

to at least 16 hours of private office space per month (in addition to certain support services and other requirements), then that customer will not be considered a CMRA customer for postal purposes. We understand that the fees charged by CECs for services that include the right to at least 16 hours per month of private office occupancy will generally significantly exceed the fees charged by CMRAs and will ensure a meaningful distinction between CMRA and CEC customers. However, we were also mindful that the standard not be set too high. We believe that some customers use CECs because they are primarily interested in private office space, rather than CMRA-type services, but only need such space on a limited basis due to the nature of their businesses. We also note that this proposed test is based on private office space being set aside for 16 hours for a specific individual or firm, regardless of the actual hours that the individual or firm occupies the space. A test based on actual occupancy would be difficult to administer and would create a burden on CECs to maintain occupancy records. We have also proposed several other changes to the procedures of the original proposal and made other changes that are not substantive in nature.

During recent discussions, CEC representatives also proposed a change in terminology. They explained that the preferred terminology for their businesses is "office business center" or OBC. The Postal Service is incorporating the request in this NPRM.

Although exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. of 553(b), (c)) regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), the Postal Service invites public comment on the following proposed revisions to the Domestic Mail Manual, incorporated by reference in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 39 CFR Part 111.1.

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: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 3001 3011, 3201–3219, 3403–3406, 3621, 5001.

2. Section D042.2.0 of the Domestic Mail Manual is amended by adding subsection D042.2.8 to read as follows:

D Deposit, Collection, and Delivery
D000 Basic Information

* * * * *

D040 Delivery of Mail

* * * * *

D042 Conditions of Delivery

* * * * *

2.0 DELIVERY TO ADDRESSEE'S AGENT

* * * * *

[Add new 2.8 to read as follows:]

2.8 OBC Acting as a CMRA

The procedures for an office business center (OBC) or part of its operation acting as a commercial mail receiving agency (CMRA) for postal purposes are as follows:

a. An OBC is a business that operates primarily to provide private office facilities and business support services to individuals or firms (customers). OBCs receive single point delivery. OBC customers that receive mail at the OBC address will be considered CMRA customers for postal purposes under the standards set forth in b. Parties considered CMRA customers under this provision must comply with the standards set forth in 2.5 through 2.7. An OBC must register as a CMRA and comply with all other CMRA standards if one or more customers receiving mail through its address is considered a CMRA customer.

b. An OBC customer is considered to be a CMRA customer for postal purposes if its written agreement with the OBC provides for mail service only or mail and other business services (without regard for occupancy or other services that the OBC might provide and bill separately). Additionally, an OBC customer receiving mail at the OBC address is considered to be a CMRA customer for postal purposes if each of the following is true:

(1) The customer's written agreement with the OBC does not provide for the full-time use of one or more of the private offices within the OBC facility; and

(2) The customer's written agreement with the OBC does not provide all of the following:

(A) The use of one or more of the private offices within the OBC facility for at least 16 hours per month;

(B) Full-time receptionists service and live personal telephone answering service during normal business hours and voice mail service after hours;

(C) A listing in the office directory, if available, in the building in which the OBC is located; and

(D) Use of conference rooms and other business services on demand, such as secretarial services, word processing, administrative services, meeting

planning, travel arrangements, and videoconferencing.

c. Notwithstanding any other standards, a customer whose written agreement provides for mail services only or mail and other business support services will not be considered an OBC customer (without regard for occupancy or other services that an OBC may provide and bill for on demand).

d. The Postal Service may request from the OBC copies of written agreements or any other documents or information needed to determine compliance with these standards. Failure to provide requested documents or information may be a basis for suspending delivery service to the OBC under the procedures set forth in 2.6f through h.

* * * * *

An appropriate amendment to 39 CFR 111.3 to reflect this change will be published if the proposal is adopted.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 01–17239 Filed 7–10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[TX–134–4–7503; FRL–7010–8]

Proposed Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Non-Road Large Spark-Ignition Engines; Agreements With Airport Operators and Airlines Regarding Control of Pollution From Ground Support Equipment for the Houston/Galveston Ozone Nonattainment Area (HGA)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve revisions to the Texas State Implementation Plan. This rule making covers two separate actions. We are proposing approval of:

A rule requiring that non-road large spark-ignition engines of 25 horsepower (hp) or larger in all counties of the State of Texas conform to requirements identical to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9; and

Agreements requiring owners and operators at major airports in the HGA to bring about oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emission reductions for sources under their control.

This new rule and the agreements will contribute to attainment of the ozone standard in the HGA. The EPA is

approving these revisions to the Texas SIP to regulate emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (the Act).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before August 10, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Mr. Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), at the EPA Region 6 Office listed below. Copies of documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations.

Anyone wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least two working days in advance.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733. Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, Office of Air Quality, 12124 Park 35 Circle, Austin, Texas 78753.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Diana Hinds, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-7561.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document "we," "us," and "our" refers to EPA.

This document concerns control of air pollution of NO_x for non-road equipment sources in the HGA area and the control measures for attainment demonstration purposes. For further information, please see the Technical Support Document (TSD) prepared for this action.

What Action Are We Taking?

On December 22, 2000, the Governor of Texas submitted to EPA revisions to the 30 TAC, Chapter 114, "Control of Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles," as a revision to the SIP. That submission included requirements that non-road large spark-ignition engines of 25 horsepower (hp) or larger conform to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9; and NO_x reductions from airport Ground Support Equipment (GSE).

Also on December 22, 2000, the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC) withdrew its adopted rule revising 30 TAC Chapter 114, Subchapter I, Division 7 (Houston/Galveston GSE), and substituted agreements with airlines and airport operators in the HGA for equivalent NO_x reductions.

These new rules will contribute to attainment of the ozone standard in the HGA area. The EPA is proposing to

approve these revisions to the Texas SIP to regulate emissions of NO_x in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (the Act).

For more information on the SIP revision, please refer to our TSD.

What Are the Requirements of the December 22, 2000, Texas SIP for non-Road Large Spark-Ignition (LSI) Engines?

Non-road, LSI engines are primarily used to power industrial equipment such as forklifts, generators, pumps, compressors, aerial lifts, sweepers, and large lawn tractors. The engines are similar to automotive engines and can use similar automotive technology, such as closed-loop engine control and three-way catalysts, to reduce emissions.

Texas developed a non-road LSI engine strategy which establishes emission requirements for non-road, LSI engines 25 hp and larger for model year 2004 and subsequent model-year engines, and all equipment and vehicles that use such engines, by requiring non-road LSI engines in all counties in the state to meet emission limits equivalent to, and certified in, a manner identical to 13 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 9.

Although emissions from non-road, LSI engines have not yet been regulated by EPA under section 209(e)(2) of the Act, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has adopted exhaust emission standards for these engines (EPA proposed rules at 65 FR 76797 on December 7, 2000). Section 209(e)(2)(A) of the Act authorizes EPA to approve California regulation of non-road engines other than those used in locomotives, construction and farm equipment. Section 209(e)(2)(B) of the Act allows another state to adopt requirements for non-road engines if such regulations are identical to California's requirements. EPA has promulgated regulations, codified at 40 CFR section 85.1606, setting forth the criteria for adoption of California regulations regarding non-road vehicles and non-road engines. We are proposing that Texas has met the statutory and regulatory requirements for adoption of the California LSI program. All counties in the State are affected by this rule.

What Are the Requirements of the December 22, 2000, Texas SIP for Reduction of Oxides of Nitrogen From Airport Ground-Support Equipment?

On August 25, 2000, Texas proposed rules that required reductions of NO_x emissions of up to 90% of the 1996 contributions attributable to airport GSE from the airports which have the most air carrier operations in the eight county

ozone nonattainment area. Texas withdrew the rule (see 25 TexReg 12639; December 22, 2000), after entering into enforceable agreements with airport owners and operators that brought about equivalent emission reductions. The state signed an Agreed Order with Continental Airlines for its operations at Houston's George Bush Intercontinental Airport on October 18, 2000, and signed a similar Agreed Order with Southwest Airlines for its operations at William Hobby Airport on December 6, 2000. The Agreements made enforceable specific local emission reductions of NO_x from sources under the airlines' control. On October 18, 2000, Texas approved a Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Houston to bring about additional reductions from operations in the Houston Airport System. The sum of these agreed reductions is equal to those reductions imposed in the withdrawn Texas rulemaking package.

The Agreements with Southwest and Continental airlines require that NO_x emissions from mobile or stationary sources under the airlines' control be reduced by an amount equal to 25% of the NO_x emitted from its 1996 GSE fleet by December 31, 2003; 50% by December 31, 2004; and 75% by December 31, 2005. Further, Reasonably Available Control Considering Costs (RACCC), or alternative-fuel and/or electric-powered equipment, will be installed on GSE equipment added to the fleet after 1996; best available technology (BAT) will be utilized for GSE added to the fleet after 2004; and the airlines will assist the State in demonstrating that 75% NO_x reductions, based on emission levels of the 1996 GSE fleet, have been achieved. Plans for the implementation of the NO_x reduction measures are due to the state by May 1, 2002.

The City of Houston's Memorandum of Agreement states that the Houston Airport System will provide 15% NO_x reductions in addition to the 75% NO_x reductions (based on 1996 GSE emission levels) agreed to by Southwest and Continental airlines. The Houston Airport System includes George Bush Intercontinental Airport/Houston, William P. Hobby Airport, Ellington Field, and any other future facility acquired by Houston. By December 31, 2004, Houston agrees to have implemented strategies and achieved agreed reductions. Strategies include consolidation of rental car facilities and common bussing, consolidation of employee parking lot and busses, cleaner busses for the City economy lot, a pilot program for fuel cell technology, and infrastructure support for voluntary

reductions of GSE emissions by various operators in the Houston Airport System. Alternative strategies may be implemented to bring about, or count for, the agreed reductions. A plan to achieve the agreed reductions is due to the state by May 1, 2002.

Texas believes that the NO_x reductions claimed in the HGA Post-99 Rate-of-Progress/Attainment SIP will be achieved through these Agreements as alternate but equally enforceable mechanisms. These measures will contribute to the attainment and maintenance of the one-hour ozone standard in the HGA.

For additional information concerning these rule revisions, please refer to our TSD.

What Areas in Texas Will These Actions Affect?

The Non-Road LSI rule affects all Texas counties. The agreements concerning NO_x reductions from GSE affect airports in the HGA area.

Proposed Action

We are proposing approval of two rules: Requirements for Non-Road Large Spark-Ignition Engines, and specified NO_x reduction agreements with airlines and airport operators in the Houston-Galveston ozone nonattainment area.

Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. This proposed action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4). This rule also does not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), nor

will it 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 the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it merely approves a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this proposed rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the executive order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Motor vehicle pollution, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Reporting and record keeping.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: June 26, 2001.

Jerry Clifford,

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 01-17336 Filed 7-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 63

[FRL-7009-5]

Approval of Section 112(l) Program of Delegation; Ohio

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing approval of a request for delegation of the Federal air toxics program. The State's mechanism of delegation involves the straight delegation of all existing and future section 112 standards unchanged from the Federal standards. The actual delegation of authority of individual standards, except standards addressed specifically in this action, will occur through a mechanism set forth in a memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and EPA. This request for approval of a mechanism of delegation encompasses all Part 70 and non-Part 70 sources subject to a section 112 standard with the exception of the Coke Oven standard.

In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's request as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for approving the State's request is set forth in the direct final rule. The direct final rule will become effective without further notice unless the Agency receives relevant adverse written comment on this action. Should the Agency receive such comment, it will publish a final rule informing the public that the direct final rule will not take effect and such public comment received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. If no adverse written comments are received, the direct final rule will take effect on the date stated in that document and no further activity will be taken on this proposed rule. EPA does not plan to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before August 10, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Pamela Blakley, Chief, Permits and Grants Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S.