

SUMMARY: The Commission is establishing a docket to consider a proposed change in certain analytical methods used in periodic reporting. The proposed change has two parts. One part would update the mail processing portion of the Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service cost models. The other part would modify the Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service transportation cost model. This action responds to a Postal Service rulemaking petition. Establishing this docket will allow the Commission to consider the Postal Service's proposal and comments from the public.

DATES: *Comments are due:* February 3, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at stephen.sharfman@prc.gov or 202-789-6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 22, 2010, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 asking the Commission to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes in the analytical methods approved for use in periodic reporting.¹ The Petition submits two distinct sets of proposals for approval. It proposes to use both sets in the Postal Service's FY 2010 Annual Compliance Report.

Proposal Thirteen is a set of proposals to update the mail processing portion of the Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service cost models.² Petition at 1. The Postal Service states that much of the input data and cost methodology that it proposes to use in the new Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service cost model are the same as that relied upon in its Standard Mail parcel/non-flat machinable (NFM) processing cost model that was filed as Proposal Seven on September 8, 2010. Proposal Thirteen at 1. These new data will change the productivity figures and arrival/dispatch profiles used in the model.³ More detailed descriptions of

proposed changes to the Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service mail processing cost model are provided under seal as USPS-RM2011-6/NP1. The Postal Service says that the impact of Proposal Thirteen would be to decrease the mail processing unit cost estimates for price categories that require more processing steps, and increase the cost estimates for the DDU and RDU categories. *Id.* at 3.

Proposal Fourteen is a set of proposals to modify the Parcel Select/Parcel Return Service transportation cost model.⁴ *Id.* at 1. It proposes to modify that model to (1) present transportation cost estimates only for the current price categories; (2) use PostalOne! data to estimate the cost of the transportation legs for non-dropshipped price categories; (3) incorporate the official revenue, pieces, and weight volumes into the model; (4) use the method relied upon to distribute Parcel Select transportation costs to distribute Parcel Return Service transportation costs; and (5) use a new method to estimate the return network distribution center cubic foot miles by zone. *Id.* at 1-2. The Postal Service states that it cannot estimate the impact of Proposal Fourteen since it would use data that was not available in 2009. *Id.* at 2.

The Petition, including the attachments, is available for review on the Commission's Web site, <http://www.prc.gov>.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, John P. Klingenberg is designated as Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding. Comments are due no later than February 3, 2011.

It is ordered:

1. The Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Thirteen-Fourteen), filed December 22, 2010, is granted.

2. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2011-6 to consider the matters raised by the Postal Service's Petition.

3. Interested persons may submit comments on Proposals Thirteen and Fourteen no later than February 3, 2011.

4. The Commission will determine the need for reply comments after review of the initial comments.

5. John P. Klingenberg is appointed to serve as the Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

data that was collected to develop the Standard Mail/non-flat machinable (NFM) mail processing cost model. It also proposes to use Parcel Select arrival profile data that were collected during FY 2009. *Id.* at 2.

⁴ Proposal Fourteen is described in an attachment to the Petition (Proposal Fourteen).

6. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.
Shoshana M. Grove,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010-33173 Filed 1-3-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2011-5; Order No. 625]

Periodic Reporting

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; availability of rulemaking petition.

SUMMARY: The Commission is establishing a docket to consider a proposed change in certain analytical methods used in periodic reporting. This action responds to a Postal Service rulemaking petition. Establishing this docket will allow the Commission to consider the Postal Service's proposal and comments from the public.

DATES: *Comments are due:* January 28, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at stephen.sharfman@prc.gov or 202-789-6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Regulatory History*, 75 FR 58449 (Sept. 24, 2010).

On December 20, 2010, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 asking the Commission to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes in the analytical methods approved for use in periodic reporting.¹ Four separate proposals, labeled Proposals Nine through Twelve, are included in the Petition.

Proposal Nine proposes to update the input data to the mail processing cost model for First-Class Mail and Standard Mail presort letters in several respects, and to change the method by which the cost of sorting bundles of letters is

¹ Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Thirteen-Fourteen), December 22, 2010 (Petition).

² Proposal Thirteen is described in an attachment to the Petition (Proposal Thirteen).

³ Proposal Thirteen proposes to populate the Parcel Select/Parcel Return model with much of the

¹ Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Nine-Twelve), December 20, 2010 (Petition).

estimated. The Postal Service proposes to rely primarily on data from the manual density table to estimate the number of handlings of letter bundles. It comments that any additional changes to the cost methodology and structure of the presort letter cost models should be addressed in Docket No. RM2010–13. *Id.* at 2.

Proposal Ten concerns Inbound International Mail. For FY 2010, it proposes to change the assignment of In-Office Cost System (IOCS)-based clerk and mail handler labor costs to country groups Canada, Industrialized Countries, and Developing Countries, so that normal downstream Cost and Revenue Analysis (CRA) and International Cost and Revenue Analysis (ICRA) processes can automatically distribute costs to those groups consistent with the way that clerk and mail handler costs are distributed to other products. (The standard distribution method reflects cost pools, container types, and shape distinctions—not just direct IOCS tallies).

Proposal Eleven concerns International Money Transfers (IMTS). The Postal Service proposes to change the method for reporting IMTS separately for Inbound and Outbound products using information gathered from Point-of-Sale (POS), IOCS, and Chapter 9 in USPS–FY09–NPS. This, it says, will create two new line items in the ICRA report: IMTS-Outbound and IMTS-Inbound, but would not affect the sum currently reported in the IMTS line in that report.

Proposal Twelve would affect the Media/Library Mail Processing Cost Model, the Bound Printed Matter Transportation Cost Model, and the Bulk Parcel Return Service Cost Model. In the 2009 ACD, the Commission expressed concern that use of the Intra- and Inter-BMC volume split for single-piece Parcel Post in the above-referenced cost models is no longer appropriate because that distinction no longer exists for single-piece Parcel Post. The Postal Service proposes to use the percent of total single-piece Parcel Post volume comprised of volume for Zones 1, 2, and 3 as the new proxy in the above-referenced models.

The Petition includes attachments that discuss the background, rationale, and impact of Proposals Nine through Twelve. The Petition, including the attachments, is available for review on the Commission's Web site, <http://www.prc.gov>. Comments on Proposals Nine through Twelve are due no later than January 28, 2011.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, John P. Klingenberg is appointed as Public

Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

It is ordered:

1. The Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytic Principles (Proposals Nine–Twelve), filed December 20, 2010, is granted.

2. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2011–5 to consider the matters raised by the Postal Service's Petition.

3. Interested person may submit comments on Proposals Nine through Twelve no later than January 28, 2011.

4. The Commission will determine the need for reply comments after review of the initial comments.

5. John P. Klingenberg is appointed to serve as the Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

6. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2010–33170 Filed 1–3–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R09–OAR–2010–0907; FRL–9247–2]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from crude oil production operations and refineries. We are proposing action on local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by February 3, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA–R09–OAR–2010–0907, by one of the following methods:

1. **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. **E-mail:** steckel.andrew@epa.gov.

3. **Mail or Deliver:** Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Instructions: All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. <http://www.regulations.gov> is an “anonymous access” system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Docket: The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joanne Wells, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4118, wells.joanne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rules did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
 - C. What is the purpose of the submitted rules and rule revisions?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. What are the rule deficiencies?
 - D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules