

Postage Rates

Weight not over (pound)	Rate
Custom Designed Service ^{1, 2}	
1	\$29.00
2	31.70
3	35.40
4	39.10
5	42.80
6	46.50
7	50.20
8	53.90
9	57.60
10	61.30
11	65.00
12	68.70
13	72.40
14	76.10
15	79.80
16	83.50
17	87.20
18	90.90
19	94.60
20	98.30
21	102.00
22	105.70
23	109.40
24	113.10
25	116.80
26	120.50
27	124.20
28	127.90
29	131.60
30	135.30
31	139.00
32	142.70
33	146.40
On Demand Service ²	
1	20.00
2	23.70
3	27.40
4	31.10
5	34.80
6	38.50
7	42.20
8	45.90
9	49.60
10	53.30
11	57.00
12	60.70
13	64.40
14	68.10
15	71.80
16	75.50
17	79.20
18	82.90
19	86.60
20	90.30
21	94.00
22	97.70
23	101.40
24	105.10
25	108.80
26	112.50
27	116.20
28	119.90
29	123.60
30	127.30
31	131.00
32	134.70
33	138.40

¹Rates in this table are applicable to each piece of International Custom Designed Express Mail shipped under a Service Agreement providing for tender by the customer at a designated Post Office.

²Pickup is available under a Service Agreement for an added charge of \$5.60 for each pickup stop, regardless of the number of pieces picked up. Domestic and International Express Mail picked up together under the same Service Agreement incurs only one pickup charge.

Areas Served

Jerusalem
Tel Aviv—Yofo
Haifa

Weight Limit

33 Lbs. (15 Kg.)

Size Limit

Minimum: 3½"x5½"

Maximum: Greatest length 36 inches.

Greatest length and girth combined: 78 inches.

Service Standard From International Exchange Office

See Table 7-2.

An appropriate amendment to 39 CFR 10.3 to reflect these changes will be published when the final rule is adopted.

(39 U.S.C. 401, 404, 407)

Fred Eggleston,

Assistant General Counsel, Legislative Division.

[FR Doc. 82-31451 Filed 11-16-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 50

[Docket No. OAQPS 79-7; AD-FRL-2244-5]

Proposed Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability of support document.

SUMMARY: On August 18, 1980, EPA proposed revisions to the existing primary national ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide (CO) and revocation of the existing secondary standards (45 FR 55066). The availability of several additional support documents was announced on June 18, 1982 (47 FR 26407). The present notice announces the availability of another support document, "Investigation of Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards Based on Multiple Expected Exceedances." A copy of the document is being placed in the docket (see address below) and a limited number of copies are available from Mr. Michael Jones (see contact below). The Agency plans to take final action on revising the CO standards soon.

ADDRESS: A docket (Number OAQPS 79-7) containing the document referred to above and other information relevant to this rulemaking is available for public inspection and copying between 8:00

a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday at EPA's Central Docket Section, West Tower Lobby, Gallery I, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Michael Jones, Strategies and Air Standards Division (MD-12), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27711, Telephone (919) 541-5531 (FTS 629-5531).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The document, "Investigation of Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards Based on Multiple Expected Exceedances," referred to above, presents the results of two statistical investigations of the effect on air quality of single and multiple expected exceedance standards for CO. The statistical analyses described in the document are based on a large set of monitored 8-hour average CO pollutant concentration data collected from numerous sites during the period 1979 to 1981. Several methods were used to estimate relative standard equivalencies and the expected incidence of peak CO values for different standard levels and exceedance rates. The document supports the proposition that a multiple expected exceedance 8-hour average standard focuses control strategy decisions on a CO air quality value that is more predictable than the highest or second highest value expected in a year. Such a standard tends to reduce the impact of unusual meteorological events on air quality values which are used to establish control programs.

Dated: November 9, 1982.

