

### Clarity of This Rule

We are required by Executive Orders 12866 and 12988 and by the Presidential Memorandum of June 1, 1998, to write all rules in plain language. This means that each rule we publish must:

- (a) Be logically organized;
- (b) Use the active voice to address readers directly;
- (c) Use clear language rather than jargon;
- (d) Be divided into short sections and sentences; and
- (e) Use lists and tables wherever possible.

If you feel that we have not met these requirements, send us comments by one of the methods listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. To better help us revise the rule, your comments should be as specific as possible. For example, you should tell us the numbers of the sections or paragraphs that are unclearly written, which sections or sentences are too long, the sections where you feel lists or tables would be useful, *etc.*

### Drafting Information

The primary authors of this regulation were Stephen Prokop, former Chief Ranger CACO; Bob Grant, Chief Ranger CACO; Carrie Phillips, former Chief of Resources Management, CACO; Robin Lepore, Office of the Regional Solicitor, Department of the Interior; Philip A. Selleck, Associate Regional Director, Operations and Education, National Park Service, National Capital Region; Russel J. Wilson, Chief Regulations and Special Park Uses, National Park Service, Washington, DC; and A.J. North, Regulations Coordinator, National Park Service, Washington, DC.

### Public Participation

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulation Identifier Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

### Public Availability of Comments

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

### List of Subjects in 36 CFR Part 7

National Parks, Hunting, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the National Park Service proposes to amend 36 CFR part 7 as follows:

#### **PART 7—SPECIAL REGULATIONS, AREAS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM**

1. The authority citation for Part 7 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1, 3, 9a, 462(k); Sec. 7.96 also issued under 36 U.S.C. 501–511, DC Code 10–137 (2001) and DC Code 50–2201 (2001).

2. In § 7.67 revise paragraph (f) to read as follows:

#### **§ 7.67 Cape Cod National Seashore.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) *Hunting.* (1) Hunting is allowed at times and locations designated by the Superintendent as open to hunting.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in this section, hunting is permitted in accordance with § 2.2 of this chapter.

(3) Only deer, upland game (including Eastern Wild Turkey), and migratory waterfowl may be hunted.

(4) Hunting is prohibited from March 1st through August 31st each year, except for the taking of Eastern Wild Turkey as designated by the superintendent.

(5) The superintendent may:

- (i) Require permits and establish conditions for hunting.
- (ii) Temporarily limit, restrict, or terminate hunting access or activities after taking into consideration public health and safety, natural and cultural resource protection, and other management activities and objectives, such as those described in the Cape Cod National Seashore Hunting Program/ Final Environmental Impact Statement.

(6) The public will be notified of such closures through one or more methods listed in § 1.7(a) of this chapter.

(7) Violating a closure, designation, use or activity restriction or a term or condition of a permit is prohibited. Violating a term or condition of a permit may also result in the suspension or revocation of the permit by the superintendent.

Dated: March 14, 2011.

**Will Shafroth,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.*

[FR Doc. 2011–6703 Filed 3–21–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–WV–P**

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### Patent and Trademark Office

#### 37 CFR Chapter I

[Docket No. PTO–C–2011–0017]

#### Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Request for information.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) is preparing a preliminary plan to review its existing significant regulations in response to the President’s Executive Order 13563 on Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review. The purpose of this regulatory review is to determine whether any of these regulations should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed in order to make the Office’s regulatory program more effective and less burdensome. More effective and less burdensome regulations will help the Office in its mission to foster innovation and competitiveness through providing high quality and timely examination of patent and trademark applications, guiding domestic and international intellectual property policy, and delivering intellectual property information and education worldwide. The Office is asking the public to provide ideas and information about preparing such a review plan and to help the Office identify which regulations should be reviewed.

**DATES:** You must submit any comments on or before April 21, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically by e-mailing them directly to the Office at [regulatory\\_review\\_comments@uspto.gov](mailto:regulatory_review_comments@uspto.gov). Comments may also be submitted by mail addressed to: Office of the General Counsel, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, marked to the attention of Nicolas Oettinger. Although comments may be submitted by mail, the Office prefers to receive comments via the Internet. Comments may also be submitted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Additional instructions on providing comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal are available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. All comments submitted directly to the Office or provided on the Federal eRulemaking Portal should include the docket number (PTO–P–2011–0017).

