

quantifying both costs and benefits, reducing costs, harmonizing rules, and promoting flexibility. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

VA's impact analysis can be found as a supporting document at <http://www.regulations.gov>, usually within 48 hours after the rulemaking document is published. Additionally, a copy of the rulemaking and its Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) are available on VA's website at <http://www.va.gov/orpm/>, by following the link for "VA Regulations Published From FY 2004 Through Fiscal Year to Date."

#### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

This proposed rule contains no provisions constituting a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521).

#### *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Secretary certifies that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612. There are no small entities involved with the process and/or benefits associated with this rulemaking. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604 do not apply.

#### *Unfunded Mandates*

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires, at 2 U.S.C. 1532, that agencies prepare an assessment of anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any rule that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year. This proposed rule would have no such effect on State, local, and tribal governments, or on the private sector.

#### *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance*

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance numbers and titles for the programs affected by this document are 64.100, Automobiles and Adaptive Equipment for Certain Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces; 64.101, Burial Expenses Allowance for Veterans; 64.104, Pension for Non-Service-Connected Disability for Veterans; 64.105, Pension to Veterans Surviving Spouses, and Children; 64.106, Specially Adapted

Housing for Disabled Veterans; 64.109, Veterans Compensation for Service-Connected Disability; and 64.110, Veterans Dependency and Indemnity Compensation for Service-Connected Death.

#### **List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 3**

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Disability benefits, Health care, Pensions, Veterans.

*Signing Authority:* Denis McDonough, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, approved this document on March 12, 2021, and authorized the undersigned to sign and submit the document to the Office of the Federal Register for publication electronically as an official document of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### **Jeffrey M. Martin,**

*Assistant Director, Office of Regulation Policy & Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, VA proposes to amend 38 CFR part 3 as follows:

#### **PART 3—ADJUDICATION**

- 1. The authority citation for part 3, subpart A, continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 38 U.S.C. 501(a), unless otherwise noted.

- 2. Revise 38 CFR 3.203(a)(1) to read as follows:

#### **§ 3.203 Service records as evidence of service and character of discharge.**

(a) \* \* \*

(1) The evidence is a document issued by the service department. A copy of an original document is acceptable if:

(i) The copy was issued by the service department; or

(ii) The copy was issued by a public custodian of records who certifies that it is a true and exact copy of the document in the custodian's custody; or

(iii) The copy was submitted by an accredited agent, attorney or service organization representative who has successfully completed VA-prescribed training on military records, and who certifies that it is a true and exact copy of either an original document or of a copy issued by the service department or a public custodian of records; or

(iv) The Department of Veterans Affairs is satisfied that an otherwise uncertified copy submitted by the claimant or by the claimant's representative is free from alteration; and

\* \* \* \* \*

(Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501(a))

[FR Doc. 2021–06535 Filed 3–31–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8320–01–P**

## **POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **39 CFR Part 3050**

[Docket No. RM2021–4; Order No. 5852]

#### **Periodic Reporting**

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is acknowledging a recent filing requesting the Commission initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to analytical principles relating to periodic reports (Proposal Two). This document informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* May 14, 2021.

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. Introduction
- II. Proposal Two
- III. Notice and Comment
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### **I. Introduction**

On March 24, 2021, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting that the Commission initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to analytical principles relating to periodic reports.<sup>1</sup> The Petition identifies the proposed analytical changes filed in this docket as Proposal Two.

#### **II. Proposal Two**

*Background.* To estimate costs avoided by mailer presort activities for First-Class Mail letters, a workshare model is developed and filed each year as part of the Postal Service's Annual Compliance Report (ACR). Petition, Proposal Two at 1. Mail processing flow is "modeled by rate category, and the activities involved are assigned costs based on the appropriate wage rate, productivity, and related indirect (*i.e.*

<sup>1</sup> Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposal Two), March 24, 2021 (Petition).

