

8. To what extent should participant-directed individual account plans be required to provide or promote investment education for participants? For example, should plans be required or encouraged to provide a primer or glossary of investment-related terms relevant to a plan's investment options (e.g., basis point, expense ratio, benchmark, redemption fee, deferred sales charge); a copy of the Department's booklet entitled "A Look at 401(k) Fees" (www.dol.gov/ebsa/publications/401k_employee.html) or similar publication; or investment research services? Should such a publication include an explanation of other investment concepts such as risk and return characteristics of available investment options? Please explain views, addressing costs and other issues relevant to adopting such a requirement.

Disclosure of Information Relating to Plan and Individual Account Administrative Fees and Expenses

9. What information is currently furnished to participants about the plan and/or individual administrative expenses charged to their individual account? Such expenses may include, for example: audit fees, legal fees, trustee fees, recordkeeping expenses, individual participant transaction fees, participant loan fees or expenses.

10. What information about administrative expenses would help plan participants, but is not currently disclosed? Please explain the nature and usefulness of such information.

11. How are charges against an individual account for administrative expenses typically communicated to participants? Is such information included as part of a participant's individual account statement or furnished separately? If separately, is the information communicated via paper statements, electronically, or via website access?

12. How frequently is information concerning administrative expenses charged to a participant's account communicated?

13. What, if any, requirements should the Department impose to improve the disclosure of administrative expenses to plan participants? Please be specific as to any recommendation and include estimates of any new compliance costs that may be imposed on plans or plan sponsors.

14. Should charges for administrative expenses be disclosed as part of the periodic benefit statement required under ERISA section 105?

General Questions

15. What, if any, distinctions should be considered in assessing the informational needs of participants in plans that intend to meet the requirements of section 404(c) as contrasted with those of participants in plans that do not intend to meet the requirements of section 404(c)?

16. What (and what portion of) plan administrative and investment-related fees and expenses typically are paid by sponsors of participant-directed individual account plans? How and when is such information typically communicated to participants?

17. How would providing additional fee and expense information to participants affect the choices or conduct of plan sponsors and administrators, and/or that of vendors of plan products and services? Please explain any such effects.

18. How would providing additional fee and expense information to participants affect their plan investment choices, plan savings conduct or other plan related behavior? Please explain any such effects and provide specific examples, if available.

19. Please identify any particularly cost-efficient (high-value but inexpensive) fee and expense disclosures to participants, and to the contrary any particularly cost-inefficient ones. Please provide any available estimates of the dollar costs or benefits of such disclosures.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 20th day of April 2007.

Bradford P. Campbell,

Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. E7-7884 Filed 4-24-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

33 CFR Part 334

United States Marine Corps Restricted Area and Danger Zone, Neuse River and Tributaries, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC

AGENCY: United States Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Corps of Engineers is proposing to amend its regulations to designate an existing rifle range fan as a danger zone. The military exercise

area is located within the Rifle Range of Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina, along the Neuse River. The danger zone will only be activated by the Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point during range operational hours. The Marine Corps will advise residents in the vicinity of the range fan thus ensuring their safety by alerting them to temporary potential hazardous conditions which may exist as a result of small arms exercises. There will be no change in the use of the existing exercise area. The area, however, needs to be marked on navigation charts to insure security and safety for the public. Entry points into the danger zone will be prominently marked with signage indicating the boundary of the danger zone. The placement of aids to navigation and regulatory markers will be installed in accordance with the requirements of the United States Coast Guard. If the proposed signage exceeds nationwide permit and/or regional general permit conditions, the Commander, United States Marine Corps, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina will seek additional Department of the Army authorizations.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before May 25, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number COE-2007-0011, by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

E-mail:

david.b.olson@usace.army.mil. Include the docket number, COE-2007-0011, in the subject line of the message.

Mail: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN: CECW-CO (David B. Olson), 441 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20314-1000.

Hand Delivery/Courier: Due to security requirements, we cannot receive comments by hand delivery or courier.

Instructions: Direct your comments to docket number COE-2007-0011. All comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available on-line at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the commenter indicates that the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit information that you consider to be CBI or otherwise protected through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. The

<http://www.regulations.gov> Web site is an anonymous access system, which means we will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send an e-mail directly to the Corps without going through <http://www.regulations.gov>, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available on the Internet. If you submit an electronic comment, we recommend that you include your name and other contact information in the body of your comment and with any disk or CD-ROM you submit. If we cannot read your comment because of technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, we may not be able to consider your comment. Electronic comments should avoid the use of any special characters, any form of encryption, and be free of any defects or viruses.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to www.regulations.gov. All documents in the docket are listed. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, such as CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the Internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form.

Consideration will be given to all comments received within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Olson, Headquarters, Operations and Regulatory Community of Practice, Washington, DC at (202) 761-4922, Mr. Scott Jones, Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, Regulatory Branch, at (252) 975-1616, or Ms. Tracey Wheeler, Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, Regulatory Branch, at (252) 975-1616.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to its authorities in Section 7 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1917 (40 Stat. 266; 33 U.S.C. 1) and Chapter XIX of the Army Appropriations Act of 1919 (40 Stat. 892; 33 U.S.C. 3), the Corps proposes to amend 33 CFR 334.430 by adding a danger zone along the Neuse River as described below. The regulations governing the restricted area are not proposed to be changed.

Procedural Requirements

a. Review Under Executive Order 12866

This proposed rule is issued with respect to a military function of the

Defense Department and the provisions of Executive Order 12866 do not apply.

b. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

This proposed rule has been reviewed under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354) which requires the preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis for any regulation that will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (*i.e.*, small businesses and small governments). Unless information is obtained to the contrary during the public notice comment period, the Corps expects that the establishment of this danger zone would have practically no economic impact on the public, result in no anticipated navigational hazard, or interfere with existing waterway traffic. This proposed rule, if adopted, will have no significant economic impact on small entities.

c. Review Under the National Environmental Policy Act

Due to the administrative nature of this action and because there is no intended change in the use of the area, the Corps expects that this regulation, if adopted, will not have a significant impact to the quality of the human environment and, therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement will not be required. An environmental assessment will be prepared after the public notice period is closed and all comments have been received and considered. The environmental assessment may be reviewed at the District office listed at the end of **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, above.

d. Unfunded Mandates Act

This proposed rule does not impose an enforceable duty on the private sector and, therefore, it is not a Federal private sector mandate and it is not subject to the requirements of either Section 202 or Section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act. We have also found under Section 203 of the Act that small governments will not be significantly and uniquely affected by this rulemaking.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 334

Danger zones, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Restricted areas, Waterways.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Corps proposes to amend 33 CFR part 334, as follows:

PART 334—DANGER ZONE AND RESTRICTED AREA REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 334 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 40 Stat. 266 (33 U.S.C. 1) and 40 Stat. 892 (33 U.S.C. 3).

2. Section 334.430 is revised to read as follows:

§ 334.430 Neuse River and tributaries at Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina; restricted area and danger zone.

(a) *The restricted area.* That portion of Neuse River within 500 feet of the shore along the reservation of the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, extending from the mouth of Hancock Creek to a point approximately 6,800 feet west of the mouth of Slocum Creek, and all waters of Hancock and Slocum Creeks and their tributaries within the boundaries of the reservation.

(b) *The danger zone.* The waters within an area beginning at latitude 34.923425° N, longitude—76.853222° W; thence northeasterly across Hancock Creek to latitude 34.925258° N, longitude—76.849864° W; continuing northeasterly to latitude 34.933382° N, longitude—76.835081° W; thence northwesterly to the Neuse River shoreline at latitude 34.936986° N, longitude—76.841197° W, continuing northwesterly to latitude 34.943275° N, longitude—76.852169° W; thence southwesterly along the shoreline to latitude 34.935111° N, longitude—76.859078° W; thence southeasterly along Hancock Creek shoreline to the point of origin.

(c) *The regulations.* (1) Except in cases of extreme emergency, all persons or vessels, other than those vessels operated by the U.S. Navy or Coast Guard, are prohibited from entering the restricted area or danger zone without prior permission of the enforcing agency.

(2) Entry points into the danger zone will be prominently marked with signage indicating the boundary of the danger zone.

(3) Firing will take place both day and night at irregular periods throughout the year. Appropriate warnings will be issued through official government and civilian channels serving the region. Such warnings will specify the time and duration of operations and give such other pertinent information as may be required in the interest of safety. Upon completion of firing or if the scheduled firing is cancelled for any reason, the warning signals marking the danger zone will be removed.

(4) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the danger zone will be open to general public access. Vessels, watercraft, and other vehicles may proceed through the danger zone.

(5) The regulations in this section shall be enforced by the Commanding Officer, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina, and/or persons or agencies as he/she may designate.

Lawrence A. Lang,

Acting Chief, Operations Directorate of Civil Works.

[FR Doc. E7-7901 Filed 4-24-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

Revised Standards for Mailing Sharps Waste and Other Regulated Medical Waste

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service™ is proposing to revise the mailing standards for medical waste so that medical professionals can more easily use the mail to ship waste to disposal sites. For over 15 years we have safely permitted approved vendors to use the mail for return of sharps and other regulated medical waste for disposal.

Under our current standards, mail-back medical waste containers are most often used by individuals who self-inject medications to control diseases such as diabetes and arthritis. By increasing the maximum allowable weight of medical waste mail-back containers and at the same time requiring additional packaging safeguards, we intend to provide small medical offices the option of using the mail for sending medical waste for disposal. This proposal would allow medical professionals a safe, easy, and cost-effective means of disposing of sharps and other regulated medical waste.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before May 25, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Mail or deliver written comments to the Manager, Mailing Standards, Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Room 3436, Washington, DC 20260-3436. You may inspect and photocopy all written comments at the Postal Service Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW., 11th Floor N, Washington, DC between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bert Olsen, 202-268-7276.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal would increase the use of the mail for shipping medical waste while improving packaging requirements so that these items continue to be safe

while transported in the mail. Currently, mailing standards require that primary sharps receptacles not exceed 3 gallons and that primary receptacles for other regulated medical waste not exceed 5 gallons. This proposal would allow for a single larger primary receptacle that could accommodate several pre-primary sharps receptacles (sharps receptacles normally used in doctors' offices) as well as several tie-closed bags of other regulated medical waste. This change would add additional receptacles (pre-primary) to the currently required triple-packaging system and therefore would increase protection of the contents.

The pre-primary receptacles may be different in size and design. The primary receptacle that holds the pre-primary receptacles and the bags of other regulated medical waste must be capable of passing all current package tests. The new standards would set the total mailpiece weight limit to 35 pounds for packages approved as "Medical Professional Packaging." All other medical waste mailpieces would be required to conform to the current 25-pound weight limit.

Although we are exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act [5 U.S.C. of 553(b), (c)] regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), we invite public comment on the following proposed revisions to Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM®), incorporated by reference in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 39 CFR 111.1.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111

Administrative practice and procedure, Postal Service.

Accordingly, 39 CFR part 111 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 111—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 416, 3001-3011, 3201-3219, 3403-3406, 3621, 3626, 5001; chapter 36 of Title 39; Pub. L. No 109-435, 120 Stat. 3198 (2006).

2. Revise the following sections of the Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), as follows:

* * * * *

600 Basic Standards for All Mailing Services

601 Mailability

* * * * *

10.0 Hazardous Materials

* * * * *

10.17 Infectious Substances (Hazard Class 6, Division 6.2)

* * * * *

10.17.6 Sharps Waste and Other Mailable Regulated Medical Waste

* * * * *

[Add a new second sentence to item b5 as follows:]

* * * Except for Medical Professional Packages as identified in 10.17.6c, which may not weigh more than 35 pounds.* * *

* * * * *

[Renumber items 6c through 6f as new 6d through 6g. Add new item 6c as follows:]

c. Medical Professional Packaging. One primary receptacle larger than 5 gallons in volume may be used for mailing pre-primary sharps receptacles (sharps receptacles normally used in doctors' offices) and other regulated medical waste under the following conditions:

- 1. The mailpiece must meet all the requirements in 10.17.6, except for the primary receptacle capacity limits in 10.17.6b1.
2. Only rigid, securely closed, puncture- and leak-resistant pre-primary sharps receptacles that meet or exceed Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards may be placed inside the primary receptacle. Each pre-primary sharps container may contain no more than 50 ml (1.66 ounces) of residual waste liquid. Several pre-primary sharps receptacles may be enclosed in the single primary receptacle.
3. Multiple tie-closed plastic bags of regulated medical waste may be placed inside the single primary receptacle.
4. The primary receptacle must be lined with a plastic bag at least 4 mil in thickness and include sufficient absorbent material within the liner to absorb all residual liquid in the primary receptacle.
5. The mailpiece must not weigh more than 35 pounds.

* * * * *

[Renumber items d1 through d7 as new d2 through d8. Add new number d1 as follows:]

1. For Medical Professional Packages, the additional marking, "Medical Professional Packaging," must be clearly printed in lettering at least 2 inches high on the address side of the outer shipping container.

* * * * *

[Add two new sentences to the introductory text renumbered item f as follows:]

f. Testing Criteria. Packages tested for approval as Medical Professional