

a paper filing. Commenters that are not able to file comments electronically must send an original and 14 copies of their comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. For paper filings, the original and 14 copies of such comments should be submitted to the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

22. All comments will be placed in the Commission's public files and may be viewed, printed, or downloaded remotely, as described in the Document Availability section below. Commenters on this proposal are not required to serve copies of their comments on other commenters.

VIII. Document Availability

23. In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the **Federal Register**, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through FERC's Home Page (<http://www.ferc.gov>) and in FERC's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street, NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

24. From FERC's Home Page on the Internet, this information is available in eLibrary. The full text of this document is available in eLibrary both in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number, excluding the last three digits of this document in the docket number field.

25. User assistance is available for eLibrary and the FERC's Web site during the Commission's normal business hours. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support by e-mail at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov, or by telephone at 202-502-6652 (toll-free at (866) 208-3676) or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

List of Subjects in 18 CFR Part 284

Continental shelf, Incorporation by reference, Natural gas, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

By direction of the Commission.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Commission proposes to amend part 284, Chapter I, Title 18, *Code of Federal Regulations*, as follows:

PART 284—CERTAIN SALES AND TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS UNDER THE NATURAL GAS POLICY ACT OF 1978 AND RELATED AUTHORITIES

1. The authority citation for part 284 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 717-717w, 3301-3432; 42 U.S.C. 7101-7352; 43 U.S.C. 1331-1356.

2. Section 284.12 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (vi), adding paragraph (a)(1)(vii), and revising the introductory text of paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 284.12 Standards for pipeline business operations and communications.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

(i) Additional Standards (General Standards, Creditworthiness Standards, and Gas/Electric Operational Communications Standards) (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006);

(ii) Nominations Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006);

(iii) Flowing Gas Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006);

(iv) Invoicing Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006);

(v) Quadrant Electronic Delivery Mechanism Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006) with the exception of Standard 4.3.4;

(vi) Capacity Release Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006 (with minor corrections applied December 13, 2006); and

(vii) Internet Electronic Transport Related Standards (Version 1.8, September 30, 2006) with the exception of Standard 10.3.2.

* * * * *

(b) *Business practices and electronic communication requirements.* An interstate pipeline that transports gas under subparts B or G of this part must comply with the following requirements. The regulations in this paragraph adopt the abbreviations and definitions contained in the North American Energy Standards Board Wholesale Gas Quadrant standards incorporated by reference in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. E8-22206 Filed 9-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3001

[Docket No. RM2008-6; Order No. 108]

Periodic Reporting Rules

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; availability of rulemaking petition.

SUMMARY: Under a new law, the Postal Service must file an annual compliance report with the Postal Regulatory Commission on costs, revenues, rates, and quality of service associated with its products. It has filed documents with the Commission to change some of the methods it uses to compile the fiscal year 2008 report. In the Commission's view, these documents constitute a rulemaking petition. Therefore, this document provides an opportunity for the public to comment on potential changes in periodic reporting rules.

DATES: 1. *Initial comments:* September 26, 2008.

2. *Reply comments:* October 3, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Regulatory History*, 73 FR 51983 (September 8, 2008).

On September 12, 2008, the Postal Service filed a petition to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding comparable to Docket No. RM2008-2 to consider two more proposed changes to the costing methods approved for periodic reporting.¹ In Docket No. RM2008-2, nine numbered proposals are the subject of notice and comment rulemaking procedures. The Postal Service proposes that the two additional proposed changes be referred to as Proposal Ten and Proposal Eleven to avoid confusion with the nine proposals already under review. The Postal Service's petition describes its two additional proposals, explains their background, objectives, rationale, and, to the extent possible, their likely impact in FY 2008.

I. Procedural Expedition

The same factors that led the Commission to expedite review of the

¹ Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Further Proposed Methodology Changes for the FY 2008 ACR (Proposals Ten-Eleven), September 12, 2008 (Petition).

nine proposals in Docket No. RM2008–2 apply here. There are fewer proposals and they appear to be simpler and potentially less controversial than there were in Docket No. RM2008–2. Accordingly, the Commission will set a shorter period for comments and reply comments for these two additional proposals, and will not schedule a technical conference ahead of time, as it did in Docket No. RM2008–2.

II. Substance of Postal Service Proposals

The Postal Service proposals, *see* Petition at 3 *et seq.*, are described below.

Proposal Ten. Proposed Change in Costing of Parcel Post Products.

Objective: Changes are proposed for the development of costs for products within the old Parcel Post subclass: market dominant product Parcel Post Single-Piece, and competitive products Parcel Select and Parcel Return Service (PRS).

