

handling of mailpieces from broken or loose bundles results in delayed delivery and increases our processing costs.

Although we are exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. of 553(b), (c)) regarding proposed rulemaking by 39 U.S.C. 410(a), we invite public comments on the following proposed revisions 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.

**PART 111—[AMENDED]**

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR Part 111 continues to read as follows:

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

2. Amend the following sections of Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service, Domestic Mail Manual (DMM) as explained below.

**300 Discount Flats**

\* \* \* \* \*

**330 First-Class Mail**

\* \* \* \* \*

**335 Mail Preparation**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.0 Bundles**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.4 Securing Bundles**

[Revise introductory text and items a, b, and c as follows; delete items d through f. Make these same changes to 345.2.4 (for Standard Mail flats), 365.2.4 (for Bound Printed Matter flats), 375.2.4 (for Media Mail flats), 385.2.4 (for Library Mail flats), 435.2.5 (for First-Class Mail parcels), 465.2.4 (for Bound Printed Matter parcels), 475.2.4 (for Media Mail parcels), 485.2.4 (for Library Mail parcels), 705.8.5.10 (for bundles on pallets), and 707.19.4 (for Periodicals).]

Mailers must meet the following standards when preparing and securing bundles.

a. Secure bundles with banding, shrinkwrap, or shrinkwrap supplemented with one or more bands. Banding includes plastic bands, rubber bands, twine, string, and similar material.

b. Mailers using only banding to secure bundles must meet the following conditions.

1. Use at least one band to encircle the length of the bundle and use at least one band to encircle the girth of the bundle.

2. Use tension sufficient to tighten and depress the edges of the bundle so pieces will not slip out of the banding during transit and processing.

3. Do not place any bands closer than 1 inch from any bundle edge.

4. When using twine or string to band bundles, secure the knot(s) so the banding does not come loose during transit and processing.

5. Do not use wire or metal banding.

6. Do not use any loose banding.

c. Bundles must withstand normal transit and handling without breaking and without causing injury to postal employees or damage to Postal Service equipment.

\* \* \* \* \*

**340 Standard Mail**

\* \* \* \* \*

**345 Mail Preparation**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.0 Bundles**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.5 Preparing Bundles in Sacks**

(Revise introductory text and item b as follows. Make these same changes in 707.19.8 (for Periodicals).)

Mailers must meet the following standards when preparing and securing bundles placed in sacks.

\* \* \* \* \*

b. Secure bundles with at least two bands (plastic bands, rubber bands, twine, or string), one around the length and one around the girth. As options, secure bundles entirely with shrinkwrap, or with shrinkwrap plus one or two bands.

\* \* \* \* \*

**400 Discount Parcels**

\* \* \* \* \*

**440 Standard Mail**

\* \* \* \* \*

**445 Mail Preparation**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.0 Bundles**

\* \* \* \* \*

(Switch 2.5 and 2.4. Revise new 2.4 using the text in 335.2.4 above; revise new 2.5 using the text in 345.2.5 above.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**700 Special Standards**

\* \* \* \* \*

**705 Advanced Preparation and Special Postage Payment Systems**

\* \* \* \* \*

**8.0 Preparation for Pallets**

\* \* \* \* \*

**8.5 General Preparation**

\* \* \* \* \*

(Revise title of 8.5.10 as follows.)

**8.5.10 Securing Bundles on Pallets**

(Replace text in 8.5.10 with text from new 335.2.4.)

(Delete 8.5.11; renumber 8.5.12 and 8.5.13 as new 8.5.11 and 8.5.12.)

\* \* \* \* \*

We will publish an appropriate amendment to 39 CFR 111.3 if the proposal is adopted.

**Neva R. Watson,**

*Attorney, Legislative.*

[FR Doc. 05–21777 Filed 11–1–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–12–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Parts 52 and 81**

[R08–OAR–2005–UT–0006; FRL–7992–7]

**Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Provo Attainment Demonstration of the Carbon Monoxide Standard, Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, and Approval of Related Revisions**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Utah. On April 1, 2004, the Governor of Utah submitted an attainment demonstration and plan for the Provo metropolitan area (hereafter, Provo area) for the carbon monoxide (CO) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) to replace the demonstration and plan that were submitted by Governor Leavitt on July 11, 1994. The Governor’s submittal also contained a request to redesignate the Provo area to attainment for the CO NAAQS and a maintenance plan which includes transportation conformity motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEB) for 2014 and 2015. The Governor also submitted revisions to: Utah’s Rule R307–110–12, “Section IX, Control Measures for Area and Point Sources, Part C, Carbon Monoxide,” which incorporates the attainment

demonstration, plan, and maintenance plan; Utah's Rule R307-110-31, "Section X, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program, Part A," which incorporates general requirements and applicability for motor vehicle emissions inspections; and Utah's Rule R307-110-34, "Section X, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program, Part D, Utah County," which incorporates a revised vehicle inspection and maintenance program for Utah County. The Governor's April 1, 2004 submittal also stated that the prior July 11, 1994 submittal of Utah's Rule R307-1-4.12, "Emissions Standards for Residential Solid Fuel Burning Devices and Fireplaces" to restrict woodburning in Utah County, remains part of her April 1, 2004 submittal and requested that Utah's Rule R307-301, "Oxygenated Gasoline Program," be eliminated from the Federally-approved SIP. We note that on September 20, 1999, the Governor submitted Utah Rules R307-302-3 and -4, which together comprise a re-numbered and re-titled version of R307-1-4.12. The text of Rules R307-302-3 and -4 is identical to the text of Rule R307-1-4.12 that the Governor submitted on July 11, 1994.

EPA is proposing to approve the Provo area's attainment demonstration and plan, the request for redesignation to attainment for the Provo area, the maintenance plan, the transportation conformity MVEBs for 2014 and 2015, the revisions to Rule R307-110-12, the revisions to Rule R307-110-31, the revisions to Rule R307-110-34, Rules R307-302-3 and -4, and the request to remove Rule R307-301 from the Federally-approved SIP. EPA is also identifying the transportation conformity MVEB for the year 2000, which is derived from the attainment year emission inventory in the attainment plan. This action is being taken under section 110 of the Clean Air Act.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties

interested in commenting must 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 may be 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:** Written comments must be received on or before December 2, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by RME Docket Number R08-OAR-2005-UT-0006, by one of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- Agency Web site: <http://docket.epa.gov/rmepub/index.jsp>. Regional Materials in EDOCKET (RME), EPA's electronic public docket and comment system for regional actions, is EPA's preferred method for receiving comments. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- E-mail: [long.richard@epa.gov](mailto:long.richard@epa.gov) and [russ.tim@epa.gov](mailto:russ.tim@epa.gov).

- Fax: (303) 312-6064 (please alert the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** if you are faxing comments).

- Mail: Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 999 18th Street, Suite 200, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466.

- Hand Delivery: Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 999 18th Street, Suite 200, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466. Such deliveries are only accepted Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:55 p.m., excluding Federal holidays. Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Russ, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 999 18th Street, Suite 200, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, phone (303) 312-6436, and e-mail at: [russ.tim@epa.gov](mailto:russ.tim@epa.gov)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations section of the **Federal Register**.

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

Dated: October 24, 2005.

**Robert E. Roberts,**

*Regional Administrator, Region VIII.*

[FR Doc. 05-21836 Filed 11-1-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[R03-OAR-2005-VA-0007; FRL-7993-1]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Redesignation of the City of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania County, and Stafford County Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a redesignation request and a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ) is requesting that the City of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania County, and Stafford County (the Fredericksburg area) be redesignated as attainment for the 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). In conjunction with its redesignation request, the Commonwealth submitted a State Implementation Plan revision consisting of a maintenance plan for the Fredericksburg area that provides for continued attainment of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS for the next 10 years. EPA is proposing to make a determination that the Fredericksburg area has attained the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. This proposed determination is based on three years of complete, quality-assured ambient air quality monitoring data for 2002-2004 that demonstrate the 8-hour NAAQS has been attained in the area. EPA's proposed approval of the 8-hour ozone redesignation request is based on its determination that the Fredericksburg area has met the criteria for redesignation to attainment specified in the Clean Air Act (CAA). EPA is providing information on the status of its adequacy determination for the motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) that are identified in the 8-hour maintenance plan for the Fredericksburg area for purposes of transportation conformity, and is also proposing to approve those MVEBs. EPA is proposing approval of the