

the purpose of the trip. For the purposes of this analysis, we assume this travel will be personal travel and will be local travel. We identify the value of time multiplier recommended by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) for personal, local travel, as 0.5.⁴ Finally, we account for the value of the travel delay. Since the added time spent traveling is considered more inconvenient than the baseline travel, we account for this by using a factor that weighs time inconvenienced more heavily than baseline travel time. This factor, 1.47, is multiplied by the average wage rate and the DOT value of time multiplier for personal, local travel for a travel time value of \$11.56 per traveler ($\$15.73 \times 0.5 \times 1.47$).⁵

We next multiply the estimated number of U.S. citizens entering through Morses Line in a year (8,147) by the average delay (0.137 hours calculated above) to arrive at the number of additional hours U.S. citizens would be delayed as a result of this rule—1,116 hours. We multiply this by the value of travel time (\$11.56) to arrive at the value of the additional driving time for U.S. citizens arriving in the United States once Morses Line is closed. Finally, we double this to reach a total time cost of a round trip for U.S. citizens of \$25,802.

Besides the cost of additional travel time, we must consider the vehicular costs of a longer trip. We must first estimate the number of miles the closure of Morses Line would add to U.S. citizens' trips. The annual traffic arriving at Morses line is 14,600 vehicles. Since CBP does not track the number of vehicles entering by nationality, we estimate those owned by U.S. citizens. Since 31 percent of the passengers entering the United States by car in the Boston Field Office (which includes Morses Line) are U.S. citizens, we assume that 31 percent of the vehicles are owned by U.S. citizens. Therefore, we estimate that 4,526 U.S.-owned vehicles would be affected by this rule. We multiply this by the average increase in round trip distance of 11.4 miles for a total distance delay for U.S. owned vehicles of 51,596 miles. We next monetize the delay by applying the IRS's standard mileage rate for business travel of \$0.50 to these vehicles, which includes fuel costs, wear-and-tear, and depreciation of the

vehicle. Because this is an estimate for business travel, it may overstate slightly costs for leisure travelers using their vehicles on leisure activities. We estimate that a closure of Morses line would cost U.S. citizens \$25,798 in additional vehicular costs (14,600 vehicles \times 31 percent U.S. citizens \times 11.4 miles \times \$0.50 per mile = \$25,798).

The final cost we must consider is the cost to the economy of lost tourism revenue resulting from potential decreased Canadian travel. Because of the lack of local tourism data for this specific region, we are unable to monetize or quantify these costs. We therefore discuss this qualitatively.

Since both U.S. and foreign travelers would be inconvenienced by the closure of the Morses Line crossing, it is possible that fewer foreign travelers would choose to cross the border into the United States. To the extent that these visitors were spending money in the United States, local businesses would lose revenue. Since the average trip would only be lengthened by about 8 minutes, this effect would likely be very small. Also, it could be mitigated by U.S. citizens who would now choose to remain in the United States. We believe that the total impacts on the economy due to decreased travel to the United States are negligible.

In summary, the closure of the Morses Line crossing would cost CBP \$158,000 in direct closure costs in the first year, and U.S. travelers \$25,802 in time costs and \$25,798 in vehicular costs annually. Total costs to close the port would thus be \$210,000 in the first year and \$52,000 each following year.

Net Effect of Closure

The costs to CBP of leaving the Morses Line crossing open would be \$5.7 million the first year and \$692,000 each following year. The costs of closing the crossing would be \$210,000 the first year and \$52,000 each following year. Thus, the net benefit of the crossing closure would be about \$5.5 million the first year and \$640,000 each year after the first year.

Dated: September 29, 2011.

Janet Napolitano,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011-25748 Filed 10-4-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-14-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 26

[Docket No. PRM-26-7; NRC-2011-0220]

Cheri Swensson; Certification of Substance Abuse Experts

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Petition for rulemaking; request for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing for public comment a notice of receipt of a petition for rulemaking (PRM), dated May 5, 2011, and supplemented on August 3, 2011, which was filed with the NRC by Cheri Swensson (the petitioner), on behalf of the American Academy of Health Care Providers in the Addictive Disorders (the Academy). The petition was docketed by the NRC on September 9, 2011, and has been assigned Docket No. PRM-26-7. The petitioner requests that the NRC amend its regulations to include the Academy as one of the organizations authorized to certify a substance abuse expert.

