because it does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

12. Energy Effects
This action is not a “significant energy action” under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use.

13. Technical Standards
This rule does not use technical standards. Therefore, we did not consider the use of voluntary consensus standards.

14. Environment
We have analyzed this rule under Department of Homeland Security Security Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16473.1D, which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have determined that this action is one of a category of actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This rule involves establishment of a safety zone. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist and a Categorical Exclusion Determination are available in the docket where indicated under ADDRESSES. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this rule.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165
Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 165 as follows:

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

§ 165.T11–554 Safety zone; Desert Storm Shootout; Lake Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ

(a) Location. This safety zone encompasses the waters of Lake Havasu on the Colorado River and is bound by the following coordinates:

34°26′51″N, 114°20′41″W
34°27′17″N, 114°20′51″W
34°22′18″N, 114°22′34″W
34°26′55″N, 114°22′59″W

(b) Enforcement period. This rule will be enforced from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on April 26 and April 27, 2013. If the event is delayed by inclement weather, this rule will also be enforced on April 26, 2013, from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. If the need for the safety zone ends before the scheduled termination time, the Captain of the Port will cease enforcement of this safety zone and his designative representative will announce that the safety zone is no longer in effect.

(c) Definitions. The following definition applies to this section:

Designated representative means any commissioned, warrant, and petty officer of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, and local, state, or federal law enforcement vessels who have been authorized to act on behalf of the Captain of the Port.

(d) Regulations. (1) Entry into, transit through or anchoring within this safety zone is prohibited unless authorized by the Captain of the Port of San Diego or his designative representative.

(2) Mariners requesting permission to transit through the safety zone may request authorization to do so from the Patrol Commander (PATCOM). The PATCOM may be contacted on VHF–FM Channel 21.

(3) All persons and vessels shall comply with the instructions of the Coast Guard Captain of the Port or his designative representative.

(4) Upon being hailed by U.S. Coast Guard patrol personnel by siren, radio, a flashing light, or other means, the operator of a vessel shall proceed as directed.

(5) The Coast Guard may be assisted by other Federal, State, or local agencies.

Dated: March 18, 2013.
S.M. Mahoney,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port San Diego.

[FR Doc. 2013–06705 Filed 3–22–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9110–04–P
changes as to inter partes review proceedings conducted by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (Board).

Summary of Major Provisions:
Consistent with section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, this final rule permits a petitioner to file an inter partes review petition challenging a first-to-invent patent or reissue patent, upon issuance, eliminating the nine-month “dead zone” as to first-to-invent patents and reissue patents.

Costs and Benefits:
This rulemaking is not economically significant under Executive Order 12866 (Sept. 30, 1993), as amended by Executive Order 13258 (Feb. 26, 2002) and Executive Order 13422 (Jan. 18, 2007).

Background:

Under the AIA, as originally enacted, a petition for inter partes review could only be filed after the later of either: (1) The date that is nine months after the issuance of an original patent or reissue patent; or (2) If a post-grant review is instituted, the date of the termination of such post-grant review. Notably, inter partes reviews were available only for patents that had been issued for at least nine months. Additionally, post-grant reviews were not available for first-to-invent patents and reissued patents where the original patent was no longer eligible for post-grant review (35 U.S.C. 325(f)). See sections 6(d) and (f)(2) of the AIA. That created two nine-month “dead zones,” namely first-to-invent patents and reissued patents could not be challenged in inter partes proceedings before the Office during the first nine months after issuance.

The AIA Technical Corrections Act was enacted on January 14, 2013. See Pub. L. 112–274 (2013). Section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act amended 35 U.S.C. 311(c) to eliminate the “dead zones” by allowing first-to-invent patents and reissued patents to be challenged in inter partes reviews during the first nine months after issuance. Pursuant to section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, the Office is revising the rules of practice to permit petitioners to file inter partes review petitions challenging first-to-invent patents and reissue patents upon issuance.

