seals, tape and glue are not required, to read as follows.]

Although not required, mailpieces may be prepared with tabs, wafer seals, cellophane tape, or permanent glue (continuous or spot) if these sealing devices do not interfere with the recognition of the barcode, rate marking, postage information, and delivery and return addresses.

7.0 TURNING ABILITY AND DEFLECTION

7.1 Turning Ability

[Amend renumbered 6.1 by adding ''881'' to read as follows:]

A flat-size mailpiece meeting the FSM 881 dimensions in 2.0 must fit between two concentric arcs drawn on a horizontal flat surface, one with a radius of 15.72 inches and the other with a radius of 16.72 inches in one of these ways:

7.2 Deflection

[Renumber Exhibit 5.2 as Exhibit 6.2; amend renumbered 6.2 by adding ''881'' to read as follows:]

A flat-size mailpiece meeting the FSM 881 dimensions in 2.0 must be rigid enough so that, when placed flat on a surface to extend unsupported 5 inches off that surface, no part of the edge of the piece that is opposite the bound, folded, or final folded edge (as applicable) deflects more than 1¾ inches (if the piece is less than ⅛ inch thick) or more than 2⅜ inches (if the piece is from ⅛ to ¾ inch thick). See Exhibit 6.2.

* * * * *

C840 Barcoding Standards

* * * * *

3.0 BARCODE LOCATION—FLAT-SIZE PIECE

[Revise 3.0 to read as follows:]

On any flat-size piece claimed at an automation rate the barcode may be anywhere on the address side that is at least ⅛ inch from any edge of the piece. For FSM 1000 pieces, is it preferred that the barcode be placed at least 2 inches from the dimension that is the length for that type of automation piece (the longest edge, or for pieces with a folded or bound edge, the folded or bound edge). That portion of the surface of the piece on which the barcode is printed must meet the reflectance standards in 5.0. The address side may bear only one POSTNET-format barcode (i.e., the correct barcode for the delivery address on the mailpiece). Other mailer-applied non-POSTNET barcodes may appear on the address side if their format is not intelligible or not confusing to automated postal equipment. Address block barcodes are subject to the standards in 2.5a through 2.5e.

* * * * *

M820 Flat-Size Mail

1.0 BASIC STANDARDS

* * * * *

[Revise the second sentence of 1.5 to read as follows:]

1.5 Package Preparation

All pieces must be prepared in packages. Firm packages must not be included in mailings prepared under M820. Pieces meeting the size dimensions for the FSM 881 under C820.2.0 must be prepared in separate packages from pieces that do not meet the FSM 881 dimensions (but that meet the dimensions for FSM 1000 processing). Each FSM 881 package and each FSM 1000 package must separately meet the package size minimum number of pieces in 2.1, 3.1, or 4.1 as applicable for the class of mail. When the total number of FSM 881 or FSM 1000 pieces for a specific presort destination (e.g., the 5-digit ZIP Code 12345) meets or exceeds the applicable minimum package size, the pieces for that presort destination must be banded into a package or packages labeled to that presort destination in accordance with the standards for the rate claimed. The physical size of each package for that specific presort destination may contain the exact package minimum, more pieces than the package minimum, or fewer pieces than the package minimum depending on the size of the pieces in the mailing or the total quantity of the pieces to that destination. Rate eligibility is not affected when a physical package for a presort destination contains fewer pieces than the minimum package size for the above reasons, provided the total number of FSM 881 pieces physically packaged for that presort destination, or provided the total number of FSM 1000 pieces physically packaged for that presort destination, meets or exceeds the rate eligibility package minimum under E140, E240, or E640.

[Renumber 1.6 and 1.7 as 1.7 and 1.8, respectively, and insert new 1.6 to read as follows.]

1.6 Sack Preparation

Mailers may combine FSM 881 packages and FSM 1000 packages in the same tray (First-Class Mail) or in the same sack (Standard Mail (A) and Periodicals).

* * * * *

[Amend the heading of renumbered 1.8 to read ''Exception—Periodicals Packages.'']

[Insert new 1.9 to read as follows.]

1.9 Exception—Periodicals Automation and Nonautomation

For Periodicals, packages of automation mail (both FSM 881 and FSM 1000 packages) prepared under 3.1 and packages of nonautomation mail prepared under M200.2.4 c–f may be sacked together under 3.2 d–e and 3.3. Automation and nonautomation packages may not be combined in 5-digit sacks. Under this exception, documentation required under P012 must identify the mail claimed at each rate by package and sack sortation level. Under this exception, nonautomation mail continues to qualify for rates under E230 and automation mail continues to qualify for rates under E 240 (i.e., rates for pieces in automation flats packages are based on the package level and rates for pieces in nonautomation flats packages are based on the package and sack level).

* * * * *

An appropriate amendment to 39 CFR 111.3 to reflect these changes will be published if the proposal is adopted.

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 98–22937 Filed 8–25–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–12–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MD068–3027b; FRL–6144–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compounds From Sources That Store and Handle Jet Fuel

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Maryland for the purpose of establishing volatile organic compound control requirements on sources that store or handle jet fuel. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving Maryland's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set

forth in the direct final rule and the accompanying technical support document. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. 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 on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by September 25, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to David L. Arnold, Chief, Ozone and Mobile Sources Section, Mailcode 3AP21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103; Maryland Department of the Environment, 2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, 21224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristeen Gaffney, (215) 814–2092, at the EPA Region III address above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.

Dated: August 5, 1998.

Thomas C. Voltaggio

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 98–22796 Filed 8–25–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 14

RIN 1018–AD98

Humane and Healthful Transport of Wild Mammals, Birds, Reptiles and Amphibians to the United States

AGENCY: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The Fish and Wildlife Service withdraws the June 6, 1997 proposed rule to amend 50 CFR part 14, subpart J, pertaining to the establishment of standards for the humane and healthful transport of live reptiles and amphibians to the United States. We promulgated this proposed rule under the authority of the Lacey Act, as amended, enacted on November 16, 1981. This action is being taken in part to allow for the completion of the current revision process of the *Live Animals Regulations* (LAR) of the International Air Transport Association (IATA).

This decision was made to allow us to explore all possible opportunities to align United States humane and healthful transport regulations with the IATA LAR standards, which have generally been adopted by the international community, including the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the European Community (EC), as their required humane transport standards.

ADDRESSES: Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, c/o Office of Management Authority, either by mail 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, VA 22203, or by fax (703) 358–2298, or by e-mail to R9OMA__CITES @mail.fws.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Bruce Weissgold, Office of Management Authority, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, telephone (703) 358–1917, fax (703) 358–2298, or e-mail Bruce__Weissgold@mail.fws.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the proposed rule of June 6, 1997 (62 FR 31044), we recognized three justifications for amending 50 CFR Part 14, subpart J. First, the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (U.S.C. 42(c)) prohibit the transportation of all classes of species into the United States under inhumane or unhealthful conditions, and require that the United States Government promulgate regulations governing the transportation of wildlife. We established rules for the humane and healthful transport of wild mammals and birds to the United States on June 17, 1992 (57 FR 27094) in 50 CFR Part 14 subpart J.

Therefore, we proposed to extend 50 CFR Part 14, subpart J to include rules for the transport of reptiles and amphibians in order to more fully comply with the Lacey Act, which requires the humane transport of all animals and the promulgation of necessary regulations. Furthermore, many reptiles and amphibians are species included in the Appendices of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). CITES requires that all species listed on the CITES Appendices be packed and shipped in accordance with the IATA LAR.

Our second justification for the proposed amendment to the rule is the need to protect the well-being of reptiles and amphibians during transport. The proposed amendment to 50 CFR Part 14, subpart J responded to this problem by providing the Division of Law Enforcement with the authority to cite shippers for failure to comply with specific regulatory requirements even where, by chance, high mortality has not resulted. This additional authority would help us ensure increased compliance with humane and healthful shipping standards, and thus reduce mortality and injury for transported reptiles and amphibians.

Finally, the proposed amendments to 50 CFR Part 14 subpart J would enable us to process the high and increasing volume of reptiles and amphibians entering the United States, and provide a mechanism for adequate data capture and recording or inhumane and unhealthful transport conditions. Specifically, the proposed regulations would equip us with rules that address the particular biological requirements of reptiles and amphibians, and enable us to respond better to the problems associated with transporting these species, and to record instances of mortality of animals in transit and/or substandard shipping conditions.

IATA intends to convene a meeting of its Live Animals and Perishables Board (LAPB) in Montreal, Canada, in October 1998. One component of this meeting would be the introduction, consideration, and debate of amendments to its LAR for reptiles and amphibians. We would like to reevaluate our rule-making effort following the outcome of the IATA revision process, which may include modifications to the packing standards associated with the IATA LAR Container Requirements, specifically regulating the shipping of live reptiles and amphibians.

After proposing amendments to 50 CFR part 14, subpart J, we received a large number of comments from the general public, both in writing, and verbally at public meetings in New York City (January 17, 1998) and Los Angeles (January 27, 1998). Substantial information was received during the comment periods to warrant changes to our proposed rule. The comments that we received covered a broad array of positions, including biological, technical, legal, and animal welfare issues associated with the proposed rule. Some commenters considered our proposals harmful to live reptiles and amphibians in commerce by being