

respect to the 50% of those funds that would remain if the partial distribution is granted. In Phase I of a cable royalty distribution, royalties are distributed to certain categories of broadcast programming that have been retransmitted by cable systems. The categories have traditionally been movies and syndicated television series, sports programming, commercial and noncommercial broadcaster-owned programming, religious programming, music and Canadian programming. In Phase II of a cable royalty distribution, royalties are distributed to claimants within each of the Phase I categories. Any party submitting comments on the existence of a Phase II controversy must identify the category or categories in which there is a dispute, and the extent of the controversy or controversies.

The Board must be advised of the existence and extent of all Phase I and Phase II controversies by the end of the comment period. It will not consider any controversies that come to its attention after the close of that period.

Dated: September 8, 2005.

Bruce G. Forrest,

Interim Chief Copyright Royalty Judge.

[FR Doc. 05-18128 Filed 9-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-72-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA-319-0488b; FRL-7966-3]

Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). These revisions concern volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from facilities storing and processing organic liquids such as crude oil and petroleum by-products. We are proposing to approve local rules to regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

DATES: Any comments on this proposal must arrive by October 13, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Andy Steckel, Rulemaking Office Chief (AIR-

4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, or e-mail to steckel.andrew@epa.gov, or submit comments at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

You can inspect copies of the submitted SIP revisions, EPA's technical support document (TSD), and public comments at our Region IX office during normal business hours by appointment.

You may also see copies of the submitted SIP revisions by appointment at the following locations:

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 1001 "I" Street, Sacramento, CA 95814; and

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, 1990 East Gettysburg Street, Fresno, CA 93726

A copy of the rule may also be available via the Internet at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/drdbtxt.htm>. Please be advised that this is not an EPA Web site and may not contain the same version of the rule that was submitted to EPA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jerald S. Wamsley, EPA Region IX, at either (415) 947-4111, or wamsley.jerry@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This proposal addresses SJVUAPCD Rule 4623—Storage of Organic Liquids. In the Rules and Regulations section of this **Federal Register**, we are approving this local rule in a direct final action without prior proposal because we believe these SIP revisions are not controversial. However, if we receive adverse comments, we will publish a timely withdrawal of the direct final rule and address the comments in subsequent action based on this proposed rule.

We do not plan to open a second comment period, so anyone interested in commenting should do so at this time. If we do not receive adverse comments, no further activity is planned. For further information, please see the direct final action.

Dated: August 19, 2005.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 05-18018 Filed 9-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[R07-OAR-2005-IA-0005; FRL-7967-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Iowa for the purpose of establishing guidelines to identify stationary sources of air pollution potentially subject to Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) emission control requirements. Owners and operators of stationary sources meeting the eligibility criteria will be required to submit source identification and emission unit description information to the state by September 1, 2005. BART-eligibility information is to be submitted on Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) form 542-8125 that lists facility information and emission unit identification and description. Annual emission totals in tons-per-year (potential) for PM₁₀, NO_x, SO₂ and VOCs are also required.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by October 13, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Heather Hamilton, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Comments may also be submitted electronically or through hand delivery/courier; please follow the detailed instructions in the Addresses section of the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Heather Hamilton at (913) 551-7039, or by e-mail at hamilton.heather@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct