with the mailing industry to determine the percentage increase for Address Quality threshold.

On September 21, 2018, the Postal Service published a final rule, **Federal Register** Notice (83 FR 47839) *Changes to Validations for IMpb* to amend mailing standards, to add new IMpb compliance quality validations and thresholds for Address Quality, Barcode Quality, and (Shipping Services File) Manifest Quality.

Additional time was needed to discuss the validation requirements for Address Quality before increasing the AQ threshold. The Postal Service and mailing industry have agreed on 90% as the new AQ threshold. The new AQ threshold is effective January 31, 2019, and the assessment of the IMpb Noncompliance Fee pursuant to this new AQ threshold will begin on February 1, 2019. Additionally, the Address Quality (AQ) validation ''*valid primary street number*'' will be removed from the measurement.

The Postal Service adopts the following changes to *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service,* Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), incorporated by reference in the *Code of Federal Regulations.* See 39 CFR 111.1.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 111

Administrative practice and procedure, Postal Service.

Accordingly, 39 CFR part 111 is amended as follows:

PART 111—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 111 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 13 U.S.C. 301–307; 18 U.S.C. 1692–1737; 39 U.S.C. 101, 401, 403, 404, 414, 416, 3001–3011, 3201–3219, 3403–3406, 3621, 3622, 3626, 3632, 3633, and 5001.

■ 2. Revise the following sections of *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service,* Domestic Mail Manual (DMM), as follows:

Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM)

* * * * *

200 Commercial Mail

* * * * *

204 Barcode Standards

* * * * *

2.0 Standards for Package and Extra Service Barcodes

2.1 Intelligent Mail Package Barcode

* * * * *

2.1.8 Compliance Quality Thresholds

[Add a new second sentence and revise the last sentence in 2.1.8 to read as follows:]

* * * Failure to meet any compliance quality threshold in Exhibit 2.1.8 will result in the assessment of the IMpb Noncompliance Fee. For details, see Publication 199: *Intelligent Mail Package Barcode (IMpb) Implementation Guide for: Confirmation Services and Electronic Verification System (eVS) Mailers,* available on PostalPro at *http://postalpro.usps.com.*

EXHIBIT 2.1.8—IMPB COMPLIANCE QUALITY THRESHOLDS

[Revise the ''*Compliance Threshold*'' *for the* ''*Address Quality*'' *line item to read* ''*90*''*; and* ''*Validations*'' *for the* ''*Address Quality*'' *to remove* ''*valid primary street number line.]*

* * * * *

We will publish an appropriate amendment to 39 CFR part 111 to reflect these changes.

Brittany M. Johnson,

Attorney, Federal Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2018–26665 Filed 12–10–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0022; FRL–9987–60–Region 10]

Air Plan Approval; Oregon; Removal of Obsolete Regulations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is approving the removal of outdated rules in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for the State of Oregon because they are duplicative or obsolete. Removal of such material from the air program subparts is designed to improve cost effectiveness and usability of the CFR. The EPA is also approving non-substantive revisions to reflect updated citations and correcting a typographical error. This final action makes no substantive changes to the Oregon State Implementation Plan and imposes no new requirements.

DATES: This action is effective on January 10, 2019.

ADDRESSES: The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R10–OAR–2018–0022. All documents in the docket are listed on the *https://www.regulations.gov* website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *e.g.,* CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available at *https://www.regulations.gov,* or please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for additional availability information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christi Duboiski, EPA Region 10, at (360) 753–9081, or *duboiski.christi@epa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, wherever ''we'', ''us'' or ''our'' is used, it is intended to refer to the EPA.

I. Background

This action is being taken pursuant to Executive Order 13563—*Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review*. It is intended to reduce the number of pages in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) by identifying those rules in 40 CFR part 52, subpart MM, for the State of Oregon that are duplicative or obsolete. This action removes historical information and rules that no longer have any use or legal effect because they have been superseded by subsequently approved state implementation plan (SIP) revisions or they are no longer necessary because the EPA previously promulgated administrative rule actions to replace these sections with summary tables in 40 CFR 52.1970 (78 FR 74012, December 10, 2013). On October 10, 2010, the EPA proposed to approve these changes and received no comments on our proposed rulemaking (83 FR 50867).

