exclusionary limit, is the only state with a dollar limit above \$25.31

With respect to enforcement, states have been much more active in enforcing their state rules than has the Commission.32 This is no doubt due at least in part to the fact that the states are closer to consumers who suffer from many of the unscrupulous activities involving sales in the home and in transient locations.

Because I am not persuaded that the federal Cooling-Off Rule's long-standing \$25 exclusionary limit on transient sales should be raised to \$130, and because I find there is convincing evidence on the overall need to continue protecting consumers through cooling-off rules, I urge state policy makers, law enforcement officials, and regulators to not interpret today's amendment to the federal Cooling-Off Rule as a signal that they should follow suit and raise the exclusionary limit of their respective cooling-off rules for sales in transient locations. Indeed, the often highly localized nature of potentially deceptive practices involving sales in transient locations puts states in the best position to determine the wisdom of raising their own exclusionary limits for sales in transient locations. I strongly encourage any state that may consider following the course of action taken by the Commission today to engage first in a more focused effort to gather evidence about potentially unscrupulous activities involving transient sales in their jurisdictions.

[FR Doc. 2015-00164 Filed 1-8-15; 8:45 am]

#### BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

(exempting purchases of under \$25 where there is no contract or receipt); Oregon has no dollar limit, Or. Rev. Stat. Ann. sections 83.710, 720; and New York has a \$25 limit, N.Y. Pers. Prop. Law section

## **DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND** SECURITY

## **Coast Guard**

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2014-0912]

# **Drawbridge Operation Regulation:** Lake Washington Ship Canal, Seattle,

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS. **ACTION:** Notice canceling temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is canceling the temporary deviation concerning the operating schedule that governs the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) double leaf bascule Ballard Bridge across the Lake Washington Ship Canal, mile 1.1, at Seattle, WA. This deviation was necessary to accommodate evening detoured commute traffic during road construction. It is being cancelled due to the construction project has been completed.

**DATES:** The temporary deviation published on November 14, 2014, 78 FR 68120, is cancelled as of January 9, 2015.

ADDRESSES: The docket for this deviation, [USCG-2014-0912] is available at http://www.regulations.gov. Type the docket number in the "ŠĒARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this deviation. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12-140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidavs.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this temporary deviation, call or email Steven Fischer, Coast Guard Thirteenth District, Bridge Specialist; telephone 206-220-7277, email d13-pf-d13bridges@uscg.mil. If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202-366-9826.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### A. Basis and Purpose

On November 14, 2014, we published a temporary deviation entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Lake Washington Ship Canal, Seattle, WA." in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 68120). The temporary deviation concerned the Seattle Department of

Transportation (SDOT) request that the Ballard Bridge, mile 1.1, across the Lake Washington Ship Canal accommodate evening detoured commute traffic during road construction. This deviation allowed the bridge to remain in the closed position for an extra hour during evening traffic. Vessels able to pass through the bridge in the closed positions may do so at anytime. The bridge would not be able to open during this construction period, and extend the daily closure one hour Monday through Friday. This deviation from the operating regulations was authorized under 33 CFR 117.35.

#### **B.** Cancellation

The deviation was intended to facilitate routing of heavy traffic during peak commute time on the bridge. The deviation is not necessary at this time because SDOT has completed the construction on the Ballard Bridge.

Dated: December 23, 2014.

#### Steven M. Fischer,

Bridge Administrator, Thirteenth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 2015-00174 Filed 1-8-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

#### **Coast Guard**

# 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2014-1057]

# **Drawbridge Operation Regulations;** Norwalk River, Norwalk, CT

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard has issued a temporary deviation from the operating schedule that governs the Metro-North WALK Bridge across the Norwalk River, mile 0.1, at Norwalk, Connecticut. This deviation will test a change to the drawbridge operation schedule to determine whether a permanent change to the schedule is needed. This deviation will allow the Metro-North WALK Bridge to operate under an alternate schedule to facilitate the high volume of rail service across the Metro-North WALK Bridge at peak hours, while balancing both the needs of rail and marine traffic.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective without actual notice from January 9, 2015 through 11:59 p.m. on June 28, 2015. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from 12:01

<sup>31</sup> N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. section 361-B:1.

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g., Second Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 11-16, 34-36, State of West Virginia v. Quick Silver Restoration, LLC, et al., No. 14-C-1952 (W. Va. Cir. Ct. filed Nov. 6, 2014) (alleging that a roofing and home improvement company engaged in high pressure door-to-door solicitations that violated several consumer protection laws and regulations, including the state and federal cooling-off rules; Compl. at ¶ 1, State of Vermont v. Terry, No. 570-9-14 Wncv (Vt. Super. Ct. filed Sept. 24, 2014) (alleging that a door-to-door meat salesman violated the state's Consumer Protection Act by failing to notify consumers of their three-day right to cancel, misleading consumers regarding the price and guarantee on the meat, failing to disclose material information to the consumer, and selling meat without a required license); Compl., Commonwealth of Virginia v. KLMN Readers Servs. Inc., No. CL13002796-00 (Chesapeake Cir. Ct. filed Nov. 25, 2013) (alleging that a door-to-door magazine company violated Viriginia's Consumer Protection and Home Solicitation Sales Acts) (default judgment granted Sept. 24, 2014). In contrast, the last time the Federal Trade Commission employed the federal Cooling-Off Rule in an enforcement action was nearly 15 years ago. Compl., F.T.C. v. College Resource Mgmt., Inc. et al., No. 3-01CV0828-G (N.D. Tex. May 1, 2001) (alleging, inter alia, that a purported college financial services company violated Section 5 of the FTC Act and the Cooling-Off Rule in connection with its deceptive practices in financial aid sales seminars held at hotels or in banquet rooms).