Kathleen M. Bennett,

Assistant Administrator for Air, Noise and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 82-31470 Filed 11-16-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 52

[KY-005; A-4-FRL 2239-7]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Kentucky: Set II VOC Regulations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is today proposing full approval of State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions for control of volatile organic compounds (VOC), Set II, which the Commonwealth of Kentucky

submitted pursuant to requirements of Part D, Title I, of the Clean Air Act (CAA), EPA on November 24, 1981, *Federal Register* (46 FR 57486), approved the revisions submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky on condition that the State adopt and submit a regulation for leaks from gasoline tank trucks and collection systems by March 1, 1982. The State has adopted and submitted such a regulation and so EPA proposes to remove the condition on its approval of Kentucky's Set II VOC regulations. The public is asked to submit written comments on the proposal.

DATE: Written comments must reach us on or before December 17, 1982, to be considered.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the materials submitted by the State may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Air Management Branch, EPA, Region IV, 345 Courtland Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30365

Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection, 18 Reilly Road, Building 2, Fort Boone Plaza, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Comments should be sent to Waymond Blackmon of the EPA Region IV Air Management Branch at the Atlanta address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Waymond Blackmon, EPA Region IV, Air Management Branch, 404/881-2864 or FTS 257-2864.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Part D of the Title I of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1977, requires that States revise their State Implementation Plan (SIP) for all areas that have not attained the National Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

As part of their control strategies for attainment of the NAAQS for ozone (O₃) Kentucky revised their SIP to require control of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from additional categories of sources which have emissions before control of 100 tons per year or more. SIP revisions were submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky on June 6, 1979, February 5, 1981, and September 24, 1982. EPA gave conditional approval to the Kentucky regulations because of the lack of an appropriate gasoline tank truck certification regulation (November 24, 1981 *Federal Register* (46 FR 57486)). Since the State has adopted and submitted such a regulation, EPA is proposing to remove the condition on its approval of Kentucky's Set II VOC regulations and is soliciting public comments on the regulation. The regulation defines leak-tight conditions and related test procedures for tank trucks and their vapor collection

systems while loading and unloading at bulk plants in urban non-attainment counties, bulk terminals in non-attainment counties or in unclassified counties if the terminal is a part of a major source of volatile organic compounds, and service stations in urban non-attainment counties with an annual throughput of greater than 120,000 gallons. It applies only to the transfer of gasoline.

Action: EPA today proposes full approval of the revisions submitted by the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Administrator has certified (46 FR 8709) that the proposed rule will not if promulgated have a significant economic impact of a substantial number of small entities. This action only approves state actions. It imposes no new requirements.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons.

(Secs. 110 and 172 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7410 and 7502))

Dated: October 22, 1982.

Charles R. Jeter,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 82-31449 Filed 11-18-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 228

[WH-FRL 2212-8]

Ocean Dumping; Proposed Designation of At-Sea Incineration Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA today proposes to designate a new at-sea incineration site in the North Atlantic Ocean where the thermal destruction of liquid organic chemical wastes may be conducted by incineration at sea. This proposed designation will make available a suitable location off the North Atlantic Coast of the United States where permitted incineration at sea activities may take place. Organic chemical wastes will be the primary materials incinerated at the site. Incineration of other wastes will require research studies or equivalent technical documentation to determine their acceptability.

Incineration at sea provides virtually complete destruction of the wastes, which results in emission products that are compatible with and have no adverse impacts on the marine environment. EPA studies on previous at-sea incineration operations have determined it is an environmentally sound proposal method for certain highly toxic wastes.

The purpose of this notice is to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed designation of this site as an Approved Ocean Dumping Site.

DATE: Comments must be received on or before January 3, 1983.

ADDRESS: Send comments to: Mr. T. A. Wastler, Chief, Marine Protection Branch (WH-585), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

The final EIS on this proposed action is available for public inspection at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, 401 M Street, S.W., Room 2404, Washington, D.C. 20460.

Environmental Protection Agency, Region II, Library, Room 1002, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10278

Environmental Protection Agency, Region II, Library, Woodbridge Avenue, GSA Raritan Depot, Edison, New Jersey 08817

NOAA/RD/OMPA—North East Office, Old Biology Building, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794

Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, P.O. Box 1401, Dover, Delaware 19901

Department of Natural Resources, Water Resources Administration, Tawes State Office Building, Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. T. A. Wastler, 202-755-0356.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Incineration of wastes at sea requires a permit for ocean dumping issued under the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1401 et seq. (hereafter "the Act"). Section 102(c) of the Act gives the Administrator of EPA the authority to designate sites where permitted ocean dumping may be conducted. On September 19, 1980, the Administrator delegated the authority to designate ocean dumping sites to the Assistant Administrator for Water and Waste Management, now the Assistant Administrator for Water. This proposed

site designation is made pursuant to that authority.

Incineration at sea was first used in Europe in the late 1960's as a technique for destruction of certain types of liquid organic wastes. The first incineration at sea activities in the United States took place in 1974 and 1975 under EPA research and special permits at a site in the Gulf of Mexico. They were conducted on a research basis with extensive monitoring of the stack emissions and the ocean near the incinerator vessel. Combustion efficiencies were in excess of 99.9 percent, and no adverse effects on the marine environment were found.

The Gulf of Mexico Incineration Site was designated in 1976 as an EPA Approved Ocean Dumping Site for a period of five years. From October 1974 to April 1977, a total of approximately 29,100 metric tons of mixed organohalogen wastes from the Shell Chemical Company in Deer Park, Texas, were burned at the site aboard the M/T VULCANUS. Results of the burns yielded combustion efficiencies greater than 99.9 percent; principal products of combustion were HCL and carbon dioxide.

Incineration of approximately 10,400 metric tons of Herbicide Orange took place during May-September 1977, under permits issued to the U.S. Air Force, at a site located in the Pacific Ocean 190 km west of Johnston Island, where the bulk of the herbicide had been stored. The site was selected and designated by EPA solely for incinerating the herbicide and only for the length of time necessary to complete the operation.

EPA proposed redesignation of the Gulf of Mexico site for continuing use on October 16, 1981 (46 FR 50986), based on its prior use and additional need for the site as requested in several more recent permit applications. EPA issued a research permit for incineration of liquid PCB-laden wastes at the site, which occurred in the late December of 1981. Three additional permit applications to incinerate an organochlorine waste mixture, DDT and Silvex at the gulf site are presently being considered. On April 26, 1982, EPA published the final designation of the Gulf of Mexico site for continuing use.

The proposed site, therefore, would be the second incineration site designated as an Approved Ocean Dumping Site for continuing use. Its location is centered 266 km (140 nm) east from Delaware Bay, and 294 km (155 nm) east-southeast from Ambrose Light (entrance to New York Harbor). The site covers 4,250 km² (1,240 nm²) on the Continental Rise, bounded by latitudes 38°00'N to 38°40'N and longitudes 71°50'W to 72°30'W.

Water depths range from approximately 2,400 m (7920 ft) at the northwest corner of the site to approximately 2,900 m (9570 ft) at the eastern edge.

Primary use of the proposed site would be for the incineration of liquid organic chemical wastes, primarily organohalogen wastes. Although it is unlikely that more than one incinerator ship would be using the site to concurrently conduct burns, a restriction is placed during burns conducted under a research permit to limit the use of the site to those ships involved in the research, in order to facilitate the collection of accurate data.

Environmental Impact Statement

The EPA prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and EPA's Statement of Policy for Voluntary Preparation of EIS's (39 FR 16186). The draft EIS was filed with EPA and made available to the public on December 29, 1980. The final EIS was filed and made available to the public on December 11, 1981.

The EIS was based on historical information gathered from records and data on the New York Bight area and acquired during the earlier incineration at sea operations conducted in the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. The proposed site location in this area of the North Atlantic was selected because it meets or exceeds each of the criteria in the Ocean Dumping Regulations.

Alternatives considered in the EIS were:

- (1) No action; not selecting or postponing selection of an ocean site for incineration at sea off the middle Atlantic States;
- (2) Selecting the proposed site; or
- (3) Selecting an alternative site in the general area or in another oceanic region.

The no action alternative was rejected because a demonstrated need for the site in the North Atlantic region exists; environmental baseline data on the existing disposal site (106-Mile Ocean Waste Disposal Site) adjacent to the proposed site support its use; and EPA studies conclude that incineration at sea is an environmentally sound alternative for disposal of certain highly toxic wastes.

The alternatives of selecting another site in the general area or in some other region in the Atlantic were rejected. No additional safeguards to the environment could be gained by studying and evaluating other sites in the area and, since the current need for this disposal method is concentrated in the Mid-Atlantic coastal region, shipping

the wastes to a more distant region would involve greater transportation hazards and costs. From the scientific information available, there appears to be no reason to believe that another site in that area would be environmentally preferable.

Twenty-four sets of comments on the draft EIS were received from Federal and State agencies, interested organizations and individuals, which were responded to in the final EIS. Several comments received on the final EIS were answered individually by letter. This information is available to the public at the locations previously listed.

Classification

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, EPA is required to perform a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for all rules which may have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. EPA has determined that this proposal will not have a significant impact on small entities. The site designation will only have the effect of providing a disposal option for incineration at sea of liquid organic chemical wastes. Under Executive Order 12291, EPA must judge whether a regulation is "major" and therefore subject to the requirement of a Regulatory Impact Analysis. This action will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or cause any of the other effects which would result in its being classified by the Executive Order as a "major" rule. Consequently, this proposed rule does not necessitate the preparation of a Regulatory Impact Analysis.

This proposed rule was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review as required by Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 228

Water pollution control.

(33 U.S.C. 1412 and 1418)

Dated: November 12, 1982.

Frederic A. Eidsness, Jr.,

Assistant Administrator for Water.

PART 228—[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, Subchapter H of Chapter I of Title 40 is proposed to be amended by adding to § 228.12(b) an ocean dumping site for Headquarters as follows:

§ 228.12 Delegation of management authority for interim ocean dumping sites.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(17) North Atlantic Incineration Site—Headquarters. Location: coordinates

38°00' to 38°40'N Latitudes and 71°50' to 72°30'W Longitudes.

Size: 1,240 square nautical miles.

Depth: Ranges from 2,400 to 2,900 meters.

Primary Use: At-sea incineration of wastes. Incineration of materials other than those previously authorized by EPA will require research studies or equivalent technical documentation to determine acceptability for at-sea incineration.

Period of Use: Continuing use.

Restriction: At-sea incineration of aqueous organic chemical wastes, primarily organohalogenes. Only those ships involved in the research will be permitted at the site during a research burn.

[FR Doc. 82-31415 Filed 11-16-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Ch. I

[CC Docket No. 82-548; CC Docket No. 82-540]

Regulatory Policies Concerning Direct Access to INTELSAT Space Segment for the U.S. International Service Carriers; Modification of Policy on Ownership and Operation of the U.S. Earth Stations That Operate With the INTELSAT Global Communications Satellite System; Order Extending Time for Filing Comments and Reply Comments

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of inquiry; extension of comment/reply comment periods.

SUMMARY: This action, by the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, pursuant to delegated authority, grants requests by the Communication Satellite Corporation and the TRT Telecommunications Corporation to extend the time for the filing of comments and reply comments in response to the Commission's Notice of Inquiry in CC Docket No. 82-540, Modification of Policy on Ownership and Operation of the U.S. Earth Stations that operate with the INTELSAT Global Communications Satellite System and the Commission's Notice of Inquiry in CC Docket No. 82-548, Regulatory Policies Concerning Direct Access to INTELSAT Space Segment for the U.S. International Service Carriers.

DATES: The deadlines in both dockets have been extended to December 1, 1982, for filing comments and to January 15, 1982 for filing reply comments.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joel Pearlman, Common Carrier Bureau, (202) 632-4047.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

In the matter of regulatory policies concerning direct access to INTELSAT space segment for the U.S. International Service Carriers; modification of policy on ownership and operation of the U.S. Earth Stations that operate with the INTELSAT Global Communications Satellite System; CC Docket No. 82-548¹ (9-13-82; 47 FR 40226); CC Docket No. 82-540, (8-19-82; 47 FR 36235).

