Domestic Mail Manual (DMM)

A Addressing

A000 Basic Addressing

* * * * *

A040 Alternative Addressing Formats

1.0 SIMPLIFIED ADDRESS

* * * * *

1.2 Use—City Routes, P.O. Boxholders

[Revise 1.2 by deleting the last sentence in the first paragraph and replacing it with the following sentence:]

* * * The following also applies:

* * *

* * * * *

1.3 Mail Preparation

[Revise 1.3 as follows:]

All pieces must be prepared in carrier route or 5-digit carrier route or carrier routes containers; 3-digit carrier route or carrier routes containers are not allowed. All flat-size pieces must be prepared in carrier route or 5-digit carrier sacks. All pieces for the same carrier route must be tied in packages of 50, so far as practicable, and each package must bear a facing slip showing desired distribution (*e.g.*, 5-digit ZIP Code and route number). If the pieces are tied in quantities other than 50 each, the actual number must be shown on the facing slip. Delivery statistics for routes may be obtained as described in A930. Pieces in such mailings must also meet the following standards:

a. All pieces must be in the same processing category.

b. Pieces must be marked according to M012.

c. Letter-size pieces must be prepared in trays, and flat-size pieces must be prepared in sacks under M220 or M620, as applicable.

d. If selective distribution is desired, enough pieces must be presented to cover the route or routes selected.

[Delete 1.4. Redesignate 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 as 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6, respectively.]

* * * * *

4.0 CONGRESSIONAL FRANK

* * * * *

[Redesignate current 4.3 and 4.4 as 4.4 and 4.5, and add new 4.3 to read as follows:]

4.3 Mail Preparation

Mailers must prepare containers of mail using the simplified address format in the manner listed below:

a. Containers of congressional frank mailpieces using the simplified address format must be prepared under A040.

b. PS Tag 11, *Congressional Mail*, ''Postmaster—Open and Distribute'' must be securely affixed to each sack or tray of congressional mail to ensure adequate identification of the mail. On trays, the tag must be affixed to the end that bears the tray label.

[Redesignate current 4.3 and 4.4 as 4.4 and 4.5, and add new 4.3 to read as follows:]

* * * * *

E Eligibility

* * * * *

E200 Periodicals

E230 Carrier Route Rates

* * * * *

3.0 WALK-SEQUENCE DISCOUNTS

* * * * *

3.3 Addressing Standards

[Revise 3.3b as follows:]

b. Official matter, whether mailed under congressional frank or by certain government entities for delivery on a city route, may use the appropriate simplified address format described in A040.

* * * * *

M Mail Preparation and Sortation

* * * * *

M200 Periodicals (Nonautomation)

* * * * *

M220 Carrier Route Rates

1.0 BASIC INFORMATION

1.1 General Preparation Standards

[Add new item h to read as follows:]

* * * h. Pieces with a simplified address must meet the corresponding preparation standards in A040 and the eligibility standards in E215.

* * * * *

[Revise the heading of 3.0 to read as follows:]

3.0 PREPARATION (LETTER-SIZE PIECES)

[Designate 3.0 as 3.1 and add new 3.2 to read as follows:]

3.2 Tray Line 2 for Pieces with Simplified Address

For trays that contain letter-size pieces with a simplified address prepared under A040, use ''MAN'' on Line 2 in place of ''BC.''

* * * * *

[An appropriate amendment to 39 CFR part 111 will be published to reflect these changes.]

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 02–27233 Filed 10–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 247–0364a; FRL–7396–1]

Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is taking direct final action to approve a revision to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). This revision concerns emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOX) and carbon monoxide (CO) from stationary internal combustion engines. In accordance with the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act), we are taking action on a local rule that regulates these emission sources.

DATES: This rule is effective on December 24, 2002, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by November 25, 2002. If we receive such comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

You can inspect a copy of the submitted SIP revision and EPA's technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office during normal business hours. You may also see a copy of the submitted SIP revision at the following locations:

Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Room B–102, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., (Mail Code 6102T), Washington, DC 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 ''I'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 Country Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003

A copy of the rule may also be available via the Internet at *http://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdbltxt.htm.* This is not an EPA Web site and it may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA. Readers should verify that the adoption date of the rule listed is the same as the rule submitted

to EPA for approval and be aware that the official submittal is only available at the agency addresses listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX; (415) 947–4118.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, ''we,'' ''us'' and ''our'' refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

I. The State's Submittal
A. What rule did the State submit?
B. Are there other versions of this rule?
C. What is the purpose of the submitted rule revisions?
II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
A. How is EPA evaluating the rule?
B. Does the rule meet the evaluation criteria?
C. EPA recommendations to further improve the rule
D. Public comment and final action
III. Background Information
Why was this rule submitted?
IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rule Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rule addressed by this proposal with the dates that it was revised by the local air agency and submitted to EPA by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULE

Local agency	Rule number	Rule title	Revised	Submitted
VCAPCD	74.9	Stationary Internal Combustion Engines	11/14/00	05/08/01

On July 20, 2001, this rule submittal was found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51, appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are There Other Versions of This Rule?

