catalog item. If future catalogs add new items, the $1.25 rate will apply to these as well. The mailer has the option of performing their own harmonization, provided it is done in a format compatible with the Postal Service's Customs Pre-Advisory System (CPAS) software.

The above rule change will be incorporated into the rules for new destination countries announced for Global Package Link.

DATES: The interim regulations take effect as of 12:01 midnight on October 30, 1996. Comments must be received on or before December 15, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed or delivered to International Business Unit, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, 370 IBU, Washington, DC 20260–6500. Copies of all written comments will be available for public inspection and photocopying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mike Opiela, (202) 314–7134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Global Package Link is a service that assists mail order companies and other customers that send merchandise to Japan, Canada, and the U.K. Presently, the Postal Service has Global Package Link processing facilities in New York City, Dallas, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, and Seattle. The service includes expedited customs clearance through use of a software-based information system containing all the applicable duty and tax rates for specific products being mailed to destination countries. In order for a mailer to utilize this service, the mailers products must be ''harmonized'' with the customs classifications and the applicable duties for each destination country and put into an electronic database format for transmission to customs officials in the destination country.

The Postal Service will provide these harmonization services for the mailer at a price of $1.25 per catalog item. If catalog items are subsequently added or changed in a manner requiring re-classification, the $1.25 charge would apply to each changed item. The mailer may arrange its own catalog harmonization, provided it is done in a format compatible with the Postal Service' proprietary software, known as Custom's Pre-Advisory System (CPAS). The CPAS software is an integral part of the Global Package Link service and is used to pre-advise destination country customs officials of the contents of a Global Package Link shipment.

Accordingly, the Postal Service hereby adopts this amendment to the interim rule for Global Package Link to Japan, Canada, and the U.K. Although 39 U.S.C. 407 does not require advance notice and opportunity for submission of comments, and the Postal Service is exempted by 39 U.S.C. 410(a) from the advance notice requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act regarding proposed rulemaking (5 U.S.C. 553), the Postal Service invites interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments concerning the interim rule.

The Postal Service adopts the following amendments to the International Mail Manual, issue 14, which is incorporated by reference in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 39 CFR 20.1.

List of Subjects in 39 CFR Part 20

International postal service, Foreign relations.

PART 20—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 39 CFR part 20 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a); 39 U.S.C. 401, 404, 407, 408.

2. Effective October 30, 1996, subchapter 620 of the International Mail Manual, Issue 17, is amended as follows:

6 SPECIAL PROGRAMS

* * * * *

620 GLOBAL PACKAGE LINK

* * * * *

626.9 Catalog Harmonization Services

All catalog harmonization service performed for the Global Package Link mailer by the Postal Service will be billed to the mailer at a rate of $1.25 per catalog item. If the catalog is changed in the future, the new items will also be charged at $1.25 per item. The mailer has the option of performing their own harmonization, provided it is done in a format compatible with the Postal Service's Customs Pre-Advisory System (CPAS) software.

* * * * *

3. Effective October 30, 1996, the Individual Country Listing for Canada in the International Mail Manual, issue 17, is amended by adding the regulations concerning Global Package Link catalog harmonization service.

* * * * *

Global Package Link (620)

* * * * *

INSURANCE AND INDEMNITY

* * * * *

Ground Courier Service

Packages sent through Ground Courier Service include up to $100 (Canadian) insurance at no additional cost.

* * * * *

CATALOG HARMONIZATION SERVICES

All catalog harmonization service performed for the Global Package Link mailer by the Postal Service will be billed to the mailer at a rate of $1.25 per catalog item. If the catalog is changed in the future, the new items will also be charged at $1.25 per item. The mailer has the option of performing its own harmonization, provided it is done in a format compatible with the Postal Service's Customs Pre-Advisory System (CPAS) software.

4. Effective October 30, 1996, the Individual Country Listing for Great Britain and Northern Ireland in the International Mail Manual, Issue 17, is amended by adding the regulations concerning Global Package Link catalog harmonization services.

Global Package Link (620)

* * * * *

CATALOG HARMONIZATION SERVICES

All catalog harmonization service performed for the Global Package Link mailer by the Postal Service will be billed to the mailer at a rate of $1.25 per catalog item. If the catalog is changed in the future, the new items will also be charged at $1.25 per item. The mailer has the option of performing its own harmonization, provided it is done in a format compatible with the Postal Service's Customs Pre-Advisory System (CPAS) software.

* * * * *

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 96–27350 Filed 10–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[TX–7–1–5220a; FRL–5629–5]

Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, Texas; Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist Emissions From Existing Sulfuric Acid Production Plants and Total Reduced Sulfur From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: This document approves the Texas plan for controlling sulfuric acid mist emissions from existing sulfuric acid production plants and for controlling total reduced sulfur (TRS) from existing kraft pulp mills. The plans were submitted to fulfill the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (the Act), and regulations promulgated thereunder. The plans consist of the document: *Texas Air Control Board Plan for the Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist, Total Reduced Sulfur, and Fluoride Emissions from Existing Facilities;* and sections 112.41 to 112.47 (for control of sulfuric acid) and sections of 112.51 to 112.59 (for control of total reduced sulfur) of Texas Regulation II (31 TAC Chapter 112) *Control of Air Pollution from Sulfur Compounds.* These plans were adopted by the State of Texas on May 12, 1989, and submitted by the Governor to the EPA in a letter dated August 21, 1989.

DATES: This action is effective on December 27, 1996, unless notice is postmarked by November 27, 1996 that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the Federal Register.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Thomas H. Diggs, Chief, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. Copies of the State's plan and other information relevant to this action are available for inspection during normal hours at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460

Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, Air Quality Program, 12124 Park 35 Circle, Austin, Texas 78753

Anyone wishing to review this plan at the EPA office is asked to contact the person below to schedule an appointment 24 hours in advance.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lt. Mick Cote, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7219.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The State of Texas submitted to the EPA on August 21, 1989, plans for controlling sulfuric acid mist from sulfuric acid plants and for controlling TRS from kraft pulp mills. The plans were developed to meet the requirements of section 111(d) of the Act.

Under section 111(d) of the Act, the EPA established procedures whereby States submit plans to control existing sources of designated pollutants. Designated pollutants are defined as pollutants which are not included on a list published under section 108(a) of the Act (i.e., National Ambient Air Quality Standard pollutants), but to which a standard of performance for new sources applies under section 111. Under section 111(d), emission standards are to be adopted by the States and submitted to the EPA for approval. The standards limit the emissions of designated pollutants from existing facilities which, if new, would be subject to the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). Such facilities are called designated facilities.

The procedures under which States submit these plans to control existing sources are defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR); specifically subpart B of 40 CFR part 60. According to subpart B, the States are required to develop plans within Federal guidelines for the control of designated pollutants. The EPA publishes guidelines documents for development of State emission standards along with the promulgation of any NSPS for a designated pollutant. These guidelines apply to designated pollutants and include information such as a discussion of the pollutant's effects, description of control techniques and their effectiveness, costs and potential impacts. Also as guidance for the States, recommended emission limits and times for compliance are set forth, and control equipment which will achieve these emission limits are identified. In subpart B, two types of designated pollutants are discussed. One type of designated pollutant is the type that may cause or contribute to the endangerment of public health. The other type of designated pollutant is a welfare-related pollutant, for which adverse effects on public health have not been demonstrated. The emission guidelines for health-related pollutants (such as sulfuric acid mist) are promulgated (in 40 CFR part 60) while emission guidelines for welfare-related pollutants appear only in the applicable guideline document.

For welfare-related pollutants such as TRS, States have the option of balancing emission guidelines, times for compliance, and other information provided in a guideline document against other factors of public concern in the establishment of emission standards, compliance schedules and variances, as long as the guidelines document and public hearing information are considered and all the other requirements of subpart B are met. Therefore, States have greater flexibility in establishing plans for the control of TRS. Factors other than technology and costs can be considered in developing a TRS control plan.

II. Analysis of State Submittal

A. Texas Plan for Sulfuric Acid Mist Emissions From Existing Sulfuric Acid Production Plants

Sulfuric acid mist is considered a health-related pollutant. The EPA published guidance entitled *Final Guideline Document: Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist Emissions from Existing Sulfuric Acid Production Units* (EPA–450/2–77–019 (NTIS: PB–274–085)), in September 1977. The final section 111(d) emission standard was promulgated October 18, 1977 (42 FR 55796), and codified in the CFR at 40 CFR subpart C, sections 60.30 to 60.34. The standard was moved to a new subpart Cb, *Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Sulfuric Acid Production Units,* on February 11, 1991 (56 *FR* 5525).

The emission guideline specified in 40 CFR 60, subpart Cb, for sulfuric acid production units at designated facilities, is 0.25 grams sulfuric acid mist (as measured by Method 8 of appendix A of 40 CFR part 60) per kilogram of sulfuric acid produced (0.5 pounds per ton), the production being expressed as 100 percent sulfuric acid.

The State of Texas submitted to the EPA on August 21, 1989, a section 111(d) plan for controlling sulfuric acid mist from existing sulfuric acid plants. The plan was adopted by the TACB on May 12, 1989. The plan consists of the document *Texas Air Control Board Plan for the Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist, Total Reduced Sulfur, and Fluoride Emissions from Existing Facilities;* and sections 112.41 to 112.47, *Control of Sulfuric Acid,* of Texas Regulation II (31 TAC Chapter 112) *Control of Air Pollution from Sulfur Compounds* as revised May 12, 1989. The EPA has reviewed the plan and developed an evaluation report [1], which is based on

[1] Evaluation Report for Texas 111(d) Plan for the Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist from Existing Sulfuric Acid Production Plants.

the requirements of section 111(d) of the Act of 1977, as amended, 40 CFR part 60 subpart B and the EPA guideline document titled *Final Guideline Document: Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist Emissions from Existing Sulfuric Acid Production Units* (EPA–450/2–77–019 (NTIS: PB–274–085)).

The State of Texas has ten designated sulfuric acid plants. These are: Diamond-Shamrock Corporation in Sunray; Amoco Oil Company in Texas City; E. I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Inc., in La Porte; Mobil Mining and Minerals in Pasadena; Rohm and Haas, Texas Inc., in Deer Park; Stauffer Chemical Company in Baytown; Stauffer Chemical Company in Houston; Olin Corporation in Beaumont; Stauffer Chemical Company in Pasadena; and Stauffer Chemical Company in Fort Worth. The last two have been inactive since 1984 and 1982, respectively.

The emission limits in the Texas plan are the same as those required in subpart Cb. Subpart Cb requires plants to be capable of attaining the specified level of emissions within 17 months after the effective date of a State emission standard. The State plan was effective May 12, 1989, and designated sources were required to be in compliance by July 31, 1990. Therefore, compliance schedules are not required to be submitted.

B. Texas Plan for TRS Emissions From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

The TRS consists of the sulfur compounds hydrogen sulfide, methyl mercaptan, dimethyl sulfide, and dimethyl disulfide, all of which are commonly emitted by kraft pulp mills. Although these TRS emissions have no demonstrated adverse effects on human health at low concentrations; they can corrode or tarnish exposed copper, zinc, and silver and discolor paints containing heavy metal slats, e.g., lead. More importantly perhaps, TRS emissions have a distinctly unpleasant odor which may adversely affect property values and economic development in the vicinity of kraft pulp mills.

