

(g) *Effective date.* These regulations are effective on August 1, 1995.

**Margaret Milner Richardson,**  
*Commissioner of Internal Revenue.*

Approved: June 21, 1995.

**Leslie Samuels,**

*Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.*

[FR Doc. 95-18625 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

**POSTAL SERVICE**

**39 CFR Part 111**

**Changes in Preferred Postage Rates—  
Second-Class Mail, Third-Class Mail,  
and Fourth-Class Library Rate Mail**

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Postage rate changes;  
Corrections.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains  
postage rate corrections to three of the

several rate tables published in the **Federal Register** on July 5, 1995 (60 FR 34854-34856). As a customer convenience, the corrected tables are reprinted in this document along with the remaining tables published on that date.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The Board of Governors has directed that the changes pertaining to postage rates be implemented effective 12:01 a.m., Sunday, October 1, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Ernest Collins, (202) 268-5316.

In the rules beginning on page 34854 in the issue of Wednesday, July 5, 1995, make the following corrections:

On page 34855 in table 7.0, Special Bulk Third-Class Nonletter-Size Minimum Per-Piece Rates—Pieces 0.2149 Lb. (3.4383 Oz.) or Less, in the eleventh column titled 3/5-Digit Barcoded, the second row shown in the

table was “0.130.” This row should read “0.131.”

On page 34856 in table 8.0, Special Bulk Third-Class Piece/Pound Rates—Pieces More Than 0.2149 Lb. (3.4383 Oz.), in the fourth column titled Carrier route, the second row shown in that table (continued from page 34855) was “0.38.” This row should read “0.386.”

On page 34856 in table 6.0, Library Rates, in the second column titled Single-piece rate, the ninth row through the seventieth row shown in the table began with “3.99” and ended with “16.19.” These should read “4.00” and “16.81,” respectively. All rates shown from 9 pounds through 70 pounds were incorrectly calculated with the accumulative addend of 20 cents. The correct accumulative addend is 21 cents.

Dated: July 27, 1995.

**Stanley Mires,**  
*Chief Counsel, Legislative.*

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

**Changes in Preferred Postage Rates—Second-, Third-, and Fourth-Class Mail Effective October 1, 1995**

**Domestic Mail Manual**

**R—Rates and Fees**

\* \* \* \* \*

**R200 Second-Class Mail**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.0 IN-COUNTY RATES**

\* \* \* \* \*

**2.2 Piece Rates**

Per addressed piece:

Level	Regular	ZIP+4 (Letter-Size)	Barcoded (Letter-Size)	ZIP+4 Barcoded (Flat-Size)
J1	\$0.080	\$0.080	\$0.080	\$0.080
J3	0.080	0.076	0.076	0.065
J5	0.080	0.076	0.063	0.065
K1	0.042	—	—	—
K2	0.037	—	—	—
K3	0.035	—	—	—

\* \* \* \* \*

**3.0 SPECIAL NONPROFIT RATES**

**3.1 Pound Rates**

Pound rates are:

For the nonadvertising portion—\$0.140 per pound or fraction.

\* \* \* \* \*

**3.2 Piece Rates**

Per addressed piece:

Level	Regular	ZIP+4 (Letter-Size)	Barcoded (Letter-Size)	ZIP+4 Barcoded (Flat-Size)
G	\$0.208	\$0.200	\$0.188	\$0.181
H3	0.157	0.152	0.145	0.139
H5	0.157	0.152	0.137	0.139
I1	0.112	—	—	—
I2	0.110	—	—	—
I3	0.104	—	—	—

\* \* \* \* \*

**4.0 CLASSROOM RATES**

\* \* \* \* \*

**4.2 Piece Rates**

Per addressed piece:

Level	Regular	ZIP+4 (Letter-Size)	Barcoded (Letter-Size)	ZIP+4 Barcoded (Flat-Size)
G	\$0.168	\$0.161	\$0.151	\$0.145
H3	0.125	0.121	0.115	0.110
H5	0.125	0.121	0.108	0.110
I1	0.087	—	—	—
I2	0.085	—	—	—
I3	0.080	—	—	—

\* \* \* \* \*

R300 Third-Class Mail

\* \* \* \* \*

6.0 SPECIAL BULK THIRD-CLASS LETTER-SIZE MINIMUM PER-PIECE RATES—PIECES 0.2149 LB. (3.4383 OZ.) OR LESS

Entry Discount	Nonautomation Rates				Automation Rates				
	Basic	3/5	Carrier Route	Saturation W-S	Basic ZIP+4	3/5 ZIP+4	Basic Barcoded	3-Digit Barcoded	5-Digit Barcoded
None	\$0.124	\$0.111	\$0.086	\$0.083	\$0.117	\$0.107	\$0.106	\$0.101	\$0.093
BMC	0.112	0.099	0.074	0.071	0.105	0.095	0.094	0.089	0.081
SCF	0.106	0.093	0.068	0.065	0.099	0.089	0.088	0.083	0.075
Delivery Unit	—	—	0.063	0.060	—	—	—	—	—

7.0 SPECIAL BULK THIRD-CLASS NONLETTER-SIZE MINIMUM PER-PIECE RATES—PIECES 0.2149 LB. (3.4383 OZ.) OR LESS

Entry Discount	Nonautomation Rates					Automation Rates				
	Basic	3/5	Carrier Route	125-Pc. W-S	Saturation W-S	Basic ZIP+4	3/5 ZIP+4	Basic Barcoded	3-Digit Barcoded	3/5-Digit Barcoded
None	\$0.175	\$0.161	\$0.128	\$0.126	\$0.121	—	—	\$0.149	—	\$0.143
BMC	0.163	0.149	0.116	0.114	0.109	—	—	0.137	—	0.131
SCF	0.157	0.143	0.110	0.108	0.103	—	—	0.131	—	0.125
Delivery Unit	—	—	0.105	0.103	0.098	—	—	—	—	—

8.0 SPECIAL BULK THIRD-CLASS PIECE/POUND RATES—PIECES MORE THAN 0.2149 LB. (3.4383 OZ.)

Per Piece/Pound	Nonautomation Rates					Automation Rates				
	Basic	3/5	Carrier Route	125-Pc. W-S	Saturation W-S	Basic ZIP+4	3/5 ZIP+4	Basic Barcoded	3-Digit Barcoded	3/5-Digit Barcoded
Per-Piece Rates (for all entry categories)	\$0.074	\$0.060	\$0.027	\$0.025	\$0.020	—	—	\$0.048	—	\$0.042
	Plus					Plus				
Per-Pound Rates (by entry discount)										
None	\$0.470	\$0.470	\$0.470	\$0.470	\$0.470	—	—	\$0.470	—	\$0.470
BMC	0.410	0.410	0.410	0.410	0.410	—	—	0.410	—	0.410
SCF	0.386	0.386	0.386	0.386	0.386	—	—	0.386	—	0.386
Delivery Unit	—	—	0.362	0.362	0.362	—	—	—	—	—

\* \* \* \* \*

R400 Fourth-Class Mail

\* \* \* \* \*

6.0 LIBRARY RATES

Weight Not Exceeding (pounds)	Single-Piece Rate
1	\$1.12
2	1.53
3	1.94
4	2.35
5	2.76
6	3.17
7	3.58
8	3.79
9	4.00
10	4.21
11	4.42
12	4.63
13	4.84
14	5.05
15	5.26
16	5.47
17	5.68
18	5.89
19	6.10
20	6.31
21	6.52
22	6.73
23	6.94
24	7.15
25	7.36
26	7.57
27	7.78
28	7.99
29	8.20
30	8.41
31	8.62
32	8.83
33	9.04
34	9.25
35	9.46

Weight Not Exceeding (pounds)	Single-Piece Rate
36	\$ 9.67
37	9.88
38	10.09
39	10.30
40	10.51
41	10.72
42	10.93
43	11.14
44	11.35
45	11.56
46	11.77
47	11.98
48	12.19
49	12.40
50	12.61
51	12.82
52	13.03
53	13.24
54	13.45
55	13.66
56	13.87
57	14.08
58	14.29
59	14.50
60	14.71
61	14.92
62	15.13
63	15.34
64	15.55
65	15.76
66	15.97
67	16.18
68	16.39
69	16.60
70	16.81

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 95-18847 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-C

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Parts 52 and 81**

[OH50-5-7072, FRL-5258-9]