“piggyback”) costs of each operation.” *Id.* The resulting costs are called “directly modeled” costs. *Id.* Mail processing costs are separately calculated as part of the Cost and Revenue Analysis (CRA) Report using In-Office Cost System (IOCS) data for the same activities at the product level, or within the same cost pools. *Id.* However, the “directly modeled” costs can differ from those calculated as part of the CRA Report for several reasons.<sup>2</sup> As a result, the “CRA Adjustment Factor” was developed in order to “calibrate the model and ‘true-up’ the modeled costs to the costs reported in the CRA Report,” using the following equation:<sup>3</sup>

$$\text{MailProcUnitCost}_i = \text{ModelUnitCost}_i * \text{CRAAdjustmentFactor} + \text{FixedUnitCost}$$

The Postal Service notes that, under the current methodology, “cost pools that are directly modeled are treated as proportional, cost pools that are operationally determined to be unrelated to workshare are treated as fixed, and the remaining cost pools are treated as partly proportional.” Petition, Proposal Two at 3. It further notes that, for the last group of cost pools, “unit costs are divided into proportional and fixed components based on costs in the directly assigned cost pools.” *Id.*

The Postal Service indicates that, in the years since the methodology described above was first established, “the structure of cost pools has been configured to better align with operational practice, enhancing the ability to conduct operational analysis of cost pools.” *Id.* The Postal Service further indicates that, “[w]ith these developments in data availability, the current methodology for calibrating the [cost avoidance] models to CRA costs is in need of refinement.” *Id.*

*Proposal.* With Proposal Two, the Postal Service seeks to “revise cost pool classifications for the determination of the proportional and fixed adjustment to modeled costs” and “update the cost pool classification vocabulary to better reflect how the cost pools are treated in the calibration methodology.” *Id.* at 4. The Postal Service proposes three new cost pool classifications: “Modeled/Proportional Pools,” “Unrelated to

Presort” and “Correlated with Presort.” *Id.*

“Modeled/Proportional Pools” include “cost pools where the mailflow model directly characterizes the flow of mail through the pools and measures the cost of the component activities.” *Id.* at 5. “Unrelated to Presort” include cost pools where the “activities performed are incurred because of piece characteristics unrelated to presort and thus the costs are invariant to presort, and pools where the costs have spurious correlation with presort.” *Id.* at 6. “Correlated with Presort” include cost pools that are generally associated with non-piece sorting allied labor and support operations. *Id.* at 8. The Postal Service notes that “Correlated with Presort” cost pools may include costs that are “partly avoidable with a greater degree of presorting, but not directly proportional to modeled piece costs.” *Id.*

Finally, the Postal Service notes that the model would be modified in one additional way. The Postal Service indicates that costs associated with the distribution of mailpieces to P.O. Boxes will no longer be included as part of the model. *Id.* at 10. It describes subsequent “costing enhancements” that have eliminated the need to model these costs, which it states are “explicitly measured” as part of the ACR. *Id.* at 10–11.

*Impact.* Under the Postal Service’s proposed methodology, avoided costs and passthroughs associated with First-Class Mail letters would be affected. Those effects are presented in Table 3 of the proposal. *See id.* at 14.

### III. Notice and Comment

The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2021–4 for consideration of matters raised by the Petition. More information on the Petition may be accessed via the Commission’s website at <http://www.prc.gov>. Interested persons may submit comments on the Petition and Proposal Two no later than May 14, 2021. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Katalin K. Clendenin is designated as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

### IV. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2021–4 for consideration of the matters raised by the Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposal Two), filed March 24, 2021.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than May 14, 2021.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Katalin K. Clendenin to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

**Erica A. Barker,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2021–06633 Filed 3–31–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R08–OAR–2021–0002; FRL–10021–88–Region 8]

### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules; Regional Haze

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a revision to the North Dakota State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted by the State of North Dakota on November 11, 2016 and supplemented on March 15, 2021, that addresses amendments to the regional haze provisions of the North Dakota Administrative Code (NDAC). These revisions were submitted to remove certain regional haze requirements related to Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) in the first planning period. EPA is also proposing to approve a revision to the North Dakota SIP submitted on August 3, 2020, that addresses additional amendments to the regional haze provisions of the NDAC. The 2020 SIP revision was submitted to update the incorporation by reference date for regional haze definitions, add emission reduction requirements to make reasonable progress during the second and subsequent regional haze planning periods, and revise the regional haze monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements to be applicable under the second and subsequent planning period. EPA is taking this action pursuant to section 110 and Part C of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* The Postal Service notes that CRA costs are not only subject to sampling variation, but the data used to calculate costs for the CRA Report capture additionally incurred costs from activities that cannot be directly modeled. *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *See id.* at 1–2. The CRA Adjustment Factor was initially developed in Docket No. R2006–1. *Id.* at 2–3; *see generally* Docket No. R2006–1, Opinion and Recommended Decision, Volume 1, February 26, 2007.