On February 23, 1978 (43 FR 7566), the EPA promulgated, at 40 CFR 60 subpart BB, NSPS for eight affected facilities or emission sources in the kraft pulping industry. These sources are: recovery furnace, digester system, multiple-effect evaporator system, lime kiln, brown stock washer system, black liquor oxidation system, smelt dissolving tank, and condensate stripper system. In relevant part, the NSPS designated TRS as a welfare-related pollutant to be controlled. Subsequently, in March 1979, the EPA issued guidance entitled *Kraft Pulping, Control of TRS Emissions from Existing Mills* (EPA–450/2–78–003b (NTIS: PB–296–135)), for use by the States when developing regulations. On May 20, 1986 (51 FR 18538), the EPA amended the NSPS to allow a higher level of TRS emissions from smelt dissolving tanks. The NSPS for emissions from smelt dissolving tanks was changed from 0.0084 to 0.016 grams/kilogram black liquor solids (BLS) as hydrogen sulfide.

The State of Texas submitted to the EPA on August 21, 1989, a section 111(d) plan for controlling TRS from kraft pulp mills. The plan was adopted by the TACB on May 12, 1989. The plan consists of the document: *Texas Air Control Board Plan for the Control of Sulfuric Acid Mist, Total Reduced Sulfur, and Fluoride Emissions from Existing Facilities* and sections 112.51 to 112.59, *Control of Total Reduced Sulfur (TRS),* of Texas Regulation II (31 TAC Chapter 112) *Control of Air Pollution from Sulfur Compounds* as revised May 12, 1989. The EPA has reviewed the plan and developed an evaluation report [2], which is based on the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act of 1977, as amended, 40 CFR part 60 subpart B and the EPA guideline document titled *Kraft Pulping: Control of TRS Emissions from Existing Mills*.

The State of Texas has six designated kraft pulp mills. These are: Simpson Paper company in Pasadena; Champion International in Sheldon; Temple-Eastex, Inc. in Evadale; Champion International in Lufkin; International Paper Company in Domino; and Inland-Orange, Inc. in Orange.

The Texas section 111(d) Plan for TRS emissions from existing kraft pulp mills has the same emission limits as specified in the guideline document. The emission limit for smelt dissolving tanks is 0.016 grams/kilogram BLS, the same as the 1986 NSPS.

One concern was raised by the EPA during the review of the TRS regulation during the State comment period. This concern was the allowance for the State's approval of an alternate emission limitation if a facility submitted its request to the State before July 31, 1990. This provision is included in Section 112.53 of Texas Regulation II. The EPA stated that the concept of allowing for alternate emission limitation was acceptable; our concern was that the regulation did not require approval of an alternate emission limitation by the EPA.

Texas committed in their response to satisfy the administrative requirements outlined in 40 CFR part 60, regarding formal 111(d) plan revisions, and to complete, prior to submission to the EPA, a technical review regarding the application for an alternate emission limit. The State, in their evaluation of testimony, stated that the EPA would have the opportunity to comment at public hearings. Although this response did not fully address our concerns, this issue is now a moot point, since no facility submitted an application for an alternate emission limit before July 31, 1990. Therefore, this issue does not stand in the way of approval of the State's plan.

All kraft pulp mills in Texas were required to be in compliance with the recovery furnace emissions limit by July 31, 1992, and all other applicable emission limits by July 31, 1991. Therefore no compliance schedules are required.

III. Final Action

The EPA is publishing this action without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in a separate document in this Federal Register publication, the EPA is proposing to approve this plan should adverse or critical comments be filed. This action will be effective December 27, 1996 unless, by November 27, 1996, adverse or critical comments are received.

