

Markets leasing regime to a national public safety licensee. Application of secondary markets leasing to the 700 MHz public safety band would require a modification of current reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

5. Steps Taken To Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities and Significant Alternatives Considered

13. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

14. Generally, the Commission's primary objective in issuing the *NPRM* is to maximize public safety access to interoperable, broadband spectrum in the 700 MHz band and, at the same time, foster and promote the development and deployment of advanced broadband applications, related radio technologies, and a modern, IP-based system architecture. To assist the Commission in its analysis, commenters are requested to provide information regarding which public safety entities and manufacturers would be affected by the proposed changes to the 700 MHz public safety band plan as described in this *NPRM*. In particular, we seek estimates of how many small entities might be affected and whether any of the proposals under consideration would be too burdensome to public safety.

15. In the *NPRM*, we seek data demonstrating the costs and benefits of modifying the 700 MHz band to accommodate a nationwide, broadband, interoperable public safety communications network. Pursuant to the proposed plan, a single nationwide public safety licensee would be selected to hold a single nationwide license for 12 MHz of public safety spectrum. The national licensee then would make this spectrum available for broadband, interoperable public safety operations, as well as in the 700 MHz narrowband spectrum on a secondary basis. Furthermore, the national licensee would be able to lease excess capacity in these bands to commercial entities on an unconditionally preemptible basis. The *NPRM* asks commenters to identify

the criteria for selection of a national public safety licensee, how the national licensee can best implement a broadband, interoperable network, the amount of discretion the national licensee should be afforded in designing the best system architecture, how to ensure nationwide build-out, and the appropriate degree of network resiliency and disaster restoration capabilities for this public safety network. The *NPRM* also explores funding options, including the imposition of usage fees charged to public safety users as well as commercial users. Accordingly, we seek comment on the costs and benefits of modifying the existing rules to accommodate deployment of a broadband, interoperable public safety network as proposed.

16. With regard to alternatives, we do not anticipate that any of the proposals under consideration in this *NPRM* would impose any additional economic burdens on public safety entities. We believe our proposals will provide a resource for public safety to utilize a more cost-effective and spectrally efficient communications system to address their homeland security and emergency response needs. Indeed, one of the major objectives underlying this proposal is to minimize economic burdens on public safety entities. Because we do not anticipate that our proposal will impose additional economic burdens on public safety, and is in fact designed to reduce economic burdens on public safety, we see no reason to propose alternatives to accomplish our objectives. However, we remain open to discussing alternatives to reaching our objectives should an alternative be stated in comments for the specific purpose of minimizing the impact on public safety entities. Accordingly, we seek comment on alternatives including any that may further minimize the impact on public safety entities.

6. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rule

17. None.

Ordering Clauses

18. Accordingly, *it is ordered* that pursuant to sections 1, 2, 4(i), 5(c), 7, 10, 201, 202, 208, 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 314, 316, 319, 324, 332, 333, 337 and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 152, 154(i), 155(c), 157, 160, 201, 202, 208, 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 314, 316, 319, 324, 332, 333, 337 and 403, the Ninth Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is hereby *adopted*.

19. *It is further ordered* that the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Reference Information Center, *shall send* a copy of this *NPRM*, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-171 Filed 1-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 172 and 174

[Docket No. RSPA-04-18730 (HM-232E)]

RIN 2137-AE02

Hazardous Materials: Enhancing Rail Transportation Safety and Security for Hazardous Materials Shipments

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: On December 21, 2006 the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, in consultation with the Federal Railroad Administration and the Transportation Security Administration, published a notice of proposed rulemaking proposing to revise the current requirements in the Hazardous Materials Regulations applicable to the safe and secure transportation of hazardous materials transported in commerce by rail. Specifically, we are proposing to require rail carriers to compile annual data on specified shipments of hazardous materials, use the data to analyze safety and security risks along rail transportation routes where those materials are transported, assess alternative routing options, and make routing decisions based on those assessments. We are also proposing clarifications of the current security plan requirements to address en route storage, delays in transit, delivery notification, and additional security inspection requirements for hazardous materials shipments. PHMSA will hold two public meetings, on February 1, 2007, in Washington, DC, and February 9, 2007, in Dallas, Texas, to obtain stakeholder comments on the proposed rail security requirements. Information on the dates and locations of the public meetings is provided in this notice.

DATES: Public Meetings:

(1) February 1, 2007, starting at 9 a.m., in Washington, DC; and

(2) February 9, 2007, starting at 9 a.m., in Dallas, Texas.

Comments: In accordance with the timeframe established by the December 21, 2006 NPRM, comments to this docket must be received no later than February 20, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Public Meetings:

(1) Holiday Inn Capitol, 550 C Street, SW., Washington, DC 20024.

(2) Hyatt Regency Dallas Fort Worth Airport, International Parkway, P.O. Box 619014, DFW Airport, Texas, USA 75261.

Oral Presentations: Any person wishing to present an oral statement should notify Ben Supko, by telephone or in writing at least four business days before the date of the public meeting at which the person wishes to speak. Oral statements will be limited to 15 minutes per commenter. For information on facilities or services for persons with disabilities or to request special assistance at the meetings, contact Mr. Supko as soon as possible.

Docket: To access the docket for review of the comments and regulatory actions affecting this rulemaking go to <http://dms.dot.gov> and/or Room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Written Comments: We invite interested parties who are unable to attend the public meeting, or who otherwise desire to submit written comments or data to submit any relevant information, data, or comments to the DOT Docket Management System Docket Number RSPA-04-18730 by any of the following methods:

- Web site: <http://dms.dot.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on the DOT electronic docket site.

- Fax: 1-202-493-2251.
- Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Nassif Building, Room PL-401, Washington, DC 20590.

- Hand Delivery: Room PL-401 on the plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

Instructions: You must include the agency name and docket number RSPA-04-18730 for this notice at the beginning of your comment. Internet users may access comments received by DOT at <http://dms.dot.gov>. Note that comments received may be posted

without change to <http://dms.dot.gov> including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act section of this document.

While all comments should be sent to DOT's Docket Management System (DMS), comments or those portions of comments PHMSA determines to include trade secrets, confidential commercial information, or sensitive security information (SSI) will not be placed in the public docket and will be handled separately. If you believe your comments contain trade secrets, confidential commercial information, or SSI, those comments or the relevant portions of those comments should be appropriately marked so that DOT may make a determination. PHMSA procedures in 49 CFR part 105 establish a mechanism by which commenters may request confidentiality.

In accordance with 49 CFR 105.30, you may ask PHMSA to keep information confidential using the following procedures: (1) Mark "confidential" on each page of the original document you would like to keep confidential; (2) send DMS both the original document and a second copy of the original document with the confidential information deleted; and (3) explain why the information is confidential (such as a trade secret, confidential commercial information, or SSI). In your explanation, you should provide enough information to enable PHMSA to determine whether the information provided is protected by law and must be handled separately.

In addition, for comments or portions of comments that you believe contain SSI as defined in 49 CFR 15.7, you should comply with Federal regulations governing restrictions on the disclosure of SSI. See 49 CFR 1520.9 and 49 CFR 15.9, Restrictions on the disclosure of sensitive security information. For example, these sections restrict the sharing of SSI to those with a need to know, set out the requirement to mark the information as SSI, and address how the information should be disposed. Note also when mailing in or using a special delivery service to send comments containing SSI, comments should be wrapped in a manner to prevent the information from being read. PHMSA and TSA may perform concurrent reviews on requests for designations as SSI.

After reviewing your request for confidentiality and the information provided, PHMSA will analyze applicable laws and regulations to decide whether to treat the information as confidential. PHMSA will notify you of the decision to grant or deny confidentiality. If PHMSA denies

confidentiality, you will be provided an opportunity to respond to the denial before the information is publicly disclosed. PHMSA will reconsider its decision to deny confidentiality based on your response.

Regarding comments not marked as confidential, prior to posting comments received in response to this notice in the public docket, PHMSA will review all comments, whether or not they are identified as confidential, to determine if the submission or portions of the submission contain information that should not be made available to the general public. PHMSA will notify you if the agencies make such a determination relative to your comment. If, prior to submitting your comment, you have any questions concerning the procedures for determining confidentiality or security sensitivity, you may call one of the individuals listed below under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for more information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Gorsky or Ben Supko, Office of Hazardous Materials Standards, (202) 366-8553, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

On December 21, 2006, PHMSA, in consultation with the Federal Railroad Administration and the Transportation Security Administration of the Department of Homeland Security, published an NPRM proposing to revise the current requirements in the Hazardous Materials Regulations applicable to the safe and secure transportation of hazardous materials transported in commerce by rail. Specifically, the NPRM proposes to require rail carriers to compile annual data on specified shipments of hazardous materials, use the data to analyze safety and security risks along rail transportation routes where those materials are transported, assess alternative routing options, and make routing decisions based on those assessments. It also proposes to clarify the current security plan requirements to address en route storage, delays in transit, delivery notification, and additional security inspection requirements for hazardous materials shipments. In addition to our NPRM, TSA also published an NPRM in the December 21, 2006 edition of the **Federal Register** proposing additional security requirements for rail transportation.

We urge interested parties to review the NPRM and the regulatory evaluation prepared in support of the NPRM and make oral presentations regarding the issues we discuss in the documents. A summary of the NPRM follows:

- We propose to require rail carriers transporting certain types of hazardous materials to compile information and data on the commodities transported, including the transportation routes over which these commodities are transported.

- We propose to require rail carriers transporting certain types of hazardous materials to use the data they compile on commodities they transport to analyze the safety and security risks for the transportation routes used and one possible alternative route to the one used. Rail carriers would be required to utilize these analyses to transport these materials over the safest and most secure commercially practicable routes.

- We propose to require rail carriers to specifically address the security risks associated with shipments delayed in transit or temporarily stored in transit as part of their security plans.

- We propose to require rail carriers transporting certain types of hazardous materials to notify consignees if there is a significant unplanned delay affecting the delivery of the hazardous material.

- We propose to require rail carriers to work with shippers and consignees to minimize the time a rail car containing certain types of hazardous materials is placed on track awaiting pick-up or delivery or transfer from one carrier to another.

- We propose to require rail carriers to notify storage facilities and consignees when rail cars containing certain types of hazardous materials are delivered to a storage or consignee facility.

- We propose to require rail carriers to conduct security visual inspections at ground level of rail cars containing hazardous materials to inspect for signs of tampering or the introduction of an improvised explosive device (IED).

We are particularly interested in comments related to the feasibility and practicability from an operational perspective of the proposals in the NPRM, factors that should be considered by railroads in making routing decisions, and the costs that would be incurred to comply with the requirements proposed in the NPRM.

Documents

A copy of the December 21, 2006 NPRM, the regulatory evaluation prepared in support of the NPRM, and any comments addressed to this docket are available through the DOT Docket

Management System Web site: <http://dms.dot.gov> and/or Room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 3, 2007, under authority delegated in 49 CFR part 106.

Robert A. McGuire,

Associate Administrator for Hazardous Materials Safety.

[FR Doc. E7-131 Filed 1-9-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 061228342-6342-01; I.D. 122206A]

RIN 0648-AT66

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2007-2009 Specifications

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed specifications; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS proposes specifications for the 2007-2009 Atlantic herring fishery. The intent of the specifications is to conserve and manage the Atlantic herring resource and provide for a sustainable fishery.

DATES: Comments must be received no later than 5 p.m., eastern standard time, on February 9, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Copies of supporting documents, including the Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Impact Review, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (EA/RIR/IRFA), and Essential Fish Habitat Assessment are available from Paul J. Howard, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council, 50 Water Street, Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950. The EA/RIR/IRFA is also accessible via the Internet at <http://www.nero.gov>.

Written comments on the proposed rule may be sent by any of the following methods:

- Mail to Patricia A. Kurkul, Regional Administrator, NMFS, Northeast Regional Office, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930. Mark the outside of the envelope "Comments, 2007-2009 Herring Specifications";

- Fax to Patricia A. Kurkul 978-281-9135;

- E-mail to the following address: Herr2007to2009Specs@noaa.gov.

Include in the subject line of the e-mail comment the following document identifier: "Comments, 2007-2009 Herring Specifications;" or

- Electronically through the Federal e-Rulemaking portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Jay Dolin, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978-281-9259, e-mail at eric.dolin@noaa.gov, fax at 978-281-9135.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 28, 2006, the New England Fishery Management Council (Council) recommended specifications for the Atlantic herring fishery. At the time, Amendment 1 to the Atlantic Herring Fishery Management Plan (Amendment 1) was under development. The notice of availability for Amendment 1 was published in the **Federal Register** on September 6, 2006 (71 FR 52521), with the comment period ending on November 6, 2006. One of the measures recommended in Amendment 1 was the establishment of a 3-year specifications setting process. Because Amendment 1 was still under review when the Council submitted its proposed specifications, the specifications package included a contingency provision. If the measure proposed in Amendment 1 to establish 3-year specifications was approved by NMFS, then the specifications described in the Council's package would be set for 3 years; but if the measure was not approved, the specifications proposed by the Council would be implemented for the 2007 fishing year only. On December 6, 2006, NMFS partially approved Amendment 1, including the 3-year specifications setting process. As a result, the specifications proposed in this action would be set for 3 years. While Amendment 1 has been partially approved, the final rule implementing the Amendment is still under development. The proposed rule for Amendment 1 was published in the **Federal Register** on September 27, 2006 (71 FR 56446), and the comment period ended on November 13, 2006. NMFS expects to publish the final rule implementing the approved measures in Amendment 1 in the near future.

As modified by Amendment 1, the regulations implementing the FMP require the Council's Plan Development Team (PDT), which advises the Council on technical matters pertaining to