

advertising neglected to provide any example of putative innovations. The argument that the regulation as enforced imposes costs and practical difficulties that outweigh the benefits of detailed tax disclosure ignores the fact that the policy does not require that government-imposed fees be listed separately from the fare but merely permits this. The argument that enforcement action under section 41712 alone would not be any more cumbersome than it is now, since the Department must already prove violations on a case-by-case basis, ignores the considerable difference between having to prove only that conduct is prohibited by § 399.84, as interpreted, and having to prove that conduct has violated section 41712, which requires a showing of actual or likely consumer harm. With § 399.84 in place, any act that it prohibits is a per se violation of section 41712. The argument that consumers know that advertised prices do not include taxes ignores the vast difference between the sales tax applicable to most goods and services and the much higher taxes and fees—both absolutely and as a percentage of the base price—applicable to airfares. Aer Lingus does not explain why it believes that listings on carriers' Web sites should not be considered advertisements, nor does it specify how it believes Internet travel agencies' fare displays should be treated.

The supporters of Option III B have also not persuaded us to dilute § 399.84. We agree with the Council of Better Business Bureaus that sellers could advertise deceptively under this option, for example, by falsely implying that a carrier's own surcharges were government-imposed or by failing to meet the Federal Trade Commission's standards for prominence, readability, and clarity. As in the case of Options III A and IV, moreover, enforcement would be far more burdensome than under the status quo.

Similarly, the overwhelming support among individuals for enforcing § 399.84 as written notwithstanding, the comments fail to establish a rationale for undoing over 20 years of permitting exceptions to the rule's strict terms as a matter of enforcement policy. Strict enforcement of § 399.84 would still create marketing difficulties for sellers without necessarily making prices more transparent to consumers. Option II's strong support from consumers does, however, serve to fortify the case against eliminating or diluting the rule and enforcement policy.

We are maintaining the status quo and withdrawing the NPRM rather than codifying the current exceptions to

§ 399.84 allowed by the Enforcement Office. We do not think that codification is necessary to make the enforcement policy transparent and available. As we observed in the NPRM, sellers and lawyers practicing in this industry are already familiar with the policy and both consumers and newcomers to the industry can find the details of the policy on the Department's Web site at <http://airconsumer.ost.dot.gov/rules/guidance.htm>. 70 FR at 73963. As we also observed in the NPRM, given that enforcement is by nature discretionary, by not codifying the exceptions to § 399.84, we are retaining the flexibility within the Enforcement Office to continue refining its enforcement policy without the delays and costs that rulemaking would entail, *id.*

Two clarifications are in order. First, several commenters argue for leeway to lump all of the government fees and charges that may be broken out from the fare together as one sum rather than being required to list them individually. In practice, except for *ad valorem* taxes and the September 11th Security Fee, which under the Department of Homeland Security's regulations must be disclosed separately, the Enforcement Office already allows this. Second, several commenters argue that the requirements for disclosure of government-imposed charges in billboard, television, and radio advertisements should be dropped because as a practical matter these disclosures are invariably unintelligible. The fact remains, however, that failure to disclose these charges effectively renders an advertisement deceptive. Sellers always have the option of including these charges in the fares advertised (using a range of prices or using the word "from" with the minimum price if need be).

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, we are withdrawing the NPRM.

Issued this day of September 18, 2006, at Washington, DC, under authority delegated by 49 CFR 1.56a.

Michael W. Reynolds,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 06-8041 Filed 9-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-9X-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R08-OAR-2006-0210; FRL-8220-6]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Utah; Revised Definitions of Volatile Organic Compounds and Clearing Index; Proposed Rule

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Utah on November 11 and November 23, 2005. The revisions are to the Utah Administrative Code (UAC) rule R307-101-2 and (1) incorporate by reference the Federal definition of "Volatile Organic Compounds" (VOC), and (2) update the definition of "Clearing Index". The intended effect of this action is to make federally enforceable those provisions that EPA is approving. This action is being taken under section 110 of the Clean Air Act.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as noncontroversial SIP revisions and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the preamble to the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments 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 must do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before October 23, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R08-OAR-2006-0210, by one of the following methods:

- <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.

- E-mail: long.richard@epa.gov and mastrangelo.domenico@epa.gov.
- Fax: (303) 312-6064 (please alert the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** if you are faxing comments).

- Mail: Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 999 18th Street, Suite 200, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466.

- Hand Delivery: Richard R. Long, Director, Air and Radiation Program, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, Mailcode 8P-AR, 999 18th Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466. Such deliveries are only accepted Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:55 p.m., excluding Federal holidays. Special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instruction on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Domenico Mastrangelo, Air and Radiation Program, Mailcode 8P-AR, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8, 999 18th Street, Suite 200, Denver, Colorado 80202-2466, (303) 312-6436, mastrangelo.domenico@epa.gov.

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: September 1, 2006.

Kerrigan G. Clough,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 8.

[FR Doc. 06-7955 Filed 9-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR PART 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0543; FRL-8217-9]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Wisconsin State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone. In these revisions, the State has incorporated changes EPA made to its definition of volatile organic compound

(VOC) and its VOC control requirements for yeast manufacturing. As a result of EPA's approval, five chemical compounds will no longer be considered VOCs. The changes to VOC control requirements match the EPA maximum achievable control technology (MACT) limits for yeast manufacturers.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 23, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0543, by one of the following methods:

- www.regulations.gov: Follow the on-line instructions for submitting comments.
- E-mail: mooney.john@epa.gov.
- Fax: (312) 886-5824.
- Mail: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, (AR-18)), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.
- Hand Delivery: John M. Mooney, Chief, Criteria Pollutant Section, (AR-18)), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Such deliveries are only accepted during the Regional Office normal hours of operation, and special arrangements should be made for deliveries of boxed information. The Regional Office official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. excluding Federal holidays.

Please see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register** for detailed instructions on how to submit comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matt Rau, Environmental Engineer, Criteria Pollutant Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18)), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6524, rau.matthew@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated. 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. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment. For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: August 23, 2006.

Jerri-Anne Garl,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 06-8112 Filed 9-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-8221-7]

National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Delete the Army Materials Technology Laboratory Superfund Site from the National Priorities List.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 1 announces its intent to delete the Army Materials Technology Laboratory Superfund Site (Site) located in Watertown, Massachusetts, from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this proposed action. The NPL, promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended, is found at Appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). The EPA and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, through the Department of Environmental Protection, have determined that all appropriate response actions under CERCLA—other than operation and maintenance and five-year reviews—have been completed. However, this deletion does not preclude future actions under Superfund.

In the "Rules and Regulations" section of today's **Federal Register**, EPA is publishing a direct final notice of deletion of the Army Materials