

as the copyright protected material is only accessible to viewers within the station's local market (as defined by Nielsen's Designated Market Area).<sup>26</sup> CBC believes that providers of Internet video and wireless technologies, similar to cable and satellite carriers under the statutory licenses, should not be subject to copyright royalties for retransmitting local broadcasts to parties who already have the option to receive the programming free over-the-air. See CBC Comments at 4.<sup>26</sup>

Copyright Owners state that the retransmission of copyrighted broadcast programming over the Internet constitutes a public performance within the meaning of Section 106(4) of the Act and may also implicate copyright owners' exclusive reproduction rights under Section 106(1) of the Act. Copyright Owners argue that unless a statutory exemption or statutory license is available to the entity that seeks to retransmit broadcast programming over the Internet, that entity must obtain a privately negotiated license from the affected copyright owners. They further argue that nothing in the Copyright Act provides a general exemption for the public performance of third parties' copyrighted works on the Internet. They add that neither Section 111 nor any other statutory provision affords any statutory licensee the right to retransmit television programming over the Internet. As such, Copyright Owners urge the Copyright Office to reject CBC's requested "clarification." Copyright Owners Reply Comments at 26–27.

*Discussion.* This is the wrong forum for discussing the Internet retransmission of digital broadcast signals. This matter was not raised by the Copyright Owners in their Petition nor was it a subject addressed in the NOI. In any event, many parties have discussed this matter at length in the Copyright Office's pending Section 109 proceeding. See *Section 109 Report to Congress*, Notice of Inquiry, 72 FR 19039 (Apr. 16, 2007) and comments filed thereunder. Internet retransmission of television broadcast signals will be a subject addressed in the Section 109 Report due to Congress in June 2008.

#### IV. Conclusion

We hereby seek comment from the public on the proposals identified herein associated with the retransmission of digital broadcast signals by cable systems under Section 111 of the Copyright Act.

<sup>26</sup>After filing its comments, CBC requested that its comments be withdrawn from the public record in this proceeding. We decline this request because other parties have already joined issue with the matters raised by CBC.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act Statement

Although the Copyright Office, as a department of the Library of Congress and part of the Legislative Branch, is not an "agency" subject to the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, the Register of Copyrights has considered the effect of the proposed amendments on small businesses. The Register has determined that the proposed amendments would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses because the NPRM clarifies the application of existing law to changes in the cable industry. In any event, interested parties may file comments demonstrating that such changes could result in substantive burdens to smaller businesses.

#### List of Subjects in 37 CFR Part 201

Copyright.

#### Proposed Regulation

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Copyright Office proposes to amend part 201 of title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

#### PART 201—GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The authority citation for part 201 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 17 U.S.C. 702.

2. Section 201.17 is amended as follows:

- a. By revising the first sentence of paragraph (b)(1);
- b. By adding "analog or digital" after "primary television transmitters whose" in paragraph (e)(9) introductory text; and
- c. By revising paragraphs (e)(9)(i) and (vi).

The revisions and additions to § 201.17 read as follows:

#### § 201.17 Statements of Account covering compulsory licenses for secondary transmissions by cable systems.

(b) \* \* \*(1) Gross receipts for the "basic service of providing secondary transmissions of primary broadcast transmitters" include the full amount of monthly (or other periodic) service fees for any and all services or tiers which include one or more secondary transmissions of television or radio broadcast signals, for additional set fees, and for converter fees, including any service fees, converter fees, CableCard fees, additional set fees, whole home network fees, and any related fees that subscribers must pay to receive digital broadcast signals. \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

(9) \* \* \*

(i) The station call sign of the primary transmitter, including the designation "TV" for analog signals and "DT" (followed by the subchannel number) for digital signals.

\* \* \* \* \*

(iv) A designation as to whether that primary transmitter is a "network station," an "independent station," or a "noncommercial educational station." In the case of stations engaged in digital multicasting, that designation shall be made for each digital stream that the cable system carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: May 21, 2008.

**Marybeth Peters,**

*Register of Copyrights,*

*U.S. Copyright Office.*

[FR Doc. E8–11855 Filed 5–30–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410–33–S

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2007–1132; FRL–8573–4]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Interstate Transport of Pollution

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a request submitted by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) on October 23, 2007, to revise the Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP). The submission would address the "good neighbor" provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA). These provisions require each state to submit a SIP that prohibits emissions that adversely affect another state's air quality through interstate transport. MPCA has adequately addressed the four distinct elements related to the impact of interstate transport of air pollutants. These include prohibiting significant contribution to nonattainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in another state, interference with maintenance of the NAAQS in another state, interference with plans in another state to prevent significant deterioration of air quality, and interference with plans in another state to protect visibility.

In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal, because EPA

views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If we do not receive any adverse comments in response to these direct final and proposed rules, we do not contemplate taking any further action in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, we will withdraw the direct final rule and will respond to all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 2, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1132 by one of the following methods:

- *http://www.regulations.gov:* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- *E-mail:* [aburano.douglas@epa.gov](mailto:aburano.douglas@epa.gov).
- *Fax:* (312) 886-5824.

- *Mail:* Douglas Aburano, Acting Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

- *Hand Delivery:* Douglas Aburano, Acting Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Hatten, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6031, [hatten.charles@epa.gov](mailto:hatten.charles@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial

submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule, and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: May 21, 2008.

**Walter W. Kovalick Jr.**,  
Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.  
[FR Doc. E8-12223 Filed 5-30-08; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 60

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0699; FRL-8568-9]

RIN 2060-AO90

### Standards of Performance for Equipment Leaks of VOC in the Synthetic Organic Chemicals Manufacturing Industry; Standards of Performance for Equipment Leaks of VOC in Petroleum Refineries

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; stay.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to extend the stay of certain provisions of the standards of performance for equipment leaks of VOC in the Synthetic Organic Chemicals Manufacturing Industry (SOCMI) and Petroleum Refineries. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** we are extending the stay as a direct final rule without a prior proposed rule. If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by July 2, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0699, by mail to Air and

Radiation Docket (2822T), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. Please include a total of two copies. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

We request that you also send a separate copy of each comment to the contact persons listed below (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Karen Rackley, Coatings and Chemicals Group, Sector Policies and Programs Division, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (E143-01), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-0634; fax number: 919-541-0246; e-mail address: [rackley.karen@epa.gov](mailto:rackley.karen@epa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Why Is EPA Issuing This Proposed Rule?

This document proposes to take action on the standards of performance for equipment leaks of VOC in the SOCMI and Petroleum Refineries. We have published a direct final rule extending the stay of the provisions under reconsideration and the stay of the clarification of the definition of process unit in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** because we view this as a noncontroversial action and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this action in the preamble to the direct final rule.

If we receive no adverse comment, we will not take further action on this proposed rule. If we receive adverse comment, we will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. We would address all public comments in any subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule.

We do not intend to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting must do so at this time. For further information, please see the information provided in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

#### II. Does This Action Apply to Me?

Categories and entities potentially regulated by this action are synthetic organic chemicals manufacturers and petroleum refineries. The New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for equipment leaks of VOC in SOCMI and petroleum refineries affect the following categories of sources: