

B. Intra-Day Scheduling

19. INGAA also requests that we clarify that any changes regarding intra-day scheduling need not be implemented by November 1, 2007, and that instead it is appropriate for NAESB to consider and propose any industry-wide standards. We agree with INGAA. Order No. 698 did not adopt changes in the intra-day nomination timeline, so the November 1, 2007 deadline does not apply to any such change. While the Commission did not require the pipelines to make any changes in nomination schedules, we did indicate that such standards could be very beneficial to the industry and that pipelines with gas-fired generators should, on their own, consider the addition of other intra-day nomination opportunities that would be of benefit to the shippers.¹⁸ Pipelines are free to propose additional intra-day nomination opportunities prior to any proposal by NAESB if they so choose.

C. Non-Public Information

20. INGAA maintains that the Commission should clarify that Order No. 698 does not require pipelines to convey any non-public information as a result of the standards incorporated by reference in the Final Rule. In particular, INGAA points to information concerning a pipeline's methods for dealing with hourly flow variances, the administration of operational balancing agreements, the operation of compressor units, and the operation of meter stations.

21. INGAA does not point to which, if any, standards it believes would require the dissemination of this information, so we cannot provide a definitive answer. The standards themselves do not generally detail the type of information that should be provided. For example, it appears from the examples that INGAA may be referring to standard 0.3.12, which states that: "The Power Plant Operator (PPO) and the Transportation Service Provider(s) (TSP) that is directly connected to the PPO's Facility(ies) should establish procedures to communicate material changes in circumstances that may impact hourly flow rates." This standard does not require the dissemination of detailed information about why the hourly flow rates are affected; it requires only that the pipeline establish communication procedures so that the power plant operator and the pipeline are made timely aware that such hourly flow changes may occur. Without a more

detailed explanation of which other standards would require the disclosure of information that INGAA wishes to keep non-public, we cannot address this issue further. INGAA and the pipelines may bring any specific issue to the Commission's attention.

The Commission orders:

The requests for rehearing and clarification are resolved as discussed in the body of the order.

By the Commission.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-25121 Filed 12-31-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2007-0146]

RIN 1625-AA09

Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Milhomme Bayou, Stephenville, LA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is changing the regulation governing the operation of the Stephenville Bridge across Milhomme Bayou, mile 12.2, (Landside Route) at Stephenville, St. Martin Parish, Louisiana and canceling the test deviation concerning this bridge. Currently the bridge opens on signal, but due to the minimal waterway traffic, the bridge owner requested this change. The rule will require the draw of the bridge to open on signal if at least one hour of advance notice is given. During the advance notice period, the draw shall open on less than one hour notice for an emergency, and shall open on demand should a temporary surge in waterway traffic occur.

DATES: This rule is effective February 1, 2008. The test deviation published on October 5, 2007, 72 FR 56898 is cancelled as of February 1, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Comments and related materials received from the public, as well as documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket, are part of docket USCG-2007-0146. The docket is available at <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bart Marcules, Bridge Administration Branch, telephone (504) 671-2128. If

you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202-366-9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

On October 2, 2007, we published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Milhomme Bayou, Stephenville, LA" in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 56025). We received no letters commenting on the proposed rule. No public meeting was requested, and none was held.

Background and Purpose

St. Martin Parish requested that the operating regulation on the Stephenville Bridge be changed in order to operate the bridge more efficiently. The Stephenville Bridge located on Milhomme Bayou at mile 12.2 (Landside Route of the Morgan City Port Allen Alternate Route) in Stephenville, St. Martin Parish, Louisiana has a vertical clearance of 5.8 feet above mean high water, elevation 3.5 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL) in the closed position and unlimited clearance in the open position. The Stephenville Bridge opened on signal as required by 33 CFR 117.5; however, the waterway traffic is minimal and during the past twelve months an average of 5 boats per day have requested an opening. Most of the boats requesting openings are commercial vessels consisting of tugboats with barges and shrimp trawlers that routinely transit this waterway and are able to give advance notice.

Concurrent with the publication of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking concerning this schedule of operation, a Test Deviation was published on October 5, 2007, entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Milhomme Bayou, Stephenville, LA" in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 56898). This test deviation was issued to allow St. Martin Parish to test the proposed schedule and to obtain data and public comments. This deviation is being canceled upon this final rule going into effect because there have been no comments or complaints, and the new operating schedule will be permanent upon cancellation. This deviation from the operating regulations was authorized under 33 CFR 117.35.

Regulatory Evaluation

This rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, and does not

¹⁸ Order No. 698, FERC Stats. & Regs. [Regulations Preambles] ¶ 31,251 at P 69.

require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that Order. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under that Order.

We expect the economic impact of this proposed rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary.

The current and historical waterway traffic is very minimal with an average of 5 signals to open a day and most signals come from commercial vessels able to schedule an opening. The bridge is also only requiring a one hour advance notice, and will open as soon as possible for emergencies. Also the bridge will open on demand should a temporary surge in waterway traffic occur, and this schedule was tested without any complaints.

Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), we have considered whether this rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule will affect a limited number of small entities. These entities include operators of tugboats and trawlers using the waterway. This rule will have no impact on any small entities because they are able to give notice prior to transiting through this bridge and most vessel operators that require an opening are currently providing advance notice. Lastly, no comments or complaints were received concerning this new operating schedule.

Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we offered to assist small entities in understanding the rule so that they could better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rulemaking process. The Coast Guard provided contact information, so that small entities could ask questions concerning this rule. No small entities contacted the Coast Guard.

Collection of Information

This rule calls for no new collection of information under the Paperwork

Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on State or local governments and would either preempt State law or impose a substantial direct cost of compliance on them. We have analyzed this rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year. Though this rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

Taking of Private Property

This rule will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets applicable standards in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and would not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that might disproportionately affect children.

Indian Tribal Governments

This rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 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.

Energy Effects

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13211, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use. We have determined that it is not a “significant energy action” under that order because it is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866 and is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has not designated it as a significant energy action. Therefore, it does not require a Statement of Energy Effects under Executive Order 13211.

Technical Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs agencies to use voluntary consensus standards in their regulatory activities unless the agency provides Congress, through the Office of Management and Budget, with an explanation of why using these standards would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., specifications of materials, performance, design, or operation; test methods; sampling procedures; and related management systems practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.

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

Environment

We have analyzed this rule under Commandant Instruction M16475.ID which guides the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f), and have made a preliminary determination that this action is not likely to have a significant effect on the human environment because it simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

Words of Issuance and Regulatory Text

■ For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard amends 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Section 117.481 is added to read as follows:

§ 117.481 Milhomme Bayou

The draw of the Stephenville Bridge, mile 12.2 (Landside Route) at Stephenville shall open on signal if at least one hour of advance notice is given. During the advance notice period, the draw shall open on less than one hour notice for an emergency, and shall open on demand should a temporary surge in waterway traffic occur.

Dated: December 21, 2007.

J.R. Whitehead,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. E7–25495 Filed 12–31–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket No. USCG–2007–0093]

RIN 1625–AA87

Security Zone; Kahului Harbor, Maui, HI

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: On November 28, 2007, the Coast Guard published a temporary interim rule that created a security zone in the waters of Kahului Bay and Kahului Harbor, Maui, and on designated adjacent areas of land. This temporary final rule modifies the activation period of the security zone from the previous interim rule to allow the public greater access to Kahului Harbor and Kahului Bay during the transit of the Hawaii Superferry. This temporary final rule is intended to enable the Coast Guard and its law enforcement partners to better protect people, vessels, and facilities in and around Kahului Bay and Kahului Harbor during the transit of the Hawaii Superferry. This rule complements, but does not replace or supersede, existing regulations that establish a moving 100-yard security zone around large passenger vessels like the Superferry.

DATES: This rule is effective from January 2, 2008, through January 31, 2008. The Coast Guard will accept comments on this rule through January 31, 2008.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments and related material, identified by Coast Guard docket number USCG–2007–0093, by any of the four methods listed below. To avoid duplication, please use only one of the following methods:

(1) *Mail:* Lieutenant Sean Fahey, U.S. Coast Guard District 14 (dl), Room 9–130, PJKK Federal Building, 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Honolulu, Hawaii 96850.

(2) *Electronically:* E-mail to Lieutenant Sean Fahey at Sean.C.Fahey@uscg.mil using the subject line “Comment—Maui Security Zone.”

(3) *Fax:* (808) 541–2101.

(4) *Online:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket USCG–2007–0093 and are available for inspection and copying at U.S. Coast Guard District 14 (dl), Room 9–130, between 7 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Sean Fahey, U.S. Coast Guard District 14 at (808) 541–2106.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory Information

We did not publish a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) for this temporary rule. Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing an NPRM. It would be contrary to the public interest to delay implementing this temporary rule, as any delay might result in damage or injury to the public, the Hawaii Superferry (HSF) and its passengers and crew, other vessels, facilities, and law enforcement personnel. Though operation of the HSF from Oahu to Maui was temporarily enjoined by the state circuit court in Maui, that injunction was lifted on November 14, 2007, following action by the Hawaii State legislature, and daily service to Maui resumed on December 13, 2007.

At the time we published the temporary interim rule for Kahului Bay and Kahului Harbor on November 28, 2007 (72 FR 67251), we cited assessments by the Maui Police Department that waterborne obstruction tactics similar to those used in Kauai in August 2007 were likely to be employed in Maui as our justification for implementing that rule without first publishing an NPRM, and for making

the rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. In that rule, the security zone for Kahului Bay and Kahului Harbor is automatically activated for enforcement 60 minutes prior to the Superferry's arrival in the zone, and remains activated for enforcement until 10 minutes after its departure. Notice of the zone's activation is provided by broadcast notice to mariners and the display of flags at Gate 1 at the main entrance to the harbor, on Pier No. 2, and at the harbor entrance on Wharf Street.

The Coast Guard position from the start has been that we would only enforce a fixed security zone in and around Kahului Harbor if it was necessary to do so to ensure the safety and security of people, vessels and facilities. As of December 21, 2007, the HSF has been able to transit through Kahului Bay and Kahului Harbor without serious impediment, and the Coast Guard believes that it is appropriate to modify the previously published interim rule in light of these events to allow lawful users greater access to the land and waters areas of the security zone. This modification will allow the Coast Guard the discretion to activate the security zone only when such action is necessary to respond to actions by would-be obstructers, such as using themselves as human shields to obstruct the HSF's passage. This modification will be effected by changing the activation of the zone from an automatic event (one hour before the HSF arrives in, until ten minutes after the HSF departs from, Kahului Harbor) to a discretionary event—a determination by the Captain of the Port that activation of the zone is necessary to respond to the actions of HSF obstructers.

Though the Coast Guard has determined that the current security situation justifies a policy of only implementing the fixed security zone in and around Kahului Harbor when necessary to respond to acts or threatened acts that pose a hazard to the safety and security of people, vessels and facilities, the Coast Guard has also determined that it would be irresponsible to do away with a fixed security zone entirely. Just over a week of unopposed sailings into and out of Kahului by the HSF does not guarantee that would-be obstructers have entirely given up any thought of employing dangerous obstruction tactics in the harbor, when the HSF is most restricted in its ability to maneuver and thus at its most vulnerable. Indeed, waterborne protesters have illegally entered the waters of the security zone on several