic benefits conditions, the Natural Resources Division (non-Federal Interest) has initiated an action to proceed with additional analyses and a feasibility study under the Section 203 authority.

Alternatives: The EIS will evaluate an array of alternatives and the most feasible of the alternatives will be recommended. Alternatives will consist of the 'No-Action' alternative and alternatives to extend the heads of shallow-draft navigation into Southwest Arkansas. The shallow-draft navigation alternatives include: (1) extending navigation from Shreveport, Louisiana to Garland, Arkansas; (2) extending navigation from Shreveport, Louisiana to Fulton, Arkansas; and, (3) extending