II. Final Action

This final action is a ''housekeeping'' exercise that removes duplicative or obsolete CFR provisions and corrects a non-substantive typographical error. The EPA is approving the removal of 40 CFR 52.1973, 40 CFR 52.1974 paragraphs (b) and (c), 40 CFR 52.1977, and 40 CFR 52.1982; and approving the amendment to 40 CFR 52.1974(a). The EPA is removing the duplicative or obsolete rules because they have been revised or superseded by subsequently approved SIP revisions. These actions make no substantive changes to the SIP. The changes will be accurately reflected in 40 CFR part 52, subpart MM for the State of Oregon.

III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the CAA, the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866;
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- 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);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- Is not subject to requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and
- Does not provide the EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

The SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian tribe has demonstrated that a tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The EPA will submit a report containing this action and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by February 11, 2019. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: November 19, 2018.

Michelle L. Pirzadeh,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart MM—Oregon

§ 52.1973 [Removed and Reserved]

■ 2. Section 52.1973 is removed and reserved.

■ 3. Section 52.1974 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.1974 Original identification of plan section.

(a) This section identified the original ''State of Oregon Clean Air Act Implementation Plan'' and all revisions submitted by Oregon that were federally approved prior to July 1, 2013. The information in this section is available in the 40 CFR, part 52, Volume 4 (§ 52.1970 to End) edition revised as of July 1, 2013.

(b)–(c) [Reserved]

§§ 52.1977 and 52.1982 [Removed and Reserved]

■ 4. Sections 52.1977 and 52.1982 are removed and reserved.

■ 5. In § 52.1988, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.1988 Air contaminant discharge permits.

(a) Except for compliance schedules under OAR 340–200–0050, emission limitations and other provisions contained in Air Contaminant Discharge Permits issued by the State in accordance with the provisions of the Federally-approved rules for Air Contaminant Discharge Permits (OAR chapter 340, Division 216), Plant Site Emission Limit (OAR chapter 340, Division 222), Alternative Emission Controls (OAR 340–226–0400) and Public Participation (OAR chapter 340, Division 209), shall be applicable requirements of the Federally-approved Oregon SIP (in addition to any other provisions) for the purposes of section 113 of the Clean Air Act and shall be enforceable by EPA and by any person in the same manner as other requirements of the SIP. Plant site emission limits and alternative emission limits (bubbles) established in Federal Operating Permits issued by the State in accordance with the Federally-approved rules for Plant Site Emission Limit (OAR chapter 340, Division 222) and Alternative Emission Controls (OAR 340–226–0400), shall be applicable requirements of the Federally-approved Oregon SIP (in addition to any other

provisions) for the purposes of section 113 of the Clean Air Act and shall be enforceable by EPA and by any person in the same manner as other requirements of the SIP.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2018–26688 Filed 12–10–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 36

[WC Docket No. 14–130, CC Docket No. 80–286; FCC 18–141]

Comprehensive Review of the Uniform System of Accounts; Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission simplifies its jurisdictional separations rules, applying the separations processes previously reserved for smaller carriers to all carriers subject to those rules, and harmonizing the jurisdictional separations rules with the accounting rules. With this action, the Commission continues to modernize existing rules and eliminate outdated compliance requirements.

DATES: *Effective date:* January 1, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christopher Koves, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau at 202–418–8209 or by email at *Christopher.Koves@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Report and Order, WC Docket No. 14–130, CC Docket No. 80–286; FCC 18–141, adopted on October 16, 2018, and released on October 17, 2018. A full-text version of this document can be obtained at the following internet address: *https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-harmonizes-separations-rules-revised-accounting-rules.*

Synopsis

I. Introduction

1. In this Report and Order (Order), the Commission simplifies its part 36 jurisdictional separations rules to allow all carriers to use the simpler jurisdictional separations processes previously reserved for smaller carriers. In so doing, the Commission harmonizes its part 36 rules with the Commission's previous amendments to its part 32 accounting rules. The amendments the Commission adopts today to its part 36 rules further its goal of updating and modernizing its rules to eliminate outdated compliance burdens on carriers so that they can focus their resources on building modern networks that bring economic opportunity, job creation, and civic engagement to all Americans.

