

Postal Service invites public comments on the following proposed amendments to the Code of Federal Regulations.

For the reasons set out in this document, the Postal Service is proposing to amend 39 CFR part 501 as follows:

#### **PART 501—AUTHORIZATION TO MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTE POSTAGE METERS**

1. The authority citation for part 501 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 410, 2601, 2605; Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (Public Law 95-452, as amended), 5 U.S.C. App. 3.

2. Sections 501.22 and 501.28 are revised to read as follows:

##### **§ 501.22 Inventory control.**

(a) An authorized manufacturer must maintain sufficient facilities for and records of the distribution, control, storage, maintenance, repair, replacement, and destruction or disposal of all meters and their components to enable accurate accounting thereof throughout the entire life cycle of the meter.

Recordkeeping is required for all meters including newly produced meters; active leased meters; inactive, unleased meters; and lost and stolen meters. All such facilities and records are subject to inspection by Postal Service representatives.

(b) If the manufacturer uses a third party to control, distribute, maintain, replace, repair, or dispose of meters, the Manager of Postage Technology Management, USPS Headquarters, must specifically authorize in writing all aspects of the arrangement between the parties relating to the custody and control of postage meters.

(1) The third-party relationship shall not compromise any security element of the meter. The functions of the third party with respect to meters are subject to the same scrutiny as the equivalent functions of the manufacturer.

(2) Any authorized third party must keep adequate facilities for and records of meters and their components in accordance with (a). All such facilities and records are subject to inspection by Postal Service representatives, in so far as they are used to distribute, control, store, maintain, repair, replace, destroy, or dispose of meters.

(3) The manufacturer must ensure that any party acting in its behalf in any of the functions described in subsection (a)

maintains adequate facilities, records, and procedures for the security of the meters. The Postal Service can request termination of the third-party arrangement relating to the custody and control of postage meters if it finds deficiencies and the deficiencies are not corrected in a timely manner.

\* \* \* \* \*

##### **§ 501.28 Protection and control of internal and security components.**

Any physical or electronic access to the internal components of a meter, as well as any access to software or security parameters, must be conducted within an approved factory or meter repair facility under the manufacturer's direct control and active supervision. The Postal Service must check meters out of service before any component, software, or security parameter is accessed or modified in any way or internal repairs are undertaken. This does not apply to Postal Service-approved user, field, or postal access to a specific internal component or software. To prevent unauthorized use, the manufacturer or any third party acting on its behalf must keep secure any equipment or other component that can be used to open or access the internal, electronic, or secure components of a meter.

\* \* \* \* \*

An appropriate amendment to 30 CFR part 501 to reflect these changes will be published if the proposal is adopted.

**Stanley F. Mires,**  
*Chief Counsel, Legislative.*

[FR Doc. 02-9921 Filed 4-23-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710-12-P**

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

##### **40 CFR Part 52**

**[CA 262-0338b; FRL-7174-3]**

#### **Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California

State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern SJVUAPCD Rule 4354, which controls oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions from glass melting furnaces. We are proposing to approve a local rule to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). We are taking comments on this proposal and plan to follow with a final action.

**DATES:** Any comments must arrive by May 24, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board,  
Stationary Source Division, Rule  
Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street,  
Sacramento, CA 95814.

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air  
Pollution Control District, 1990 E.  
Gettysburg Ave., Fresno, CA 93726.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Charnjit Bhullar, Rulemaking Office  
(AIR-4), U.S. Environmental Protection  
Agency, Region IX, (415) 972-3960.

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

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. The State's Submittal
  - A. What Rule Did the State Submit?
  - B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?
  - C. What Is The Purpose of the Submitted Rule?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
  - A. How Is EPA Evaluating This Rule?
  - B. Does This Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?
  - C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve This rule.
  - D. Public Comment and Final Action.
- III. Background Information
  - Why was this rule submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

#### **I. The State's Submittal**

##### **A. What Rule Did the State Submit?**

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the dates that it was adopted by the local air agency and submitted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule #	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
SJVUAPCD	4354	Glass Melting Furnaces .....	02/21/02 .....	03/05/02

On March 27, 2002, this rule submittal was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

*B. Are There Other Version of This Rule?*

On September 1, 2000, EPA published a limited approval and limited disapproval of a version of rule 4354 that was submitted to EPA on September 29, 1998.

*C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule?*

The EPA published a limited approval and limited disapproval of a previous version of this rule because some rule provisions conflicted with section 110 and part D of the Clean Air Act. Those provisions included the following:

1. Section 3.17.3 and 4.2 allowed unlimited exemption periods as long as the furnace operated below 60% capacity.

2. The equation to calculate the Tier 1 emission limit in section 5.3 needed to be clarified.

3. Section 7.1 did not specify a final date for major NO<sub>x</sub> sources to adopt CEMS or alternate continuous monitoring methods to prevent avoidance of continuous monitoring by running forever without an official "rebuild".

4. Section 7.2.3 did not specify a final date for facilities to achieve full Tier 2 compliance.

5. Section 9.0, 9.4, and 9.7 provided an Alternate Emission Control Plan (AECp) which was not consistent with the EPA Emissions Trading Policy Statement (ETPS), the Economic Incentive Program Rules (EIP), and EPA policies regarding equivalency provisions.

The TSD has more information about this rule.

**II. EPA's Evaluation and Action**

*A. How Is EPA Evaluating This Rule?*

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the Act), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A) and 182(f)), and must not relax existing requirements (see sections 110(l) and 193). The SJVUAPCD regulates an ozone nonattainment area (see 40 CFR part 81), so Rule 4354 must fulfill RACT.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to help evaluate the criteria consistently include the following:

1. Issues Relating to VOC Regulation, Cut points, Deficiencies, and Deviations (the "Blue Book"), U.S. EPA, May 25, 1988.

2. Guidance Document for Correcting VOC Rule Deficiencies: U.S. EPA Region IX and California Air Resources Board, April 1991.

3. State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendment of 1990 (the "NO<sub>x</sub> Supplement to the General Preamble"), U.S. EPA, 57 FR 55620, November 25, 1992.

4. Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans, U.S. EPA, 40 CFR part 51.

5. State Implementation Plans for National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards, Section 110 of the Clean Air Act, and Plan Requirements for Nonattainment Areas, Title I Part D of the Clean Air Act.

6. State of California, Air Resources Board, Suggested Control Measure for the Control of Oxides of Nitrogen from Glass Melting Furnaces, September 5, 1980.

7. Cost Effective Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT), U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 16, 1994.

8. State Implementation Plans (SIPs): Policy Regarding Excess Emissions During Malfunctions, Startup, and Shutdown, dated September 20, 1999.

*B. Does This Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?*

We believe this rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability, RACT, and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation and how the previously identified deficiencies have been corrected.

*C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve This Rule*

None.

*D. Public Comment and Final Action*

Because EPA believes the submitted rule fulfills all relevant requirements, we are proposing to fully approve it as described in section 110(k)(3) of the Act. We will accept comments from the public on this proposal for the next 30 days. Unless we receive convincing new information during the comment period, we intend to publish a final approval action that will incorporate this rule into the federally enforceable SIP.

**III. Background Information**

*Why Was This Rule Submitted?*

NO<sub>x</sub> helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of this local agency NO<sub>x</sub> rule.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978 .....	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988 .....	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990 .....	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.
May 15, 1991 .....	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

#### IV. 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. For this reason, this proposed action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). 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 tribal implications because it will 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). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does 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 the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely proposes to approve 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, “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks” (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. This proposed 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, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: April 10, 2002.

**Nora L. McGee,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 02–9910 Filed 4–23–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 52

[MO 155–1155; FRL–7175–2]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Missouri for the purpose of controlling volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from stationary and area sources in Clay, Platte, and Jackson Counties in the Kansas City, Missouri, area. This action also proposes to provide full approval of the revised maintenance plan and rescinds the prior conditional approval of the revised maintenance plan. In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State’s SIP revision and providing full approval of the revised maintenance plan as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the

approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision is severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by May 24, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Leland Daniels, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Leland Daniels at (913) 551–7651.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: April 11, 2002.

**James B. Gulliford,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 7.*

[FR Doc. 02–9912 Filed 4–23–02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 271

[FRL–7173–8]

#### Hazardous Waste Management Program: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions for State of Arkansas

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule and request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA (also, “the Agency” in this preamble) is proposing to grant final authorization to the hazardous waste program revisions submitted by the State of Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality for its hazardous waste program revisions, specifically, revisions needed to meet the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Clusters