methodology for valuation dates during February 2009.

The interest assumptions that PBGC will use for its own lump-sum payments (set forth in Appendix B to part 4022) will be 3.00 percent for the period during which a benefit is in pay status and 4.00 percent during any years preceding the benefit's placement in pay status. These interest assumptions represent a decrease (from those in effect for January 2009) of 1.00 percent in the immediate annuity rate and are otherwise unchanged. For private-sector payments, the interest assumptions (set forth in Appendix C to part 4022) will be the same as those used by PBGC for determining and paying lump sums (set forth in Appendix B to part 4022).

PBGC has determined that notice and public comment on this amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest. This finding is based on the need to determine and issue new interest assumptions promptly so that the assumptions can reflect current market conditions as accurately as possible.

Because of the need to provide immediate guidance for the valuation and payment of benefits in plans with valuation dates during February 2009, PBGC finds that good cause exists for making the assumptions set forth in this amendment effective less than 30 days after publication.

PBGC has determined that this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12866.

Because no general notice of proposed rulemaking is required for this amendment, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 does not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 601(2).

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 4022

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, Pensions, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ In consideration of the foregoing, 29 CFR part 4022 is amended as follows:

PART 4022—BENEFITS PAYABLE IN TERMINATED SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 4022 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1302, 1322, 1322b, 1341(c)(3)(D), and 1344.

■ 2. In appendix B to part 4022, Rate Set 184, as set forth below, is added to the table.

Appendix B to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates For PBGC Payments

* * * * *

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)				
	On or after	Before		i_1	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2
*	*		*	*	*	*		*
184	2–1–09	3–1–09	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	7	8

■ 3. In appendix C to part 4022, Rate Set 184, as set forth below, is added to the table.

Appendix C to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates For Private-Sector Payments

* * * * *

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)				
	On or after	Before		i_1	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2
*	*		*	*	*	*		*
184	2–1–09	3–1–09	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	7	8

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 12th day of January 2009.

Vincent K. Snowbarger,

Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. E9–832 Filed 1–15–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7709–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 160

[DoD Instruction 5000.35]

Defense Acquisition Regulations (DAR) System

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule removes the DoD's rule concerning the management and operation of the Defense Acquisition Regulations (DAR) System. The part has served the purpose for which it was intended for the Code of Federal Regulations, and is no longer necessary.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 16, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Patricia L. Toppings at 703–696–5284.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A copy of the current DoD Instruction may be obtained from *http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/500035p.pdf.*

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 160

Armed forces; government procurement.

PART 160—[REMOVED]

■ Accordingly, by the authority of 10 U.S.C. 301, 32 CFR part 160 is removed.

Dated: January 12, 2009.

Patricia L. Toppings,

OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. E9–877 Filed 1–15–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 125

[USCG–2006–24189]

Maritime Identification Credentials

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of acceptable identification credentials; phased cancellation.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public that, after their Captain of the Port (COTP) has implemented access control procedures using the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC), the COTP no longer needs to enforce the previously published notice requiring name-based vetting of certain port workers.

DATES: This announcement is effective January 16, 2009.

ADDRESSES: Documents indicated in this preamble as being available in the docket are part of docket USCG–2006–24189 and are available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. They may also be viewed online at *www.regulations.gov* at any time.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this document, call James Bull, Coast Guard, telephone 202–372–1144. If you have questions on viewing material in the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Purpose

Under the authority of 50 U.S.C. 191 and Coast Guard regulations (33 CFR part 125), the Coast Guard has the authority to require identification credentials for access to waterfront facilities and to port and harbor areas, including vessels and harbor craft in those areas. The Commandant of the Coast Guard, pursuant to 33 CFR 125.15(a), is authorized to direct, from time to time, the Captains of the Port ''to prevent access of persons who do not possess one or more of the identification credentials listed in § 125.09 to those waterfront facilities, and port and harbor areas, including vessels and harbor craft therein, where the following shipping activities are conducted: * * * [t]hose essential to the interests of national security and defense, to prevent loss, damage or injury, or to insure the observance of rights and obligations of the United States.''