DATES: Submit comments by December 19, 2011. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Please include Docket ID NRC-2011-0220 in the subject line of your comments. For additional instructions on submitting comments and instructions on accessing documents related to this action, see "Submitting Comments and Accessing Information" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document. You may submit comments by any one of the following methods:

- *Federal rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for documents filed under Docket ID NRC-2011-0220. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher, telephone: 301-492-3668; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

- *Mail comments to:* Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attn.: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

- *E-mail comments to:* Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov. If you do not receive a reply e-mail confirming that we have received your comments, contact us directly at 301-415-1677.

- *Hand deliver comments to:* 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. (telephone: 301-415-1677).

⁴ U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), *Revised Departmental Guidance, Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis*, (Memorandum from E. H. Frankel), February 2003, Tables 1.

⁵ Wardman, M., "A Review of British Evidence on Time and Service Quality Valuations," *Transportation Research Part E*, Vol. 37, 2001, pp. 107-128.

• *Fax comments to:* Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission at 301-415-1101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, *telephone:* 301-492-3667.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Submitting Comments and Accessing Information

Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be posted on the NRC Web site and on the Federal rulemaking Web site, <http://www.regulations.gov>. Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in their comments that they do not want publicly disclosed.

You can access publicly available documents related to this document using the following methods:

• *NRC's Public Document Room (PDR):* The public may examine and have copied, for a fee, publicly available documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

• *NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):* Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are available online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. From this page, the public can gain entry into ADAMS, which provides text and image files of the NRC's public documents. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC's PDR reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

• *Federal Rulemaking Web site:* Public comments and supporting materials related to this petition for rulemaking can be found at <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching on Docket ID NRC-2011-0220.

Background

Cheri Swensson, on behalf of the Academy, submitted a petition for rulemaking dated May 5, 2011, and supplemented on August 3, 2011. The petitioner requested that the NRC amend Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 26.187, "Substance abuse expert," by including the Academy at Section 26.187(b)(5). The petitioner is the Executive Director for the Academy, which is an international credentialing body composed of psychologists, medical doctors, nurses, social workers, and counselors that provides care in areas such as alcohol and gambling addiction. In 2010, the Academy received its accreditation from the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA). The NRC has determined that the petition meets the threshold sufficiency requirements for a petition for rulemaking under 10 CFR 2.802, "Petition for rulemaking," and the petition has been docketed as PRM-26-7. The NRC is requesting public comment on the petition for rulemaking.

Discussion of the Petition

The petitioner states that the Academy "is very interested in working alongside the NRC to ensure its substance abuse experts are qualified and adhere to the NRC's code of professionalism and ethical conduct through [the Academy's] Certified Addiction Specialist [CAS] certification." The petitioner states that the Academy's CAS certification was accredited by the NCCA in 2010 and is a comprehensive credential offered by the Academy which includes competencies in alcohol addiction, drug addiction, sex addiction, eating disorders and gambling addiction. The petitioner claims that its certification requirements meet or exceed the NRC's requirements. The petitioner requests that the NRC amend § 26.187(b)(5) to include the Academy as one of the organizations authorized to certify a substance abuse expert.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of September 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Annette Vietti-Cook,
Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011-25784 Filed 10-4-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

13 CFR Parts 121 and 125

RIN 3245-AG22

Small Business Subcontracting

AGENCY: U.S. Small Business Administration.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA or Agency) is proposing to amend its regulations to implement provisions of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, which pertain to small business subcontracting. SBA is proposing to amend its regulations to provide for a "covered contract" (a contract for which a small business subcontracting plan is required, currently valued above \$1.5 million for construction and \$650,000 for all other contracts), a prime contractor must notify the contracting officer in writing whenever the prime contractor does not utilize a subcontractor used in preparing its bid or proposal during contract performance. SBA is also proposing to amend its regulations to require a prime contractor to notify a contracting officer in writing whenever the prime contractor reduces payments to a subcontractor or when payments to a subcontractor are 90 days or more past due. In addition, SBA is proposing to clarify that the contracting officer is responsible for monitoring and evaluating small business subcontracting plan performance. SBA is also proposing to clarify which subcontracts must be included in subcontracting data reporting, which subcontracts should be excluded, and the way subcontracting data is reported.

SBA is also proposing to make other changes to update its subcontracting regulations, including changing subcontracting plan thresholds and referencing the electronic subcontracting reporting system (eSRS). Some of the SBA's proposed changes would require the contracting officer to review subcontracting plan reports within 60 days of the report ending date.

Finally, SBA is also proposing to address how subcontracting plan requirements and credit towards subcontracting goals can be implemented in connection with Multi-agency, Federal Supply Schedule, Multiple Award Schedule and Government-wide Acquisition indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 5, 2011.