Background: In FY2007, costs from the data systems were only available for the Parcel Post subclass as a whole. In the Annual Compliance Report, ACR2007, costs for the market-dominant product Parcel Post Single-Piece and competitive products Parcel Select and Parcel Return Service (PRS) were developed using methodologies previously accepted for the purposes of estimating cost differences deemed to be relevant to worksharing.² In other words, the estimates presented were primarily topdown. In the Annual Compliance Determination report, the Postal Regulatory Commission concluded that Parcel Return Service may have had an FY07 cost coverage of only 97.7 percent, which would have been insufficient to meet the requirements of the PAEA. The Commission acknowledged that the PRS FY07 cost coverage might have been higher if there were cost savings, such as reduced carrier costs, but noted that dispositive data on that issue were not provided.³

The Postal Service has taken the initiative to obtain data for the Parcel Post products directly from the cost data systems. The In-Office Cost System (IOCS) and Carrier Cost Systems (CCS) can identify each of the three products separately for all of FY08. The Transportation Cost System (TRACS) can separate Parcel Post Single-Piece from Bulk Parcel Post for all of FY08, but can only separate Parcel Select from PRS starting quarter 2 of FY08.

Proposal: For FY2008, we propose to develop mail processing and delivery costs for Parcel Post Single-Piece, Parcel Select and PRS using IOCS and CCS data. For transportation costs, we propose to use TRACS data to develop separate Parcel Post Single-Piece and Bulk Parcel Post, and to use the accepted methodology to split costs for Bulk Parcel Post into Parcel Select and PRS. These inputs would then be used in the CRA Model to develop a bottom-up cost estimate for each product (i.e., displaying each product as a separate row in the CRA).

Impact: The impact on costs will be unknown until the completion of the FY08 ACR. To the extent that the FY07 procedure implicitly focused only on cost differences deemed relevant for worksharing, and thus may have tended to overstate PRS costs, and to the extent that the proposed bottom-up FY08 procedures develop cost estimates intended to reflect all cost differences, and thus hopefully should neither overstate nor understate PRS costs, the new methodology perhaps may reduce PRS costs relative to the FY07 methodology.

Proposal Eleven: Proposed Change in Distribution Key for Volume-Variable Carrier Costs Relating to Blue Collection Boxes.

Objective: The purpose of this document is to propose a methodology change, for FY2008, in the manner in which cost segment 7 (city street activity) volume variable costs incurred by blue collection boxes are distributed to products.

Background: Cost Segment 7 blue collection box costs are incurred on both special purpose routes and letter routes. For special purpose routes, the accrued and volume variable costs are derived from the study of special purpose routes submitted in Docket No. R97–1. For letter routes, the accrued and volume variable costs are derived from the 2002 City Carrier Street Time Study (CCSTS), which was submitted in Docket No. R2005–1. In FY2007, the volume variable costs resulting from blue collection boxes were \$46.7 million and \$9.4 million from special purpose routes and letter routes, respectively. Currently, the same distribution factors are applied to attribute the volume variable costs from special purpose routes and letter routes to products. The existing factors are primarily derived from a special study submitted in Docket No. R84–1, but are adjusted annually based on current Revenue Pieces and Weight (RPW) data.

Proposal: The Postal Service is proposing to distribute the volume variable costs incurred by blue

collection boxes to products based on updated distribution factors from current data collected on City Carrier Cost System (CCCS) tests.

Rationale: Collection mail volumes from customer delivery points have been captured by CCCS for several years. In FY2008, CCCS augmented the type of collection volume data recorded. On letter routes, CCCS now records, separately, the same information about blue collection box contents as it does for collection mail from customer delivery points. Utilizing updated distribution factors based on the current mail contents in blue boxes collected on letter routes signifies a methodology improvement for two reasons. First, the existing factors are largely derived from a study conducted approximately 25 years ago, whereas the new factors estimate the current mail contents of blue collection boxes. Second, the proposed approach would directly assign costs to Priority Mail, Express Mail, Free mail, USPS mail, and International mail based on the actual frequency of each within the sampled data from collection boxes, rather than the current two-step process of first assigning a fixed proportion of collection costs to “Other”, and then further distributing the “Other” costs to those products based on RPW volume. The current process is described in detail at pages 6–7 of the copies of materials provided at the technical conference with Notice of the United States Postal Service Regarding Materials Distributed or Requested at the August 27, 2008 Technical Conference, Docket No. RM2008–2 (August 29, 2008).

Impact: A preliminary review of partial-year new distribution data indicates First Class Mail constituting a higher percentage (i.e., in excess of 99 percent) of mail in blue collection boxes, as compared with the study submitted in Docket No. R84–1. If this result holds, then First Class Mail will receive a higher percentage of volume variable costs incurred as a result of blue collection boxes than in previous years. In FY07, \$53.8 million in volume variable costs from blue collection boxes was distributed to First Class Mail. Given that there was only \$56.1 million in such costs to distribute to the products, the dollar impact on products due to this methodology proposal will be small. However, considering the numerous changes since 1984, such as a more complicated rate structure, Carrier Pickup, and rigid security regulations, the primary result of the preliminary review (i.e., that less than one percent of mail in the collection

² In Docket No. ACR2007, these estimates were presented in USPS–FT07–9 and USPS–FY07–15.

³ Postal Regulatory Commission Annual Compliance Determination, FY 2007, p. 24.

boxes is other than First Class Mail) seems reasonable.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is Ordered:

1. The Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Further Proposed Methodology Changes for the FY 2008 ACR (Proposals Ten and Eleven), filed September 12, 2008, is granted.

2. Interested persons may submit initial comments on or before September 26, 2008. The proposals described in this order will be considered under the current procedural schedule in Docket No. RM2008-2.

3. Reply comments may be submitted on or before October 3, 2008.

4. William C. Miller is designated as the Public Representative representing the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

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

Authority: 39 U.S.C. 3652.

By the Commission.

Steven W. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-22639 Filed 9-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0705; FRL-8720-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Nevada; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Under the Clean Air Act, EPA is proposing to approve certain revisions, and to disapprove certain other revisions, of the Nevada State Implementation Plan submitted by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. These revisions relate to the application of the State's vehicle inspection and maintenance program to vehicles operated on Federal installations. EPA is also proposing to correct certain plan revisions related to this subject that EPA previously approved in error. The intended effect is to ensure that vehicles operated on Federal installations are subject only to those requirements of the State's vehicle inspection and maintenance program that apply in the same manner and to

the same extent to nongovernmental entities.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by October 27, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments, identified by docket number EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0705, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* www.regulations.gov. Follow the on-line instructions.

- *E-mail:* kaplan.eleanor@epa.gov.
- *Mail or deliver:* Eleanor Kaplan (AIR-2), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Instructions: All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at 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 www.regulations.gov or e-mail. 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 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 below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eleanor Kaplan, Air Planning Office (AIR-2), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, (415) 947-4147, kaplan.eleanor@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

I. Background

II. The State's SIP Revision Submittal

A. What revisions did the State submit?

B. What is our evaluation of the revisions?

III. Correction of Previously-Approved Provisions

A. What provisions did we previously approve?

B. What is our evaluation of the approved provisions?

IV. Public Comment and Final Action

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

On January 7, 2008 (73 FR 1175), EPA proposed, under the Clean Air Act (CAA or "Act"), to approve certain submittals by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) of revisions to the Nevada state implementation plan (SIP). The submittals that were the subject of our January 7, 2008 proposed rule primarily relate to attainment and maintenance of the carbon monoxide (CO) national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) in the Truckee Meadows nonattainment area. In our January 7, 2008 proposed rule, we also proposed to approve the State's submittal of an update to the regulatory element of the State's mobile source SIP, including statutory provisions and rules related to the State's vehicle inspection and maintenance (I/M) programs administered in Truckee Meadows (located within Washoe County) and Las Vegas Valley and Boulder City (located within Clark County).

As part of our January 7, 2008 proposed rule, we proposed to approve all of the State's vehicle I/M rules with the exception of a particular subsection (subsection (2)) of a single rule, Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) section 445B.595 ("Inspections of vehicles owned by State or political subdivisions or operated on federal installations") ("NAC 445B.595(2)"), for which we proposed neither approval nor disapproval. We explained our "no action" proposal for NAC 445B.595(2) as follows:

The Federal I/M rule requires that vehicles operated on Federal installations located within an I/M program area be tested regardless of whether the vehicles are registered in the state or local I/M area. See 40 CFR 51.356(a)(4). However, we are not requiring states to implement 40 CFR 51.356(a)(4) at this time. The Department of Justice has recommended to EPA that this Federal regulation be revised since it appears to grant states authority to regulate Federal installations in circumstances where the Federal government has not waived sovereign immunity. It would not be appropriate to require compliance with this regulation if it is not constitutionally authorized. EPA will be revising this provision in the future and will review state I/M SIPs with respect to this issue when this