

includes provisions for light-duty, medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles, by incorporating the California LEV II regulations into the New Jersey Administrative Code by reference.

New Jersey is requesting that EPA approve its LEV program regulations as submitted in its SIP submission. EPA's approval would make the program federally enforceable, further ensuring that planned emissions reductions will continue to take place.

## II. Proposed EPA Action

EPA is proposing to approve the portion of New Jersey's low emission vehicle program that is identical to the California standards for which a waiver has been granted. However, because the waiver granted for the ZEV portion of the program is limited to model year 2011 and earlier vehicles, EPA is proposing to take no action on the ZEV component. In addition, EPA is proposing to take no action on the greenhouse gas component of the program.

## III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (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. For this reason, 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). 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.*). 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).

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). 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 CAA. 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.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. 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 SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the CAA. 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 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.*).

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: March 8, 2007.

**Alan J. Steinberg,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 2.*

[FR Doc. E7-5157 Filed 3-20-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 07-951; MB Docket No. 07-39, RM-11360]

### Radio Broadcasting Services; Prineville, OR

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document requests comments on a petition for rule making filed by Terry A. Cowan ("Petitioner") proposing the allotment of Channel 226C3 at Prineville, Oregon. The proposed coordinates are 44-26-17 NL and 120-57-12 WL with a site restriction of 11.4 km (7.1 miles) north of city reference.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before April 23, 2007, and reply comments on or before May 8, 2007.

**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's counsel, as follows: William D. Silva, Esquire, Law Offices of William D. Silva, 5335 Wisconsin Avenue, NW., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20015-2003.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, MB Docket No. 07-39, adopted February 28, 2007, and released March 2, 2007. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Center, 445 Twelfth 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 <http://www.BCPIWEB.com>. 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).

The Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 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, 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, 336.

#### § 73.202 [Amended]

2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under Oregon, is amended by adding Channel 226C3 at Prineville. Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**

*Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. E7-5073 Filed 3-20-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712-01-P**

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### 47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket No. 05-311; FCC 06-180]

#### Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the Commission seeks comment on its proposal to apply the findings in Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, MB Docket No. 05-311, FCC 06-180, *Report & Order*, (“*Order*”) to cable operators that have existing franchise agreements as they negotiate renewal of those

agreements with LFAs. The Commission also seeks comment on the tentative conclusion that it cannot preempt State or local customer service laws that exceed the Commission’s standards, nor can it prevent LFAs and cable operators from agreeing to more stringent standards.

**DATES:** Comments for this proceeding are due on or before April 20, 2007; reply comments are due on or before May 7, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by MB Docket No. 05-311, 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](mailto:FCC504@fcc.gov) or phone: 202-418-0530 or TTY: 202-418-0432.

For 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](mailto:Holly.Saurer@fcc.gov) or Brendan Murray, [Brendan.Murray@fcc.gov](mailto:Brendan.Murray@fcc.gov) of the Media Bureau, Policy Division, (202) 418-2120.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission’s *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM)*, FCC 06-180, adopted on December 20, 2006, and released on March 5, 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](mailto: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(s) subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Public Law 104-13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any new or modified “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).

In this present document, we have assessed the effects of the application filing requirements used to calculate the time frame in which a local franchising authority shall make a decision, and find that those requirements will benefit companies with fewer than 25 employees by providing such companies with specific application requirements of a reasonable length. We anticipate this specificity will streamline this process for companies with fewer than 25 employees, and that these requirements will not burden those companies.

#### Summary of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

1. As discussed above, this proceeding is limited to competitive applicants under Section 621(a)(1). Yet, some of the decisions in this *Order* also appear germane to existing franchisees. We asked in the *Local Franchising NPRM* whether current procedures and requirements were appropriate for any cable operator, including existing operators. NCTA argues that if the Commission establishes franchising relief for new entrants, we should do the same for incumbent cable operators because imposing similar franchising requirements on new entrants and incumbent cable operators promotes competition. Somewhat analogously, the BSPA argues that any new franchise regulatory relief should extend to all current competitive operators and new entrants equally; otherwise, the inequities would effectively penalize existing competitive franchisees simply because they were the first to risk competition with the incumbent cable operator. The record does not indicate any opposition by new entrants to the idea that any relief afforded them also be afforded to incumbent cable operators. Some incumbent cable operators discussed the potential impact of Commission action under Section 621 on incumbent cable operators. For example, Charter argues that granting