

Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–1

Sally R. Butts,

Acting Deputy State Director, Lands and Resources.

[FR Doc. 2016–20942 Filed 8–30–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–FB–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

[S1D1S SS08011000 SX066A0067F  
167S180110; S2D2D SS08011000 SX066A00  
33F 16XS01520]

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection; Request for Comments for 1029–0113

**AGENCY:** Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) is announcing its intention to request approval for the collection of information for General Reclamation Requirements.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposed information collection must be received by October 31, 2016, to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to John Trelease, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 1951 Constitution Ave. NW., Room 203—SIB, Washington, DC 20240. Comments may also be submitted electronically to [jtrelease@osmre.gov](mailto:jtrelease@osmre.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To receive a copy of the information collection request contact John Trelease at (202) 208–2783, or via email at [jtrelease@osmre.gov](mailto:jtrelease@osmre.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implement provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities [see 5 CFR 1320.8 (d)]. This notice identifies the information collection that OSMRE will be submitting to OMB for extension. This collection is contained in 30 CFR part 874.

OSM has revised burden estimates, where appropriate, to reflect current reporting levels or adjustments based on reestimates of burden or number of respondents. OSMRE will request a

3-year term of approval for this information collection activity.

Comments are invited on: (1) the need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; (2) the accuracy of the agency's burden estimates; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collections; and (4) ways to minimize the information collection burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information. A summary of the public comments will accompany OSMRE's submission of the information collection request to OMB.

Before including your address, phone number, email 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.

This notice provides the public with 60 days in which to comment on the following information collection activity:

**Title:** 30 CFR part 874—General Reclamation Requirements.

**OMB Control Number:** 1029–0113.

**Summary:** Part 874 establishes land and water eligibility requirements, reclamation objectives and priorities and reclamation contractor responsibility. 30 CFR 874.17 requires consultation between the AML agency and the appropriate Title V regulatory authority on the likelihood of removing the coal under a Title V permit and concurrences between the AML agency and the appropriate Title V regulatory authority on the AML project boundary and the amount of coal that would be extracted under the AML reclamation project.

**Bureau Form Number:** None.

**Frequency of Collection:** Once.

**Description of Respondents:** 17 State regulatory authorities and Indian tribes.

**Total Annual Responses:** 17.

**Total Annual Burden Hours:** 1,411.

Dated: August 25, 2016.

John A. Trelease,

Acting Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. 2016–20937 Filed 8–30–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–794]

### Certain Electronic Devices, Including Wireless Communication Devices, Portable Music and Data Processing Devices, and Tablet Computers Sanction for Breaches of Administrative Protective Order

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Sanction for breaches of Commission administrative protective order.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has imposed a sanction for the breach of the administrative protective order (“APO”) issued in this investigation. The Commission determined that the law firm of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP (“Quinn Emanuel”) breached the APO by failing to adequately control access to confidential business information (“CBI”) in the investigation and litigation in the U.S. District for the Northern District of California. As a result, Quinn Emanuel attorneys and employees of complainants Samsung Telecommunications America LLC and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (collectively, “Samsung”) improperly disclosed CBI to more than 140 unauthorized persons over a fourteen-month period. Quinn Emanuel is being publicly reprimanded for pervasive problems at the firm in safeguarding CBI.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carol McCue Verratti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3088. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at (202) 205–1810. General information concerning the Commission can also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Several Quinn Emanuel attorneys inadvertently disclosed CBI designated by respondent Apple Inc. as CBI in the investigation and for cross-use in litigation in the U.S. District for the Northern District of California to persons who were not authorized to access CBI under the APO.

A junior associate at Quinn Emanuel failed to fully redact CBI from an expert report prepared for the district court action, and a partner at Quinn Emanuel failed to supervise the junior associate.

Quinn Emanuel attorneys subsequently sent the incompletely redacted expert report to unauthorized persons at Samsung and other law and consulting firms on several occasions. Some of the non-signatory recipients further disseminated the CBI to other non-signatories, including an Italian court. One of the incidents involved a partner at Quinn Emanuel emailing more than 90 Samsung employees with instructions on how to access the incompletely redacted expert report on an FTP site. Another incident involved a second associate who failed to safeguard CBI by improperly confirming the redactions. In another incident, the same junior associate who made the original redactions discovered that an incompletely redacted report had been inadvertently disclosed to a Samsung employee and alerted the second associate and a supervising partner. Although the Samsung employee deleted the report without viewing the CBI, the second associate later sent a revised version that still contained CBI. No one at Quinn Emanuel notified Apple or the Commission of the disclosure at the time. No other efforts were made to investigate whether other disclosures had been made so as to prevent further disclosures. As a result, the unauthorized disclosures continued.

