

incoming secondary sorts on automated or mechanized machines, as reflected in the MODS data reporting system, but they are not counted as flats in the RPW data reporting system. The Postal Service asserts that the absence of flatters in the RPW estimate of flat volume and the presence of flatters in the machine piece-handling counts leads to an inflated In-Plant Coverage Factor which inflates the Auto/Mech factor.

Proposal Twenty-Nine proposes adjustments to the Periodicals cost model that would reduce the Auto/Mech factor to a more realistic level. Adopting suggestions made by the Commission in Docket No. RM2009-10, the Postal Service proposes to remove the number of carrier route flats from broken bundles from the MODS volume of flats that receive a mechanized incoming secondary sort.⁷ It also proposes to use mail processing costs to estimate the proportion of letter-sized pieces that are worked on those machines. This too would reduce the volume of mail that receive a mechanized incoming secondary sort on flat sorting equipment (recorded in MODS reports, but not the RPW) and thus reduce upward bias in the measurement of the Auto/Mech Factor. See Proposal Twenty-Nine supporting material accompanying the Petition, at 3.

The hard-copy attachment to the Postal Service's Petition explains the proposal's background, objective and rationale. In the electronic attachment, the Postal Service provides a means for estimating the impact of adopting Proposal Twenty-Nine by itself, and for estimating its impact in conjunction with Proposal Twenty-Five in Docket No. RM2010-4, in the event that Proposal Twenty-Five is adopted.

Comments on Proposal Twenty-Nine are due no later than December 29, 2009.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, John Klingenberg is appointed to serve as the officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

It is ordered:

⁷ The In-Plant IS Coverage Factor is based upon the ratio of non-carrier route flats that receive a mechanized incoming secondary sort (in MODS data) and the volume of non-carrier route flats (in the RPW). Broken carrier route flats that receive a mechanized sort would be recorded in MODS volumes, but not RPW volumes, thereby producing an upward bias in the measurement of the In-Plant IS Coverage Factor unless these broken carrier route flats are removed from the MODS measurement of the number of flats that receive a mechanized incoming secondary sort.

1. The Petition of the United States Postal Service Requesting Initiation of a Proceeding to Consider a Proposed Change in Analytic Principles (Proposal Twenty-Nine), filed December 11, 2009, is granted.

2. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2010-6 to consider the matters raised in the Postal Service's Petition.

3. Interested persons may submit comments on Proposal Twenty-Nine later than December 29, 2009.

4. The Commission will determine the need for reply comments after review of the initial comments.

5. John Klingenberg is designated to serve as the Public Representative representing the interests of the general public.

6. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Shoshana M. Grove,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9-30477 Filed 12-23-09; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2008-0515; FRL-8985-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Indiana has requested that EPA approve as revisions to its State Implementation Plan both its continuous emission monitoring rule and alternative monitoring requirements for Alcoa Power Generating, Inc.—Warrick Power Plant. The alternative monitoring requirements allow the use of a particulate matter continuous emissions monitoring system in place of a continuous opacity monitor system.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before January 27, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2008-0515, by one of the following methods:

1. *www.regulations.gov*: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

2. *E-mail*: mooney.john@epa.gov.

3. *Fax*: (312) 692-2551.

4. *Mail*: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

5. *Hand Delivery*: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

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: Matt Rau, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6524, rau.matthew@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should 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. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 13, 2009.

Walter W. Kovalick Jr.,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. E9-30405 Filed 12-24-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P