

27°12'04.584" N, 80°15'41.437" W; thence to 27°11'49.005" N, 80°15'44.796" W; thence to 27°11'47.881" N, 80°15'38.271" W; thence to 27°11'46.82" N, 80°15'37.9647" W; thence to 27°11'43.49" N, 80°15'40.74" W; thence to 27°11'40.44" N, 80°15'44.64" W; thence to 27°11'41.40" N, 80°15'47.70" W; thence to 27°11'42.51" N, 80°15'49.36" W; thence to 27°11'47.99" N, 80°15'44.78" W; thence to the point of beginning. All coordinates reference Datum NAD:83.

Dated: July 22, 2003.
H.E. Johnson, Jr.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.
[FR Doc. 03-19647 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

Destination Delivery Unit Rate Bound Printed Matter Mailer Requirements for Entry

AGENCY: Postal Service.
ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service™ proposes a revision to the *Domestic Mail Manual* (DMM) that would change the preparation requirements for bulk Bound Printed Matter (BPM) by requiring mailers to prepare destination delivery unit (DDU) rate BPM items by 5-digit scheme (optional) and 5-digit sorts. Currently, there is no requirement for mailers to unload and present bulk BPM mail by 5-digit sorts, as is the requirement for Parcel Select™ mailings prepared for the DDU rate. DMM E752.5.2 inadvertently omitted this requirement from the final ruling. All costing documentation and assumptions for this particular category of mail were based on the requirement that mailers would unload the drop shipment and, in multiple ZIP Code delivery units, separate the BPM items by 5-digit bundles. Specifically, separation by 5-digit ZIP Code or optional 5-digit scheme would be required for bedloaded packages, sacks, pallets, and pallet boxes containing a mixture of 5-digit ZIP Code packages destined for a specific delivery unit. **DATES:** Submit comments on or before September 2, 2003. **ADDRESSES:** Mail or deliver written comments to the Manager, Mailing Standards, U.S. Postal Service, 1735 N. Lynn St., Room 3025, Arlington, VA 22209-6038. Copies of all written

comments will be available for inspection and photocopying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the Postal Service Headquarters Library, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., 11th Floor North, Washington, DC. Comments may also be submitted via fax to 202-268-5293, ATTN: Daniel Leonard. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dan Leonard at 202-268-4656. **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Current Postal Service standards for preparation of DDU rate mail for Package Services Destination Entry, prepared by 5-digit or 5-digit schemes, require parcels to be separated by 5-digit for DDU entry, upon request. The requirement for vehicle unloading of Parcel Select DDU drop shipments is in DMM E751.4.10c. This requirement was inadvertently missing from the requirements for DDU rate BPM mailings when they were published in *Postal Bulletin* 22039a (12-21-00, page 12). Both Parcel Select and BPM are subclasses of Package Services mail. The processing and handling costs and the need for separation by 5-digit ZIP Codes is the same for both at the delivery unit. If the mail is not separated by the driver into 5-digit containers provided by Postal Service employees, then the Postal Service will be forced to absorb the directly attributable costs associated with processing and handling this category of Package Services mail, which will raise costs in the future.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111
Postal Service.

PART 111—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 111 continues to read as follows:
Authority: U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 3001-3011, 3201-3219, 3403-3406, 3621, 3626, 5001.

2. Revise the following section of the DMM as set forth below:

Domestic Mail Manual (DMM)

* * * * *

E Eligibility

* * * * *

E700 Package Services

* * * * *

E750 Destination Entry

* * * * *

E752 Bound Printed Matter

* * * * *

6.0 Deposit

* * * * *

6.9 Vehicle Unloading
Uploading of destination entry mailings is subject to these conditions:
* * * * *
[Revise the last sentence of item c to read as follows:]
* * * The driver may be required to place bedloaded packages, pieces, sacks, and the contents of mixed 5-digit pallets in containers provided by the delivery unit in order to maintain separation by 5-digit ZIP Codes or to place containerized mail so as to maintain the separation of 5-digit ZIP Codes.
* * * * *

Stanley F. Mires,
Chief Counsel, Legislative.
[FR Doc. 03-19553 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-7528-6]

Idaho: Proposed Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Idaho has applied to EPA for final authorization of certain changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). EPA has reviewed Idaho's application, has preliminarily determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for final authorization, and is proposing to authorize the state's changes. **DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by September 15, 2003. **ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals (WCM-122), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle, Washington 98101. You can view and copy Idaho's application during normal business hours at the following addresses: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals, 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle, Washington, contact: Jeff Hunt, phone number: (206) 553-0256; or Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, 1410 N. Hilton, Boise, Idaho, contact: John Brueck, phone number (208) 373-0458. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Hunt, U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency Region 10, Office of Waste and Chemicals (WCM-122), 1200 Sixth Ave, Seattle, Washington 98101, phone number: (206) 553-0256.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?

States which have received final authorization from EPA under RCRA section 3006(b), 42 U.S.C. 6926(b), must maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the federal program. As the federal program changes, states must change their programs and ask EPA to authorize the changes. Changes to state programs may be necessary when federal or state statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, states must change their programs because of changes to EPA's regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 124, 260 through 266, 268, 270, 273 and 279.

