

Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves rescissions of state law that are unnecessary to meet Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule rescinds requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves rescissions of state law that are unnecessary to implement a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does

not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by January 2, 2008. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 16, 2007.

Wayne Nastri,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

■ Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart DD—Nevada

■ 2. Section 52.1470 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(14)(xi) and (c)(25)(ii) to read as follows:

§ 52.1470 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(14) * * *

(xi) Previously approved on July 10, 1980 in paragraph (14)(ii) and now deleted without replacement: Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) sections: 445.401, 445.466, and 445.497.

* * * * *

(25) * * *

(ii) Previously approved on March 27, 1984, in paragraph (25)(i)(A) and now deleted without replacement: Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) sections: 445.447, 445.554, 445.596, 445.662, 445.695, 445.698, 445.700, and 445.844.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. E7-21447 Filed 11-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 65

[Docket No. FEMA-B-7745]

Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

ACTION: Interim rule.

SUMMARY: This interim rule lists communities where modification of the Base (1% annual-chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs) is appropriate because of new scientific or technical data. New flood insurance premium rates will be calculated from the modified BFEs for new buildings and their contents.

DATES: These modified BFEs are currently in effect on the dates listed in the table below and revise the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) in effect prior to this determination for the listed communities.

From the date of the second publication of these changes in a newspaper of local circulation, any person has ninety (90) days in which to request through the community that the Mitigation Assistant Administrator of FEMA reconsider the changes. The modified BFEs may be changed during the 90-day period.

ADDRESSES: The modified BFEs for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the table below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William R. Blanton, Jr., Engineering Management Branch, Mitigation Directorate, Federal Emergency

Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3151.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The modified BFEs are not listed for each community in this interim rule. However, the address of the Chief Executive Officer of the community where the modified BFE determinations are available for inspection is provided.

Any request for reconsideration must be based on knowledge of changed conditions or new scientific or technical data.

The modifications are made pursuant to section 201 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4105, and are in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*, and with 44 CFR part 65.

For rating purposes, the currently effective community number is shown and must be used for all new policies and renewals.

The modified BFEs are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required to either adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or to remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

These modified BFEs, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by the other Federal, State, or regional entities. The changes BFEs are in accordance with 44 CFR 65.4.

National Environmental Policy Act. This interim rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR part 10, Environmental Consideration. An environmental impact assessment has not been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act. As flood elevation determinations are not within the scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

Regulatory Classification. This interim rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of

September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 13132, Federalism. This interim rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132, Federalism.

Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. This interim rule meets the applicable standards of Executive Order 12988.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 65

Flood insurance, Floodplains, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

■ Accordingly, 44 CFR part 65 is amended to read as follows:

PART 65—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 65 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

§ 65.4 [Amended]

■ 2. The tables published under the authority of § 65.4 are amended as follows:

State and county	Location and case No.	Date and name of newspaper where notice was published	Chief executive officer of community	Effective date of modification	Community No.
North Carolina:					
Alamance	City of Burlington (06-04-BY00P).	May 15, 2007, May 22, 2007, <i>The Times-News</i> .	The Honorable Stephen M. Ross, Mayor of the City of Burlington, P.O. Box 1358, 425 South Lexington Avenue, Burlington, North Carolina 27215.	August 20, 2007	370002
Dare	Town of Nags Head (07-04-4138P).	June 21, 2007, June 28, 2007, <i>The Coastland Times</i> .	Mr. Charles L. Cameron, Manager, Town of Nags Head, P.O. Box 99, 5401 South Croatan Highway, Nags Head, North Carolina 27959.	June 13, 2007	375356
Dare	Unincorporated Areas of Dare County (07-04-4138P).	June 21, 2007, June 28, 2007, <i>The Coastland Times</i> .	Mr. Terry Wheeler, Manager, Dare County, P.O. Drawer 1000, 211 Budleigh Street, Manteo, North Carolina 27954.	June 13, 2007	375348
Durham	City of Durham (07-04-2980P).	August 14, 2007, August 21, 2007, <i>The Herald-Sun</i> .	The Honorable William V. Bell, Mayor of the City of Durham, Office of the Mayor, 101 City Hall Plaza, Durham, North Carolina 27701.	August 7, 2007	370086
Durham	Unincorporated Areas of Durham County (07-04-2980P).	August 14, 2007, August 21, 2007, <i>The Herald-Sun</i> .	Mr. Michael M. Ruffin, Manager, Durham County, 200 East Main Street, 2nd Floor, Old Courthouse, Durham, North Carolina 27701.	August 7, 2007	370085
Orange	Unincorporated Areas of Orange County (06-04-C141P).	July 31, 2007, August 7, 2007, <i>Chapel Hill Herald</i> .	Mr. Moses Carey, Jr., Chairman of the Orange County, Board of Commissioners, 200 South Cameron Street, Hillsborough, North Carolina 27278.	November 5, 2007	370342
Union	Town of Indian Trail (06-04-BX22P).	May 15, 2007, May 22, 2007, <i>The Enquirer Journal</i> .	The Honorable Sandy Moore, Mayor of the Town of Indian Trail, P.O. Box 2430, Indian Trail, North Carolina 28079.	August 21, 2007	370235
Union	Unincorporated Areas of Union County (06-04-BX22P).	May 15, 2007, May 22, 2007, <i>The Enquirer Journal</i> .	Mr. Mike Shalati, Manager, Union County, 500 North Main Street, Room 925, Monroe, North Carolina 28112.	August 21, 2007	370234
Wake	Town of Wake Forest (07-04-0615P).	August 2, 2007, August 9, 2007, <i>The Wake Weekly</i> .	The Honorable Vivian A. Jones, Mayor of the Town of Wake Forest, 401 Elm Avenue, Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587.	November 7, 2007	370244

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 97.022, "Flood Insurance.")

Dated: October 29, 2007.

David I. Maurstad,

Federal Insurance Administrator of the
National Flood Insurance Program,
Department of Homeland Security, Federal
Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. E7-21597 Filed 11-1-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-12-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 11

[EB Docket No. 04-296; FCC 07-109]

Review of the Emergency Alert System

AGENCY: Federal Communications
Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission) amends its rules in order to ensure the efficient, rapid, and secure transmission of Emergency Alert System (EAS) alerts in a variety of formats (including text, audio, and video) and via different means (broadcast, cable, satellite, and other networks), increasing the reliability, security, and efficacy of the nation's EAS network.

DATES: The effective date is December 3, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Beers, Policy Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, (202) 418-1170, or TTY (202) 418-7233.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's *Second Report and Order* (Order) in EB Docket No. 04-296, FCC 07-109, adopted May 31, 2007, and released July 12, 2007. The complete text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. This document may also be obtained from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., in person at 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, via telephone at (202) 488-5300, via facsimile at (202) 488-5563, or via e-mail at FCC@BCPIWEB.COM. Alternative formats (computer diskette, large print, audio cassette, and Braille) are available to persons with disabilities by sending an e-mail to FCC504@fcc.gov or calling the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530, TTY (202) 418-0432. This document is also available on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.fcc.gov>.

Synopsis of the Order

Next Generation EAS

1. In the *Order*, we reaffirm the obligations of today's EAS Participants to maintain existing EAS and establish the framework for the nation's Next Generation EAS. This Next Generation EAS will include new and innovative technologies and distribution systems that will provide increased redundancy and resiliency for the delivery of emergency alerts. We also take steps to ensure that the upgraded EAS will meet the needs of all Americans, including persons with hearing and vision disabilities and those who do not speak English. Finally, we will continue to harness the benefits of existing EAS while the Next Generation EAS is developed and deployed. The combination of the existing and Next Generation EAS systems will ensure the continuity of EAS while the Next Generation EAS is being implemented, and ensure that EAS alerts reach the largest number of affected people by multiple communications paths as quickly as possible.

2. Below, we describe the four cornerstones of the Next Generation EAS: (1) Maintaining the existing EAS network; (2) utilizing a common messaging protocol, CAP, to be implemented by all EAS Participants following its adoption by FEMA; (3) incorporating new authentication and security requirements; and (4) fostering the deployment of new, redundant EAS delivery systems, including satellite, Internet, and wireline networks.

Maintaining Existing EAS

3. Although a Presidential alert has never been sent over the EAS, the current EAS network has been used for state, local, and weather-related emergencies. We recognize that in certain emergency situations, battery-powered AM or FM receivers may be the primary source of emergency information for the general public. Broadcast and cable personnel are familiar with current EAS equipment and are trained in its use. In addition, it would be inadvisable to require immediate use of a new system until that system is fully in place and its reliability tested. We therefore do not agree with those commenters who argue that the existing EAS should be wholly abandoned or replaced at this time.

4. Instead, we conclude that broadcast, cable and other current EAS Participants should maintain the existing EAS, particularly since alternative delivery mechanisms, although potentially more robust, have yet to be deployed. We recognize,

however, that EAS currently uses a station-relay message dissemination process that lacks the flexibility and redundancy of certain evolving digital communications systems. Consequently, we also require these current EAS Participants to upgrade their networks to the Next Generation EAS, as discussed below, while maintaining existing EAS.

5. *NOAA Weather Radio*. In addition, we disagree with those commenters who suggest that NWR should replace the existing EAS. We believe, however, that the NWR system should continue to be closely integrated with EAS. NWR is one of the principal sources of alert information, and is likely to continue to be the primary originator of weather-based alerts. We also recognize that voluntary efforts, including CEA's Public Alert™ Certification and Logo Program launched in April 2004, further enhance the value and potential of this proven emergency-alert delivery system. The record demonstrates that redundant alert-delivery systems will enhance the overall reach, efficacy, and reliability of the EAS as a whole. NWR provides an alternative source of emergency alerts, and we expect that it will continue to be an important component of EAS and the overall national public alert and warning system. We nevertheless caution EAS Participants that retransmit NWR alerts to ensure that such retransmission is consistent with our EAS rules and associated protocols.

Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) for EAS

6. In the *Further NPRM*, the Commission sought comment on the widespread assertion in the record that a common messaging protocol should be adopted to permit a digitally-based alert or warning to be distributed simultaneously over multiple platforms. The Commission noted that the Partnership for Public Warning had endorsed the OASIS Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) for this purpose and that many public and private organizations responsible for alerts believed that CAP offered the most practical means of quickly creating an effective interface between emergency managers and multiple emergency alert distribution platforms. Accordingly, the Commission asked whether CAP should be adopted as the common messaging protocol for any future digital alert system, and particularly for EAS alerts. The Commission also asked whether CAP would allow simultaneous distribution to radio, television, and wireless media such as mobile telephones and personal digital assistants (PDAs), and how it would ensure uniformity of alerts across