The previous version of VCAPCD Rule 74.9 is SIP Rule 74.9, Stationary Internal Combustion Engines, approved into the SIP on August 23, 1995 (60 FR 43713).

C. What Is the Purpose of the Submitted Rule Revisions?

Rule 74.9 regulates NO_X and CO emissions from stationary internal combustion engines with a brake horsepower rating of 50 or greater located at a major stationary source. The SIP rule applies to such engines throughout VCAPCD, which includes the mainland severe ozone nonattainment area plus two Channel Islands designated unclassifiable. 40 CFR 81.305. The purpose of changing Rule 74.9 relative to the SIP Rule is to include an exemption to the rule for engines operated on the two Channel Islands, San Nicolas Island (SNI) and Anacapa Island (AI). The TSD has more information about this rule.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rule?

Generally, SIP rules must be enforceable (see section 110(a) of the CAA), must require Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for major sources in nonattainment areas (see section 182(a)(2)(A)), must not interfere with applicable requirements including requirements concerning attainment (see section 110(l)), and must not relax existing requirements in effect prior to enactment of the 1990 CAA amendments (see section 193). The VCAPCD regulates sources within a severe ozone nonattainment area. 40 CFR 81.305. Therefore Rule 74.9 must fulfill RACT requirements for such sources.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to define specific enforceability and RACT requirements include the following:

- *Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans,* U.S. EPA, 40 CFR part 51.
- *Issues Relating to VOC Regulation, Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations* (the ''Blue Book''), U.S. EPA, OAQPS (May 25, 1988).
- *State Implementation Plans; Nitrogen Oxides Supplement to the General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990* (the ''NO_X Supplement to the General Preamble''), U.S. EPA, 57 FR 55620 (November 25, 1992).
- *Determination of Reasonably Available Control Technology and Best Available Retrofit Control Technology for Stationary Spark-Ignited Internal Combustion Engines,* California Air Resources Board (November 2001).

B. Does the Rule Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

The revised Rule 74.9 includes an exemption for engines used on the offshore SNI and AI. The exemptions to Rule 74.9 are reasonable, because the VCAPCD federal ozone nonattainment area does not include SNI and AI and the 1994/1995 ozone Air Quality Management Plan does not rely on decreasing NO_X emission controls on SNI and AI. Therefore there will be no interference with the requirements concerning attainment of the ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards in the VCAPCD nonattainment area and the rule complies with section 110(l) of the CAA.

The revisions to Rule 74.9 do not affect the requirements for sources within the nonattainment area. For these sources, Rule 74.9 exceeds RACT requirements for NOX emission standards and meets the more stringent NOX and CO emission standards for Best Available Retrofit Control Technology (BARCT).

We believe the rule is consistent with the relevant policy and guidance regarding enforceability and SIP relaxations. The TSD has more information on our evaluation.

C. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve The Rule

The VCAPCD Rule 74.9 TSD describes additional rule revisions that do not affect EPA's current action but are recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rule.

D. Public Comment and Final Action

As authorized in section 110(k)(3) of the CAA, EPA is fully approving the submitted rule because we believe it fulfills all relevant requirements. We do not think anyone will object to this approval, so we are finalizing the approval without proposing it in advance. However, in the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are simultaneously proposing approval of the same submitted rule. If we receive adverse comments by November 25, 2002, we will publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** to notify the public that the direct final approval will not take effect and we will address the comments in a subsequent final action based on the proposal. If we do not receive timely adverse comments, the direct final approval will be effective without further notice on December 24, 2002.

This will incorporate the rule into the federally-enforceable SIP.

III. Background Information

Why Was This Rule Submitted?

NO_X helps produce ground-level ozone, smog, and particulate matter which harm human health and the environment. EPA has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations in order to achieve and maintain the NAAQS. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agency NO_X rules.

TABLE 2.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101–549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671*q*.
May 15, 1991	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

IV. Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, ''Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use'' (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the CAA. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045, ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the CAA. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

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. EPA will submit 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 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 CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by December 24, 2002. 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 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

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

Dated: August 30, 2002.

Keith Takata,

Acting Regional Administrator, , Region IX.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

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

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

Subpart F—California

2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(284)(i)(D) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(284) * * *

(i) * * *

(D) Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

(*1*) Rule 74.9, adopted on July 21, 1981 and amended on November 14, 2000.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 02–27134 Filed 10–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

42 CFR Parts 431 and 438

[CMS–2104–F2]

RIN–0938–AK96

Medicaid Program; Medicaid Managed Care: New Provisions Correcting Amendment

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), HHS.

ACTION: Final rule; correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: In the June 14, 2002 issue of the **Federal Register** (67 FR 40989), we published a final rule implementing the Medicaid managed care provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The effective date of the final rule was August 13, 2002. This document corrects a limited number of technical and typographical errors identified in the June 14, 2002 final rule.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This correcting amendment is effective November 25, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bruce Johnson, (410) 786–0615.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Need for Corrections

In FR Doc. 02–14747 of June 14, 2002, (67 FR 40989), we published final regulations that implemented the statutory provisions from the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) related to Medicaid managed care. As published, a provision of § 431.220, and several provisions of the new part 438, contained technical errors. The errors included typographical errors, incorrect cross-references, incorrectly designated paragraphs, and contradictions. We are in this final rule correcting the identified errors.

Summary of Technical Corrections to the Regulations Text of the June 14, 2002 Medicaid Managed Care Final Rule

Section 431.220 identifies when the State agency must grant a fair hearing to a beneficiary, and was amended by the June 14, 2002 final rule to add new reasons or circumstances under which a State fair hearing must be granted. Section 438.56(f)(2) specifies that an enrollee may request a State fair hearing, for example, if the enrollee is dissatisfied with the State agency's determination that there is not good cause for disenrollment. The preamble to the final rule makes clear that it was CMS'' intent that these new rights be provided.

However, we inadvertently neglected to include a cross-reference to this new right in § 431.220, under the heading ''*When a hearing is required*''. This is corrected by adding a new item (7) to § 431.220, identifying the new circumstance when a State fair hearing must be granted as related to disenrollment.

In § 438.8, which identifies provisions that apply to PIHPs and PAHPs, paragraph (b) identifies provisions of part 438 that apply to prepaid ambulatory health plans (PAHPs). In this provision, we inadvertently omitted a reference to prohibitions against affiliations with individuals debarred by Federal agencies in § 438.610. Again, it is clear from the preamble, and from the text of § 438.610, that this provision was intended to apply to PAHPs. This error is corrected by adding a new item (8) to § 438.8(b) to reference prohibited affiliations with individuals debarred by Federal agencies in § 438.610.

In § 438.10, which sets forth requirements relating to information, in subparagraph (e)(1)(ii) the term ''PIHP'' and in subparagraph (i)(3) the term ''potential enrollee,'' are in the singular form, but should be plural to conform with other nouns that are plural in the provision. These grammatical errors are corrected by making the terms plural.

In several paragraphs, there were inaccurate cross-references to other provisions of the regulations text. In § 438.10(f)(6)(iv), the reference to ''§ 438.10(h)'' should be ''§ 438.10(h)(1)''. In § 438.52(d), the reference to paragraphs ''(b)(2) or (b)(3)'' should be ''(b) or (c)''. In § 438.100(b)(iii), the reference to ''§ 438.10(f)(6)(xiii)'' should be ''§ 438.10(f)(6)(xii)''. In § 438.102(c), the reference to ''§ 438.10(e)(2)(ii)'' should be ''§ 438.10(e)(2)(ii)(E)''. These are corrected in this final rule by inserting the correct regulatory citations.

In both subparagraph (b)(2) and paragraph (c) in § 438.102, which addresses provider-enrollee communications, we added the clarifying term ''paragraphs'' following ''§ 438.102'.

In § 438.114, governing emergency and post-stabilization services, the requirements in paragraphs (a) through (e) were intended to apply to all types of managed care programs. It is clear from the preamble to the final rule that this was CMS's intent. However, in paragraph (d)(ii), ''PIHP'' and ''PAHP'' inadvertently were omitted.

This is corrected in this final rule by including a reference to ''PIHP'' and ''PAHP''.

Paragraph (b)(2)(i) of § 438.116, which sets forth solvency standards, creates an exception to the solvency standard in paragraph (b) for entities that do not provide both inpatient hospital and physician services. By definition, PAHPs would not provide inpatient services. Therefore, the references to PAHPs in paragraph (b) are extraneous. This is corrected in this final rule by removing the two references to PAHPs in paragraphs (b)(1) and (2).

In two places, paragraphs are incorrectly designated. In § 438.214, on provider selection, there are two paragraphs designated ''(a)''. This is corrected in this final rule by redesignating the second paragraph as ''(b)''. In § 438.810, on expenditures for enrollment broker services, the last paragraph (c) is actually a continuation of paragraph (b) specifying conditions that enrollment brokers must meet. This is corrected in this final rule by redesignating paragraph ''(c)'' as ''(b)(3)''.

In § 438.730, on sanctions by CMS, subparagraphs (e)(1) and (e)(2), the term ''HMO'' is used. The BBA replaced the term ''Health Maintenance Organization (HMO)'' with ''Managed Care Organization (MCO)''. The obsolete references to HMO in paragraph (e) of § 438.730 are corrected in this final rule by removing ''HMO'' and replacing it with the new acronym ''MCO''.

In § 438.810, governing expenditures for enrollment broker services, a reference to PAHPs was inadvertently omitted from the definition of ''Choice counseling'' in paragraph (a), even though the text in the remainder of the provisions in § 438.810 includes such a reference. This is corrected in this final