C. If Defendants' Antitrust Compliance Officer learns of any allegations of a violation of any of the terms and conditions contained in this Final Judgment, Defendants shall immediately investigate to determine if a violation has occurred and appropriate action is required to comply with this Final Judgment. If Defendants' Antitrust Compliance Officer learns of any violation of any of the terms and conditions contained in this Final Judgment, Defendants shall immediately take appropriate action to terminate or modify the activity so as to comply with this Final Judgment. Defendants shall report any such investigation or action in the annual compliance statement required by Section VI(B).

D. If Defendants' Antitrust Compliance Officer learns any Competitively Sensitive Information has been communicated from an MVPD to any person identified in Sections V(B)(1) and (2), excluding those communications consistent with Sections IV(D), (E), (F), (G) and (H), the Antitrust Compliance Officer shall instruct that person that he or she must not consider the Competitively Sensitive Information in any way, shall advise counsel for the MVPD which communicated the Competitively Sensitive Information that such information must not be communicated to Defendants, and report the circumstances of the Communication of the Competitively Sensitive Information and the response by the Antitrust Compliance Officer in the annual compliance statement required by Section VI(B).

VI. CERTIFICATION

A. Within sixty (60) days after entry of this Final Judgment, Defendants shall certify to Plaintiff whether they have designated an Antitrust Compliance Officer and have distributed the Final Judgment in accordance with Section V(B) above. This certification shall include the name, title, business address, email address, and business phone number of the Person designated as Antitrust Compliance Officer.

B. For the term of this Final Judgment, on or before its anniversary date, Defendants shall file with the Plaintiff an annual statement as to the fact and manner of its compliance with the provisions of Section V, including the record(s) created in accordance with Section V(B)(4) above.

VII. COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

A. For purposes of determining or securing compliance with this Final Judgment, or of determining whether this Final Judgment should be modified or vacated, and subject to any legally recognized privilege, from time to time authorized representatives of the United States Department of Justice, including consultants and other persons retained by the United States shall, upon written request of an authorized representative of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, and on reasonable notice to Defendants, be permitted:

- 1. access during Defendants' office hours to inspect and copy, or at the United States' option, to require Defendants and their members to provide copies of all books, ledgers, accounts, records, and documents in their possession, custody, or control, relating to any matters contained in this Final Judgment; and
- 2. to interview, either informally or on the record, Defendants' officers, employees, or other representatives, who may have their individual counsel present, regarding such matters. The interviews shall be subject to the reasonable convenience of the interviewee and without restraint or interference by Defendants.
- B. Upon the written request of an authorized representative of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Defendants shall submit written reports and interrogatory responses, under oath if requested, relating to any of the matters contained in this Final Judgment as may be requested.
- C. No information or documents obtained by the means provided in this section shall be divulged by the United States to any person other than an authorized representative of the executive branch of the United States, except in the course of legal proceedings to which the United States is a party (including grand jury proceedings), or for the purpose of securing compliance with this Final Judgment, or as otherwise required by law.
- D. If at the time information or documents are furnished by Defendants to the United States, Defendants identify in writing the material in any such information or documents to which a claim of protection may be asserted under Rule 26(c)(7) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Defendants mark each pertinent page of such material, "Subject to claim of protection under Rule 26(c)(7) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure," then the United States shall give ten (10) calendar days notice prior to divulging such material in any legal proceeding (other than a grand jury proceeding).

VIII. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

This Court retains jurisdiction to enable any party to this Final Judgment to apply to this Court at any time for further orders and directions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out or construe this Final Judgment, to modify any of its provisions, to enforce compliance, and to punish violations of its provisions.

IX. EXPIRATION OF FINAL JUDGMENT

Unless this Court grants an extension, this Final Judgment shall expire five (5) years from its date of entry.

X. PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION

The parties have complied with the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16, including making copies available to the public of this Final Judgment, the Competitive Impact Statement, and any comments thereon and the United States' responses to comments. Based upon the record before the Court, which includes the Competitive Impact Statement and any comments and responses to comments filed with the Court, entry of this Final Judgment is in the public interest.

SO ORDERED:

Dated: __2017 Michael W. Fitzgerald United States District Judge [FR Doc. 2017–07463 Filed 4–12–17; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Docket No. OLP 160]

Notice of Public Comment Period on Advancing Forensic Science

AGENCY: Department of Justice. **ACTION:** Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: It is the Department's mission to ensure public safety and provide federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime. Advancing the practice of forensic science is an important part of that effort. The more effective a forensic system we have, the better equipped we are to solve crimes, more swiftly absolving the innocent and bringing the guilty to justice. The second term of the National Commission on Forensic Science (NCFS) is set to expire on April 23, 2017. As part of the Department's continued efforts to advance the practice of forensic science following NCFS's expiration, the Department is seeking comment on how the

Department should move forward to evaluate and improve the underlying science of forensic evidence; improve the operational management systems of forensic science service providers; and improve the understanding of forensic science by legal practitioners.

