

(h) After the effective date of this AD, don't install any model LTP101-600A-1A or -700A-1A turboprop engine that has a gas generator turbine disc, P/N 4-111-015-14, with a SN listed in Appendix 1 of Honeywell International Inc. SB LT 101-71-00-0002, Revision 25, dated August 31, 2007; if that disc has 2,770 or more CSN.

Alternative Methods of Compliance

(i) The Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, has the authority to approve alternative methods of compliance for this AD if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19.

Related Information

(j) Honeywell International Inc. Service Bulletin LT 101-71-00-0002, Revision 25, dated August 31, 2007, pertains to the subject of this AD.

(k) Contact Robert Baitoo, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 3960 Paramount Blvd., Lakewood, CA 90712-4137; e-mail: robert.baitoo@faa.gov; telephone (562) 627-5245; fax (562) 627-5210, for more information about this AD.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on September 19, 2008.

Francis A. Favara,

Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. E8-22522 Filed 9-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 455

[Project No. P087604]

Used Motor Vehicle Trade Regulation Rule

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Reopening of period within which to submit comments in response to request for public comments.

SUMMARY: On July 21, 2008, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission") published a **Federal Register** document soliciting public comments in connection with its review of the Used Motor Vehicle Trade Regulation Rule ("Used Car Rule" or "Rule"). The document stated that comments must be received by September 19, 2008. In response to a request to extend the comment period received on September 12, 2008, the Commission has determined to reopen and extend the comment period until November 19, 2008.

DATES: Comments addressing the Used Car Rule must be received on or before November 19, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments electronically or in paper form.

Comments should refer to "Used Car Regulatory Review, Matter No. P087604" to facilitate the organization of comments. Comments containing material for which confidential treatment is requested must be filed in paper form, must be clearly labeled "Confidential," and must comply with Commission Rule 4.9(c).¹ Comments should not include any sensitive personal information, such as an individual's Social Security Number; date of birth; driver's license number or other state identification number or foreign country equivalent; passport number; financial account number; or credit or debit card number. Comments also should not include any sensitive health information, such as medical records and other individually identifiable health information. In addition, comments should not include any "[t]rade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential. . . ." as provided in Section 6(f) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and Commission Rule 4.10(a)(2), 16 CFR 4.10(a)(2) (2008).

Because paper mail in the Washington area, and specifically to the FTC, is subject to delay due to heightened security screening, please consider submitting your comments in electronic form. Comments filed in electronic form should be submitted by using the following weblink: (<https://secure.commentworks.com/ftc-UsedCarRuleReview>) (and following the instructions on the web-based form). To ensure that the Commission considers an electronic comment, you must file it on the web-based form at the weblink: (<https://secure.commentworks.com/ftc-UsedCarRuleReview>). If this document appears at <http://www.regulations.gov>, you may also file an electronic comment through that website. The Commission will consider all comments that [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) forwards to it. You may also visit the FTC website at <http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2008/07/ucr.shtm> to read the **Federal Register** document announcing the request for public comments and the news release describing it.

A comment filed in paper form should include the "Used Car Rule Regulatory Review, P087604" reference both in the text and on the envelope,

¹ Commission Rule 4.2(d), 16 CFR 4.2(d). The comment must be accompanied by an explicit request for confidential treatment, including the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comment to be withheld from the public record. The request will be granted or denied by the Commission's General Counsel, consistent with applicable law and the public interest. See Commission Rule 4.9(c), 16 CFR 4.9(c).

and should be mailed or delivered to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Room H-135 (Annex H), 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.

The FTC Act and other laws the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives, whether filed in paper or electronic form. Comments received will be available to the public on the FTC website, to the extent practicable, at (<http://www.ftc.gov/os/publiccomments.shtm>). As a matter of discretion, the FTC makes every effort to remove home contact information for individuals from the public comments it receives before placing those comments on the FTC website. More information, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, may be found in the FTC's privacy policy, at (<http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/privacy.shtm>).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John C. Hallerud, Attorney, Midwest Region, Federal Trade Commission, 55 West Monroe Street, Suite 1825, Chicago, Illinois 60603, (312) 960-5615.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission's July 21, 2008 **Federal Register** document seeks comments on the Rule's costs, benefits, and effectiveness. The document seeks comments on whether the Rule should permit used car dealers to use a single bilingual Buyers Guide and, if so, on how to design a bilingual Buyers Guide. The document also asks for comments on the Buyers Guide's pre-printed list of systems and major defects. In addition, the document solicits comments on whether the Rule should be revised to permit dealers to use alternative Buyers Guides when disclosing manufacturer's warranties and other third-party warranties.

On September 12, 2008, the Commission received a joint letter from Consumer Action, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, the Consumer Federation of America, the National Association of Consumer Advocates, and the National Consumer Law Center requesting that the comment period be extended for sixty days. Among other reasons supporting the request, these organizations cite their need to conduct research to address the numerous questions raised in the Commission's **Federal Register** document and changes that have occurred in the automotive marketplace and information technologies since the Commission last

reviewed the Rule. The organizations argue that they will be able to present more carefully considered comments if provided an additional sixty days to comment.

Based on the arguments raised in the joint letter, the Commission believes that an extension of the initial sixty-day comment period until November 19, 2008 is reasonable. The additional time should enable the organizations that sent the letter and other commenters to submit detailed and thoughtful comments in response to the document. Accordingly, the Commission has decided to extend the comment period set forth in the July 21, 2008 **Federal Register** document until November 19, 2008.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark

Secretary

[FR Doc. E8-22415 Filed 9-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-S

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

18 CFR Part 40

[Docket No. RM06-22-000]

Mandatory Reliability Standards for Critical Infrastructure Protection

Issued September 18, 2008.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Order on proposed clarification.

SUMMARY: The Commission is proposing to clarify that the facilities within a nuclear generation plant in the United States that are not regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission are subject to compliance with the eight mandatory "CIP" Reliability Standards approved in Commission Order No. 706.

DATES: Comments are due October 20, 2008.

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

- *Agency Web Site:* <http://ferc.gov>. Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format.
- *Mail/Hand Delivery:* Commenters unable to file comments electronically must mail or hand deliver an original and 14 copies of their comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jonathan First (Legal Information),
Office of General Counsel, 888 First
Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426,
(202) 502-8529.

Regis Binder (Technical Information),
Office of Electric Reliability, 888 First
Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426,
(202) 502-6460.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Before Commissioners: Joseph T. Kelliher, Chairman; Sudeen G. Kelly, Marc Spitzer, Philip D. Moeller, and Jon Wellinghoff.

1. In this order, the Commission proposes to clarify the scope of the eight Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Reliability Standards¹ approved in Order No. 706 to assure that no "gap" occurs in the applicability of these Standards.² In particular, each of the eight CIP Reliability Standards provides that facilities regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) are exempt from the Standard. It has come to the attention of the Commission that the NRC does not regulate all facilities within a nuclear generation plant. Thus, to assure that there is no "gap" in the regulatory process, the Commission proposes to clarify that the facilities within a nuclear generation plant in the United States that are *not* regulated by the NRC are subject to compliance with the eight CIP Reliability Standards approved in Order No. 706.

2. Comments on the Commission's proposed clarification are due 30 days from the date of issuance of this order, after which the Commission intends to issue a further order on the matter.

Background

3. The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), the Commission-certified Electric Reliability Organization (ERO), developed eight CIP Reliability Standards that require certain users, owners and operators of the Bulk-Power System to comply with specific requirements to safeguard critical cyber assets. In January 2008, pursuant to section 215 of the Federal Power Act (FPA),³ the Commission approved the eight CIP Reliability Standards. In addition, pursuant to section 215(d)(5)

of the FPA,⁴ the Commission directed the ERO to develop modifications to the CIP Reliability Standards to address specific concerns identified by the Commission.

4. Each of the eight CIP Reliability Standards includes an exemption for facilities regulated by the NRC. For example, Reliability Standard CIP-002-1 provides:

The following are exempt from Standard CIP-002: Facilities Regulated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. * * * [5]

5. In an April 8, 2008 public joint meeting of the Commission and the NRC, staff of both Commissions discussed cyber security at nuclear generation plants. While NRC staff indicated that the NRC has proposed regulations to address cybersecurity at nuclear generation plants,⁶ NRC staff raised a concern regarding a potential gap in regulatory coverage. In particular, NRC staff indicated that the NRC's proposed regulations on cybersecurity would not apply to all systems within a nuclear generation plant. NRC staff explained:

The NRC's cyber requirements are not going to extend to power continuity systems. They do not extend directly to what is not directly associated with reactor safety security or emergency response. * * *

As a result, and when you look at the CIP standards that were issued, there is a discrete statement in each of the seven or eight standards where it specifically exempts facilities regulated by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission from compliance with those CIP Standards. So there is an issue there in the sense that our regulations for cyber security go up to a certain point, and end.[7]

Discussion

6. The Commission shares the concern raised at the April 8, 2008 joint meeting. It appears that the NRC's regulation of a nuclear generation plant is limited to the facilities that are associated with reactor safety or emergency response.⁸ The Commission believes that a nuclear generation plant will likely include critical assets and critical cyber assets that are not safety related and, therefore, not regulated by the NRC. For example, facilities that pertain to the "continuity of operation" of a nuclear generation plant may be

⁴ 16 U.S.C. § 824o(d)(5).

⁵ Reliability Standard CIP-002-1, section 4.2 (Applicability).

⁶ Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *Power Reactor Security Requirements*, NRC Docket No. RIN 3150-AG63 (Oct. 2006).

⁷ April 8, 2008, Joint Meeting of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Federal Regulatory Commission, Tr. at 77-78.

⁸ See *id.* See also 42 U.S.C. 2133, 2201 and 2232.

¹ Reliability Standards CIP-002-1 through CIP-009-1. Reliability Standard CIP-001-1, which pertains to sabotage reporting, does not include the exemption statement that is the subject of this order.

² *Mandatory Reliability Standards for Critical Infrastructure Protection*, Order No. 706, 73 FR 7368 (Feb. 7, 2008), 122 FERC ¶ 61,040, *order on reh'g*, 123 FERC ¶ 61,174 (2008).

³ 16 U.S.C. § 824o (2006).