If the EPA receives such comments, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by publishing a subsequent action that will withdraw the final action. All public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this action serving as a proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no such comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective December 27, 1996.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any State plan. Each request for revision to the State plan shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors and in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

[2] Evaluation Report for Texas 111(d) Plan for the Control of Total Reduced Sulfur (TRS) from Existing Kraft Pulp Mills.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order (E.O.) 12866

This action has been classified as a Table 3 action for signature by the Regional Administrator under the procedures published in the Federal Register on January 19, 1989 (54 FR 2214–2225), as revised by a July 10, 1995, memorandum from Mary Nichols, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from E.O. 12866 review.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, the EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. *See* 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, the EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

State plan approvals under section 111 of the Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal State plan approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Act, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of State action. The Act forbids the EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *See Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. EPA,* 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

C. Unfunded Mandates

Under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Unfunded Mandates Act), signed into law on March 22, 1995, the EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of $100 million or more. Under section 205, the EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires the EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

The EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of $100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves preexisting requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

D. Submission to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, the EPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of this rule in today's Federal Register. This rule is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

E. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 27, 1996. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule 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 62

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Paper and paper products industry, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfuric acid plants, Sulfuric oxides.

Dated: September 30, 1996.

Jerry Clifford,

Acting Regional Administrator.

40 CFR Part 62 is amended as follows:

PART 62—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 62 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7642.

2. Part 62 is amended by adding Subpart SS to read as follows:

Subpart SS—Texas

Plan for the Control of Designated Pollutants From Existing Facilities (Section 111(d) Plan)

Sec.

62.10850 Identification of plan.

Sulfuric Acid Mist From Existing Sulfuric Acid Plants

62.10860 Identification of sources.

Total Reduced Sulfur From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

62.10870 Identification of sources.

Subpart SS—Texas

Plan for the Control of Designated Pollutants From Existing Facilities (Section 111(d) Plan)

§ 62.10850 Identification of Plan.

(a) *Identification of plan.* Texas Plan for Control of Designated Pollutants from Existing Facilities (111(d)Plan).

(b) The plan was officially submitted as follows:

(1) Control of sulfuric acid mist from existing sulfuric acid production plants as adopted by the Texas Air Control Board (TACB) on May 12, 1989, and submitted by the Governor in a letter dated August 21, 1989.

(2) Control of total reduced sulfur from existing kraft pulp mills as adopted by the Texas Air Control Board (TACB) on May 12, 1989, and submitted by the Governor in a letter dated August 21, 1989.

(c) *Designated facilities.* The plan applies to existing facilities in the following categories of sources:

(1) Sulfuric acid production plants.

(2) Kraft Pulp Mills.

Sulfuric Acid Mist From Existing Sulfuric Acid Plants

§ 62.10860 Identification of sources.

(a) *Identification of sources.* The plan includes the following sulfuric acid production plants:

(1) Diamond-Shamrock Corporation in Sunray, Texas.

(2) Amoco Oil Company in Texas City, Texas.

(3) E.I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Inc. in La Porte, Texas.

(4) Mobil Mining and Minerals in Pasadena, Texas.

(5) Rohm and Haas, Texas Inc. in Deer Park, Texas.

(6) Stauffer Chemical Company in Baytown, Texas.

(7) Stauffer Chemical Company in Houston, Texas.

(8) Olin Corporation in Beaumont, Texas.

(9) Stauffer Chemical Company in Pasadena, Texas.

(10) Stauffer Chemical Company in Fort Worth, Texas.

Total Reduced Sulfur From Existing Kraft Pulp Mills

§ 62.10870 Identification of source.

(a) Identification of sources. The plan includes the following kraft pulp mills:

(1) Simpson Paper Company in Pasadena, Texas.

(2) Champion International in Sheldon, Texas.

(3) Temple-Eastex, Inc. in Evadale, Texas.

(4) Champion International in Lufkin, Texas.

(5) International Paper Company in Domino, Texas.

(6) Inland-Orange, Inc. in Orange, Texas.

[FR Doc. 96–26557 Filed 10–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Parts 301–3, 301–5, 301–6, 301–8, 301–10, and 301–11

[FTR Amendment 50]

RIN 3090–AF96

Federal Travel Regulation; Streamlining Reimbursement Claim Review and Elimination of Requirement for Receipts, Regardless of Amount, for Certain Travel Expense Items

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) to streamline the review of travel reimbursement claims and to eliminate the requirement for a receipt, regardless of amount, for certain travel expense items. This document will ease the processing of reimbursement claims, thereby reducing agency administrative costs.