On April 28, 2006, the Coast Guard published a ''Notice of acceptable identification credentials'' in the **Federal Register** at 71 FR 25066 (''April 28, 2006 Notice''), which directed the COTPs to deny access to waterfront facilities regulated under 33 CFR part 105 to persons that did not have appropriate identification credentials, as defined by 33 CFR 125.09. This action was deemed necessary in the interests of national security and to protect these facilities from loss, damage, or injury. The appropriate credentials included a Merchant Mariner Document, an Armed Forces Identification Card, Federal law enforcement credentials, identification credentials issued to public safety officers, and other credentials defined in the April 28, 2006 Notice in accordance with 33 CFR 125.09(g).

The April 28, 2006 Notice set out a procedure by which the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) analyzed relevant information, submitted by the facility owner or operator either directly to TSA or via the Coast Guard, before determining whether or not an employee or longshoreman posed or was suspected of posing a security threat warranting denial of access to the port facility. This information included the employee's or longshoreman's legal name, date of birth, social security number (optional), and alien identification number (if applicable). TSA notified the facility and the COTP of persons that posed or were suspected of posing a security threat, and those persons were denied access to facilities regulated under 33 CFR part 105, as not having approved identification credentials under 33 CFR 125.09(f).

Facility Access Under TWIC

The April 28, 2006 Notice stated that ''when regulations implementing the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) are issued, the Coast Guard will reevaluate this action.'' (71 FR 25066). The Final Rule implementing TWIC was published in the **Federal Register** on January 25, 2007 (72 FR 3492). TWIC enrollment began in October of 2007 (72 FR 57342); there are now 149 enrollment centers open. On May 7, 2008, the Coast Guard and TSA issued a final rule extending the TWIC compliance date. (73 FR 25562). All persons required to obtain a TWIC, and all vessels and facilities required to use a TWIC as an access control measure, must comply by April 15, 2009, unless the Coast Guard issues an earlier compliance date.

On May 7, 2008, the Coast Guard began announcing earlier rolling compliance dates for facilities, as provided in 33 CFR 105.115(e). (73 FR 25757). Those compliance dates, in order of occurrence and by COTP Zone, are listed in Table 1, below.

Cancellation of Procedure Established by April 28, 2006 Notice

The procedure established in the April 28, 2006 Notice was intended to be an interim measure that would be reevaluated once the TWIC program was operational. As part of this procedure, TSA conducted a name-based security threat assessment on more than 800,000 workers. This number far exceeds the population estimates we had when the April 28, 2006 Notice was published, and has enhanced security in the nation's maritime sector. However, the security threat assessment TSA is now able to conduct through the TWIC program is more robust. Also, the TWIC enrollment process, which includes comprehensive identification verification standards and more detailed information provided by the worker, produces more complete information on which to base a security threat assessment. Thus, the results of the TWIC threat assessments are more accurate than the name-based check run under the April 28, 2006 Notice.

As a result of the above, the Coast Guard has determined that, once TWIC has been implemented in a COTP Zone (according to the date announced in the **Federal Register** and reflected in Table 1), the personal identification requirements implemented by the April 28, 2006 Notice are no longer necessary.

TABLE 1—DATES OF TWIC COMPLIANCE AND CANCELLATION OF TSA NAME–BASED VETTING

If you are in COTP zone . . .	Then your TWIC Compliance date (and the date when you may stop using the procedure from the April 28, 2006 Notice) is . . .
Boston, Northern New England, Southeastern New England	October 15, 2008 (Notice published at 73 FR 25757).
Cape Fear River, Corpus Christi, North Carolina	November 28, 2008 (Notice published at 73 FR 40739).

TABLE 1—DATES OF TWIC COMPLIANCE AND CANCELLATION OF TSA NAME–BASED VETTING—Continued

If you are in COTP zone . . .	Then your TWIC Compliance date (and the date when you may stop using the procedure from the April 28, 2006 Notice) is . . .
Buffalo, Detroit, Duluth, Lake Michigan, Sault St. Marie	December 1, 2008 (The original Notice, published at 73 FR 39323, set a compliance date of October 31, 2008. A new Notice, published at 73 FR 64208, delayed compliance until December 1, 2008).
Charleston, Long Island Sound, Jacksonville, Savannah	December 1, 2008 (Notice published at 73 FR 44653).
Baltimore, Delaware Bay, Mobile, Lower Mississippi River, Ohio Valley, Pittsburgh, San Diego.	December 30, 2008 (Notice published at 73 FR 50721).
Hampton Roads, Morgan City, New Orleans, Upper Mississippi River, Miami, Key West, St. Petersburg.	January 13, 2009 (Notice published at 73 FR 52924).
Honolulu, Prince William Sound, Southeast Alaska, Western Alaska	February 12, 2009 (Notice published at 73 FR 56730).
Portland, Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay	February 28, 2009 (Notice published at 73 FR 60951).
New York	March 23, 2009 (Notice published at 73 FR 60951).
Guam, Houston-Galveston , Los Angeles-Long Beach, San Juan	April 14, 2009 (Notice published at 73 FR 63377).
Port Arthur	April 14, 2009 (The original Notice, published at 73 FR 40739, set a compliance date of October 31, 2008. A new Notice, published at 73 FR 64208, delayed compliance until April 14, 2009).

As of the above-listed effective date of TWIC compliance in each COTP zone, the Coast Guard is rescinding its previous direction to COTPs to prevent access to all facilities regulated under 33 CFR part 125 to persons who do not have an identification credential listed in 33 CFR 125.09, as amended by the April 28, 2006 Notice. Once they have implemented access control procedures utilizing TWIC, owners and operators of these facilities, and unions, may cease the transmission of information on employees and longshoremen (respectively) to TSA. Unless further notice appears in the **Federal Register**, by April 14, 2009, all transmissions of information under the April 28, 2006 Notice should cease.

Dated: January 12, 2009.

James A. Watson,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Prevention Policy.

[FR Doc. E9–847 Filed 1–15–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

New Automation Requirements for Detached Addressed Labels

AGENCY: Postal Service™.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: To make Detached Address Labels (DALs) accompanying saturation mailings of Periodicals or Standard Mail® flats more compatible with our processing equipment, they must be automation-compatible and have a correct delivery point POSTNET(tm) barcode or Intelligent Mail® barcode with an 11-digit routing code. This requirement does not apply to DALs with simplified addresses. Also, for consistency, we are requiring return addresses on DALs.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 2, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Monica Grein at 202–268–8411.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 27, 2008, we published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** (Volume 73, Number 167, pages 50584–50585), requiring DALs to be automation-compatible and bear a delivery point barcode when used with saturation mailings of Periodicals or Standard Mail flats.

Except for DALs prepared with simplified addresses, all DALs accompanying saturation mailings of Periodicals or Standard Mail flats must be automation-compatible and have a correct delivery point POSTNET barcode or Intelligent Mail barcode with an 11-digit routing code. Automation-compatible and barcoded DALs may be processed in a manner that is more consistent with today's operating environment.

We suggest that mailers work with the local Postal Service mailpiece design analyst (MDA) to ensure that all DALs accompanying saturation mailings of Periodicals or Standard Mail flats meet the new standards. Saturation flats mailings presented with DALs that are not automation-compatible and barcoded will not qualify for saturation prices but may be entered at the basic carrier route price for Periodicals mailings or the basic Enhanced Carrier Route price for Standard Mail mailings.

We received comments from five respondents on the proposal: two from a mailer association, two from mailers that use DALs, and one from a USPS® postmaster.

Comments

One commenter suggested that to reduce costs further we should eliminate the use of DALs altogether, or also apply the automation requirements to DALs prepared with simplified addresses. Eliminating the use of DALs or requiring saturation mailers to physically apply addresses directly on each mailpiece may cause undue hardship for some mailers. We determined that such a requirement would be difficult for small local mailers sending saturation mailings to rural or highway contract routes and perhaps cause them to stop using the mail. We concluded that these additional changes were not in the best interest of the Postal Service or our customers.

One commenter requested DALs be allowed for Periodicals and Standard Mail ECR high-density mailings. This request is outside the scope of this rule.

One commenter expressed concern about the added cost of preparing an automation-compatible DAL. We considered the implications for our customers, and note that the use of DALs is an option in most instances. We continue to encourage customers to move to on-piece addressing rather than use DALs. Incidentally, on June 7, 2007, at the request of many mailers, we revised our standards to allow advertising on the front of DALs, provided that the DALs were barcoded and automation-compatible (see *Postal Bulletin* 22208 and DMM(r) 602.4.2.5.b). This change provided mailers with the ability to offset the DAL surcharge, implemented in May 2007, with new opportunities for advertising revenue.

One commenter requested we extend the use of simplified addresses to city route deliveries. This request is outside the scope of this final rule.

One commenter expressed concerns about continuing to enter DALs at destination delivery units (DDUs) while remaining eligible for DDU prices for