

filing of a request for Panel consideration. A clean copy may be submitted for the original. Responses or documents may be submitted electronically through use of the eFiling system on the FLRA's website at www.flra.gov, or by registered mail, certified mail, regular mail, or commercial delivery. Responses or documents also may be accepted by the Panel if transmitted to the facsimile machine of its office, the number of which is (202) 482-6674. A party submitting a response or document by facsimile shall also file an original for the Panel's records, but failure to do so shall not affect the validity of the filing by facsimile, if otherwise proper. While responses or documents may also be submitted by in-person delivery to the FSIP, you must first obtain permission, by calling (771) 444-5762, and then schedule an appointment at least one business day in advance of submission. In-person delivery is accepted with permission, and by appointment only, Monday through Friday (except federal holidays).

* * * * *

(d) The date of service or date served shall be the day when the matter served, if properly addressed, is deposited in the U.S. mail, deposited with a commercial-delivery service that will provide a record showing the date the document was tendered to the delivery service, or delivered in person after permission to do so is granted. Where service is made by electronic or facsimile transmission, the date of service shall be the date of transmission.

* * * * *

The Postal Service states that the usual approach of taking "the unit discount from the published benchmark price" divided by the avoided cost "did not work because the benchmark price varies with the different weights of the pieces mailed." *Id.* at 3. The Postal Service states that it could only calculate the workshare discounts for these flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail mailpieces on a weighted basis after mailing, "when the weights and

¹ Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposal One), February 8, 2024 (Petition).

Approved: February 12, 2024.

Thomas Tso,
Solicitor and Federal Register Liaison, Federal Labor Relations Authority.

[FR Doc. 2024-03210 Filed 2-15-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7627-01-P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2024-3; Order No. 6965]

Periodic Reporting

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is acknowledging a recent filing requesting the Commission initiate a rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to analytical principles relating to periodic reports (Proposal One). This document informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* February 26, 2024.

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

((Pound discount * Pounds above breakpoint) + (Piece discount * Pieces below breakpoint))

(Avoided cost per pound * Pounds above and below breakpoint)²

numbers of pieces sent were known." *Id.* The Postal Service contends that, as a practical matter, the passthrough percentages for these mailpieces could sometime vary widely with changes in mail volumes and weights which, in turn, made it more difficult for the passthrough percentages to meet the requirements of 39 CFR 3030.284 and 3030.284. *Id.*

The Postal Services states that it identified the problem complying with

² *Id.* (citing Docket No. RM2017-11, Order on Analytical Principles Used in Periodic Reporting (Proposal Seven), November 20, 2017, at 4, 8 (Order No. 4227)).

II. Proposal One
III. Notice and Comment
IV. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

On February 8, 2024, 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.¹ The Petition identifies the proposed analytical changes filed in this docket as Proposal One.

II. Proposal One

Background. The Postal Service has in recent years made several proposals to improve the methodology used to calculate dropship workshare discounts for various flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail mailpieces. Petition, Proposal One at 1. For some flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail pieces, two rates are available: (1) a per-piece rate for pieces up to a 4-ounce breakpoint weight; (2) and a combined rate, per piece and per pound, for pieces heavier than the 4-ounce breakpoint weight. *Id.* In 2017, the Postal Service's passthrough calculation divided the discount for the heavier pieces by the avoided cost per pound for all pieces, both above and below the 4-ounce breakpoint. *Id.* at 2. The Postal Services states that this method was "incomplete," because "[i]t did not include in its numerator pieces below the pricing breakpoint, but it did include the weight of those pieces in the denominator." *Id.* Therefore, the Postal Service proposed, and the Commission approved, the following methodology to calculate dropship workshare discounts for USPS Marketing Mail that included the discount for pieces at or below the breakpoint weight in the numerator:

39 CFR 3030.284 and 3030.284 in Docket No. R2021-2, "where it was mathematically impossible for the Postal Service to make all six passthrough percentages for Basic Carrier Route Flats (those on 5-Digit pallets and those on all other pallets)" comply with the Commission's workshare discount regulations.³ The Postal Service therefore filed a petition to address the non-compliance by modifying how it calculated and

³ *Id.*; see Docket No. R2021-2, Order on Price Adjustments for First-Class Mail, USPS Marketing Mail, Periodicals, Package Services, and Special Services Products and Related Mail Classification Changes, July 19, 2021 (Order No. 5937).