II. Background

2. Jurisdictional separations is the third step in a four-step regulatory process. First, a rate-of-return carrier records its costs and revenues in various accounts using the Uniform System of Accounts (USOA) prescribed by the Commission's part 32 rules. Second, the carrier divides the costs and revenues in these accounts between regulated and nonregulated activities in accordance with part 64 of the Commission's rules, a step that helps ensure that the costs of nonregulated activities will not be recovered through regulated interstate rates. Third, the carrier separates the regulated costs and revenues between the intrastate and interstate jurisdictions using the part 36 rules. Finally, the carrier apportions the interstate regulated costs among the interexchange services and rate elements that form the cost basis for its exchange access tariff. Carriers subject to rate-of-return regulation perform this apportionment in accordance with the Commission's part 69 rules.

3. Historically, the part 32 rules divided incumbent local exchange carriers (LECs) into two classes for accounting purposes based on the amounts of their annual regulated revenues. Class A incumbent LECs were the larger carriers, and Class B incumbent LECs were the smaller carriers (most recently those with less than $157 million in annual regulated revenues). The Commission's former part 32 rules required Class A carriers to create and maintain a more granular set of accounts than it required of the smaller Class B carriers. In all but one case, Class A carrier accounts could be grouped into sets that were represented by single Class B carrier accounts—that is, such Class A accounts consolidated into, or ''rolled up'' into, Class B accounts.

4. In the *Part 32 Reform Order,* 82 FR 20833, May 4, 2017, the Commission eliminated the historical distinction between Class A and Class B incumbent LECs in the part 32 rules. Now all carriers subject to part 32 are required to keep only the less onerous accounts previously kept by Class B incumbent LECs. Recognizing that the part 32 accounting reforms had implications for the part 36 jurisdictional separations rules, which distinguish between Class A and Class B incumbent LECs, the Commission referred to the Federal-State Joint Board on Jurisdictional Separations (Joint Board) consideration of how and when the part 36 rules should be modified to reflect the reforms adopted in the *Part 32 Reform Order.*

5. In October 2017, after seeking public comment on how best to harmonize the part 32 and part 36 rules, the Joint Board released a *Recommended Decision.* In its *Recommended Decision,* the Joint Board recommended changes to part 36 including deleting rules pertaining to Class A accounts, deleting references to Class A and B accounts, and allowing former Class A carriers to select between the former Class A and B procedures for apportioning general support facilities costs. The Joint Board also recommended that the Commission make certain stylistic and typographical corrections to the part 36 rules. The Joint Board recommended that the part 36 revisions it proposed be effective as soon as practicable after January 1, 2018, the effective date of the *Part 32 Reform Order.*

6. In February 2018, the Commission released the *Separations Harmonization NPRM,* 83 FR 10817, March 13, 2018, which proposed amendments to part 36 consistent with the *Recommended Decision.* The Commission also sought comment on the effective date for any changes to part 36 to harmonize those rules with part 32 reforms. USTelecom filed the only comment on the merits, and it supports the proposals in the *Separations Harmonization NPRM.*

III. Discussion

7. In this Order, the Commission harmonizes its part 36 jurisdictional separations rules with the changes to the part 32 accounting rules that the Commission adopted in the *Part 32 Reform Order.* The Commission's amendments to part 36 implement the Commission's proposals in the *Separations Harmonization NPRM* to adopt, with minor exceptions, the Joint Board's recommendations and to amend the part 36 rules consistent with those recommendations. The Commission agrees with USTelecom that these rule changes do not risk undermining the primary purpose of the part 36 rules, which is to ''prevent incumbent LECs from recovering the same costs in the interstate and intrastate jurisdictions,'' and will instead ''simplify the accounting rules by removing unnecessary burdensome regulations that require carriers and ultimately consumers to incur unnecessary costs.''