I. Introduction

On July 22, 2021, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting that the Commission initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to analytical principles relating to periodic reports. The Petition identifies the proposed analytical changes filed in this docket as Proposal Four.

II. Proposal Four

Background. The Postal Service currently develops the distribution factors used for the Special Purpose Route (SPR) city carrier cost pools based on manual data collection through the City Carrier Costing System SPR subsystem (CCCS–SPR). The Commission approved the use of this subsystem in Order No. 339, and it has been used each year since FY 2009.

Proposal. With Proposal Four, the Postal Service seeks to replace the CCCS–SPR subsystem with a new system called the Special Purpose Carrier Cost System (SPCCS). The Postal Service cites two objectives for this new system: “to replace manual sampling with scan data from Product Tracking and Reporting (PTR) combined with the clock rings from the Time and Attendance Collection System (TACS)” and “to separate the weekday SPR cost pool into peak and non-peak pools and provide separate distribution factors for each cost pool.” Petition, Proposal Four at 2.

With respect to the first objective, the Postal Service plans to use PTR delivery scans that occur within time blocks when a city carrier is clocked to Management Operating Data System (MODS) Operating Codes specific to Special Purpose Routes. Id. The Postal Service proposes to use a sample of time blocks “due to the disproportionate resources required to obtain a complete nationwide census.” Id.

Regarding the second objective, the Postal Service proposes to disaggregate the volume variabilities used for the SPR Monday through Saturday cost pool in order to create separate non-peak and peak weekday SPR cost pools. Id. at 3.

The Postal Service also proposes annual updates to the hours used to weight the new weekday non-peak SPR cost pool variabilities, Id.

Impact. The impacts of Proposal Four are outlined in Table 1 of the proposal.

---


2 See Docket No. RM2009–10, Order on Analytical Principles Used in Periodic Reporting (Proposals Three through Nineteen), November 13, 2009 (Order No. 339); Petition, Proposal Four at 1.

---

Id. at 7. The most significant change in unit costs is a decrease of $0.1743 for Collect on Delivery Service. Id. The unit cost of USPS Marketing Mail Parcels would increase by $0.0151, from $0.238 to $0.254 per unit. Id. The unit cost for total domestic market dominant services would decrease by $0.0144 per unit. Id.

III. Notice and Comment


IV. Ordering Paragraph

It is ordered:


2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than August 30, 2021.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Manon Boudreault 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.

Erica A. Barker,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2021–16294 Filed 7–29–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 35


Clean Air Act Grant; Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District; Opportunity for Public Hearing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notification; proposed determination with request for comments and notice of opportunity for public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to determine that the reduction in expenditures of non-Federal funds for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) in support of its continuing air program under section 105 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), for the calendar year 2020 are a result of non-selective reductions in expenditures. This determination, when final, will permit the SBCAPCD to receive grant funding for fiscal year (FY) 2021 from the EPA under section 105 of the CAA.

DATES: Comments and/or requests for a public hearing must be received by the EPA at the address stated below on or before August 30, 2021.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2021–0359 at https://www.regulations.gov. For comments submitted at Regulations.gov, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Proprietary Business Information (PBI) or Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (i.e. on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with disabilities who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela Latiguie, EPA Region IX, Grants and Program Integration Office, Air Division, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; phone at (415)
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 105 of the CAA provides grant funding for the continuing air programs of eligible state, local, and tribal agencies. In accordance with 40 CFR 35.145(a), the Regional Administrator may provide air pollution control agencies up to three-fifths of the approved costs of implementing programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. CAA Section 105 grants require a cost share (also referred to as a match requirement) and a maintenance of effort (MOE). An eligible agency must meet a minimum 40% match. In addition, to remain eligible for section 105 funds, an eligible agency must meet an MOE requirement under section 105(c)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7405.

Program activities relevant to the match consist of both recurring and non-recurring (unique, one-time only) expenses. The MOE provision requires that a state or local agency spend at least the same dollar level of funds as it did in the previous grant year, but only for the costs of recurring activities. Specifically, section 105(c)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7405(c)(1), provides that, “No agency shall receive any grant under this section during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures for air pollution control programs will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year.” However, pursuant to CAA section 105(c)(2), 42 U.S.C. 7405(c)(2), the EPA may still award a grant to an agency not meeting the requirements of section 105(c)(1). “. . . if the Administrator, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, determines that a reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of all Executive branch agencies of the applicable unit of Government.” These statutory requirements are repeated in the EPA’s implementing regulations at 40 CFR 35.140–35.148. The EPA issued additional guidance to recipients on the conditions caused by the COVID–19 pandemic. This action resulted in a total of over $2.7 million for Santa Barbara County projects in FY2019–2020, a 21.1% budget increase received from the previous fiscal year. These funds were used to continue expanding the reach of the grant programs initiated in FY2018–2019, including the Carl Moyer program, Community Air Protection legislation (AB617), the Funding Agricultural Replacement Measures for Emissions Reductions (FARMER) program, and the Wood Smoke Reduction program.

In order for the SBCAPCD to be eligible to receive its FY2021 CAA section 105 grant, the EPA must make a determination (after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing) that the reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of the SBCAPCD.

The SBCAPCD is a single-purpose air pollution control agency. It is the unit of government for CAA section 105(c)(2) purposes.

On March 25, 2021, the SBCAPCD submitted a request to the EPA seeking a reduction for the required MOE for FY2020. The SBCAPCD explained that it was unable to meet its MOE requirement due in large part to a budget increase of 21.1% from pass-through monies from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for multiple state projects. The State Legislature, through the budget adoption process, placed a strong emphasis on the use of funding for voluntary emission reduction programs through the network of local air districts. This action resulted in SBCAPCD’s MOE level was $8,551,345. SBCAPCD’s final federal financial report for FY2020 indicates that SBCAPCD’s MOE level is at $7,890,365. The reduced MOE is not sufficient to meet the MOE requirements under the CAA Section 105 because it is not equal to or greater than the MOE for the previous fiscal year.

In order for the SBCAPCD to be eligible to receive its FY2021 CAA section 105 grant, the EPA must make a determination (after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing) that the reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of the SBCAPCD.
**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Missouri on November 12, 2019, revising the 2008 8-hour ozone maintenance plan previously approved by EPA on September 20, 2018, demonstrating continued maintenance of the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS), the 1979 1-Hour and 1997 8-Hour ozone standards in the St. Louis area. This revision states that the St. Louis area no longer needs the clean Air Act. 

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before August 30, 2021.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2021–0360 to https://www.regulations.gov/. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

**Instructions:** All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to https://www.regulations.gov/, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Written Comments” heading of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Brown, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Ronner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number: (913) 551–7718; email address: brown.steven@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to the EPA.
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Air Plan Approval; Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Revisions to St. Louis 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual FFY 17–18</th>
<th>Actual FFY 18–19</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Actual FFY 18–19</th>
<th>Actual FFY 19–20</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Cost</td>
<td>$9,200,143</td>
<td>$11,045,606</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$11,045,606</td>
<td>$11,759,083</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Over/Under MOE Goal</td>
<td>$34,940</td>
<td>$1,774,481</td>
<td>$1,774,481</td>
<td>$1,774,481</td>
<td>$660,979</td>
<td>$660,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>