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: State of Ohio****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** On May 2, 1995, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) published a proposed and direct final rulemaking notice to approve the ozone redesignation request and associated section 175A maintenance plan for Toledo, Ohio under the Clean Air Act. The 30-day comment period for these notices concluded on June 1, 1995. Four comment letters were received in response to the May 2, 1995 proposal, and included adverse comments and a request to extend the comment period. The USEPA withdrew the direct final rulemaking but denied the request to extend the public comment period. This final rule summarizes all adverse comments and USEPA's responses, and finalizes the approval of the redesignation to attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone and section 175A maintenance plan for the Toledo area.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This action will be effective August 1, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the SIP revisions, public comments and USEPA's responses are available for inspection at the following address: (It is recommended that you telephone Angela Lee at (312) 353-5142 before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Angela Lee, Regulation Development Section, Air Enforcement Branch (AE-17J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-5142.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Background Information**

The 1977 Act required areas that were designated nonattainment to develop

SIPs with sufficient control measures to expeditiously attain and maintain applicable standards. For Ohio, Lucas and Wood Counties were designated nonattainment for ozone, see 43 FR 8962 (March 3, 1978), 43 FR 45993 (October 5, 1978), and 40 CFR part 81. After enactment of the amended Act on November 15, 1990, the nonattainment designation of the Toledo area continued by operation of law according to section 107(d)(1)(C)(i) of the Act; furthermore, the area was classified by operation of law as moderate for ozone pursuant to section 181(a)(1) (56 FR 56694, November 6, 1991), codified at 40 CFR 81.336.

More recently, ambient monitoring data for the Toledo area show no violations of the ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) during the period from 1990 through 1992. The area, therefore, became eligible for redesignation from nonattainment to attainment consistent with the amended Act. On September 17, 1993, Ohio requested redesignation of the area to attainment with respect to the ozone NAAQS. To ensure continued attainment of the ozone standard, Ohio submitted an ozone maintenance SIP for the Toledo area with the redesignation request. On November 1, 1993, Ohio held a public hearing on the maintenance plan and redesignation request.

On May 2, 1995, the USEPA published a proposed (60 FR 21490) and direct final rule (60 FR 21456) to approve the redesignation request and section 175A maintenance plan as revisions to the Ohio ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP). The USEPA withdrew the direct final rule on June 19, 1995, (60 FR 31917) in response to receiving adverse comments. This final rule addresses these comments and takes final action regarding the redesignation and section 175A maintenance plan for the Toledo area.

**II. Summary of Comments and Responses**

USEPA has considered the adverse comments received and has decided to proceed with formal action approving the redesignation. A summary of adverse comments received in response to the May 2, 1995 proposed and direct final rulemaking notices (60 FR 21490, 60 FR 21456) and responses to these comments is provided below. Comments were made by two residents of the Toledo, Ohio area, Environment Canada, and the Citizens Commission for Clean Air in the Lake Michigan Basin.

(1) *Comment:* A commentor objects to the use of the direct final procedure

when the proposed redesignation is neither noncontroversial nor routine. Another commentor objected to the final rule procedure due to insufficient opportunity for public comment. Several commentors requested that the direct final rule be withdrawn and republished as a proposed rule. The commentors also requested a 30 day extension of the public comment period. One commentor stated that "most citizens have not heard about the opportunity to comment, and should be afforded additional time to do so." Another commentor requested an extension of the comment period so that concerns about increased vehicle emissions caused by new road construction projects and a possible increase in highway tolls can be evaluated and addressed.

(1) *Response:* The USEPA did not expect adverse comments regarding the approval of the ozone redesignation request and viewed its decision as noncontroversial since it believed that all of the Clean Air Act requirements for redesignation were met. In response to the adverse comment letters which were received, the USEPA withdrew the direct final rule. In any event, that process preserves the public opportunity to comment as a proposed rule was published the same day as the direct final rule was published at 60 FR 21490.

The USEPA is denying the extension requests because it believes the period provided for public comment was adequate in light of the issues presented by the Toledo redesignation request. USEPA further notes that the public had many opportunities to become informed about the issues as Ohio itself had its own public comment period and that a public function for the rulemaking package was held on March 14, 1995, in Toledo, Ohio, which was shown on television news programs. Moreover, USEPA has already exceeded the statutory deadline of section 107(d)(3)(d) to act on this request which expired on March 17, 1995—and does not believe further delay in the action is appropriate.

(2) *Comment:* Several commentors stated that the last two summers were abnormally cool and that data for the last 10 years indicate a trend toward warmer summers in the Toledo area. The commentors requested that USEPA delay rulemaking so that one or two years of monitoring data could be collected to ensure that the improvement in air quality was not caused by cooler temperatures. The commentors also stated that it would be a waste of resources to redesignate the area to attainment when a violation