Discussion of Section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act
Section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act entitled “DEAD ZONES” provides that 35 U.S.C. 311(c) shall not apply to a petition to institute an inter partes review of a patent that is not a patent described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (35 U.S.C. 100 note). The statutory provision also amends 35 U.S.C. 311(c) by striking “or issuance of a reissue of a patent.” This final rule implements these statutory changes.

The changes for inter partes review took effect on January 14, 2013, the date of enactment of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, and apply to proceedings commenced on or after January 14, 2013. See section 1(n) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act.

Discussion of Specific Rules
Section 42.102: Consistent with section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, § 42.102(a) is amended in this final rule to read: (1) “The following dates, where applicable:” (2) “If the patent is a patent described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act,” and (3) “If the patent is a patent that is not described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the date of the grant of the patent.” Section 42.102(a) is also amended to delete “or of the issuance of the reissue patent.” Under revised § 42.102(a), a petition for inter partes review of a patent must be filed after the later of the following dates, where applicable: (1) If the patent is a patent described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the date that is nine months after the date of the grant of the patent; (2) If the patent is a patent that is not described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith American Inventions Act, the date of the grant of the patent; or (3) If a post-grant review is instituted as set forth in subpart C of this part, the date of the termination of such post-grant review.

Rulemaking Considerations
A. Administrative Procedure Act:
This final rule revises the rules of practice concerning the procedure for requesting an inter partes review. Consistent with section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, the changes set forth in this final rule eliminate the nine-month “dead zone” as to first-to-invent patents and reissue patents. Under the final rule, a petition may file an inter partes review petition challenging a first-to-invent patent or reissue patent upon issuance. Therefore, the changes adopted in this rule do not change the substantive criteria of patentability.

Moreover, good cause exists to make these procedural changes without prior notice and opportunity for comment and to be effective immediately so as to avoid inconsistencies between the regulations and the AIA Technical Corrections Act. This nine-month “dead zone” has already been eliminated by operation of the enactment of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, effective January 14, 2013. Accordingly, prior notice and opportunity for public comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) or (c) (or any other law) and thirty-day advance publication is not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) (or any other law). See also Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas, 536 F.3d 1330, 1336–37 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act:
For the reasons set forth herein, the Deputy General Counsel for General Law of the United States Patent and Trademark Office has certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration that the changes set forth in this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. See 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

Consistent with section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, the changes set forth in this final rule eliminate the nine-month “dead zone” as to first-to-invent patents and reissue patents. Under the final rule, a petitioner may file an inter partes review petition challenging a first-to-invent patent or reissue patent upon issuance. These changes mirror provisions in the AIA Technical Corrections Act and do not add any additional requirements (including information collection requirements) or fees for petitioners or patent owners.

For the foregoing reasons, none of the changes in this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

C. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review):
This rulemaking
has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866 (Sept. 30, 1993), as amended by Executive Order 13258 (Feb. 26, 2002) and Executive Order 13422 (Jan. 18, 2007).

D. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review): The Office has complied with Executive Order 13563. Specifically, the Office has, to the extent feasible and applicable: (1) Made a reasoned determination that the benefits justify the costs of the rule; (2) tailored the rule to impose the least burden on society consistent with obtaining the regulatory objectives; (3) selected a regulatory approach that maximizes net benefits; (4) specified performance objectives; (5) identified and assessed available alternatives; (6) involved the public in an open exchange of information and perspectives among experts in relevant disciplines, affected stakeholders in the private sector, and the public as a whole, and provided on-line access to the rulemaking docket; (7) attempted to promote coordination, simplification, and harmonization across government agencies and identified goals designed to promote innovation; (8) considered approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public; and (9) ensured the objectivity of scientific and technological information and processes.

E. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism): This rulemaking does not contain policies with federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism Assessment under Executive Order 13132 (Aug. 4, 1999).

F. Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation): This rulemaking will not: (1) Have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes; (2) impose substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments; or (3) preempt tribal law. Therefore, a tribal summary impact statement is not required under Executive Order 13175 (Nov. 6, 2000).

G. Executive Order 13211 (Energy Effects): This rulemaking is not a significant energy action under Executive Order 13211 because this rulemaking is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Therefore, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required under Executive Order 13211 (May 18, 2001).

H. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform): This rulemaking meets applicable standards to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden as set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 (Feb. 5, 1996).

I. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children): This rulemaking does not concern an environmental risk to health or safety that may disproportionately affect children under Executive Order 13045 (Apr. 21, 1997).

J. Executive Order 12630 (Taking of Private Property): This rulemaking will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630 (Mar. 15, 1988).


The changes in this rule are not expected to result in an annual effect on the economy of 100 million dollars or more, a major increase in costs or prices, or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

Therefore, this rulemaking is not expected to result in a “major rule” as defined in 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

L. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995: The changes set forth in this rule do not involve a Federal intergovernmental mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, or a Federal private sector mandate that will result in the expenditure by the private sector of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, and will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. See 2 U.S.C. 1501–1571.

M. National Environmental Policy Act: This rulemaking will not have any effect on the quality of the environment and is thus categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. See 42 U.S.C. 4321–4370h.

N. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act: The requirements of section 122 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) are not applicable because this rulemaking does not contain provisions which involve the use of technical standards.

O. Paperwork Reduction Act: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3549) requires that the USPTO consider the impact of paperwork and other information collection burdens imposed on the public. The rules of practice pertaining to inter partes review have been reviewed and approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3549) under OMB control number 0651–0069. Consistent with section 1(d) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act, the changes set forth in this final rule eliminate the nine-month “dead zone” as to first-to-invent patents and reissue patents. Under the final rule, a petitioner may file an inter partes review petition challenging a first-to-invent patent or reissue patent upon issuance. This final rule does not add any additional requirements (including information collection requirements) or fees for patent applicants or patentees. Moreover, this final rule eliminates the delay in filing inter partes review petitions, but would not impact the number of patents eligible for inter partes review. Therefore, the Office is not resubmitting information collection packages to OMB for its review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 because the changes in this final rule do not affect the information collection requirements associated with the information collections previously approved under OMB control number 0651–0069 or any other information collections.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

List of Subjects in 37 CFR Part 42

Administrative practice and procedure, Inventions and patents, Lawyers.

Amendments to the Regulay Text

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office amends 37 CFR part 42 as follows:
PART 42—TRIAL PRACTICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

1. The authority citation for 37 CFR part 42 is revised to read as follows:


2. Section 42.102 is amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 42.102 Time for filing.

(a) A petition for inter partes review of a patent must be filed after the later of the following dates, where applicable:

1. If the patent is a patent described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the date that is nine months after the date of the grant of the patent;

2. If the patent is a patent that is not described in section 3(n)(1) of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the date of the grant of the patent;

3. If a post-grant review is instituted as set forth in subpart C of this part, the date of the termination of such post-grant review.

* * * * *

Dated: March 20, 2013.

Teresa Stanek Rea,

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 172, 173, 176, 178

[Docket No. PHMSA–2011–0142 (HM–219)]

RIN 2137–AE79

Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Petitions for Rulemaking (RRR)

Correction

In rule document 2013–04197, appearing on pages 14702–14716 in the issue of Thursday, March 7, 2013, make the following correction:

§ 172.101 [Corrected]

On page 14713, the Table titled “§ 172.101 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TABLE” is corrected to read as set forth below:

§ 172.101 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Hazardous materials descriptions and proper shipping names</th>
<th>Hazard class or division</th>
<th>Identification No.</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>Label Code</th>
<th>Special Provisions (§ 172.102)</th>
<th>(8) Packaging (§ 173.****)</th>
<th>(9) Quantity limitations</th>
<th>(10) Vessel stowage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceptions</td>
<td>Non-bulk</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
<td>Passenger aircraft/rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dated: March 20, 2013.

Teresa Stanek Rea,