

TABLE 5.—MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSION BUDGETS FOR COLUMBIANA, MAHONING AND TRUMBULL COUNTIES, OHIO

Mahoning, Trumbull, and Columbiana Counties Ohio budgets	Year 2009	Year 2018
VOC (tons/day)	19.58	10.36
NO _x (tons/day)	33.71	13.29

VII. What Action Is EPA Taking?

EPA is proposing to make a determination that the Youngstown area is attainment the 8-hour ozone NAAQS and EPA is proposing to approve Ohio's maintenance plan for assuring that the area will continue to attain this standard. The maintenance plan demonstrates maintenance to the year 2018 and includes contingency measures to remedy possible future violations of the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, and establishes 2009 and 2018 MVEBs for these Counties. EPA is proposing to approve the 2018 MVEBs submitted by Ohio in conjunction with the redesignation request.

VIII. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, September 30, 1993), this action is not a "significant regulatory action" and, therefore, is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed 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.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed 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.*).

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, 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).

Executive Order 13132: Federalism

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 proposes to approve a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act.

Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This proposed 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).

Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks

This proposed 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.

Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use

Because it is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866 or a "significant regulatory action," this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001).

National Technology Transfer Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), 15 U.S.C. 272, requires Federal agencies to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus to carry out policy objectives, so long as such standards are not inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Absent a prior existing requirement for the state to use voluntary consensus standards, EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use such standards, and it would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in place of a program submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the requirements of section 12(d) of the NTTA do not apply.

List of Subjects

40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Dated: April 6, 2007.

Walter W. Kovalick,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. E7-7352 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 07-1448, MB Docket No. 05-228; RM-11255]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Kiowa, KS

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; dismissal.

SUMMARY: This document dismisses a pending petition for rulemaking filed by Charles Crawford to allot Channel 233A at Kiowa, Kansas for failure to state a continuing interest in the requested allotment. The document therefore terminates the proceeding.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen McLean, Media Bureau (202) 418-2738.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MB Docket No. 05-228, adopted March 28, 2007, and released March 30, 2007. The full text of this Commission decision 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 purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractors, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 1-800-378-3160 or www.BCPIWEB.com.

This document is not subject to the Congressional Review Act. (The Commission, is, therefore, not required to submit a copy of this Report and Order to Government Accountability Office, pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, *see* 5 U.S.C. Section 801(a)(1)(A) because the proposed rule is dismissed).

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. E7-7289 Filed 4-17-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket No. 07-51; FCC 07-32]

Exclusive Service Contracts for Provision of Video Services in Multiple Dwelling Units and Other Real Estate Developments

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Commission takes steps to encourage greater competition in the market for the delivery of multichannel video programming by soliciting comment on the use of exclusive contracts for the provision of video services to multiple dwelling units ("MDUs") or other real estate developments. The Commission also seeks comment on whether the use of exclusive contracts in the MDU video provider market unreasonably impedes the achievement of the interrelated federal goals of enhanced multichannel video competition and accelerated broadband deployment and, if so, how the Commission should act to address that problem.

DATES: Comments for this proceeding are due on or before June 18, 2007; reply comments are due on or before July 18, 2007.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by MB Docket No. 07-51, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Federal Communications*

Commission's Web site: <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>. Follow the

instructions for submitting comments.

- *People with Disabilities:* Contact the FCC to request reasonable accommodations (accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.) by e-mail: FCC504@fcc.gov or phone: 202-418-0530 or TTY: 202-418-0432.

For detailed instructions for submitting comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information on this proceeding, contact Holly Saurer, Holly.Saurer@fcc.gov of the Media Bureau, Policy Division, (202) 418-2120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), FCC 07-32, adopted on March 22, 2007, and released on March 27, 2007. The full text of this document is available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. These documents will also be available via ECFS (<http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/>). (Documents will be available electronically in ASCII, Word 97, and/or Adobe Acrobat.) The complete text may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554. To request this document in accessible formats (computer diskettes, large print, audio recording, and Braille), send an e-mail to fcc504@fcc.gov or call the Commission's Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (voice), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

Initial Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis

This document does not contain proposed information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden "for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees," pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107-198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

Summary of the NPRM of Proposed Rulemaking

I. Introduction

In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM"), we solicit comment on the use of exclusive contracts for the provision of video services to multiple dwelling units ("MDUs") or other real estate developments. Greater competition in the market for the delivery of multichannel video programming is one of the primary goals of Federal communications policy. Moreover, for many participants in the marketplace, the ability to offer video to consumers and the ability to deploy broadband networks rapidly are linked intrinsically. However, potential competitors seeking to enter the multichannel video programming distributor ("MVPD") marketplace have alleged that the use of exclusive contracts for the provision of video services to MDUs or other real estate developments serves as a barrier to entry. Accordingly, this NPRM is designed to solicit comment on whether the use of exclusive contracts in the MDU video provider market unreasonably impedes the achievement of the interrelated federal goals of enhanced multichannel video competition and accelerated broadband deployment and, if so, how the Commission should act to address that problem.

II. Background

1. In 1997, the Commission issued an NPRM regarding the use of exclusive access arrangements in MDUs. The Commission stated that exclusive service contracts between MDU owners and MVPDs could be considered pro-competitive or anti-competitive, depending upon the circumstances involved. Commenters who were effectively prohibited from providing service due to the existence of exclusive contracts argued that those contracts were anti-competitive. Other commenters argued that exclusive contracts were necessary to enhance their ability to recover investment costs. In the corresponding Report and Order, the Commission declined to take any action regarding exclusive agreements, concluding that there was insufficient evidence in the record to determine the extent of use of such exclusive contracts, and whether or not such contracts had significantly impeded access by competitive providers into the MDU market.

2. We note that the Commission is considering MDU access with respect to other services. In the context of