All comments will be available for public inspection upon request at the Office of the Commissioner for Patents, located in Madison East, Tenth Floor, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, and will be available on the USPTO Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov>. All comments submitted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal will be made publicly available on that Web site. Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that the submitter does not desire to make public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nicolas Oettinger, Office of the General Counsel, by telephone at 571-272-7832, by e-mail at [nicolas.oettinger@uspto.gov](mailto:nicolas.oettinger@uspto.gov), or by mail addressed to Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, marked to the attention of Nicolas Oettinger.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

On January 18, 2011, President Obama issued Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review. In the Executive Order, the President stated:

Our regulatory system must protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation. It must be based on the best available science. It must allow for public participation and an open exchange of ideas. It must promote predictability and reduce uncertainty. It must identify and use the best, most innovative, and least burdensome tools for achieving regulatory ends. It must take into account benefits and costs, both quantitative and qualitative. It must ensure that regulations are accessible, consistent, written in plain language, and easy to understand. It must measure, and seek to improve, the actual results of regulatory requirements.

E.O. 13563, 76 FR 3281, at Section 1(a). The Executive Order directed agencies to develop and submit, within 120 days, preliminary plans for reviewing their existing “significant regulations” (as that term is defined in Executive Order 12866) and determining whether and how such regulations could be made more effective and less burdensome. The Executive Order also directed agencies to provide the public with an opportunity to participate in the regulatory process and to provide comments on the development of such a plan, and further directed that timely on-line access to the rule making docket be provided so that the public had the opportunity to comment on all pertinent parts of the rule making docket.

As the Office begins work on a preliminary plan for reviewing its existing significant regulations, it is requesting that the public participate in that process. The Office is asking the public to provide comments on how such a plan should be developed, what such a plan should include, which significant regulations should be reviewed, and how those regulations might be improved. The Office recognizes that the intellectual property community and the public in general will have useful information and opinions about how USPTO regulations can be reviewed and improved in order to best achieve its mission of promoting innovation and competition. This request for comments will help the Office gather information that will inform its decisions about developing a plan for reviewing the Office’s existing significant regulations.

The Office welcomes any comments that you think might be helpful in developing a plan for reviewing significant USPTO regulations. Some questions that may be helpful to consider in preparing such comments include:

1. What is the best way for the Office to identify which of its significant regulations should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed? What process should the Office use to select rules for review and how should it prioritize such review?
2. What can the Office, relative to its regulation process, do to reduce burdens and maintain flexibility for the public while promoting its missions?
3. How can the Office ensure that its significant regulations promote innovation and competition in the most effective and least burdensome way? How can these Office regulations be improved to accomplish this?
4. Are there USPTO regulations that conflict with, or are duplicative of, regulations from other agencies? If so, please identify any such rules and provide any suggestions you might have for how this conflict or duplication can be resolved in order to help the Office achieve its mission more effectively.
5. How can the Office best encourage public participation in its rule making process? How can the Office best provide a forum for the open exchange of ideas among the Office, the intellectual property community, and the public in general?

These questions are not intended to be an exhaustive list of topics for public comment. While the Office welcomes and values all comments from the public in response to this request, these comments do not bind the Office to any

further actions related to the comments, and the Office may not respond to every comment that is submitted.

Dated: March 15, 2011.

**David J. Kappos,**

*Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[FR Doc. 2011-6660 Filed 3-21-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-16-P**

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0055-201107; FRL-9285-1]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designations of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia: Macon; Determination of Attaining Data for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standards

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to determine that the Macon, Georgia, fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) nonattainment area (hereafter referred to as “the Macon Area” or “the Area”) has attained the 1997 annual average PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Macon Area is comprised of Bibb County in its entirety and a portion of Monroe County. This proposed determination of attainment is based upon complete, quality-assured and certified ambient air monitoring data for the 2007–2009 period showing that the Area has monitored attainment of the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. If EPA finalizes this proposed determination of attainment, the requirements for the Area to submit an attainment demonstration and associated reasonably available control measures (RACM), a reasonable further progress (RFP) plan, contingency measures, and other planning State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions related to attainment of the standard shall be suspended so long as the Area continues to attain the annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 21, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R04-OAR-2011-0055, by one of the following methods: