

number of addresses receiving multiple components. Upon completion, the mailing job is then split into two mailings: one consisting of the multiple component pieces prepared as a machinable parcel mailing, and a second (separate) mailing of single component pieces prepared and mailed as flats or irregular parcels. As confirmed by one presort software vendor, firm piece preparation (if prepared as flats or irregular parcels requiring further packaging) creates a problem since it would be necessary to put a package (firm piece) into another package (presort destination), followed by the sacking or palletization. Additionally, the commenter stated that this preparation contributes to presort documentation and Mail.dat/PostalOne issues. These concerns have been brought to the attention of Business Mail Acceptance and Business Customer Support Systems.

One commenter said that the Postal Service has allowed single firm pieces in BPM mailings since January 7, 2001 (either through exception or unknowingly), and, therefore, the Postal Service should continue to do so. For the reasons stated here and in the April 24, 2002, **Federal Register** notice, the Postal Service cannot support this request.

Based on the comments, many mailers seem to believe that any BPM on SCF or finer pallets is eligible for DSCF entry. To clarify, BPM flats and BPM irregular parcels weighing less than 10 pounds are eligible for DSCF entry only as follows:

Pieces in 5-digit and 3-digit presort destination packages placed in 5-digit, 3-digit, and optional SCF sacks (DMM M722.2). Presort destination packages placed in 5-digit, 3-digit, and optional SCF sacks, then placed onto 5-digit, optional 3-digit, SCF, and ASF pallets (DMM M045.3.3). Pieces in 5-digit and 3-digit presort destination packages only placed directly onto 5-digit scheme, 5-digit, optional 5-digit metro, optional 3-digit, SCF, and ASF pallets (DMM M045.3.3). Mail on ASF pallets (DMM L602) outside of the plant's SCF service area (DMM L005) is eligible for DBMC rates.

Any further consideration of allowing firm piece preparation in Presorted BPM mailings of flats and irregular parcels can be given due consideration only as part of a future rate case.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 3001–3011, 3201–3219, 3403–3406, 3621, 3626, 5001.

Stanley F. Mires,
Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 02–20665 Filed 8–14–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[KY 125–200233(b); FRL–7259–8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Kentucky: Regulatory Limit on Potential To Emit

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is conditionally approving a revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) of the Commonwealth of Kentucky incorporating Kentucky rule 401 KAR 50:080. This rule affects sources whose actual emissions are 50 percent or less of the major source threshold whereas the sources' potential to emit (PTE) exceeds the major source threshold. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no significant, material, and adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives 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 rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 16, 2002.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to: Michele Notarianni, Air Planning Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. (404/562–9031 (phone) or notarianni.michele@epa.gov (e-mail))

Copies of the Commonwealth's submittal are available at the following addresses for inspection during normal business hours:

Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 4, Air Planning Branch, 61
Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia
30303–8960. (Michele Notarianni,
404/562–9031,
notarianni.michele@epa.gov)
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Division
for Air Quality, 803 Schenkel Lane,
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601–1403.
(502/573–3382)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Michele Notarianni at address listed
above or 404/562–9031 (phone) or
notarianni.michele@epa.gov (e-mail).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For
additional information, see the direct
final rule which is published in the
Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

J.I. Palmer, Jr.,

Regional Administrator, Region 4.

[FR Doc. 02–20746 Filed 8–14–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[FL–85–1–200107b; FRL–7259–5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida: Approval of Revisions to the Florida State Implementation Plan

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is approving revisions to the Florida State Implementation Plan (SIP) submitted on August 29, 2000, by the State of Florida through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). This submittal consists of revisions to the ozone air quality maintenance plan for the Tampa area (Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties) to remove the emission reduction credits attributable to the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program (MVIP) from the future year emission projections contained in those plans. This revision updates the control strategy for the Tampa maintenance area by removing emissions credit for the MVIP, and as such, transportation conformity must be redetermined by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) within 18 months of the final approval of this document. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the