announced today. Policy Assessment for the Review of the Secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Oxides of Nitrogen and Sulfur, contains staff analyses of the scientific bases for alternative policy options for consideration by the Agency prior to rulemaking. This document, which builds upon the historical “Staff Paper,” will serve to “bridge the gap” between the available scientific information and the judgments required of the Administrator in determining whether it is appropriate to retain or revise the standards.2 The current and potential alternative standards for oxides of nitrogen and sulfur are considered in terms of the basic elements of the NAAQS: indicator, averaging time, form, and level. The Policy Assessment builds upon information presented in the Integrated Science Assessment for Oxides of Nitrogen and Sulfur—Ecological Criteria: Final report (ISA, EPA EPA/600/R–08/082F, December 2008) and the quantitative risk and exposure assessment document (REA)—Risk and Exposure Assessment for Review of the Secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Oxides of Nitrogen and Oxides of Sulfur (EPA–452/R–09–008a and EPA–452/R–09–008b; September 2009).

A first draft Policy Assessment (EPA–452/P–10–006) was released in March 2010 to facilitate discussion with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) at an April 1–2, 2010 meeting on the overall structure, areas of focus, and level of detail to be included in the Policy Assessment (75 FR 10479–10481, March 2010). CASAC’s comments on the first draft Policy Assessment encouraged the development of a document focused on the key policy-relevant issues that draws from and is not repetitive of information in the ISA and REA. These comments were considered in developing a second draft Policy Assessment (EPA 452/P–10–008, September 2010). The EPA presented an overview of the second draft Policy Assessment at a CASAC meeting on October 6–7, 2010 (75 FR 54871–54872).

CASAC (EPA–CASAC–11–003) and public comments on the second draft Policy Assessment were considered by EPA staff in developing both the January 14, 2011 version and this current version of the final Policy Assessment, which reflects final editing and formatting, and is available through the Agency’s Technology Transfer Network (TTN) Web site at http://www.epa.gov/tnn/naaqs/standards/no2so2sec/cr_pa.html. CASAC has requested a February 15–16, 2011, meeting to review EPA’s final Policy Assessment.

Dated: February 9, 2011.

Mary E. Henigin, Acting Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 2011–3382 Filed 2–14–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY


Status of Motor Vehicle Budgets in Submitted State Implementation Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes; Connecticut; Notice of Withdrawal of Adequacy of Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of withdrawal of adequacy.

SUMMARY: EPA is notifying the public that EPA has withdrawn its previous adequacy finding on the 2012 motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs) for Connecticut’s two 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas. EPA has withdrawn the adequacy finding because Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT DEP) withdrew its 2012 motor vehicle emission budgets from its eight-hour ozone attainment demonstration SIP for both ozone nonattainment areas. As a result of our finding, Connecticut cannot use these 2012 motor vehicle emission budgets for future conformity determinations.

DATES: This finding is effective March 2, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald O. Cooke, Environmental Scientist, Air Quality Planning Unit, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, Five Post Office Square, Suite 100 (CAQ), Boston, MA 02109–3912, (617) 918–1668, cooke.donald@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, whenever “we,” “us” or “our” is used, we mean EPA.

Today’s action is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. On February 1, 2008, Connecticut submitted 2008, 2009, and 2012 summer day volatile organic compound (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) MVEBs for the Connecticut portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY–NJ–CT (Southwest Connecticut) 8-hour ozone nonattainment area and for the Greater Connecticut 8-hour ozone nonattainment area. These MVEBs were submitted to EPA as part of the 8-hour ozone attainment demonstrations and reasonable further progress plans for these areas. Although not required by the Clean Air Act or EPA regulation, Connecticut included the 2012 budgets in its ozone attainment demonstrations based on uncertainty as to whether attainment would be met by the applicable June 15, 2010 attainment date for the two nonattainment areas. EPA found Connecticut’s 2008, 2009, and 2012 MVEBs adequate for transportation conformity purposes. See 73 FR 33428; June 12, 2008.

On August 23, 2010, CT DEP withdrew the 2012 MVEBs from its 8-hour ozone attainment demonstration SIP for both ozone nonattainment areas. At that time, CT DEP also requested that EPA withdraw the adequacy findings for the 2012 MVEBs, since both ozone nonattainment areas have monitored air quality data demonstrating attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and the 2012 MVEBs are no longer necessary to ensure attainment.1

Connecticut’s request to withdraw the 2012 MVEBs was announced on EPA’s conformity Web site, and received no comments. (See http://www.epa.gov/otaq/statereources/transconf/adequacy.htm. Once there, click on “What SIP submissions are currently under EPA adequacy review?”)

On December 30, 2010, EPA sent a letter to the CT DEP withdrawing our previous adequacy finding on the 2012 MVEBs for the Southwest Connecticut and the Greater Connecticut 8-hour ozone nonattainment areas.

The 2012 MVEBs are withdrawn for transportation conformity purposes. However, the 2008 (reasonable further progress) MVEBs and the 2009 (attainment) MVEBs that were previously deemed adequate, remain adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671 q.

1 EPA has determined that the Greater Connecticut area has attained the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. See 75 FR 53219; August 31, 2010. EPA has not yet taken action regarding the Southwest Connecticut area.
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission, Comments Requested

February 8, 2011.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520. Comments are requested concerning: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission’s burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, and (e) ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small businesses with fewer than 25 employees.

The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

DATES: Written Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before March 17, 2011. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the FCC contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Nicholas A. Fraser, Office of Management and Budget, via fax at 202–395–5167 or via the Internet at Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov and to the Federal Communications Commission via e-mail to PRA@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie F. Smith, Office of Managing Director, (202) 418–0217, or via the Internet at Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0430.

Title: Section 1.1206, Permit-but-Disclose Proceedings.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or household; Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions; Federal Government; and State, local, or tribal government.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 9,990 respondents; 9,990 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 0.5 hours.

Frequency of Response: Occasion reporting requirements; recordkeeping; third party disclosure.

Obligation To Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in Sections 4(i) and 4(j), 303(r), and 409 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i) and 154(j), 303(r), and 409.

Total Annual Burden: 4,995 hours.

Total Annual Cost: $0.00.

Privacy Act Impact Assessment: No impacts.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: The Commission is not requesting that the respondents submit confidential information to the FCC. Respondents may, however, request confidential treatment for information they believe to be confidential under 47 CFR 0.459 of the Commission’s rules.

Needs and Uses: The Commission’s rules, under 47 CFR 1.1206, require that a public record be made of ex parte presentations (i.e., written presentations not served on all parties to the proceeding or oral presentations as to which all parties have not been given notice and an opportunity to be present) to decision-making personnel in “permit-but-disclose” proceedings, such as notice-and-comment rulemakings and declaratory ruling proceedings. Persons making such presentations must file two copies of written presentations and two copies of memoranda reflecting new data or arguments in oral presentations no later than the next business day after the presentation; alternatively, in proceedings in which electronic filing is permitted, a copy may be filed electronically. The information is used by parties to permit-but-disclose proceedings, including interested members of the public, to respond to the arguments made and data offered in the presentations. The responses may then be used by the Commission in its decision-making. The availability of the ex parte materials ensures that the Commission’s decisional processes are fair, impartial, and comport with the concept of due process in that all interested parties can know of and respond to the arguments made to the decision-making officials.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,
Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC).

ACTION: Notice of information collections to be submitted to OMB for review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

SUMMARY: In accordance with requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the FDIC hereby gives notice that it plans to submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request for OMB review and approval of the information collections described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 17, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments to the FDIC by any of the following methods:

- E-mail: comments@fdic.gov.

Include the name of the collection in the subject line of the message.


Hand Delivery: Comments may be hand-delivered to the guard station at the rear of the 17th Street Building (located on F Street), on business days between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.

All comments should refer to the relevant OMB control number. A copy of the comments may also be submitted to the OMB desk officer for the FDIC: Office of Information and Regulatory