

and securement systems. The NPRM also included a new requirement for automated stop and route announcements in systems with 100 or more buses and requirements specific to bus rapid transit systems. To improve accessibility, the Board proposed reducing the maximum slope of vehicle ramps. The NPRM proposed that bus ramps have slopes not steeper than 1:6 (17 percent) when deployed to the boarding and alighting areas without station platforms and to the roadway. See T303.8.1 in the NPRM. Some bus and ramp manufacturers currently provide ramps that meet this proposed provision. To minimize the ramp extension beyond the doorway, some manufacturers provide a fixed ramp slope inside the bus creating the potential for a grade break, or change in ramp slope, within a single ramp run. These designs also can reduce the level floor space at the top of the ramp.

The comment period on the NPRM ended on November 23, 2010. After the comment period ended, the Access Board received correspondence from Lane Transit District, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and Douglas Cross Transportation Consulting that raised issues regarding the usability of these ramps. The Access Board staff met with representatives from Lane Transit District and Douglas Cross Transportation Consulting to discuss these issues. The correspondence and a report on the meeting have been placed in the docket.

In August 2012, the Access Board reopened the comment period until October 31, 2012 to collect additional information on bus ramps. See 77 FR 50068, August 20, 2012. As part of this effort, the Board will hold two information meetings to discuss the usability and impacts of certain bus ramp designs that have recently been implemented.

The first information meeting will be held in Washington, DC from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. on September 19, 2012 in the Board's conference center at 1331 F Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20004-1111. Notice of the first meeting was provided in the August 20, 2012 **Federal Register** notice.

The second information meeting will be held in conjunction with the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) annual meeting in Seattle, WA from 2:15 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. on October 2, 2012 at the Washington State Convention Center, Rooms 611-612 (6th level), 800 Convention Place, Seattle, WA 98101-2350. The information meeting is open to all members of the public, including those

who are not registered to attend the APTA annual meeting.

The Access Board is interested in receiving information on the following questions at the information meetings:

1. Can a bus ramp with a slope of 1:6 be provided without a grade break and without compromising the available level space within the bus at the top of the ramp? How might bus kneeling affect these designs?

2. If the ramp slope were required to be uniform for the length of the ramp with no grade breaks, how would such a requirement affect bus and ramp designs, manufacturers, transit operators, and transit users, including those with disabilities?

3. How much level space, measured when the bus is sitting on a level surface, can be provided beyond the top of the ramp? How can this space be configured to permit individuals who use wheeled mobility devices to access fare collection devices and to turn into the main aisle? How does the slope of the ramp, the location of the fare collection device, and the configuration of the handrail affect the availability of this space?

4. If level space were required at the top of the ramp to permit access to fare collection devices and to facilitate turning into main aisles, how would such a requirement affect bus designs, manufacturers, transit operators, and transit users, including those with disabilities?

Bus and ramp manufacturers, transit operators, researchers, disability organizations, and interested individuals are invited to participate in the public information meetings and to submit comment. Transcripts of the meetings will be placed in the docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and will be available on the Access Board's Web site at <http://www.access-board.gov/transit/>.

The information meetings will be accessible to persons with disabilities. An assistive listening system, computer assisted real-time transcription (CART), and sign language interpreters will be provided. Persons attending the information meetings are requested to refrain from using perfume, cologne, and other fragrances for the comfort of other participants (see www.accessboard.gov/about/policies/fragrance.htm for more information).

David M. Capozzi,
Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2012-22554 Filed 9-12-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0466; FRL-9726-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Maximum Allowable Emission of Particulate Matter From Fuel Burning Equipment Used for Indirect Heating

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Missouri to incorporate a new rule, Maximum Allowable Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) Emissions from Fuel Burning Equipment Used for Indirect Heating. The new rule consolidates four pre-existing rules into one state-wide rule for clarity. The applicable standard addressed in this action is the PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ NAAQS promulgated by EPA in 2006. EPA is proposing this revision because the standards and requirements set by the rules will strengthen the Missouri SIP. EPA's approval of this SIP revision is being done in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by October 15, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0466, by mail to Stephanie Doolan, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier by following the detailed instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of the direct final rule located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephanie Doolan at (913) 551-7719, or by email at doolan.stephanie@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action,

no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on part of this rule and if that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those parts of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 29, 2012.

Mark J. Hague,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 2012–22470 Filed 9–12–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

43 CFR Part 2

RIN 1093–AA15

Freedom of Information Act Regulations

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

This rule would revise the regulations that the Department follows in processing records under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”). The revisions clarify and update procedures for requesting information from the Department and procedures that the Department follows in responding to requests from the public. The revisions also incorporate clarifications and updates resulting from changes to the FOIA and case law. Finally, the revisions include current cost figures to be used in calculating and charging fees and increase the amount of information that members of the public may receive from the Department without being charged processing fees.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 13, 2012.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the rulemaking by either of the methods listed below. Please use Regulation Identifier Number 1093–AA15 in your message.

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

instructions on the Web site for submitting comments.

2. *U.S. mail, courier, or hand delivery:* Executive Secretariat—FOIA regulations, Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cindy Cafaro, Office of Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs, 202–208–5342.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Why We’re Publishing This Rule and What It Does

The regulations are being revised to update, clarify, and streamline the language of procedural provisions, and to incorporate certain changes brought about by the amendments to the FOIA under the OPEN Government Act of 2007, Public Law 110–175, 121 Stat. 2524. Additionally, the regulations are being updated to reflect developments in the case law and to include current cost figures to be used in calculating and charging fees.

The revisions also incorporate changes to the language and structure of the FOIA regulations in order to improve the Department’s FOIA performance. More nuanced multitrack processing can be found at § 2.15. Partial fee waivers will expressly be permitted under § 2.45. Proposed revisions of the Department’s fee schedule can be found at § 2.42, § 2.49(a)(1), and Appendix A. The duplication charge for physical records or scanning records will increase from thirteen to fifteen cents a page. The amount at or below which the Department will not charge a fee will increase from \$30.00 to \$50.00.

II. Compliance With Laws and Executive Orders

1. Regulatory Planning and Review (Executive Orders 12866 and 13563)

Executive Order 12866 provides that the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs will review all significant rules. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has determined that this rule is not significant.

Executive Order 13563 reaffirms the principles of E.O. 12866 while calling for improvements in the nation’s regulatory system to promote predictability, to reduce uncertainty, and to use the best, most innovative, and least burdensome tools for achieving regulatory ends. The executive order directs agencies to consider regulatory approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public where these approaches are relevant,

feasible, and consistent with regulatory objectives. E.O. 13563 emphasizes further that regulations must be based on the best available science and that the rulemaking process must allow for public participation and an open exchange of ideas. We have developed this rule in a manner consistent with these requirements.

2. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

3. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA)

This is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This proposed rule:

a. Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more.

b. Will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions.

c. Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

4. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

This proposed rule does not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of more than \$100 million per year. The proposed rule does not have a significant or unique effect on State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. A statement containing the information required by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is not required.

5. Takings (E.O. 12630)

In accordance with Executive Order 12630, the rule does not have significant takings implications. A takings implication assessment is not required.

6. Federalism (E.O. 13132)

In accordance with Executive Order 13132, the proposed rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. It would not substantially and directly affect the relationship between the Federal and state governments. A Federalism Assessment is not required.

7. Civil Justice Reform (E.O. 12988)

In accordance with Executive Order 12988, the Office of the Solicitor has