

15, 2007, and retail dispensers and other affected persons must comply by January 1, 2008. Whereas all 110 counties are covered in this section, the revision covering marine fuels applies only to the HGB nonattainment area counties of Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller.

Proposed Action

We are proposing approval of these revisions to the TXLED rule as submitted May 15, 2006, June 11, 2007, and June 13, 2007. The revisions being proposed for approval maintain the potential for the projected NO_x reductions to be achieved. As a result, and in accordance with section 110(l) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. section 7410(l), these revisions will not interfere with attainment, reasonable further progress or any other applicable requirement of the Clean Air Act.

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 proposed 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 action 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 proposed 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 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), 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 Clean Air Act. 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 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. 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, Hydrocarbons, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: January 23, 2008.

Richard E. Greene,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. E8–2556 Filed 2–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 1

[WC Docket No. 07–245; FCC 07–187]

Implementation of Section 224 of the Act; Amendment of the Commission’s Rules and Policies Governing Pole Attachments; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the reply comment date for a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of February 6, 2008. The corrected reply comment date is April 7, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Reel, 202–418–0637.

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. E8–2177, beginning on page 6879 in the issue of February 6, 2008, make the following corrections:

1. On page 6879, in the Dates section, in the 2nd column, “Reply Comments are due March 24, 2008” is corrected to read “Reply Comments are due April 7, 2008”.
2. On page 6879, in the Supplementary Information section, in the 2nd column, change “Reply Comments on or before March 24, 2008” is corrected to read “Reply Comments on or before April 7, 2008”.
3. On page 6883, in the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis section, in paragraph 19, in the 2nd column, “Reply Comments are due on March 24, 2008” is corrected to read “Reply Comments are due on April 7, 2008”.
4. On page 6883, in the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis section, in paragraph 21, in the 2nd column, “Reply Comments are due March 24, 2008” is corrected to read “Reply Comments are due April 7, 2008”.

Federal Communications Commission.

Ruth A. Dancey,

Associate Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8–2564 Filed 2–11–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P