B. What Preliminary Decisions Have We Made in This Rule?

EPA has preliminarily determined that Idaho's application to revise its authorized program meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established by RCRA. Therefore, we are proposing to grant Idaho final authorization to operate its hazardous waste program with the changes described in the authorization application. Idaho will have responsibility for permitting Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs) within its borders (except in Indian country) and for carrying out the aspects of the RCRA program described in its revised program application, subject to the limitations of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). New federal requirements and prohibitions imposed by federal regulations that EPA promulgates under the authority of HSWA take effect in authorized states before the states are authorized for the requirements. Thus, EPA will implement those requirements and prohibitions in Idaho, including issuing permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so.

C. What Will Be the Effect if Idaho Is Authorized for These Changes?

If Idaho is authorized for these changes, a facility in Idaho subject to RCRA will have to comply with the authorized State requirements in lieu of the corresponding federal requirements in order to comply with RCRA. Additionally, such persons will have to comply with any applicable federally-issued requirements, such as, for

example, HSWA regulations issued by EPA for which the State has not received authorization, and RCRA requirements that are not supplanted by authorized State-issued requirements. Idaho continues to have enforcement responsibilities under its state hazardous waste management program for violations of such program, but EPA retains its authority under RCRA sections 3007, 3008, 3013, and 7003, which include, among others, the authority to:

- Conduct inspections; require monitoring, tests, analyses or reports;
- Enforce RCRA requirements; suspend or revoke permits; and
- Take enforcement actions regardless of whether the State has taken its own actions.

The action to approve these revisions would not impose additional requirements on the regulated community because the regulations for which Idaho will be authorized are already effective under State law and are not changed by the act of authorization.

D. What Happens If EPA Receives Comments That Oppose This Action?

If EPA receives comments that oppose this authorization, we will address those comments in a later final rule. You may not have another opportunity to comment. If you want to comment on this authorization, you must do so at this time.

E. What Has Idaho Previously Been Authorized for?

Idaho initially received final authorization on March 26, 1990, effective April 9, 1990 (55 FR 11015) to implement the RCRA hazardous waste management program. EPA granted authorization for changes to their program on April 6, 1992, effective June 5, 1992 (57 FR 11580), June 11, 1992, effective August 10, 1992 (57 FR 24757), April 12, 1995, effective June 11, 1995 (60 FR 18549), October 21, 1998, effective January 19, 1999 (63 FR 56086), and July 1, 2001, effective July 1, 2001 (67 FR 44069).

F. What Changes Are We Proposing?

On June 6, 2003, Idaho submitted a complete program revision application, seeking authorization for all delegable federal hazardous waste regulations codified as of July 1, 2001, as incorporated by reference in IDAPA 58.01.05.(002)-(016) and 58.01.05.997, except specific portions of the post closure rule noted in the paragraphs below ¹. We have preliminarily

determined that Idaho's hazardous waste program revision satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization, and EPA is proposing to authorize the state's changes.

In this program revision application, Idaho is seeking partial authorization of the Post Closure Rule promulgated on October 22, 1998 (63 FR 56710). Idaho is not seeking authorization for 40 CFR 270.1(c)(7), Enforceable documents for post-closure care, 40 CFR 265.121 Post-closure requirements for facilities that obtain enforceable documents in lieu of post-closure permits, 40 CFR 265.110(c), and 40 CFR 265.118(c)(4). These provisions are described in the rule preamble at 63 FR 56712 section a. Post-closure care under alternatives to permits. Idaho is seeking authorization for 40 CFR 264.90(f), 264.110(c), 264.140(d), 265.90(f), 265.110(d), and 265.140(d), as described in the rule preamble at 63 FR 56713, b. Remediation requirements for land-based units with releases to the environment. Idaho is also seeking authorization of 40 CFR 270.28, as described in the rule preamble at 63 FR 56713, c. Post-closure permit information submission requirements.

Idaho is seeking authorization for 40 CFR 264.90(e), 264.90(f), 264.110(c), 264.112(b)(8), 264.112(c)(2)(iv), 264.118(b)(4), 264.118(d)(2)(iv), 264.140(d), 265.90(f), 265.110(d), 265.112(b)(8), 265.118(c)(5), 265.140(d), 270.1(c) introduction, and 270.28, except where those sections reference the use of enforceable documents. Idaho does not seek authorization for language in those sections which states as follows: “* * * or in an enforceable document (as defined in 270.1(c)(7).”

G. Who Handles Permits After the Authorization Takes Effect?

Idaho will issue permits for all the provisions for which it is authorized and will administer the permits it issues. All permits issued by EPA prior to EPA authorizing Idaho for these revisions will continue in force until the effective date of the State's issuance or denial of a State RCRA permit, or until the permit otherwise expires or is revoked. However, EPA will administer any RCRA hazardous waste permits or portions of permits which EPA issued prior to the effective date of this authorization and until such time as Idaho's is effective and EPA's has expired. EPA will not issue any more

¹ Sections are 40 CFR part 262, subparts, E, F, & H; 40 CFR 268.5; 40 CFR 268.42(b); 40 CFR 268.44(a)-(g); and 40 CFR 268.6. Authority for implementing the provisions contained in these sections remains with EPA.