DATES: This final rule is effective October 28, 1996. This final rule applies for travel (including travel incident to a change of official station) performed on or after October 28, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert A. Clauson, Travel and Transportation Management Policy Division (MTT), Washington, DC 20405, telephone 202–501–0299.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This amendment was developed by the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) Travel Reinvention Task Force to streamline the processing of travel reimbursement claims. The General Services Administration (GSA), after review of the JFMIP recommendations, has determined that such changes are appropriate and is implementing the changes through this amendment. The amendment allows agencies to shift responsibility for travel voucher review from the voucher examiner to the travel authorizing/approving official or his/her designee (e.g., supervisor), and eliminates the requirement to provide receipts, regardless of amount, for certain travel expense items.

Receipt Requirements Removed

On December 6, 1995, GSA published in the Federal Register (60 FR 62332) FTR Amendment 45 which raised from $25 to $75 the maximum travel expense amount which may be claimed without requirement for a supporting receipt. The FTR, however, has continued to contain a list of 18 travel expense items which require a receipt regardless of amount. These items include excess baggage; baggage transfer and checking charges; clerical assistance; fees relating to travel outside the continental United States; hire of a special conveyance; miscellaneous expenses allowable under FTR § 301–9.1(e); operating expenses of a privately owned conveyance; rental of rooms for official business; rental of typewriters; personal services, such as guides, interpreters, packers and drivers of vehicles; stenographic and typing services; freight or express shipments; steamer chairs, steamer cushions, and steamer rugs; storage of baggage or property; telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms; long-distance telephone calls; copies of records; and cash payments for passenger transportation services. This amendment eliminates the requirement for a traveler to furnish a receipt, regardless of amount, for these items. The traveler will be required to furnish a receipt for these items only if the individual expense exceeds the $75 receipts threshold established in FTR Amendment 45. Additionally, this amendment makes a change to FTR part 301–8, inadvertently omitted in FTR Amendment 45, to increase to $75 the maximum amount that may be claimed without a supporting receipt for a meal under the actual expense method of subsistence reimbursement.

Supervisory Responsibilities Expanded

FTR § 301–11.4, in effect prior to this amendment, provided for supervisory review of travel vouchers primarily to confirm that travel for which expenses were claimed was performed as authorized. Voucher examiners historically have been responsible for ensuring that vouchers are properly prepared according to pertinent regulations and agency procedures before being certified for payment.

The JFMIP recommends placing this responsibility with the supervisor or other agency-designated official. Such individual should be closer to the employee both in proximity and in knowledge of the employee's need to perform official travel, and therefore better able to determine if the claimed expenses are reasonable and were necessary. This amendment will allow agencies to shift responsibility for thorough review of travel reimbursement claims from the voucher examiner to the travel authorizing/approving official or his/her designee (e.g., supervisor), as appropriate, so that the individual responsible for the travel budget also is responsible for ensuring that directed travel was performed as authorized and that travel dollars are spend wisely and properly.

GSA has determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action for the purposes of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993. This final rule is not required to be published in the Federal Register for notice and comment. Therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act does not apply. This rule is also exempt from Congressional review prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 801 since it relates solely to agency management and personnel.

List of Subjects in 41 CFR Parts 301–3, 301–5, 301–6, 301–8, 301–10, and 301–11

Government employees, Travel, Travel allowances, Travel and transportation expenses.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 41 CFR parts 301–3, 301–5, 301–6, 301–8, 301–10, and 301–11 are amended as follows:

PART 301–3—USE OF COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION

1. The authority citation for part 301–3 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 5707.

§ 301–3.4 [Amended]

2. Section 301–3.4 is amended by adding after the phrase ''shall obtain a receipt'' where it appears in the second sentence of paragraph (b)(2)(i), the parenthetical phrase, ''(when required under § 301–11.3(c))''.