○ Aging aircraft inspection program.
○ Corrosion inspection program.
○ Continued Operational Safety (COS).
• SMS Manual.

E. Other Considerations

LHFE operations, as it applies to the passenger(s) experience, is limited to the sole purpose of being onboard the aircraft during flight. The FAA will not consider expanded operations such as flight training, aerobatics, and passenger manipulation of the flight controls.

The FAA will always consider whether a request benefits the public as a whole and how the request would provide a level of safety at least equal to that provided by the rule in accordance with 14 CFR 11.81. Moreover, the FAA may impose additional conditions and limitations or deny petitions regardless of this policy statement to adequately mitigate safety concerns and risk factors as they become known.

Filing a Petition for Exemption or To Request an Amendment or Extension to an Existing Exemption

To submit a petition for exemption or to request an amendment or extension to an existing exemption, all petitioners must follow the procedures set forth in part 11 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 10, 2015.

John S. Duncan,

Director, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–17966 Filed 7–20–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG–2015–0647]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Maritime Museum Party, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Temporary final rule.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the San Diego Bay for a fireworks display on the evening of July 23, 2015. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of the participants, crew, spectators, participating vessels, and other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels are prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port or his designated representative.

DATES: This rule is effective from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on July 23, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket [USCG–2015–0647]. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to *http://www.regulations.gov,* type the docket number 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email Petty Officer Nick Bateman, Waterways Management, U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego; telephone (619) 278–7656, email *D11-PF-MarineEventsSanDiego@uscg.mil.* If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone (202) 366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Acronyms

DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
TFR Temporary Final Rule

A. Regulatory History and Information

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final rule safety zone for a planned fireworks show on San Diego Bay without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are ''impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.''

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because publishing an NPRM would be impracticable because immediate action is needed to minimize potential danger to the participants and the public during the event. Furthermore, the necessary information to determine whether the marine event poses a threat to persons and vessels was provided 15 days before the event, which is insufficient time to publish an NPRM. Because fireworks barges on the navigable waterways poses significant risk to public safety and property and the likely combination of large numbers of recreation vessels and congested waterways could easily result in serious injuries or fatalities, this safety zone is necessary to safeguard spectators, vessels and the event participants. For the safety concerns noted, it is important to have these regulations in effect during the event and impracticable to delay the regulations.

Under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. For these same reasons, the Coast Guard finds good cause for implementing this rule less than thirty days before the effective July 23, 2015.

B. Basis and Purpose

The legal basis and authorities for this temporary rule are found in 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; and Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, which collectively authorize the Coast Guard to propose, establish, and define regulatory safety zones.

The Coast Guard believes establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the San Diego Bay is necessary to ensure public safety for the fireworks display. A temporary safety zone will provide for the safety of the event participants, spectators, safety vessels, and other public users of the waterway. This event involves a planned fifteen minute fireworks display on a portion of San Diego Bay.

C. Discussion of the Final Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone that will be enforced from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on July 23, 2015. This safety zone is necessary to provide for the safety of the event participants, event spectators, safety patrol craft and to protect other vessels and users of the waterway. Persons and vessels will be prohibited from entering into, transiting through, or anchoring within this safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port, or their designated representative. Before the effective period, the Coast Guard will publish a local notice to mariners (LNM). Just prior to the event and during the enforcement of the event, the Coast Guard will issue a broadcast notice to mariners (BNM) alert via VHF Channel 16.

This temporary safety zone will be bound by a 600 foot radius of the fireworks barge, center approximately on the following coordinate (North American Datum of 1983, World Geodetic System, 1984): 32°43.14 N, 117°10.36 W

D. Regulatory Analyses

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

1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This 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 Executive Order 12866 or under section 1 of Executive Order 13563. The Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed it under those Orders. We expect the economic impact of this rule to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation is unnecessary. This determination is based on the size, location and limited duration of the safety zone. This zone impacts a small designated area of the San Diego bay for less than one hour. Furthermore, vessel traffic can safely transit around the safety zone.

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 rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This rule will affect the following entities, some of which may be small entities: The owners or operators of private and commercial vessels intending to transit or anchor in the impacted portion of the San Diego Bay from 8:30 p.m. through 9:30 p.m. on July 23, 2015.

This safety zone will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons. Vessel traffic can pass safely around the zone. The Coast Guard will publish a local notice to mariners (LNM) and will issue broadcast notice to mariners (BNM) alerts via VHF Channel 16 before the safety zone is enforced.

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 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.

Small businesses may send comments on the actions of Federal employees who enforce, or otherwise determine compliance with, Federal regulations to the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Regional Small Business Regulatory Fairness Boards. The Ombudsman evaluates these actions annually and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on actions by employees of the Coast Guard, call 1–888–REG–FAIR (1–888–734–3247). The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

4. Collection of Information

This rule will not call for a 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 rule under that Order and determined that this rule 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 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 rule will 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 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 rule under Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not create an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

11. 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.

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

Management Directive 023–01 and Commandant Instruction M16475.lD, 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 the establishment of a safety zone on the navigable waters of San Diego Bay. This rule is categorically excluded from further review under paragraph 34(g) of Figure 2–1 of the Commandant Instruction. An environmental analysis checklist supporting this determination 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

■ 1. The authority citation for part 165 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1231; 50 U.S.C. 191; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, and 160.5; Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.01.

■ 2. Add § 165.T11–647 to read as follows:

§ 165.T11–647 Safety Zone; Maritime Museum Party; San Diego, CA.

(a) *Location.* The limits of the safety zone will include all the navigable waters within 600 feet of the fireworks barge in approximate position of 32°43.14 N, 117°10.36 W (North American Datum of 1983, World Geodetic System, 1984).

(b) *Enforcement period.* This section will be enforced from 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on July 23, 2015. If the event concludes prior to the schedule termination time, the COTP will cease enforcement of this safety zone and will announce that fact via Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

(c) *Definitions.* The following definition applies to this section: *Designated representative* means any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the Coast Guard on board Coast Guard, Coast Guard Auxiliary, or local, state, or federal law enforcement vessels who have been authorized to act on the behalf of the Captain of the Port.

(d) *Regulations.* (1) Under the general regulations in subpart C of this part, 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 designated representative.

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

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

(4) The Coast Guard may be assisted by other federal, state, or local agencies in patrol and notification of the regulation.

Dated: July 10, 2015.

J.S. Spaner,

Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port San Diego.

[FR Doc. 2015–17843 Filed 7–20–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3001

[Docket No. RM2015–8; Order No. 2589]

Automatic Docket Closure Procedures

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission is issuing a set of final rules establishing new procedures concerning automatic closure of Commission dockets after an extended period of docket inactivity. The rules will permit a simplified docket closure process. Relative to the proposed rules, some of the changes are substantive and others are minor and non-substantive.

DATES: *Effective* August 20, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Regulatory History

80 FR 26517, May 8, 2015

Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. Comments
III. Commission Analysis
IV. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA), Public Law 109–435, 120 Stat. 3198 (2006), authorizes the Commission to develop rules and establish procedures that it deems necessary and proper to carry out Commission functions.[1]

On May 4, 2015, the Commission issued a notice of proposed rulemaking establishing procedures that would simplify the docket closure process by permitting automatic closure of a docket following a significant period of inactivity.[2] The Notice requested comments from interested persons regarding the proposed rules. The Commission received comments from the Postal Service and the Public Representative.[3] After consideration of the comments submitted, the Commission adopts the proposed rules, modified as described below.

II. Comments

The Postal Service and Public Representative offered positive comments and suggested revisions with respect to the Commission's proposed rules.

The Postal Service agrees that an automatic closure procedure would promote efficient docket management and provide clarity for the public because it would clear out items listed on the Commission's Web site. Postal Service Comments at 1. However, the Postal Service has concerns that, in certain proceedings, a docket may be automatically closed due to 12 consecutive months of inactivity prior to a final order being issued by the Commission. *Id.* at 1–2. The Postal Service recommends proposed rule 3001.44(a) be revised to indicate that if the final order in a docket is pending, it will not be subject to automatic closure. *Id.* at 2.

In addition, the Postal Service recommends that the Commission provide notice to the public of the impending docket closure at least 30 days prior to the automatic closure date. *Id.* The Postal Service also suggests that a motion to stay automatic closure be filed at least 15 days prior to closing, rather than 10 days prior to closing, in order to provide parties ample time to

[1] *See* 39 U.S.C. 503; *see also* Postal Reorganization Act, Public Law 91–375, 84 Stat. 759 (1970), at section 3603.

[2] Docket No. RM2015–8, Order No. 2465, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Regarding Automatic Closure of Inactive Dockets, May 4, 2015 (Notice); *see also* 80 FR 26517 (May 8, 2015).

[3] *See* Initial Comments of the United States Postal Service, June 8, 2015 (Postal Service Comments); Public Representative Comments, June 8, 2015 (PR Comments).