CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Chapter II

[CPSC Docket No. CPSC–2015–0022]

Products Containing Organohalogen Flame Retardants; Notice of Opportunity for Oral Presentation of Comments

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity for oral presentation of comments.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC or Commission) announces that there will be an opportunity for interested persons to present oral comments on the petition requesting that the Commission initiate rulemaking under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA) to declare several categories of products containing additive organohalogen flame retardants to be “banned hazardous substances.” The petition was filed by Earthjustice and the Consumer Federation of America, which are joined by American Academy of Pediatrics, American Medical Women’s Association, Consumers Union, Green Science Policy Institute, International Association of Fire Fighters, Kids in Danger, Philip Landrigan, M.D., M.P.H., League of United Latin American Citizens, Learning Disabilities Association of America, and Worksafe. CPSC staff has prepared a briefing package in response to the petition; the briefing package, which includes the petition in its entirety, is available at https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/PetitionHP15–1RequestingRulemakingCertainProductsContainingOrganohalogenFlameRetardants.pdf?ts=1498151406.72

DATES: The meeting will begin at 10 a.m., September 14, 2017. Requests to make oral presentations and the written text of any oral presentations must be received by the Office of the Secretary not later than 5 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on August 31, 2017.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814. Requests to make oral presentations, and texts of oral presentations, should be captioned: “Organohalogen Flame Retardants Petition: Oral Presentation” and submitted by email to cpsc-os@cpsc.gov, or mailed or delivered to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814, not later than 5 p.m. EDT on August 31, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information about the purpose or subject matter of this meeting, contact Michael Babich, Division of Toxicology & Risk Assessment, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 5 Research Place, Rockville, MD 20850; telephone (301) 504–7923. For information about the procedure to make an oral presentation, contact Rockelle Hammond, Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7923.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

On July 1, 2015, the Commission received a petition requesting that the Commission initiate rulemaking under the FHSA to declare several categories of products containing additive organohalogen flame retardants to be “banned hazardous substances.” The petition was filed by Earthjustice and the Consumer Federation of America, which are joined by American Academy of Pediatrics, American Medical Women’s Association, Consumers Union, Green Science Policy Institute, International Association of Fire Fighters, Kids in Danger, Philip Landrigan, M.D., M.P.H., League of United Latin American Citizens, Learning Disabilities Association of America, and Worksafe. CPSC staff has prepared a briefing package in response to the petition; the briefing package, which includes the petition in its entirety, is available at https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/PetitionHP15–1RequestingRulemakingCertainProductsContainingOrganohalogenFlameRetardants.pdf?ts=1498151406.72

B. The Public Meeting

The Commission is providing this forum for oral presentations concerning the petition. See the information under the headings DATES and ADDRESSES at the beginning of this notice for information on making requests to give oral presentations at the meeting.

Participants should limit their presentations to approximately 10 minutes, exclusive of any periods of questioning by the Commissioners. To prevent duplicative presentations, groups will be directed to designate a spokesperson. The Commission reserves the right to limit the time further for any presentation and impose restrictions to avoid excessive duplication of presentations.


Todd A. Stevenson,
Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.
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Background. As currently calculated, the traditional passthrough for “USPS Marketing Mail” flats and parcels divides the discount by the avoided cost as shown in Table 1 attached to the Petition. The numerator is the per-pound discount above the breakpoint, for pieces above the breakpoint, versus origin-entered. The denominator represents the average avoided cost per pound for all volume, both above and below the breakpoint, versus origin-entered. The Petition, Proposal Seven at 1. The Postal Service states this has two shortcomings. The numerator does not include the other price element that varies by depth of entry, the per-piece price element below the breakpoint. Second, the numerator and denominator are mismatched; the numerator represents volume above the breakpoint while the denominator represents volume both above and below the breakpoint. Id. at 1–2.

Proposal. The Postal Service proposes to calculate dropship passthrough of “USPS Marketing Mail” flats and parcels rate categories to reflect both price elements that vary by depth of entry (per-pound above the breakpoint and per-piece below the breakpoint) as shown in column (i) of Table 1. Id. at 2. The Postal Service says this calculation now divides the entire value of the dropship discount, both per piece and per pound, by the total avoided cost. While the denominator can be expressed as either the total avoided cost per piece times the total number of pieces or the total avoided cost per pound times the total number of pounds, Table 1 opts for the former alternative, cost per piece times the total number of pieces \((f \times [(a) + (b)])\). Id.

Impacts. The Postal Service states that the proposed methodology could provide a more accurate representation of passthrough to ensure discounts do not exceed the Postal Service cost avoided as a result of dropshipping. Id. Under the proposal, one passthrough reported in the FY 2016 Annual Compliance Report would have increased from 75.7 percent to 111.0 percent. If adopted, the Postal Service would seek to reset the passthrough at 100 percent or less in the next market dominant price adjustment proceeding or cite a statutory exception. Petition, Proposal Seven at 2–3.

III. Notice and Comment

The Commission establishes Docket No. RM2017–11 for consideration of

matters raised by the Petition. More information on the Petition may be accessed via the Commission’s Web site at http://www.prc.gov. Interested persons may submit comments on the Petition and Proposal Seven no later than September 15, 2017. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Katalin K. Clendenin is designated as officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding.

IV. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:


2. Comments by interested persons in this proceeding are due no later than September 15, 2017.

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

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

By the Commission.

Stacy L. Ruble, Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017–16543 Filed 8–4–17; 8:45 am]
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Periodic Reporting

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commission is announcing a recent filing requesting that the Commission initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider changes to an analytical method for use in periodic reporting (Proposal Six). This document informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: Comments are due: September 13, 2017.

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:
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I. Introduction

On July 28, 2017, the Postal Service filed a petition pursuant to 39 CFR 3050.11 requesting the Commission to initiate an informal rulemaking proceeding to consider proposed changes to an analytical method related to periodic reports. The Petition identifies the proposed analytical method changes filed in this docket as Proposal Six.

II. Proposal Six

Background. In January 2016, the Postal Service removed the originating network distribution center and network distribution center presort price categories for Parcel Select and the return network distribution center price category for Parcel Return Service (PRS). Petition, Proposal Six at 1. The Postal Service states that “[d]uring the process of modifying these models to remove the portions of the cost studies related to the discontinued price categories, the Postal Service detected some minor errors that required correction.” Id. The Postal Service conducted a review of these models to “ensure that they reflected current processing methods” and determine if new data could be incorporated. Id.

Proposal. The Postal Service seeks to revise the mail processing and transportation cost models for Parcel Select and PRS mail. The proposed changes update the cost models, correct errors, incorporate new data, and re-evaluate some assumptions and methodologies.

Impact. The Postal Service estimates that its proposed changes will result in adjustments to both its mail processing and transportation models for Parcel Select and PRS mail. For mail processing costs, the revisions will decrease Parcel Select Ground Machinable unit cost estimates by 3.4 percent. Petition, Proposal Six at