2. Does the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No. This proposed rulemaking does not involve technical standards. Therefore, EPA did not consider the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.


**Dated:** September 20, 2006.

Susan Parker Bodine, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. E6-15854 Filed 9–26–06; 8:45 am]
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**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Administration for Children and Families**

45 CFR Part 263

RIN 0970–AC15

Cost Allocation Methodology Applicable to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program

**AGENCY:** Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Administration for Children and Families proposes to regulate the cost allocation methodology to be used in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. The proposed rule would require States to use the “benefiting program” cost allocation methodology required by OMB Circular A–87 (2 CFR Part 225) and previously required under HHS’ Office of Grants and Acquisition Management (OGAM) Action Transmittal (AT) 98–2, dated September 30, 1998, which required States to allocate costs to each “benefiting program” in accordance with OMB Circular A–87.

**II. Background**

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has issued government-wide standards for allocating the costs of government programs. Specifically, OMB Circular A–87, “Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments,” provides that “A cost is allocable to a particular cost objective if the goods or services involved are chargeable or assignable to such cost objective in accordance with relative benefits received.” Thus, costs that benefit multiple programs may not be allocated to a single program. An illustrative way to determine whether multiple programs benefit from costs is to ask, for example: In the absence of the TANF program, would another program still have to undertake the function? If the answer is yes, there is a benefit to each program and the costs should be allocated using the “benefiting programs” cost allocation method. The “benefiting program” cost allocation method applies to all Federal programs, unless there is a statutory or OMB-approved exception. Prior to enactment of the TANF program, HHS allowed States and the Territories to charge the common administrative costs of determining eligibility and case maintenance activities for the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs to the AFDIC program—a so-called “primary program” allocation method. This exception to the “benefiting program” cost allocation requirement of OMB Circular A–87 was consistent with Conference Committee language indicating AFDC might pay for these common costs because families who were eligible for AFDC (the primary program) were also automatically eligible for Medicaid and the categorical, but not necessarily the income, requirements of Food Stamps.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) (Pub. L. 104–193) was enacted on August 22, 1996. Title I of PRWORA repealed the AFDIC program and replaced it with the TANF program. Unlike AFDC, TANF eligibility no
The proposed rule contains no new information collection activities that are subject to review and approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, codified at 44 U.S.C. 3507.

V. Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The Secretary certifies, under 5 U.S.C. 605(b), as enacted by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96–354), that this rule will not result in a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The primary impact is on State governments. State governments are not considered small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

VI. Regulatory Impact Analysis

Executive Order 12866 requires that regulations be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the priorities and principles set forth in the Executive Order. The Department has determined
that this rule is consistent with these priorities and principles. This rule is considered a “significant regulatory action” under the Executive Order, and therefore has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Since all States should be using a “benefitting program” cost allocation methodology under TANF, we believe the impact of this proposed rule is minimal. We do not believe the proposed policy will have a significant negative impact or reduce potential Federal reimbursement. Funding for TANF is a fixed block grant amount that is not affected by the allocation method.

We welcome comments on our analysis and other circumstances that could impact on States and urge States to consider the interaction of the proposed policy on their operations. We will carefully consider these comments as we finalize the regulations.

VII. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 requires that a covered agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes any Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more in any one year.

The Department has determined that this rule would not impose a mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of more than $100 million in any one year.

The Department has determined that this rule would not impose a mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of more than $100 million in any one year.

VIII. Congressional Review

This regulation is not a major rule as defined in 5 U.S.C. Chapter 8.

IX. Assessment of Federal Regulation and Policies on Families

Section 654 of The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act of 1999 requires Federal agencies to determine whether a proposed policy or regulation may affect family well-being. If the agency’s determination is affirmative, then the agency must prepare an impact assessment addressing seven criteria specified in the law. These regulations will not have an impact on family well-being as defined in the legislation.

X. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132 “Federalism” requires that Federal agencies consult with State and local government officials in the development of regulatory policies with Federalism implications. We solicit and welcome comments from State and local government officials on this proposed rule, consistent with Executive Order 13132.

List of Subjects in 45 CFR Part 263

Grant programs—Federal aid programs, Penalties, Public assistance programs—Welfare programs.

Dated: July 5, 2006.


Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Administration for Children and Families proposes to amend 45 CFR chapter II to read as follows:

PART 263—EXPENDITURES OF STATE AND FEDERAL TANF FUNDS

1. The authority citation for 45 CFR part 263 continues to read as follows:


2. Add section 263.14 to subpart B to read as follows:

§263.14 What methodology shall a State or Territory use to allocate TANF costs?

A State or Territory shall use a benefiting program cost allocation methodology consistent with the general requirements of OMB Circular A–87 to allocate TANF costs.

[FR Doc. E6–15852 Filed 9–26–06; 8:45 am]
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FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CG Docket No. 03–123; FCC 06–106]

Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals With Hearing and Speech Disabilities

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a proposed rule published in the Federal Register on September 13, 2006, regarding Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities. This correction clarifies text that was revised or omitted when previously published in the Federal Register.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 30, 2006. Reply comments are due on or before November 13, 2006. Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments on the proposed information collection requirements should be submitted on or before November 13, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas Chandler, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau, Disability Rights Office at (202) 418–1475 (voice), (202) 418–0597 (TTY), or e-mail at Thomas.Chandler@fcc.gov.

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. E6–14901, beginning on pages 54009 and 54010 in the issue of September 13, 2006, make the following corrections:

1. On page 54009, in the 2nd column, correct the ADDRESSES section as follows:

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by [CG Docket number 03–123 and/or FCC Number 06–106], 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) 418–0539 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. In addition, you may submit your PRA comments by e-mail or U.S. postal mail. To submit your comments by e-mail send them to PRA@fcc.gov, and to Allison E. Zaleski, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10236 NEOB, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, or via the Internet to Allison.E.Zaleski@omb.eop.gov, or via fax at (202) 395–6466. To submit your comments by U.S. postal mail, mark it to the attention of Leslie F. Smith, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Room 1–C216, Washington, DC 20554.

2. On page 54010, in the 2nd and 3rd columns, where it reads Initial Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis, correct as follows: