

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY****Coast Guard****33 CFR Part 117**

[Docket No. USCG–2013–0848]

RIN 1625–AA09

**Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Venice, FL****AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to change the operating schedule that governs the Hatchett Creek (US–41) Twin Bridges, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway mile 56.9, Venice, FL. Changing the operational schedule of the Hatchett Creek (US–41) Twin Bridges will allow the Iron Man Triathlon event to be unimpeded for an eight hour period. This event is anticipated to be scheduled on the second Sunday of November annually from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

**DATES:** Comments and related material must reach the Coast Guard on or before February 19, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG–2013–0848 using any one of the following methods:

(1) *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

(2) *Fax:* 202–493–2251.

(3) *Mail or Delivery:* Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001. Deliveries accepted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments. To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email Ms. Danielle Mauser, Seventh Coast Guard District, Bridge Branch, 305–415–6946, email [Danielle.L.Mauser2@uscg.mil](mailto:Danielle.L.Mauser2@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Barbara Hairston, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Table of Acronyms**

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
§ Section Symbol  
U.S.C. United States Code

**A. Public Participation and Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting comments and related materials. All comments received will be posted, without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided.

**1. Submitting Comments**

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this proposed rulemaking (USCG–2013–0848), indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online (<http://www.regulations.gov>), or by fax, mail or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. If you submit a comment online via <http://www.regulations.gov>, it will be considered received by the Coast Guard when you successfully transmit the comment. If you fax, hand deliver, or mail your comment, it will be considered as having been received by the Coast Guard when it is received at the Docket Management Facility. We recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the docket number USCG–2013–0848 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on “Submit a Comment” on the line associated with this rulemaking. If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period and may change the rule based on your comments.

**2. Viewing Comments and Documents**

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>, type the

docket number USCG–2013–0848 in the “SEARCH” box and click “SEARCH.” Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC, 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**3. Privacy Act**

Anyone can search the electronic form of comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review a Privacy Act notice regarding our public dockets in the January 17, 2008, issue of the **Federal Register** (73 FR 3316).

**4. Public Meeting**

We do not now plan to hold a public meeting. But you may submit a request for one using one of the three methods specified under **ADDRESSES**. Please explain why one would be beneficial. If we determine that one would aid this rulemaking, we will hold one at a time and place announced by a later notice in the **Federal Register**.

**B. Regulatory History and Information**

The current operating regulation governing the Hatchett Creek (US–41) bridges, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway mile 56.9 at Venice, FL as listed in § 117.287(b), provides the draw of the Hatchett Creek (US–41) bridge, mile 56.9 at Venice, shall open on signal, except that, from 7 a.m. to 4:20 p.m., Monday through Friday except Federal holidays, the draw need open only on the hour, 20 minutes after the hour, and 40 minutes after the hour and except between 4:25 p.m. and 5:25 p.m. when the draw need not open. On Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays from 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. the draw need open only on the hour, quarter-hour, half-hour, and three quarter-hour.

**C. Basis and Purpose**

The proposed changes will have a minor impact on vessels transiting the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Venice, Florida and will still meet the reasonable needs to navigation. This action will accommodate the Sarasota Iron Man Triathlon held annually on the second Sunday of November.

## D. Discussion of Proposed Rule

This proposed rule will allow the Hatchett Creek Bridge to remain closed to navigation for eight hours once a year for an annual event. The Hatchett Creek (US-41) Bridge provides a vertical clearance of 16 feet at mean high water in the closed position and a horizontal clearance of 90 feet. Vessels with a height of less than 16 feet may pass through the bridge at any time. The Gulf of Mexico is the only alternative route and this route would be unacceptable for certain classes of vessels such as tugs and barges.

## E. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes or executive orders.

### 1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders.

This action will have a minor impact on vessels transiting the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Venice, Florida and will still meet the reasonable needs of navigation.

### 2. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. 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 proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This proposed rule would affect the following entities, some of which might be small entities: The owners or operators of vessels needing the draw to open for safe transit under the bridge from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on the second Sunday of November each year.

This action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial

number of small entities for the following reasons. This rule will be in effect for eight hours annually. Vessels that can safely transit under the bridge may do so at any time. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will issue maritime advisories widely available to users of the river.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

### 3. Assistance for Small Entities

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, above. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

### 4. Collection of Information

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520).

### 5. Federalism

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, Federalism, if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it does not have implications for federalism.

### 6. Protest Activities

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

### 7. 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 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this rule elsewhere in this preamble.

### 8. Taking of Private Property

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

### 9. Civil Justice Reform

This proposed 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.

### 10. Protection of Children

We have analyzed this proposed 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.

### 11. Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, because it would 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 proposed rule 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 proposed 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

Management Directive 023-01 and 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 one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. This rule is categorically excluded, under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction.

Under figure 2-1, paragraph (32)(e), of the Instruction, an environmental analysis checklist and a categorical exclusion determination are not required for this rule. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

#### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 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. In § 117.287, revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

#### § 117.287 Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) The draw of the Hatchett Creek (U.S.-41) bridge, mile 56.9 at Venice, shall open on signal, except that, from 7 a.m. to 4:20 p.m., Monday through Friday except Federal holidays, the draw need open only on the hour, 20 minutes after the hour, and 40 minutes after the hour and except between 4:25 p.m. and 5:25 p.m. when the draw need not open. On Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays from 7:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. the draw need open only on the hour, quarter-hour, half-hour, and three quarter-hour. This bridge need not open to navigation on the second Sunday of November annually from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. to facilitate the Iron Man Triathlon event.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: October 25, 2013.

**J.H. Korn,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander,  
Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2013-27564 Filed 11-20-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-04-P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

### 39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2014-1; Order No. 1877]

### Periodic Reporting (Proposals Six Through Nine)

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning the initiation of a proceeding to consider proposed changes in analytical principles (Proposals Six Through Nine). This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* December 2, 2013. *Reply comments are due:* December 9, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at 202-789-6820.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Proposals
- III. Notice and Comment
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

On November 8, 2013, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting the Commission initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider three changes to analytical principles for use in periodic reporting.<sup>1</sup> Petition at 1. The Petition labels the proposed analytical principle changes attached to its Petition filed on November 8, 2013 in this docket as Proposals Six through Eight. On November 12, 2013, the Postal Service filed an errata to its Petition to add

<sup>1</sup> Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposals Six through Eight), November 8, 2013 (Petition).

Proposal Nine attached to its Revised Petition.<sup>2</sup> The changes contained in Proposals Six through Nine are described below.

## II. Proposals

### A. Proposal Six: Proposed Changes in Stamp Fulfillment Services (SFS) Handling and Philatelic Sales Cost Estimation Models

To address a concern raised by the Commission in the FY 2012 ACD, the Postal Service proposes to update its methodology for calculating the costs for Philatelic Sales and the handling costs of SFS in order to align the product description in the Mail Classification Schedule (MCS).

To do so, the Postal Service proposes to update the cost model for SFS handling costs (StFS2012.xls) and the way handling revenue (the \$1.25 and the \$1.75 fees) is classified by not including the handling costs and revenue (the \$1.25 and \$1.75 fees) for Philatelic Sales in the SFS handling workpaper going forward. The handling costs of Philatelic Sales will be included solely in the Philatelic Sales cost estimation workpaper (StFS Philatelic2012.xls). *Id.*

The Postal Service further states that this proposal also seeks to update the methodology in order to capture the window costs of Philatelic products sold in retail.

### B. Proposal Seven: Change in Attributable Costs for Competitive Post Office Box Service Enhancements

The Postal Service states Proposal Seven updates and improves the methodology for developing attributable costs for the enhancements to competitive Post Office Box service, as requested by the Commission in the FY 2012 ACD at 163 and 199. There are two elements of these costs: (1) handling of packages from third-party carriers; and (2) information technology costs. *Id.*, Proposal 7 at 1.

The Postal Service filed under seal a non-public version of Proposal Seven in USPS-RM2014-1/NP1 which includes material provided under seal in the FY 2012 Annual Compliance Report, as well as updates to that material.<sup>3</sup>

The proposed methodology for information technology costs, (which is a description of the calculation done for FY 2012) entails consulting with Engineering to determine: (1) The

<sup>2</sup> Notice of the United States Postal Service of Revision to Add Proposal Nine to the Petition for Rulemaking—Errata, November 12, 2012 (Revised Petition).

<sup>3</sup> Notice of Filing of USPS-RM2014-1/NP1 and Application for Nonpublic Treatment, November 8, 2013.