70.8(c). However, EPA has never objected to a CAA Title V permit in Oklahoma.[4]

Oklahoma has proposed revisions to OAC 252:100–8–8 which correct this deficiency. The Oklahoma Air Quality Council and the Oklahoma Air Quality Board have both approved the proposed revisions. Before this revision becomes effective its must be approved by the Governor. Oklahoma also needs to submit the revisions to EPA for approval. If EPA does not receive the revisions in a time frame that would allow full approval to become effective by December 1, 2001, then EPA would still grant Oklahoma full approval of its program (assuming that no relevant comments are received that would cause us not to approve the program). However, EPA would include the EPA Review Deficiency along with the other minor deficiencies identified in the June 12, 2001, letter in a Notice of Deficiency published in the **Federal Register**. Since this deficiency is not identified as an interim approval deficiency, it does not need to be corrected prior to the granting of full approval. Also, Oklahoma has agreed in writing not to issue a permit over EPA's objection.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, EPA believes that since Oklahoma has corrected all of its interim approval deficiencies, and the new deficiencies are either minor or have been adequately addressed in the interim, these deficiencies are not a barrier to proposing full approval of Oklahoma's Operating Permits Program. However, a notice of deficiency will be issued to Oklahoma in the near future requiring Oklahoma to take action to correct these deficiencies.

What Is Involved in This Proposed Action?

The State of Oklahoma has fulfilled the conditions of the interim approval granted on February 5, 1996 (61 FR 4220), so EPA is proposing full approval of the State's operating permit program. EPA is also proposing approval of certain other program changes made by the State since interim approval was granted.

Administrative Requirements

Under Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review'' (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) the Administrator certifies that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it merely approves state law as meeting federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. This rule does not contain any unfunded mandates and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4) because it proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duties beyond that required by state law. 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, ''Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments'' (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This rule also does not have Federalism implications because it will 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, ''Federalism'' (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). The rule merely proposes to approve existing requirements under state law, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities between the State and the Federal government established in the Clean Air Act. 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) or 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 significantly regulatory action under Executive Order 12866. This action will not impose any collection of information subject to the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, other than those previously approved and assigned OMB control number 2060–0243. For additional information concerning these requirements, see 40 CFR part 70. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

In reviewing State operating permit programs submitted pursuant to title V of the Clean Air Act, EPA will approve State programs provided that they meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and EPA's regulations codified at 40 CFR part 70. 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 State operating permit program for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews an operating permit program, to use VCS in place of a State program 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.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 70

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Operating permits, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 2, 2001.

Lawrence E. Starfield,

Acting Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 01–25740 Filed 10–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[4] These deficiencies will be addressed in a Notice of Deficiency published in the **Federal Register** at a later date.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 01–2250, MM Docket No. 01–262, RM–10231]

Radio Broadcasting Services; La Pryor, TX

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Katherine Pyeatt proposing the allotment of Channel 278A at La Pryor, Texas, as that community's first local FM service. The coordinates for Channel 278A at La Pryor are 28–58–09 and 99–56–05. There is a site restriction 8.9 kilometers (5.6 miles) west of the community. Since La Pryor is located within 320 kilometers of the U.S.-Mexican border, concurrence of the Mexican Government will be requested for the allotment at La Pryor.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before November 19, 2001, and reply comments on or before December 4, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Katherine Pyeatt, 6655 Aintree Circle, Dallas, Texas 75214.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 01–262, adopted September 19, 2001, and released September 28, 2001. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Information Center, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Qualex International Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY–B402, Washington, DC, 20554, telephone 202–863–2893, facsimile 202–863–2898, or via e-mail qualexint@aol.com.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of l980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 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 adding La Pryor, Channel 278A.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 01–25915 Filed 10–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 01–2251; MM Docket No. 01–263; RM–10280; MM Docket No. 01–264; RM–10281; MM Docket No. 01–265; RM–10282; MM Docket No. 01–266; RM–10283; MM Docket No. 01–267; RM–10289]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Junction, TX; Chino Valley, AZ; Arkadelphia, AR; Aspermont, TX; Cotulla, TX

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a five petitions for rulemaking proposing new channels. A petition filed by Maurice Salsa, proposing the allotment of Channel 292A at Juntion,Texas as that community's second commercial FM transmission service. Channel 292A can be allotted to Junction without a site restriction at coordinates 30–29–21NL and 99–46–18 WL. Mexican concurrence will be requested for this allotment. A petition filed by Charles Crawford proposing the allotment of Channel 223A at Chino Valley, Arizona, as the community's second local service. Channel 223A can be allotted at Chino Valley at a site 6 kilometers (3.7 miles) west of the community at coordinates 34–46–10 NL and 112–31–03 WL. A petition filed by Charles Crawford proposing the allotment of Channel 228A at Arkadelphia, Arkansas, as the community's second local FM service. Channel 228A can be allotted at Arkadelphia at a site 11.5 kilometers (7.2 miles) west of the community at coordinates 34–07–1–NL and 93–10–43 WL. A petition filed by Jeraldine Anderson proposing the allotment of Channel 226C2 at Aspermont, Texas, as the community's first local aural transmission service. Channel 226C2 can be allotted at Aspermont at a site 6.7 kilometers (4.1 miles) north of the community at coordinates 33–11–27 NL and 100–14–50 WL. A petition filed by Jeraldine Anderson proposing the allotment of Channel 289A at Cotulla, Texas, as the community's second local service. Channel 289A can be allotted at Cotulla at a site 5.0 kilometers (3.1 miles) southwest of the community. Mexican concurrence will be requested for this allotment.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before November 19, 2001, and reply comments on or before December 4, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioners, as follows: Maurice Salsa, 5616 Evergreen Valley Drive, Kingwood, TX 77345 (petitioner for Junction, TX); Charles Crawford, 4553 Bordeaux Ave., Dallas, TX 75205 (petitioner for Chino Valley, AZ and Arkadelphia, AR); Jeraldine Anderson, 1702 Cypress Drive, Irving, TX 75061 (petitioner for Aspermont, TX and Cotulla, TX) .

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victoria McCauley, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket Nos. 01–263, 01–264, 01–265, No. 01–266, and 01–267, adopted September 19, 2001, and released September 28, 2001. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Information Center (Room CY–A257), 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualtex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone (202) 863–2893.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of l980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible ex parte contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications