

authority in regulation to inform the public of reimbursement amounts, application procedures, and standards for the caskets or urns. These statutory provisions became effective on January 10, 2014, one year after the enactment date of the law. Accordingly, we are providing a 30-day comment period for the public to comment on the proposed rule.

#### Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance program number and title for this proposed rule are 64.201, National Cemeteries.

#### Signing Authority

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or designee, approved this document 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. Jose D. Riojas, Chief of Staff, approved this document on June 13, 2014, for publication.

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

Administrative practice and procedure, Cemeteries, Veterans.

Dated: June 27, 2014.

**William F. Russo,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Regulation Policy & Management, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.*

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Department of Veterans Affairs proposes to amend 38 CFR part 38 as set forth below:

#### PART 38—NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 38 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 38 U.S.C. 107, 501, 512, 2306, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2408, 2411, 7105.

■ 2. Add § 38.628 to read as follows:

#### § 38.628. Reimbursement for caskets and urns for unclaimed remains of Veterans.

(a) VA will reimburse any individual or entity for the actual cost of a casket or an urn, purchased by the individual or entity for the burial in a national cemetery of an eligible veteran who died on or after January 10, 2014, for whom VA:

(1) Is unable to identify the veteran's next-of-kin; and

(2) Determines that sufficient resources are otherwise unavailable to furnish the casket or urn.

(b) An individual or entity may request reimbursement from VA under

paragraph (a) of this section by completing and submitting VA Form 40–10088, and supporting documentation, in accordance with the instructions on the form. Prior to approving reimbursement VA must find all of the following:

(1) The veteran is eligible for burial in a VA national cemetery;

(2) The individual or entity has certified that they cannot identify the veteran's next-of-kin, and VA's records do not identify a next-of-kin;

(3) The individual or entity has certified that, to the best of their knowledge, sufficient resources are otherwise unavailable to furnish the casket or urn, and VA's records do not indicate such resources;

(4) The invoice presented by the individual or entity clearly indicates the purchase price of the casket or urn purchased by the individual or entity; and

(5) The invoice presented by the individual or entity contains information sufficient for VA to determine, in conjunction with a visual inspection, that the casket or urn meets the following minimum standards:

(i) Caskets must be of 20-gauge metal construction, designed for containing human remains, sufficient to contain the remains of the deceased veteran, include a gasketed seal, and include external fixed rails or swing arm handles.

(ii) Urns must be of durable plastic construction, with a secure closure to contain the cremated remains, and must be designed for containing cremated human remains.

(c) Reimbursement under paragraph (a) of this section will not exceed the average cost of a casket or urn for the fiscal year preceding the calendar year of purchase, as determined by VA and published annually in the **Federal Register**.

(d) If, before July 2, 2014, an individual or entity purchased a casket or urn for burial in a VA national cemetery of the remains of a veteran who died after January 10, 2014, and the burial receptacle is not at least a 20-gauge metal casket or a durable plastic urn, VA will reimburse the purchase price of the burial receptacle, providing all other criteria in this regulation are met. The reimbursement amount will be subject to the maximum reimbursement amount calculated for 2014.

(Authority: 38 U.S.C. 2306, 2402, 2411)

[FR Doc. 2014–15531 Filed 7–1–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8320–01–P**

#### POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### 39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2014–6; Order No. 2103]

#### Periodic Reporting

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Petition for rulemaking; acceptance.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing concerning the initiation of a proceeding to consider proposed changes in analytical principles (Proposals Three through Eight). This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* July 28, 2014. *Reply comments are due:* August 12, 2014.

**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. Summary of Proposals
- III. Notice and Opportunity for Comment
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

On June 20, 2014, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting that the Commission initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to six analytical methods for use in periodic reporting.<sup>1</sup> The Petition identifies the proposed analytical method changes filed in this docket as Proposals Three through Eight. Petition at 1.

#### II. Summary of Proposals

##### A. Proposal Three: Revision to Parcel Return Service Full Network Cost Model

The Postal Service proposes a change in modeling transportation costs for Parcel Return Service (PRS) Contract 4.

<sup>1</sup> Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposals Three Through Eight), June 20, 2014 (Petition). The Petition was accompanied by public and nonpublic Excel files. With respect to Proposal Six; *see also* Docket No. RM2011–3, Notice of the United States Postal Service of Filing Proposal to Update Highway Variabilities, June 20, 2014.

Petition, Proposal Three at 1. The model currently uses Parcel Select non-presort model transportation costs as a proxy. The Postal Service states that this was deemed appropriate since, at the time the PRS Contract 4 was filed, the average size and cube of Parcel Select Non-presort was approximately equivalent to the partner pieces. *Id.* However, the Postal Service asserts that the characteristics of the Parcel Select Non-presort pieces have changed substantially since the cost model was developed. *Id.* In particular, it states that the average weight of a Parcel Select Non-presort piece has increased, whereas the average PRS contract piece remained much lighter. The Postal Service therefore proposes an adjustment to the transportation cost for the contract pieces to account for the difference in their size vis-à-vis FY2013 Parcel Select Non-presort pieces. *Id.* It states that if this proposal were adopted, the FY 2013 cost coverage for PRS Contract 4 would increase from below 100 percent (as reported in the FY2013 ACR) to above 100 percent. *Id.* at 2.

*B. Proposal Four: Proposed Change in International Mail Costing Methodology*

The Postal Service proposes to revise the costing methodology of the non-Negotiated Service Agreement (NSA) portion of International Priority Mail (IPA) and International Surface Airlift (ISAL) (the IPA and ISAL published rates). Petition, Proposal Four at 1. The proposal stems from cost coverage and costing concerns raised in the FY 2013 ACD. *Id.* The Postal Service's proposed solution to these concerns is to adjust how NSA costs are developed for application to the NSA data in the "ICM Costing Module." *Id.* at 4. The Postal Service explains that pricing group costs by product are developed in the reporting section of the ICRA and then staged for use in the ICM Costing Module. *Id.* It states that this staging has been based on unitizing settlement and transportation costs by gross weight (as that is the basis for costing in the ICRA), but describes how procedures using net weight can be employed. *Id.* at 4–5. For consistency, the Postal Service proposes that the same type of staging based on net weights be applied to ePackets, PMI parcels and PMI envelopes, which also have differences in the costing system between gross and net weight.<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 5. The Postal Service further proposes that the allocation of NSA data to the four country groupings (Canada, Mexico, Universal Postal Union (UPU) Target countries and UPU Transition countries)

be discontinued and that competitive pages A–3, A–4, B–3 and B–4 be discontinued from the ICRA reporting. *Id.*

*C. Proposal Five: Proposed Change in PRIME Express Costing Methodology*

The Postal Service proposes to revise the costing methodology underlying its response to USPS–ACR–FY13, Chairman's Information Request No. 3, question 8 and implemented by the Commission in PRC–ACR2013–NP–LR1 Imputed ICRA and PRC–ACR2013–NP–LR1 Booked files. Petition, Proposal Five at 1. The Postal Service states that this revision affects both the Booked and Imputed version of Postal Service's Reports files. *Id.* The proposal is based on the Postal Service's conclusion that the PRIME adjustment incorporated in the referenced Excel files is not correct. *Id.* at 2. The proposed remedy is to subtract the Express amounts, except volume, from the appropriate Target or Transition Countries. *Id.*

The Postal Service further observes that two separate products are associated with each PRIME mailpiece: the Express product and the Inbound Single-Piece First-Class Mail product. *Id.* at 3. Its proposal includes reporting the two products separately by using a methodology similar to treating the Express product as if it were a special service. *Id.* To avoid double counting, the reporting totals would not include the special service volumes because those pieces are included with the mailpiece (also called the host mail-piece or parent product). *Id.* at 3–4.

*D. Proposal Six: Updating the Highway Transportation Variabilities*

The Postal Service proposes to update the variabilities used to determine the levels of attribution for purchased highway transportation expenses in Cost Segment 14.<sup>3</sup> *Id.* It states that the unit of analysis is the contract cost segment, not the contract. *Id.* It also states that as in previous analyses of purchased highway transportation, a translog functional form was used to estimate the relevant equations; describes other steps; and presents several supporting tables. *Id.* at 2–5.

*E. Proposal Seven: Modification of the Standard Mail Destination Entry Cost Model and the Standard Mail Parcel Mail Processing Cost Model*

The Postal Service proposes to modify the Standard Mail destination entry cost

model and the Standard Mail parcel mail processing cost model. Petition, Proposal Seven at 1.

*Standard Mail destination entry cost model* (USPS–FY13–13). For this model, the Postal Service proposes: (1) Consolidating three EXCEL workbooks (letters, flats, and parcels/total) into one workbook; (2) correcting two errors;<sup>4</sup> (3) removing obsolete operations and input data; (4) incorporating more recent productivity data; and (5) adding a new parcel mail characteristics profile to the model to separately estimate parcel cost avoidance values.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 1–2.

*Standard Mail parcel mail processing cost model* (USPS–FY13–12). The Postal Service proposes to add a worksheet to the Standard Mail parcel mail processing cost model. It states that this would allow the Standard Mail parcel arrival profile and volume data to be presented in a format similar to the mail characteristics profiles for Standard Mail letters and flats.<sup>6</sup> *Id.* The Postal Service states that this modification does not affect the USPS–FY13–12 price category cost estimates in any way. *Id.* The parcel mail characteristics profile will then be used each fiscal year to estimate the non-transportation costs for Standard Mail parcels in the USPS–FY13–13 Standard Mail destination entry cost model (discussed above). *Id.*

*F. Proposal Eight: Changes in Attributable Costs Related to USPS Tracking*

The Postal Service proposes changes in the methodology for attributing costs related to Other Ancillary Services, such as USPS Tracking (formerly Delivery Confirmation), which are provided for certain shipping products at no extra charge. Petition, Proposal Eight at 1. The Postal Service also proposes additional changes to the methodology for attributing costs for paid USPS Tracking. It asserts these changes reflect the evolution of postal operations and take advantage of the availability of census data. *Id.*

Specifically, the Postal Service proposes using data from the Point of Service (POS) to assign window

<sup>4</sup> One error concerns certain entries for Basic Carrier Route volume and weight data by shape in USPS–FY13–13. *Id.* at 3. The other concerns the input value representing the number of letters (in trays) that a pallet contains. The Postal Service states that the average pallet contained 6,653 letters in FY 2013. *Id.* It proposes incorporating this statistic into the mail characteristics file (USPS–FY13–14) in the future and relying upon it to estimate the letters non-transportation costs. *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> The proposed Standard Mail destination entry cost model is contained in the file PROP.7.USPS–FY13–13.xlsx. *Id.* at 2.

<sup>6</sup> The proposed Standard Mail parcels mail processing cost model is contained in the file PROP.7.USPS–FY13–12.xlsx. *Id.*

<sup>2</sup> The reference costing system is System for International Revenue and Volume Outbound.

<sup>3</sup> The Postal Service states that it provides a more complete discussion in public folder USPS–RM2014–6/1, along with the complete data set and econometric results, plus all necessary documentation. Petition, Proposal Six at 1.

acceptance costs appropriately between the paid USPS Tracking Service and the host pieces. This entails attributing costs related to final, en-route and non-window acceptance scans to the host product, not to the USPS Tracking Service, and performing the calculations in the B workpapers rather than making a D report adjustment. This means the cost model for USPS Tracking in NP26 will no longer be needed for the D report adjustment. *Id.* at 2. In addition, in the In-Office Cost System, the percentage of volume from the POS retail system that was paid for the extra service to attribute costs to USPS Tracking will be used for window-related acceptance costs. *Id.*

### III. Notice and Opportunity for Comment

The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2014–6 for consideration of matters raised by the Petition. Additional information concerning the Petition may be accessed via the Commission's Web site at <http://www.prc.gov>. Interested persons may submit comments on the Petition and Proposals Three through Eight no later than July 28, 2014. Reply comments are due no later than August 12, 2014. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Tracy N. Ferguson is designated as 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. RM2014–6 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 (Proposals Three Through Eight), filed June 20, 2014.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than July 28, 2014. Reply comments are due no later than August 12, 2014.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Tracy N. Ferguson 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.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–15452 Filed 7–1–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 13

[FRL–9910–13–OCFO]

### Administrative Wage Garnishment

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to amend EPA's claims collection standards to include administrative wage garnishment. This rule amends the EPA's debt collection regulations to implement the administrative wage garnishment (AWG) provisions of the Debt Collection Act of 1982, as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (DCIA). The proposed rule will allow the EPA to garnish non-Federal wages to collect delinquent non-tax debts owed the United States without first obtaining a court order. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register** we are approving an amendment to EPA's regulations on claims collection standards by using administrative wage garnishment as a direct final rule without a prior proposed rule. If we receive no adverse comment, the direct final rule will go into effect and we will not take further action on this proposed rule.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by August 1, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments by one of the following methods:

1. *Email:* [jones.anita@epa.gov](mailto:jones.anita@epa.gov).

2. *Fax:* (202) 565–2585.

3. *Mail:* OCFO–2014–0001; FRL–9910–13–OCFO, FPPS c/o Anita Jones, OCFO/OFM/FPPS, Mailcode 2733R, Environmental Protection Agency, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460.

Comments may be submitted electronically 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:

FPPS c/o Anita Jones, OCFO/OFM/FPPS, Mailcode 2733R, Environmental Protection Agency, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–4969; fax number: (202) 565–2585; email address: [jones.anita@epa.gov](mailto:jones.anita@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

This proposed rule implements the administrative wage garnishment provisions in section 31001(o) of the

Debt Collection Improvement Act of the 1996 (DCIA), Public Law 104–134, 110 Stat. 1321–358, codified as 31 U.S.C. 3720D. Under the administrative wage garnishment provisions of the DCIA, Federal agencies may garnish administratively up to 15 percent of the disposal pay of a debtor to satisfy a delinquent non-tax debt owed to the United States. Prior to the enactment of the DCIA, Federal agencies were required to obtain a court judgment before garnishing non-Federal wages. Section 31001(o) of the DCIA preempts State laws that prohibit wage garnishment or otherwise govern wage garnishment procedures.

As authorized by the DCIA, a Federal agency collecting a delinquent non-tax debt may garnish a delinquent debtor's wages in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Bureau of Fiscal Services, a bureau of the Department of the Treasury (Treasury), is responsible for promulgating the regulations implementing this and other debt collection tools established by the DCIA. The Bureau of Fiscal Services published its final rule at 63 FR 25136, May 6 1998, (Treasury Final Rule) and published technical amendments at 64 FR 22906, 22908, April 28, 1999 and 66 FR 51867, 51868, October 11, 2001. The Treasury Final Rule, as amended, is published in § 285.11 of title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Pursuant to 31 CFR 285.11 (f), Federal agencies must either prescribe regulations for the conduct of AWG hearings consistent with the procedural requirements set forth in the Treasury Final Rule or adopt § 285.11 without change by reference.

#### Basic Provisions

In accordance with the requirements of the DCIA and the implementing regulations at 31 CFR 285.11, the EPA is adopting the provisions of 31 CFR 285.11 concerning administrative wage garnishment, including the hearing procedures described in 31 CFR 285.11(f).

#### Use of the Direct Final Rule

This document proposes to take action on amending EPA's regulations on claims collection standards by using administrative wage garnishment. We have published a direct final rule amending EPA's regulations on claims collection standards by using administrative wage garnishment in the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register** because we view this as a noncontroversial action and anticipate no adverse comment. We have explained our reasons for this