

Example 19. Assume the same facts as stated in *Example 18*, except that instead of making a deposit of \$h into B, Y enters into a guarantee agreement with B. The guarantee agreement provides that if X defaults on the loan, Y will repay the balance due on the loan to B. B was unwilling to make the loan to X in the absence of Y's guarantee. X must use the proceeds from the loan to construct the new child care facility. At the same time, X and Y enter into a reimbursement agreement whereby X agrees to reimburse Y for any and all amounts paid to B under the guarantee agreement. The signed guarantee and reimbursement agreements together constitute a "guarantee and reimbursement arrangement." Y's primary purpose in entering into the guarantee and reimbursement arrangement is to further Y's educational purposes. No significant purpose of the guarantee and reimbursement arrangement involves the production of income or the appreciation of property. The guarantee and reimbursement arrangement significantly furthers the accomplishment of Y's exempt activities and would not have been made but for such relationship between the guarantee and reimbursement arrangement and Y's exempt activities. Accordingly, the guarantee and reimbursement arrangement is a program-related investment.

(c) *Effective/applicability date.*

Paragraph (b), *Examples 11* through *19* of this section will be effective on the date of publication of the Treasury decision adopting these examples as final regulations in the **Federal Register**. Taxpayers may rely on paragraph (b), *Examples 11* through *19* of this section before these proposed regulations are finalized.

Steven T. Miller,

Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2012-9468 Filed 4-18-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MB Docket No. 08-150; RM-11390; DA 12-512]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Asbury and Maquoketa, IA, and Mineral Point, WI

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; dismissal.

SUMMARY: The Audio Division dismisses the petition for rule making filed by KM Radio of Independence, LLC, proposing the allotment of Channel 238A at Mineral Point, Wisconsin, and the substitution of reserved Channel *254A for reserved vacant Channel *238A at

Asbury, Iowa, 73 FR 50,297, and terminates the proceeding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Dupont, Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order*, MB Docket No. 08-150, adopted April 2, 2012, and released April 2, 2012. 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, www.bcpweb.com. The *Report and Order* is not subject to the Congressional Review Act, and therefore the Commission will not send a copy of it in a report to be sent to Congress and the Government Accountability Office, see U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

Federal Communications Commission.

Nazifa Sawez,

Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2012-9401 Filed 4-18-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

[Docket No. FWS-R7-ES-2012-0009; 4500030113]

RIN 1018-AY40

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Special Rule for the Polar Bear

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; availability of draft environmental assessment.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), propose to amend the regulations at 50 CFR part 17, which implement the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA), to create a special rule under authority of section 4(d) of the ESA that provides measures that are necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of the polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*). The Secretary has the discretion to prohibit by regulation with

respect to the polar bear any act prohibited by section 9(a)(1) of the ESA.

DATES: We will consider comments we receive on or before June 18, 2012. We must receive requests for public hearings, in writing, at the address shown in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by June 4, 2012.

ADDRESSES:

Document availability: You can view this proposed rule and the associated draft environmental assessment on <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket No. FWS-R7-ES-2012-0009.

Written comments: You may submit comments on the proposed rule and associated draft environmental assessment by one of the following methods:

- *U.S. mail or hand-delivery:* Public Comments Processing, Attn: Docket No. FWS-R7-ES-2012-0009; Division of Policy and Directives Management; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 2042-PDM; Arlington, VA 22203; or

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments to Docket No. FWS-R7-ES-2012-0009.

Please indicate to which document, the proposed rule or the draft environmental assessment, your comments apply. We will post all comments on <http://www.regulations.gov>. This generally means that we will post any personal information you provide us (see the *Public Comments* section below for more information).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Hamilton, Marine Mammals Management Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 7, 1011 East Tudor Road, Anchorage, AK 99503; telephone 907-786-3309. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Summary

Why We Need To Publish a Proposed Rule

In response to litigation against the Service challenging our December 16, 2008 final 4(d) special rule for the polar bear, the District Court for the District of Columbia (Court) found that although the final 4(d) special rule for the polar bear was consistent with the ESA, the Service violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Administrative Procedure Act by failing to conduct a NEPA analysis when it promulgated the final 4(d)