owners and transmission operators likely come under the following category and associated size threshold: Electric bulk power transmission and control, at 500 employees.[54]

70. Based on U.S. economic census data, the approximate percentage of small firms in this category is 57 percent.[55] Currently, the Commission does not have information concerning how the economic census data compares with entities registered with NERC and is unable to estimate the number of small transmission owners and transmission operators using the new SBA definition. However, the Commission recognizes that proposed Reliability Standard CIP–014–1 only applies to transmission owners and transmission operators that own and/or operate certain critical Bulk-Power System facilities. The Commission believes that the proposed Reliability Standard will be applicable to a relatively small group of large entities and that an even smaller subset of large entities will have to comply with each of the requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard.

71. Based on the above, the Commission certifies that proposed Reliability Standard CIP–014–1 will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, no initial regulatory flexibility analysis is required. The Commission seeks comment on this proposal.

VI. Comment Procedures

72. The Commission invites interested persons to submit comments on the matters and issues proposed in this notice to be adopted, including any related matters or alternative proposals that commenters may wish to discuss. Comments are due September 8, 2014. Reply comments are due September 22, 2014. Comments must refer to Docket No. RM14–15–000, and must include the commenter's name, the organization they represent, if applicable, and their address in their comments.

73. The Commission encourages comments to be filed electronically via the eFiling link on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov.* The Commission accepts most standard word processing formats. Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format. Commenters filing electronically do not need to make a paper filing.

74. Commenters that are not able to file comments electronically must send an original of their comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

75. All comments will be placed in the Commission's public files and may be viewed, printed, or downloaded remotely as described in the Document Availability section below. Commenters on this proposal are not required to serve copies of their comments on other commenters.

VII. Document Availability

76. In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the **Federal Register**, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through the Commission's Home Page (*http://www.ferc.gov*) and in the Commission's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

77. From the Commission's Home Page on the Internet, this information is available on eLibrary. The full text of this document is available on eLibrary in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number excluding the last three digits of this document in the docket number field.

78. User assistance is available for eLibrary and the Commission's Web site during normal business hours from the Commission's Online Support at 202–502–6652 (toll free at 1–866–208–3676) or email at *ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov,* or the Public Reference Room at (202) 502–8371, TTY (202) 502–8659. Email the Public Reference Room at *public.referenceroom@ferc.gov.*

Issued: July 17, 2014.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–17231 Filed 7–22–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[54] 13 CFR 121.201, Sector 22, Utilities.

[55] Data and further information are available on the SBA Web site. *See* SBA Firm Size Data, available at *http://www.sba.gov/advocacy/849/12162.*

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. RM2014–5; Order No. 2117]

39 CFR Part 3050

Postal Price Elasticities

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Petition for rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is establishing a rulemaking docket in response to a petition concerning price elasticities and internet diversion. The Commission has scheduled a technical conference for a public discussion based on the filing. This notice informs the public of the filing, the scope of the technical conference, and the availability of certain related documents. It also invites public comment and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Technical conference:* August 13, 2014 (9:30 a.m.). *Comments are due:* September 19, 2014.

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
II. Postal Service Answer
III. Reply in Support of Petition
IV. Commission Analysis
V. Initial Technical Conference and Comments
VI. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction

On May 2, 2014, the National Postal Policy Council, the Association for Mail Electronic Enhancement, the Association of Marketing Service Providers, GrayHair Software, Inc., the Greeting Card Association, the International Digital Enterprise Alliance, Inc., the Major Mailers Association, and the National Association of Presort Mailers (Petitioners) filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11.[1] The Petition requests that the Commission initiate a proceeding to review and consider improvements to the econometric elasticities demand model used by the Postal Service and the Commission. Petition at 2. Petitioners contend that the econometric volume demand model prepared by the Postal Service materially understates the true price elasticities of demand for major postal products. *Id.*

[1] Petition to Improve Econometric Demand Equations for Market-Dominant Products and Related Estimates of Price Elasticities and Internet Diversion, May 2, 2014 (Petition).

First, Petitioners propose that firm-level models of the demand for transactional and marketing mail and similar models for the consumer mail market be developed, with the results aggregated to produce industry-level price elasticities. *Id.* at 14–16. Second, Petitioners advise re-estimating the econometric demand model by including a factor for electronic diversion. *Id.* at 16–17. Finally, Petitioners recommend comparing the elasticities derived from the firm-level models and the modeling of consumer behavior to the elasticities derived from the econometric demand estimates, as a method of corroborating each approach. *Id.* at 17.

II. Postal Service Answer

On May 9, 2014, the Postal Service filed its answer opposing the Petition.[2] The Postal Service contends that a proceeding would serve no useful purpose and that the interests of the Commission and the Postal Service would be better served by focusing their scarce resources elsewhere. Postal Service Answer at 1. The Postal Service also opposes the Petition on the following grounds: (1) The facts used to support the Petition were already considered and rejected by the Commission in Docket No. R2013–11; (2) demand elasticities and other forecasting parameters are outside of the Commission's purview; (3) a process that contemplates ''advance review'' of changes in the demand analysis and forecasting models would be unfeasible; and (4) a proceeding would inject consideration of issues currently before the Court of Appeals with respect to the Commission's decision in Docket No. R2013–11. *Id.* at 2–5. Finally, the Postal Service suggests that Petitioners pursue their own research or market surveys outside of any involvement by the Commission or the Postal Service. *Id.* at 5–6.

III. Reply in Support of Petition

On May 19, 2014, the Petitioners filed a reply to the Postal Service's Answer.[3] Petitioners state that the analytical principles used in postal demand modeling and volume forecasting methods are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Reply at 3. Petitioners also assert that: (1) Any worries that the Commission may prescribe a demand model by regulation are premature; (2) the proceeding is not a collateral attack on the Commission's decision in Docket No. R2013–11; and (3) it would be unrealistic and unaffordable for Petitioners to develop their own analyses for the Commission's consideration. *Id.* at 3–4.

IV. Commission Analysis

The Commission adopted the periodic reporting rules in 39 CFR part 3050 on April 16, 2009.[4] In Order No. 203, the Commission clearly stated its intent to define the term ''analytical principle'' in a way that encompassed the analytical principles used in econometric models of demand. *Id.* at 39–40. The Commission agreed with the Postal Service that advance Commission review of the methods of calculating demand elasticities would not be required. *Id.* at 43. However, the Commission underscored its legitimate needs for estimates of demand elasticity, and its ability to evaluate the methods used to calculate them. *Id.*

The Postal Service affirmed this understanding in its comments on the proposed periodic reporting rules:

> The Commission, of course, would have the opportunity to react to the Postal Service's demand analysis materials in the ACD, or later in the year at a time of its own choosing. Over the years, the Postal Service has consistently endeavored to respond to the Commission's identification of areas of possible improvement in demand analysis and forecasting, and there is no reason to believe that the Postal Service would forgo the benefits of that practice. While this may not be 'advance' input like that provided in the proposed costing rulemakings, it could perform an essentially similar function.

Docket No. RM2008–4, Initial Comments of the United States Postal Service in Response to Order No. 104, October 16, 2008, at 29.

The Commission considers the Petition a request to identify areas of possible improvement in demand analysis and forecasting.[5] To the extent that the Petition would require amendment to the Commission's rules, it considers the Petition a request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(e) to amend the Commission's rules in 39 CFR part 3050.

At this juncture, the Commission believes it appropriate to explore areas of possible improvement in demand analysis and forecasting. As a preliminary step, the Commission intends to explore possible improvements to the current method of deriving demand elasticities by product.

Petitioners request that ''the Commission . . . conduct an effort to correct the flaws that it has identified in the current demand equations.'' Petition at 16. The Commission believes that it may be useful to explore deriving separate elasticities for individual products. Similarly, separate elasticity of demand may also facilitate review of market dominant negotiated service agreements. If data are available for actual volume response to price changes, such elasticities could be derived by mailer or industry.

V. Initial Technical Conference and Comments

To better evaluate a petition to change an accepted analytical principle, the Commission may order that it be made the subject of discovery. 39 CFR 3050.11(c). Accordingly, as an initial step in this docket, the Commission finds it would be worthwhile to consider the elasticity of demand issue by exploring alternative methods that have already been developed and can be presented for discussion. Therefore, the Commission is scheduling a technical conference on August 13, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in the Commission's hearing room. At the conference, Lyudmila Y. Bzhilyanskaya, Margaret M. Cigno, and Edward S. Pearsall will discuss their paper titled ''A Branching AIDS Model for Estimating U.S. Postal Price Elasticities.'' A copy of this paper is attached to this Order as Library Reference 1. The Commission stresses that the views expressed in Library Reference 1 are those of its authors and have not been reviewed or endorsed by the Commission or any Commissioner.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Kenneth E. Richardson is designated as officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding. Interested persons may submit comments on Library Reference 1 and matters discussed during the technical conference no later than September 19, 2014.

VI. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2014–5 for consideration of the matters raised by the Petition filed May 2, 2014.

2. A technical conference is scheduled on August 13, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in the Commission's hearing room.

[2] Answer of the United States Postal Service in Opposition to Petition to Initiate a Proceeding Regarding Postal Demand Analysis, May, 9, 2014 (Postal Service Answer).

[3] Reply in Support of Petition, May 19, 2014 (Reply). Petitioners also filed a motion for leave to file their reply. Motion for Leave to File, May 19, 2014. The motion is granted.

[4] Docket No. RM2008–4, Notice of Final Rule Prescribing Form and Content of Periodic Reports, April 16, 2009 (Order No. 203).

[5] The Postal Service periodically files with the Commission an explanation of its econometric demand equations for market dominant products, which describes the Postal Service's current methodology to estimate elasticities and demand. The most recent report is available at *http://www.prc.gov/Docs/89/89962/MD.Prod.Demand.Narrative.pdf.*

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Kenneth E. Richardson to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

4. Comments by interested persons, with respect to Library Reference 1 and matters discussed during the technical conference are due no later than September 19, 2014.

5. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–17249 Filed 7–22–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 13

[EPA–HQ–OA–2014–0012; FRL–9914–28–OCFO]

Administrative Wage Garnishment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule, extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The EPA is extending the period for providing comments on the proposed rule entitled, Administrative Wage Garnishment published in the **Federal Register** on July 2, 2014 to September 2, 2014.

DATES: Comments. The public comment period for the proposed rule published July 2, 2014, (79 FR 37704) is being extended to September 2, 2014 in order to provide the public additional time to submit comments and supporting information.

ADDRESSES: Comments. Written comments on the proposed rule may be submitted to the EPA electronically, by mail, by facsimile or through hand delivery/courier. Please refer to the proposal (79 FR 37704) for the addresses and detailed instructions.

Docket: Publically available documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection either electronically at *http://www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at the Administrative Wage Garnishment Docket in the EPA Docket Center, EPA/DC, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. The Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is 202–566–1744. The EPA has established the official public docket # EPA–HQ–OA–2014–0012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: FPPS c/o Anita Jones, OCFO/OFM/FPPS, Mailcode 2733R, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–4969; fax number: (202) 565–2585; email address: *jones.anita@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In response to requests from the public, the EPA is extending the previously announced public-comment period. The public-comment period will end September 2, 2014, rather than August 1, 2014. The direct final rule published at 79 FR 37644 on July 2, 2014 was withdrawn. The withdrawal notice of the direct final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, July 17, 2014 at 79 FR 41646.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 13

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Debt Collection, Government employees, Garnishment of wages, Hearing and appeal procedures, Salaries, Wages.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552a, 5512, and 5514; 31 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.; 3720A; and 3720D.

Dated: July 17, 2014.

Jeanne Conklin,

Acting Director Office of Financial Management.

[FR Doc. 2014–17322 Filed 7–22–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R04–OAR–2013–0486; FRL–9914–26–Region–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Kentucky: New Source Review for Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve changes to the Kentucky State Implementation Plan (SIP), submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, through the Kentucky Division for Air Quality (KDAQ) to EPA on January 31, 2013. The SIP revision modifies the Commonwealth's New Source Review (NSR), Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) regulations to adopt into the Kentucky SIP Federal NSR permitting requirements for the implementation of the fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). All of the changes in Kentucky's January 31, 2013 SIP submission are necessary to comply with Federal requirements. EPA is proposing approval of the Commonwealth's January 31, 2013 revision to the Kentucky SIP because the Agency has preliminarily determined that the changes are consistent with the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act). Additionally, EPA is proposing to convert two conditional approvals for SIP infrastructure requirements (related to Kentucky's permitting program) to full approval under the CAA.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 22, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No EPA–R04–OAR–2013–0486, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov:* Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
2. *Email: R4-RDS@epa.gov.*
3. *Fax:* (404) 562–9019.
4. *Mail:* EPA–R04–OAR–2013–0486 Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960.
5. *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Ms. Lynorae Benjamin, Chief, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office's normal hours of operation. The Regional Office's official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., excluding Federal holidays.

Instructions: Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA–R04–OAR–2013–0486. EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at *www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes information claimed to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Do not submit through *www.regulations.gov* or email information that you consider to be CBI