DATES: Written public comment regarding the issue for comment should be submitted through www.regulations.gov before June 9, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Office of Legal Policy, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20530, by phone at 202-514-4601 or via email at Forensics.OLP@usdoj.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In February 2013, the U.S. Department of Justice and the National Institute of

Standards and Technology (NIST) announced a partnership that included the formation of the National Commission on Forensic Science (NCFS). The NCFS is one of several federal initiatives relating to forensic science that was created following the 2009 report by the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council on "Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward." NCFS was established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act to provide advice and recommendations to the Attorney General on: (1) Strengthening the reliability and usefulness of the forensic sciences (including medicolegal death investigation); (2) enhancing quality assurance and quality control in forensic science laboratories and units; (3) identifying and recommending scientific guidance and protocols for evidence seizure, testing, analysis, and reporting by forensic science laboratories and units; and (4) identifying and assessing other needs of the forensic science communities to strengthen their disciplines and meet the increasing demands generated by the criminal and civil justice systems at all levels of government.

The NCFS charter identifies six goals: (1) To recommend priorities for standards development to the Attorney General; (2) to review and recommend guidance identified or developed by subject-matter experts; (3) to develop proposed guidance concerning the intersection of forensic science and the courtroom; (4) to develop policy recommendations, including a uniform code of professional responsibility and minimum requirements for training, accreditation, and certification; (5) to consider the recommendations of the National Science and Technology Council's Subcommittee on Forensic Science; and (6) to identify and assess

the current and future needs of the forensic sciences to strengthen their disciplines and meet growing demands. The NCFS's supporting documents, including current charter, bylaws, and work product development guidance, are available for review at https:// www.justice.gov/ncfs and https:// www.justice.gov/ncfs/work-products.

Federal advisory committees operate on two-year renewable terms. Term 1 for NCFS began on April 23, 2013, when the original charter was filed, and concluded on April 23, 2015. NCFS was renewed for Term 2, which expires on April 23, 2017. Over the last 3 years (as of April 9, 2017), NCFS developed 43 work products, including 20 recommendations to the Attorney General, to support these goals. The NCFS has met its initial mandate, and in light of the upcoming expiration of its charter, the Department is now considering appropriate next steps.

Issue for Comment—Commenters are requested to identify proposals to: (1) Improve the underlying science and validity of forensic evidence; (2) improve the operational management systems of forensic science service providers; and (3) improve the understanding of forensic science by legal practitioners.

In formulating a proposal, commenters may wish to consider the following questions:

(A) What are the biggest needs in forensic science inside the Department and at the federal, state, local, and tribal level?

(B) What is required to improve forensic science practices at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels?

(C) What is needed to improve capacity at federal, state, local, and tribal levels?

(D) What are the barriers to improving capacity and what resources are needed to overcome those barriers?

(E) What are the specific issues related to digital forensic evidence analysis and how can the Department address those needs?

(F) How should the Department, or any Department entity, coordinate with the Organization of Scientific Area Committees?

(G) What resources and relationships can the Department draw on to ensure thoughtful and representative input?

Proposals may include some combination of a Federal Advisory Committee, a new office at the Department, an inter-agency working group, regularly scheduled stakeholder meetings, etc. If the commenter believes a Federal Advisory Committee structure is appropriate, commenters are encouraged to address structural issues

such as size, membership, work product development process, reporting structure (i.e., to whom recommendations are provided), opportunity for public comment, and opportunity for robust debate among members.

Posting of Public Comments: To ensure proper handling of comments, please reference "Docket No. OLP 160" on all electronic and written correspondence. The Department encourages all comments be submitted electronically through www.regulations.gov. Paper comments that duplicate the electronic submission are not necessary as all comments submitted to www.regulations.gov will be posted for public review and are part of the official docket record.

In accordance with the Federal Records Act, please note that all comments received are considered part of the public record, and shall be made available for public inspection online at www.regulations.gov. The comments to be posted may include personally identifiable information (such as your name, address, etc.) and confidential business information voluntarily submitted by the commenter.

The Department will post all comments received on www.regulations.gov without making any changes to the comments or redacting any information, including any personally identifiable information provided. It is the responsibility of the commenter to safeguard personally identifiable information. You are not required to submit personally identifying information in order to comment and the Department recommends that commenters not include personally identifiable information such as Social Security Numbers, personal addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses that they do not want made public in their comments as such submitted information will be available to the public via www.regulations.gov. Comments may be provided anonymously, but those commenters who do share contact information are requested to include brief background information regarding commenter subject-matter experience and expertise. Comments submitted through www.regulations.gov will not include the email address of the commenter unless the commenter chooses to include that information as part of his or her comment.

