

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 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. 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 submittals, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Given this role, absent a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submittal for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submittal, 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 April 3, 2006. 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, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: December 22, 2005.

**Jane Diamond,**

*Acting for 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 F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(337)(i)(B) and (c)(342) to read as follows:

##### § 52.220 Identification of plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
(337) \* \* \*  
(i) \* \* \*

(B) Ventura County Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 74.14, adopted on November 24, 1987 and revised on April 12, 2005.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*

(342) New and amended regulations for the following APCDs were submitted on October 20, 2005, by the Governor's designee.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District.

(1) Rule 2.21, adopted on March 23, 1994 and revised on September 14, 2005.

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 06-894 Filed 1-31-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R09-OAR-2005-0557c; FRL-8024-9]

### Interim Final Determination to Stay and/or Defer Sanctions, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Interim final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is making an interim final determination to stay sanctions based on a proposed approval of revisions to the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**. The revisions concern Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District Rule 2.21, Organic Liquid Storage and Transfer.

**DATES:** This interim final determination is effective on February 1, 2006. However, comments will be accepted until March 3, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments, identified by docket number [DOCKET NUMBER], by one of the following methods:

1. Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the on-line instructions.

2. E-mail: [steckel.andrew@epa.gov](mailto:steckel.andrew@epa.gov).

3. Mail or deliver: Andrew Steckel (Air-4), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

**Instructions:** All comments will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided, unless the comment includes Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Information that you consider CBI or otherwise protected should be clearly identified as such and should not be submitted through <http://www.regulations.gov> or e-mail. <http://www.regulations.gov> is an "anonymous access" system, and EPA will not know your identity or contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. If you send e-mail directly to EPA, your e-mail

address will be automatically captured and included as part of the public comment. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

**Docket:** The index to the docket for this action is available electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov> and in hard copy at EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. While all documents in the docket are listed in the index, some information may be publicly available only at the hard copy location (e.g., copyrighted material), and some may not be publicly available in either location (e.g., CBI). To inspect the hard copy materials, please schedule an appointment during normal business hours with the contact listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jerald S. Wamsley, EPA Region IX, at either (415) 947-4111, or [wamsley.jerry@epa.gov](mailto:wamsley.jerry@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document, “we,” “us” and “our” refer to EPA.

## I. Background

On January 22, 2004 (69 FR 3012), we published a limited approval and limited disapproval of Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District Rule 2.21 as adopted locally on June 12, 2002 and submitted by the State on August 6, 2002. We based our limited disapproval action on certain deficiencies in the submittal. This disapproval action started a sanctions clock for imposition of offset sanctions 18 months after January 22, 2004 and highway sanctions 6 months later, pursuant to section 179 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and our regulations at 40 CFR 52.31.

On September 14, 2005, YSAQMD adopted revisions to Rule 2.21 that were intended to correct the deficiencies identified in our limited disapproval action. On October 20, 2005, the State submitted these revisions to EPA. In the Proposed Rules section of today’s **Federal Register**, we have proposed approval of this submittal because we believe it corrects the deficiencies identified in our January 22, 2004 disapproval action. Based on today’s proposed approval, we are taking this final rulemaking action, effective on publication, to stay sanctions that were triggered by our January 22, 2004 limited disapproval.

EPA is providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this stay of sanctions. If comments are submitted that change our assessment described in this final determination and the

proposed full approval of revised YSAQMD Rule 2.21, we intend to take subsequent final action to reimpose sanctions pursuant to 40 CFR 51.31(d). If no comments are submitted that change our assessment, then all sanctions and sanction clocks will be permanently terminated on the effective date of a final rule approval.

## II. EPA Action

We are making an interim final determination to stay CAA section 179 sanctions associated with YSAQMD Rule 2.21 based on our concurrent proposal to approve the State’s SIP revision as correcting deficiencies that initiated sanctions.

Because EPA has determined preliminarily that the State has corrected the deficiencies identified in EPA’s limited disapproval action, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, EPA is invoking the good cause exception under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) in not providing an opportunity for comment before this action takes effect (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)). However, by this action, EPA is providing the public with a chance to comment on EPA’s determination after the effective date, and EPA will consider any comments received in determining whether to reverse such action.