reported passthroughs for USPS Marketing Mail flats.⁴ Specifically, the Postal Service proposed to calculate and report passthroughs for USPS Marketing Mail Carrier Route Flats on 5-digit pallets and passthroughs for all other USPS Marketing Mail Carrier Route Flats together rather than separately. Petition, Proposal One at 4. The Commission approved this proposal and Postal Service notes that the Commission observed that the prior methodology “leads to anomalous results and could precipitate inefficient pricing.”⁵

The Postal Service states that while the adjustments in 2021 prevented the compliance problem for USPS Marketing Mail Carrier Route Flats on 5-digit pallets from reoccurring, “the adjustments did not otherwise change the methodology for calculating passthrough percentages for other flat-shaped [USPS] Marketing Mail pieces with piece and pound price components.” *Id.* at 5. Instead, the Postal Service states that changes in volumes and weight cause compliance issues with 39 CFR 3030.284 and 3030.284. *Id.* The Postal Service states that it “found a great disparity in the volumes and weights of [USPS] Marketing Mail Carrier Route Flats dropshipped at the [destination sectional center facility] DSCF and [destination delivery unit (DDU)].” *Id.* at 5. The Postal Service states that it requested, and the Commission granted, a waiver permitting the passthrough percentage for USPS Marketing Mail Carrier Route Flats dropshipped at the DDU to be 105 percent.⁶ Thereafter, the Postal Service again revised the way it prices flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail pieces with piece and pound price components and offering dropship discounts on per-piece prices only, which the Commission approved.⁷

⁴ Petition, Proposal One at 3; see Docket No. RM2021–6, Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposal Three), April 8, 2021.

⁵ Petition, Proposal One at 4–5 (citing Docket No. RM2021–6, Order on Analytical Principles Used in Periodic Reporting (Proposal Three), November 4, 2021, at 11 (Order No. 6032)). Additionally, the Postal Service states that, in approving the price adjustments in Docket No. R2021–2, the Commission also granted a one-time exemption from 39 CFR part 3030, subpart J for Basic Carrier Route Flats entered at the [Destination Delivery Unit] DDU workshare discount that noted the “mathematical impossibility” of compliance. Petition, Proposal One at 4.

⁶ *Id.* at 5–6 (citing Docket No. RM2022–12, Order Approving Postal Service Application for Waiver under 39 CFR 3030.286, August 30, 2022, at 9, 11 (Order No. 6261)).

⁷ Petition, Proposal One at 6, 7–8 (citing Docket No. RM2023–4, Petition of the United States Postal Service for the Initiation of a Proceeding to

The Postal Service’s current methodology for calculating workshare discount passthrough percentages is “the same . . . as it uses for most other products, dividing the per-piece discount by the per-piece cost avoidance.” Petition, Proposal One at 7. The Postal Service states that the passthrough percentages no longer vary with the different weights of pieces mailed because the passthroughs are calculated independently of the volumes and weights of pieces mailed. *Id.*

The Postal Service states that its current methodology for calculating workshare discount passthrough percentages “has some limitations.” *Id.* The Postal Service argues that because pound prices do not vary by dropship entry point, it reduces incentives for mailers to dropship flat-shaped pieces weighing more than 4 ounces closer to their delivery destinations. *Id.* at 8. The Postal Service also states that its current methodology does not “reflect the avoided costs of delivering flat-shaped [USPS] Marketing Mail pieces as closely as they could.” *Id.* at 9. Instead, the Postal Service states that workshare discounts for pieces weighing more than 4 ounces are too small relative to their avoided costs, while those for pieces weighing 4 ounces or less are too large. *Id.*

Proposal. The Postal Service proposes to address the limitations in its current methodology for calculating workshare discount passthrough percentages by separately deriving prices for flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail pieces at or below the 4-ounce breakpoint from those pieces above the 4-ounce breakpoint. *Id.* For mailpieces at or below the 4-ounce breakpoint, the Postal Service states that:

- mailers would continue to pay only a per-piece price;
- dropship discounts would be given on these per-piece prices, so that per-piece prices would still vary based upon entry (*i.e.*, origin, (destination network distribution center) DNDC, DSCF, or DDU); and
- the methodology for calculating passthroughs would remain substantially unchanged from the current formula.

Id. at 10. The Postal Service states that the only difference in its proposed methodology and the current methodology is the per-piece cost avoidance from Folder 13, as submitted in its annual compliance filing. *Id.* The

Consider Proposed Changes in Analytical Principles (Proposal One), February 10, 2023; Docket No. RM2023–4, Order on Analytical Principles Used in Periodic Reporting (Proposal One), April 6, 2023, at 14 (Order No. 6474).

Postal Service’s proposed methodology for calculating workshare discount passthrough percentages for these pieces is as follows:

Per-piece dropship discount/per-piece dropship cost avoidance of lightweight pieces (Folder 13)

Id. The Postal Service contends that the change to the cost avoidance component of the passthrough calculation is much closer to actual avoided costs than if the weights of pieces over 4-ounces were included. *Id.*

For mailpieces weighting 4-ounces or more, the Postal Services states:

- prices would continue to have per-piece and per-pound components;
- pound prices would, once again, apply to the entire weight of a piece, not just the pounds above the breakpoint as they do in the current price structure; and

• the Postal Service would reintroduce per-pound dropship discounts, and so the per-pound prices would again vary by dropship entry point, as they did prior to adopting the current methodology.

Id. at 10–11. The Postal Service states that, instead of basing dropship discounts on the per-piece rates and cost avoidances, it proposes to base dropship workshare discounts for pieces weighing 4 ounces or more on the per-pound component of the rates. *Id.* at 12. As such, the Postal Service’s proposed methodology for calculating passthroughs for pieces weighing 4 ounces or more is:

Per-pound dropship discount/Per-pound dropship cost avoidance (Folder 13)

Id.

The Postal Service contends that “the virtue” of the proposed methodology is that the discounts are tied directly to the per-pound cost avoidance and are “better aligned with actual cost avoidances” because they are “based on actual weight.” *Id.* at 12. Finally, the Postal Service argues that an “immediate effect” of its proposal would be to double the number of workshare discounts, from eight discounts to 16, for dropshipped flat-shaped USPS Marketing Mail mailpieces. *Id.* at 12–13.

III. Notice and Comment

The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2024–3 for consideration of matters raised by the Petition. More information on the Petition may be accessed via the Commission’s website at <http://www.prc.gov>. Interested persons may submit comments on the Petition and Proposal One no later than February 26, 2024. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C.

505, JP Klingenberg is designated as an 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. RM2024–3 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 (Proposal One), filed February 8, 2024.

2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than February 26, 2024.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints JP Klingenberg 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. 2024–03270 Filed 2–15–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 70

[EPA–R07–OAR–2024–0064; FRL–11722–01–R7]

Air Plan Approval; Iowa; State Implementation Plan and State Operating Permits Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the Iowa State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the Operating Permit Program for the State of Iowa. The revisions update incorporations by reference to EPA methods for performance testing (stack testing), update the definitions, and adopt the most recent National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone. These revisions do not impact the stringency of the SIP or have an adverse effect on air quality. The EPA’s proposed approval of this rule revision is being done in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 18, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2024–0064 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: Bethany Olson, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number: (913) 551–7905; email address: olson.bethany@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to the EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. Written Comments
- II. What is being addressed in this document?
- III. What SIP revisions are being proposed by EPA?
- IV. What operating permit plan revisions are being proposed by EPA?
- V. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP and the operating permit plan revisions been met?
- VI. What action is the EPA taking?
- VII. Incorporation by Reference
- VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R07–OAR–2024–0064, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. 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 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, 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>.

II. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Iowa SIP and the Operating Permits Program received on March 29, 2023. The revisions incorporate recent changes to Iowa Administrative Code. The following chapters are impacted:

- Chapter 20, “Scope of Title—Definitions;”
- Chapter 22, “Controlling Pollution;”
- Chapter 25, “Measurement of Emissions;” and
- Chapter 28, “Ambient Air Quality Standards.”

The revisions update incorporations by reference to EPA methods for performance testing (stack testing) and adopt the most recent National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone. EPA proposes to find that these revisions meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act, do not impact the stringency of the SIP, and do not adversely impact air quality. The full text of these changes can be found in the State’s submission, which is included in the docket for this action.

Sections 111 and 112 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) allow EPA to delegate authority to states for New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs). EPA has delegated authority to Iowa for approved portions of these sections of the CAA. Changes made to Iowa’s Chapter 23 pertaining to new and revised NSPS and NESHAPs are not directly approved into the SIP, but rather, are adopted by reference. Thus, EPA is not proposing to approve the changes to Chapter 23 of the Iowa Administrative Code into the state’s SIP.

III. What SIP revisions are being proposed by EPA?

The EPA is proposing the following revisions to the Iowa SIP:

Chapter 20, Subrule 20.2, Scope of Title-Definitions: The state revised the definition of “EPA reference method” to adopt the most current performance test (stack test) method as specified in 40 CFR part 60, appendix A and amended or corrected through February 16, 2021. The proposed update will ensure that state reference methods are equivalent to Federal reference methods; thus, EPA proposes to approve this change.