Adopted October 29, 1982.

Released: November 2, 1982.

1. Before the Bureau are two motions by the Communications Satellite Corporation ("Comsat") and a motion by the TRT Telecommunications Corporation ("TRT") seeking extensions of time for the filing of Comments and Reply Comments in the above-captioned proceedings. In CC Docket No. 82-548 ("Direct Access NOI"), Comsat requests that the time for filing of Comments be extended from November 15, 1982 to December 15, 1982 and that the time for filing of Reply Comments be extended from December 15, 1982 to February 15, 1983. In CC Docket No. 82-540 ("Earth Station Ownership NOI"), Comsat requests extensions of time from November 1, 1982 to December 15, 1982 for the Comment period and from December 1, 1982 to February 15, 1983 for the Reply Comment period. TRT requests an extension of time to November 15, 1982 for the Comment period in this docket. Also before the Bureau is an opposition by Western Union International ("WUI") to Comsat's motions.²

2. In support of its motions, Comsat contends that it is presently confronted with a number of pending matters that potentially will have a major impact on its future business activities and corporate structure. Comsat states that it does not have the manpower to deal adequately with all of these matters in the time allocated. Particularly, it claims that it will be unable to conduct the level and type of analysis of the legal and policy issues involved in the Direct Access and Earth Station Ownership proceedings that will be meaningful to

¹ Docket No. 82-548 was published in the Notices section of the Federal Register, 47 FR 40226, September 13, 1982.

² Comsat has also requested an extension of time for its filings in our *Comsat Structure* proceeding. In the Matter of Changes in the Corporate Structure and Operations of the Communications Satellite Corporation, FCC 82-372 (adopted August 5, 1982).

the Commission. Further, Comsat argues that, since much of the analysis required for one proceeding will directly or indirectly affect the analysis conducted in the other, it would be desirable that the pleading schedules of the two proceedings coincide with one another. TRT also cites the interrelationship of the proceedings as the reason for its request.

3. In support of its opposition, WUI contends that Comsat's requests are unreasonable excessive considering that the issues in both dockets are not new. Further, it maintains that the extensive time extensions sought by Comsat will maintain the status quo in important areas which favor Comsat.

4. While we are concerned that persons participating in these proceedings have the opportunity to address fully all relevant issues, we also believe that public interest requires that we conduct proceedings as expeditiously as possible. We have evaluated the complexity of the issues in these proceedings and have reviewed the filing periods previously granted in similar proceedings. We conclude that Comsat has not shown good cause to warrant the full extension of existing filing deadlines that it requests. The original filing deadlines were not unreasonable.

5. However, since we do recognize the interrelationship of the Direct Access and Earth Station Ownership NOI's, we agree that it would be desirable to align the pleading schedules in these two proceedings. Further, because the parties may be relying on the same staff to prepare their pleadings in both proceedings, we shall grant a limited extension in each proceeding. Therefore, we shall extend the time in both NOI's to December 1, 1982 for Comments and to January 15, 1983 for Reply Comments. We do not foresee any harm to WUI from this limited extension.³ No further extensions will be granted.

³ WUI also argued that if the Commission were to grant Comsat an extension of time in Dockets 82-540 and 82-548, it should grant, *sua sponte*, WUI commensurate extension of time in which to comment on Comsat's pending application and tariff revisions looking towards Comsat's retail market entry. WUI's reason is that it has concentrated its resources on the instant dockets in accordance with the original time schedules. We are not inclined to grant such extensions, *sua sponte*. As to Comsat's application, the public notice was released October 27, 1982 and parties have 30 days from that date to file Comments. As to Comsat's tariff filing, parties have a twenty-five day period starting from October 19, 1982 in which to file petitions against the tariff. We do not agree with WUI that extensions of time in CC Docket Nos. 82-540 and 82-548 will affect its ability to make timely filings in response to either the application or the tariff.