EPA believes that notice-and-comment rulemaking before the effective date of this action is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. EPA has reviewed the State’s submittal and is indicating through our proposed action that, more likely than not, the State has corrected the deficiencies that started the sanctions clocks. Therefore, it is not in the public interest to impose sanctions initially or to keep sanctions applied and in place when the State has most likely done all it can to correct the deficiencies that triggered the sanctions clocks. Moreover, it would be impracticable to go through notice-and-comment rulemaking on a finding that the State has corrected the deficiencies prior to the rulemaking approving the State’s submittal. Therefore, EPA believes that it is necessary to use the interim final rulemaking process to stay while EPA completes its rulemaking process on the approvability of the State’s submittal. Moreover, with respect to the effective date of this action, EPA is invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the APA because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction (5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1)).

## III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action stays federal sanctions and imposes no additional requirements.

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this action is not a “significant regulatory action” and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget.

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, “Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action.

The administrator certifies that this action 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.*).

This rule 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 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 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 rule 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.

The requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272) do not apply to this rule because it imposes no standards.

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 to Congress and the Comptroller General. However, section 808 provides that any rule for which the issuing agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the agency promulgating the rule determines. 5 U.S.C. 808(2). EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefore, and established an effective date of February 1, 2006. 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 rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by April 3, 2006. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purpose of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which 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, Intergovernmental regulations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: January 6, 2006.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 06-893 Filed 1-31-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 06-14; MB Docket No. 03-87; RM-10686]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Dilley and Pearsall, TX

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Audio Division, at the request of Pearsall Radio Works, Ltd.,

reallots Channel 237A from Pearsall to Dilley, Texas, and modifies Station KVVG-FM's license accordingly. See 68 FR 18177, April 15, 2003. Channel 237A can be allotted to Dilley in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements with a site restriction of 2.7 kilometers (1.7 miles) east at Petitioner's requested site. The reference coordinates for Channel 237A at Dilley are 28-39-55 North Latitude and 99-08-35 West Longitude. Additionally, Channel 227A can be allotted to Pearsall, Texas, as a replacement service with a site restriction of 1.7 kilometers (1.1 miles) west at Petitioner's requested site. The reference coordinates for Channel 227A at Pearsall are 28-53-13 North Latitude and 99-06-40 West Longitude. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION, infra**.

**DATES:** Effective February 21, 2006. The window period for filing applications for Channel 227A at Pearsall, Texas, will not be opened at time. Instead, the issue of opening this allotment for auction will be addressed by the Commission in a subsequent order.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sharon P. McDonald, Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order*, MB Docket No. 03-87, adopted January 4, 2006, and released January 6, 2006. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Information Center, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, (800) 378-3160, or via the company's Web site, <http://www.bcpweb.com>. The Commission will send a copy of this *Report and Order* in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, see U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A).

Since Pearsall and Dilley are located within 320 kilometers (199 miles) of the Mexican border, the Commission sought Mexican concurrence for the allotment of Channel 237A at Dilley and Channel 227A at Pearsall, Texas. Mexican concurrence has been received for Channel 227A at Pearsall. However, concurrence of the Mexican government has not yet been received for Channel 237A at Dilley. If a construction permit for Channel 237A at Dilley, Texas, is granted prior to the Commission's

receipt of formal concurrence in the allotment by the Mexican Government, the construction permit will include the following condition: "Use of this allotment is subject to suspension, modification, or termination without right to hearing, if found by the Commission to be necessary in order to conform to the 1992 USA-Mexico FM Broadcast Agreement or if specifically objected to by Mexico's Secretaria de Comunicaciones Y Transportes."

#### List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio, Radio broadcasting.

■ Part 73 of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

### PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334 and 336.

#### § 73.202 [Amended]

■ 2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under Texas, is amended by removing Channel 255C2 and adding Channel 255C1, Channel 227A and Channel 237A at Dilley and by removing Channel 237A at Pearsall.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 06-753 Filed 1-31-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Parts 73 and 76

[FCC 05-211]

#### Order Staying Effective Date, In the Matter of Children's Television Obligations of Digital Television Broadcasters

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule; stay of effectiveness.

**SUMMARY:** This document stays three sections of the CFR regarding the requirements for Internet Web site address displays in children's television programming and the core children's programming processing guideline for digital broadcasters in MM Docket 00-167, until 60 days after publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission's order on reconsideration in that proceeding. These requirements were previously scheduled to become effective on January 1, 2006.