Dated: April 10, 2017. **Kira Antell,**

Senior Counsel, Office of Legal Policy.
[FR Doc. 2017–07512 Filed 4–12–17; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Georgia Coastal Land Co., et al.,* No. 2:16–cv–00060–LGW–RSB, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia on April 7, 2017.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against Georgia Coastal Land Company, Provident Land Holdings Company, Provident Construction Company, and William L. Nutting, pursuant to Sections 301, 309, and 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311(a), 1319(g)(9), and 1344(s), to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendants to restore impacted areas and perform mitigation, and to pay civil and administrative penalties.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Samara Spence, Trial Attorney for the United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Environmental Defense Section, Post Office Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044 and refer to United States v. Georgia Coastal Land Co., et al., DJ #90–5–1–1–20782.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, Brunswick Division, 801 Gloucester Street, Brunswick, GA 31520. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees.

Cherie L. Rogers,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

 $[FR\ Doc.\ 2017\text{--}07499\ Filed\ 4\text{--}12\text{--}17;\ 8\text{:}45\ am]$

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Labor Certification Process for the Temporary Employment of H–2A and H–2B Foreign Workers in the United States: 2017 Allowable Charges for Agricultural Workers' Meals and for Travel Subsistence Reimbursement, Including Lodging

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor is issuing this Notice to announce: (1) The allowable charges for 2017 that employers seeking H-2A workers in occupations other than range herding may charge their workers when the employer provides three meals a day, and (2) the maximum travel subsistence meal reimbursement that a worker with receipts may claim in 2017 under the H-2A and H-2B programs. The Notice also includes a reminder regarding employers' obligations with respect to overnight lodging costs as part of required subsistence.

DATES: Effective on April 13, 2017. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William W. Thompson, II, Administrator, Office of Foreign Labor Certification (OFLC), U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room PPII–12–200, Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: 202–513–7350 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals with hearing or speech impairments may access the telephone number above via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at 1–800– 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States (U.S.) Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security will not approve an employer's petition for the admission of H-2A or H-2B nonimmigrant temporary workers in the U.S. unless the petitioner has received from the DOL an H-2A or H-2B labor certification. Both the H-2A and H-2B labor certifications provide that: (1) There are not sufficient U.S. workers who are qualified and who will be available to perform the labor or services involved in the petition; and (2) the employment of the foreign worker(s) in such labor or services will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the U.S. similarly employed. See 20 CFR 655.1(a)(H-2B); 20 CFR 655.100 (H-2A).

Allowable Meal Charge

Among the minimum benefits and working conditions that the Department requires employers to offer their U.S. and H–2A workers who are not engaged in range occupations are three meals a day or free and convenient cooking and kitchen facilities so workers may prepare their own meals. See 20 CFR 655.122(g). Where the employer provides the meals, the job offer must state the charge, if any, to the worker for such meals. Id.

The Department establishes the methodology for determining the maximum amounts that H-2A agricultural employers may charge their U.S. and foreign workers for providing them with three meals per day during employment. See 20 CFR 655.173(a). This methodology allows for annual adjustments of the previous year's maximum allowable charge based upon updated U.S. Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI–U) data for Food, not seasonally adjusted. Id. The maximum charge allowed by 20 CFR 655.122(g) is adjusted by the same percentage as the 12-month percent change in the CPI for all Urban Consumers for Food (CPI-U for Food).2 Id. The OFLC Certifying Officer may also permit an employer to charge workers a higher amount for providing them with three meals a day, if the higher amount is justified and sufficiently documented by the employer, as set forth in 20 CFR 655.173(b).

The percentage change in the CPI–U for Food between December 2015 and December 2016 was –0.2 percent.³ Accordingly, the maximum allowable charge under 20 CFR 655.122(g) shall be no more than \$12.07 per day, unless the OFLC Certifying Officer approves a higher charge as authorized under 20 CFR 655.173(b).

Reimbursement for Daily Travel Subsistence

The H–2A regulations (20 CFR 655.122(h)(1)) and the H–2B regulations (20 CFR 655.20(j)(1)(i)) establish that the minimum daily travel subsistence expense for meals, for which a worker is entitled to reimbursement, must be at

¹H–2A employers must provide workers engaged in herding or the production of livestock on the range meals or food to prepare meals without charge or deposit charge. *See* 20 CFR 655.210(e).

² The 12-month percent change in the CPI–U for Food for 2006 through 2016 is available through BLS' Web site at https://www.bls.gov/cpi/.

³ In 2016, the maximum allowable charge under 20 CFR 655.122(g) was \$12.09 per day. 81 FR 9885, 9886 (Feb. 26, 2016). As a result, the maximum allowable meal charge for 2017 has decreased only \$.02.