In connection with the investigation before the Commission, a mid-level associate at Quinn Emanuel failed to redact the same CBI from an outline for a brief on remedy and the public interest. Quinn Emanuel attorneys subsequently sent versions of the outline and the public interest brief containing CBI to unauthorized persons at Samsung and other law firms on several occasions. A partner at Quinn Emanuel discovered one such disclosure, but did not notify Apple or the Commission at the time because he had acted promptly after the discovery to prevent unauthorized persons from viewing CBI.

A third party filed a motion for a protective order in the district court action, alleging that Samsung had obtained CBI. Quinn Emanuel notified the Commission of certain of the disclosures a month later, and two weeks after it had notified the third party of the same disclosures.

The Commission considered several aggravating factors, including the viewing of CBI by unauthorized persons; the discovery of the breaches by a third party; Quinn Emanuel's failure and delay in reporting to the Commission the disclosures when they were discovered; the lengthy period of time in which CBI was unprotected; multiple breaches by Quinn Emanuel

attorneys in the same investigation; and multiple breaches by Quinn Emanuel attorneys in a two-year period. The Commission also considered several mitigating factors, including the inadvertent nature of the breaches; Quinn Emanuel's recent implementation of a firm-wide policy to help prevent unauthorized disclosures; Quinn Emanuel's prompt and strenuous efforts to investigate, cure, and prevent further breaches; and the fact that a federal district court has already sanctioned the disclosures and conduct underlying the breaches relating to the expert report.

Although Quinn Emanuel had procedures to prevent unauthorized disclosures, the firm did not ensure that attorneys complied with those procedures and made unilateral decisions regarding the APO's scope and requirements. The large number and the vast extent of the unauthorized disclosures show that the failure to safeguard CBI was a pervasive problem at Quinn Emanuel.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 25, 2016.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2016-20869 Filed 8-30-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

[Docket No. ATF 2015R-15]

#### Electronic Collection and Transfer of Import Information: Cessation of PGA Message Set Pilot Program

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) announces cessation of the pilot program that tested the transfer of data between the Participating Government Agency (PGA) Message Set in the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) and ATF's Web-based data analytics system. ACE is the Web-based portal for the collection and use of international trade data maintained by

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). The PGA Message Set is the data related to merchandise regulated by an agency, such as ATF, that CBP will receive electronically from importers for its use as well as for the PGA's use. The data enables ATF to determine the actual items imported. Although this notice announces the cessation of the pilot program, the mandatory filing date for filing entries in ACE has yet to be determined.

**DATES:** This notice is effective on August 31, 2016.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William E. Majors, Chief, Firearms and Explosives Imports Branch, Firearms and Explosives Services Division, Enforcement Programs and Services; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; U.S. Department of Justice; 244 Needy Road, Martinsburg, WV 25401; telephone (304) 616-4589, fax: (304) 616-4551, or email: [William.Majors@atf.gov](mailto:William.Majors@atf.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

ATF participated in a voluntary CBP pilot program of the International Trade Data System (ITDS) involving the use of the PGA Message Set in ACE. See 80 FR 45548 (July 30, 2015). The pilot allowed importers to submit required data to CBP through ACE for the purposes of obtaining CBP release and receipt. CBP validated that information electronically, and electronically transmitted entry and release information to ATF for purposes of satisfying certification requirements. The pilot program confirmed the efficiency and effectiveness of digitizing traditional, manual paperwork. While the pilot has been suspended, the mandatory filing date for filing entries in ACE has yet to be determined.

Importers should be aware that no changes have been made to the requirement that importers submit their copy of the Form 6A (with Sections I and III completed) to ATF within 15 days of release from CBP custody.

**Thomas E. Brandon,**

*ATF Deputy Director.*

[FR Doc. 2016-20939 Filed 8-30-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-FY-P**