¹ Sections of the Federal hazardous waste program are not delegable to the states. These

new permits or new portions of permits for provisions for which Idaho is authorized after the effective date of this authorization. EPA will continue to implement and issue permits for HSWA requirements for which Idaho is not yet authorized.

H. What Is Codification and Is EPA Codifying Idaho's Hazardous Waste Program as Authorized in This Rule?

Codification is the process of placing the State's statutes and regulations that comprise the State's authorized hazardous waste program into the Code of Federal Regulations. We do this by referencing the authorized State rules in 40 CFR part 272. Through three codification actions dated December 6, 1990 (55 FR 50327), June 11, 1992 (57 FR 24757), and June 25, 1999 (64 FR 34180) the EPA codified at 40 CFR part 272, subpart N all authorization actions for the State of Idaho RCRA program, except the most recent authorization revision published on July 1, 2001.

We reserve the amendment of 40 CFR part 272, subpart N for this authorization of Idaho's program changes until a later date.

I. How Would Authorizing Idaho for These Revisions Affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. 1151) in Idaho?

Idaho is not authorized to carry out its hazardous waste program in Indian country, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. Indian country includes:

1. All lands within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations within or abutting the State of Idaho;
2. Any land held in trust by the U.S. for an Indian tribe; and
3. Any other land, whether on or off an Indian reservation that qualifies as Indian country. Therefore, this action has no effect on Indian country. EPA retains the authority to implement and administer the RCRA program in Indian country.

J. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

1. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant," and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely affect in a material way, the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or

safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs, or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order. It has been determined that this proposed Rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of Executive Order 12866 and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

2. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*, is intended to minimize the reporting and recordkeeping burden on the regulated community, as well as to minimize the cost of Federal information collection and dissemination. In general, the Act requires that information requests and record-keeping requirements affecting ten or more non-Federal respondents be approved by OPM. Since the proposed Rule does not establish or modify any information or recordkeeping requirements for the regulated community, it is not subject to the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

3. Regulatory Flexibility

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, generally requires federal agencies to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions. For purposes of assessing the impacts of today's rule on small entities, small entity is defined as: (1) A small business, as codified in the Small Business Size Regulations at 13 CFR part 121; (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government of a city, county, town, school district or special district with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently owned and operated and is not dominant in its field. EPA has determined that this action will not

have a significant impact on small entities because the proposed Rule will only have the effect of authorizing pre-existing requirements under State law. After considering the economic impacts of today's proposed rule, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We continue to be interested in the potential impacts of the proposed rule on small entities and welcome comments on issues related to such impacts.

4. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4) establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures to State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any year. Before promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why the alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

This proposed rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. The proposed rule authorizes pre-existing requirements

under State law and imposes no new enforceable duty on any State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. Similarly, EPA has also determined that this proposed rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small government entities. Thus, the requirements of section 203 of the UMRA do not apply to this rule.

5. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among various levels of government."

This proposed rule does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132. This proposed rule only authorizes existing State rules as part of the State RCRA hazardous waste program.

6. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

Executive Order 13175, entitled "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications." This proposed rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175. The rule proposes to authorize existing state rules and does not establish any regulatory policy with tribal implications. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this proposed rule. EPA specifically solicits additional comment on this proposed rule from tribal officials.

7. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks

Executive Order 13045 applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be

"economically significant" as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not economically significant as defined in Executive Order 12866 and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this proposed action present a disproportionate risk to children.

8. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations that Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a "significant regulatory action" as defined under Executive Order 12866.

9. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 ("NTAA"), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus bodies. The NTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through the OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards. This proposed rulemaking does not involve "technical standards" as defined by the NTAA. Therefore, EPA is not considering the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous materials transportation, Hazardous waste, Indians-lands, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties,

Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: This proposed action is issued under the authority of sections 2002(a), 3006 and 7004(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act as amended 42 U.S.C. 6912(a), 6926, 6974(b).

Dated: July 9, 2003.

Ronald Kreizenbeck,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 03-18738 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

41 CFR Parts 51-3 and 51-4

Miscellaneous Amendments to Committee Regulations

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Committee is proposing to change the dates by which the annual certifications by participating nonprofit agencies are due to the central nonprofit agencies and the Committee.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 2, 2003.

ADDRESS: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Jefferson Plaza 2, Suite 10800, 1421 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3259.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: G. John Heyer (703) 603-0665. Copies of this notice will be made available on request in computer diskette format.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Committee is proposing to revise 41 CFR 51-3.2(m) and 51-4.3(a) to change the dates on which the Annual Certifications (Committee Form 403 or 404) submitted at the end of each Federal fiscal year by nonprofit agencies participating in the Committee's program are due to the central nonprofit agencies and the Committee. The purpose of this change is to ensure that the data is received in a more timely manner than is currently the case. The Committee is proposing to change the date the certification forms are due to the central nonprofit agencies from November 15 of each year to November 1, and the date the forms are due to the Committee from December 15 to December 1.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify that this proposed revision of the Committee regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a