

an elevator control rod that does not have a control bore hole, following Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201–40, TN 205–27, TN 206–26, TN 303–25, TN 304–12, TN 401–30, TN 501–10, and TN 604–11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), as applicable to glider model.

(4) As of the effective date of this AD, do not install an elevator control rod with a control bore hole on the side.

#### (g) Other FAA AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)*: The Manager, Standards Office, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. Send information to ATTN: Jim Rutherford, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4165; fax: (816) 329–4090; email: [jim.rutherford@faa.gov](mailto:jim.rutherford@faa.gov). Before using any approved AMOC on any airplane to which the AMOC applies, notify your appropriate principal inspector (PI) in the FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO), or lacking a PI, your local FSDO.

(2) *Airworthy Product*: For any requirement in this AD to obtain corrective actions from a manufacturer or other source, use these actions if they are FAA-approved. Corrective actions are considered FAA-approved if they are approved by the State of Design Authority (or their delegated agent). You are required to assure the product is airworthy before it is returned to service.

(3) *Reporting Requirements*: For any reporting requirement in this AD, a Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 2120–0056. Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to be approximately 5 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, completing and reviewing the collection of information. All responses to this collection of information are mandatory. Comments concerning the accuracy of this burden and suggestions for reducing the burden should be directed to the FAA at: 800 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20591, Attn: Information Collection Clearance Officer, AES–200.

#### (h) Related Information

Refer to MCAI European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD No.: 2011–0213R1, dated November 8, 2011; and Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service GmbH Technical Note TN 201–40, TN 205–27, TN 206–26, TN 303–25, TN 304–12, TN 401–30, TN 501–10, and TN 604–11, Revision 1, dated July 14, 2011 (EASA translation approval dated September 9, 2011), for related information. For service information related to this AD, contact Glasfaser Flugzeug-Service Hansjörg

Streifeneder GmbH, D–72582 Grabenstetten, Germany; phone: +49(0)73821032, fax: +49(0)73821629; email: [info@streifly.de](mailto:info@streifly.de); Internet: [www.streifly.de/](http://www.streifly.de/). You may review copies of the referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 11, 2012.

John Colomy,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2012–928 Filed 1–18–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

### 39 CFR Part 3015

[Docket No. RM2012–3; Order No. 1108]

#### Competitive Postal Products

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.  
**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is initiating a review to determine whether competitive products provide the appropriate minimum contribution to the Postal Service's institutional costs. This document invites comments to facilitate examination of this question.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* March 5, 2012. *Reply comments are due:* April 2, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Commenters who cannot submit their views electronically should contact the person identified in **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by telephone for advice on alternatives to electronic filing.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, at [stephen.sharfman@prc.gov](mailto:stephen.sharfman@prc.gov) or (202) 789–6820.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Invitation To Comment
- III. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

The Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA), Public Law 109–435, 120 Stat. 3218 (2006), directs the Commission to promulgate regulations to ensure that competitive products, collectively, bear an “appropriate share” of the Postal Service's institutional costs. See 39 U.S.C. 3633(a)(3).

The initial Commission review of this issue determined that competitive products, collectively, annually should contribute a minimum of 5.5 percent of the institutional costs of the Postal Service. Order No. 43, October 29, 2007, paras. 3040–47. The PAEA further directs the Commission to revisit this question every 5 years. See 39 U.S.C. 3633(b).<sup>1</sup>

Five years has passed since enactment of the PAEA. The Commission initiates Docket No. RM2012–3 to evaluate how to ensure that the appropriate minimum contribution to the Postal Service's institutional costs is provided by competitive products. The Commission will decide whether its rule 3015.7(c), established in Order No. 43, which sets the 5.5 percent minimum contribution, should be retained in its current form, modified, or eliminated.

When establishing the initial level of appropriate contribution from competitive products, the Commission tried to balance the risk of setting the contribution level too high with the risk of setting it too low. Given a very competitive marketplace where the Postal Service's market share is relatively small, setting the contribution level too high could adversely affect the Postal Service's ability to compete. On the other hand, establishing a markup that is too low could give the Postal Service an artificial competitive advantage. The Commission gave considerable weight to the historical contribution made by items categorized as competitive products by the PAEA. The Commission set the minimum contribution level at 5.5 percent of total institutional costs, in line with the competitive products' estimated contribution to institutional costs of 5.4 percent in FY 2005 and 5.7 percent in FY 2006.

Since rule 3015.7(c) has been in place, the Postal Service's competitive products collectively have covered more than 5.5 percent of the Postal Service's institutional costs. For FY 2007, the revenue from competitive products minus their attributable costs equaled 5.66 percent of total institutional costs.<sup>2</sup> For FY 2008, the contribution from

<sup>1</sup> REVIEW OF MINIMUM CONTRIBUTION.—Five years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 5 years thereafter, the Postal Regulatory Commission shall conduct a review to determine whether the institutional costs contribution requirement under subsection (a)(3) should be retained in its current form, modified, or eliminated. In making its determination, the Commission shall consider all relevant circumstances, including the prevailing competitive conditions in the market, and the degree to which any costs are uniquely or disproportionately associated with any competitive products.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2007 Annual Compliance Determination, March 28, 2008, at 113.

competitive products represented 5.54 percent of total institutional costs.<sup>3</sup> The contribution from competitive products to the recovery of the Postal Service's institutional costs was 6.78 percent in FY 2009 and 7.12 percent in FY 2010.<sup>4</sup> In FY 2009 and FY 2010, institutional costs were reduced compared with previous years, due in part to the congressionally mandated reductions of the required annual contribution to the Retirement Health Benefits Fund. The Postal Service also has increasingly exercised its flexibility to transfer mail volume from market dominant products to competitive products. See 39 U.S.C. 3642.

On December 29, 2011, the Postal Service filed its 2011 Annual Compliance Report with the Commission. That report indicates that in FY 2011 competitive products collectively contributed 7.84 percent of the Postal Service's institutional costs.<sup>5</sup>

## II. Invitation To Comment

The Commission invites comments to facilitate its examination of the appropriateness of the current contribution level. To inform its deliberations, the Commission requests comments from interested members of the public on whether and how changes in competitive market conditions, the allocation of costs to competitive products, the number and volume of competitive products, or any other changes should impact the minimum appropriate share of institutional costs of the Postal Service that should be provided by competitive products. As required by the statute, the Commission in making its determination must consider all relevant circumstances, including the prevailing competitive conditions in the market, and the degree to which any costs are uniquely or disproportionately associated with any competitive products. Comments also are welcome on any issues relevant to the reasonableness of the current 5.5 percent contribution requirement and retaining, modifying, or eliminating it.

Comments are due March 5, 2012. Reply comments may be submitted on or before April 2, 2012.

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, R. Kevin Harle is designated as the officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public (Public

Representative). The Public Representative will direct the activities of Commission personnel assigned to him and, upon request, will provide their names for the record. Neither the Public Representative nor any of the assigned personnel will participate in or provide advice on any Commission decision in this proceeding.

## III. Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2012–3, in compliance with 39 U.S.C. 3633(b).

2. The Commission designates R. Kevin Harle as the Public Representative representing the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

3. Comments are due March 5, 2012.

4. Reply comments are due April 2, 2012.

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

By the Commission.

**Shoshana M. Grove,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2012–851 Filed 1–18–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 63

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0797; FRL–9619–5]

RIN 2060–AQ–92

### National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants; Extension of Comment Period

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is announcing that the period for providing public comments on the December 6, 2011, proposed rule titled, “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants” is being extended for 12 days.

**DATES:** *Comments.* The public comment period for the proposed rule published December 6, 2011, (76 FR 76260) is being extended for 12 days to February 1, 2012, 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 EPA electronically, by mail, by facsimile or through hand

delivery/courier. Please refer to the proposal for the addresses and detailed instructions.

*Docket.* Publicly available documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection either electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> or in hard copy at the EPA Docket Center, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue 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. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

*World Wide Web.* The EPA Web site for this rulemaking is at: <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/alum/alumpg.html>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David Putney, Metals and Inorganic Chemicals Group (D243–02), Sector Policies and Programs Division, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; Telephone number: (919) 541–2016; Fax number (919) 541–3207; Email address: [putney.david@epa.gov](mailto:putney.david@epa.gov).

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Comment Period

Due to requests received from industry to extend the public comment period, the EPA is extending the public comment period for an additional 12 days. Therefore, the public comment period will end on February 1, 2012, rather than January 20, 2012.

### How can I get copies of this document and other related information?

The EPA has established the official public docket No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0797. The EPA has also developed a Web site for the proposed rulemaking at the addresses given above.

Dated: January 12, 2012.

**Gina McCarthy,**

*Assistant Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2012–962 Filed 1–18–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 81

[EPA–HQ–OAR–2008–0476; FRL–9619–4]

### EPA Responses to State and Tribal 2008 Ozone Designation Recommendations; Extension of Public Comment Period

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of public comment period.

<sup>3</sup> FY 2008 Annual Compliance Determination, March 30, 2009, at 87.

<sup>4</sup> FY 2009 Annual Compliance Determination, March 29, 2010, at 117; FY 2010 Annual Compliance Determination, March 29, 2011, at 138.

<sup>5</sup> See Docket No. ACR2011, FY 2011 Annual Compliance Report, December 29, 2011, at 64. Competitive products contribution, \$2.317 billion, divided by total institutional costs, \$29.554 billion.