aware of any new issues presented by the elimination of production emissions credits, and we have received no evidence to the contrary. We therefore do not find any new issues raised by the elimination of production emissions credits.

Having received no contrary evidence regarding this amendment, we find that California has met the three criteria for a within-the-scope authorization approval, and the modification of production emissions credits amendment is confirmed as within the scope of previous authorizations of California’s SORE regulations.

3. Ethanol Blend Certification Fuel Option

Finally, one of the 2008 Amendments granted manufacturers the option to “use a certification fuel with up to ten percent ethanol content when that same fuel is used for certification with the EPA.” 54 EPA received no adverse comments or evidence contradicting California’s request to consider this amendment as within the scope of previous authorizations. In regard to the first within-the-scope criterion, CARB stated that this amendment would increase “harmonization of California’s SORE certification procedures with EPA’s nonroad engine certification procedures, and could reduce the testing cost for some manufacturers.” 55 Based on the record before us and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we cannot find that California’s protectiveness determination regarding the implementation of an ethanol blend certification fuel option is arbitrary or capricious.

In regard to the second within-the-scope criterion, California found that the amendment does not affect consistency with section 209 of the Act. 56 This amendment does not regulate emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, and thus is not inconsistent with 209(a). Similarly, it did not attempt to regulate any of the permanently preempted engines or vehicles, and so is consistent with section 209(e)(1). This amendment expands rather than limits the means by which manufacturers can certify fuels, and thus poses no lead-time or technological feasibility problems. We therefore find no evidence that this amendment is inconsistent with section 209 of the Act.

In regard to the third within-the-scope criterion, California stated that the ethanol blend certification fuel option raised no new issues. 57 EPA similarly finds no new issues arising from the amendment.

Having received no contrary evidence regarding this amendment, we find that California has met the three criteria for a within-the-scope authorization approval, and the ethanol blend certification fuel option amendment is confirmed as within the scope of previous authorizations of California’s SORE regulations.

III. Decision

The Administrator has delegated the authority to grant California section 209(e) authorizations to the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation. After evaluating the 2008 Amendments to CARB’s SORE regulations described above and CARB’s submissions for EPA review, EPA is taking the following actions.

First, EPA confirms that California’s amendment modifying emissions credits and permitting emissions credit generation for ZEE is within the scope of prior authorizations. Second, EPA confirms that California’s amendment eliminating production credit generation is within the scope of prior authorizations. Third, EPA confirms that California’s amendment permitting certification with fuels with up to ten percent ethanol content provided that the same fuel is used for certification with EPA is within the scope of prior authorizations.

This decision will affect persons in California and those manufacturers and/or owners/operators nationwide who must comply with California’s requirements. In addition, because other states may adopt California’s standards for which a section 209(e)(2)(A) authorization has been granted if certain criteria are met, this decision would also affect those states and those persons in such states. See CAA section 209(e)(2)(B). For these reasons, EPA determines and finds that this is a final action of national applicability, and also a final action of nationwide scope or effect for purposes of section 307(b)(1) of the Act. Pursuant to section 307(b)(1) of the Act, judicial review of this final action may be sought only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Petitions for review must be filed by July 6, 2015. Judicial review of this final action may not be obtained in subsequent enforcement proceedings, pursuant to section 307(b)(2) of the Act.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

As with past authorization and waiver decisions, this action is not a rule as defined by Executive Order 12866. Therefore, it is exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget as required for rules and regulations by Executive Order 12866.

In addition, this action is not a rule as defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601(2). Therefore, EPA has not prepared a supporting regulatory flexibility analysis addressing the impact of this action on small business entities.

Further, the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801, et seq., as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, does not apply because this action is not a rule for purposes of 5 U.S.C. 804(3).


Janet G. McCabe,
Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 2015–10610 Filed 5–5–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
[OMB 3060–0723]

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission Under Delegated Authority

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collections. Comments are requested concerning: 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; the accuracy of the Commission’s burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; 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 ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees. The FCC may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the PRA that does not display a valid OMB control number.

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before July 6, 2015. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Nicole Ongele, FCC, via email PRA@fcc.gov and to Nicole.Ongele@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Nicole Ongele at (202) 418–2991.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:


Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirements and third party disclosure requirement. Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. Statutory authority for this information collection is contained in 47 U.S.C. 276 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Total Annual Burden: 360 hours. Total Annual Cost: No cost. Privacy Impact Assessment: No impact(s).

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: The Commission is not requesting respondents to submit confidential information to the FCC. If the Commission requests respondents to submit information which respondents believe is confidential, respondents may request confidential treatment of such information under 47 CFR 0.459 of the Commission’s rules.

Number of Respondents: Under 47 U.S.C. 276(b)(1), the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) are required to publicly disclose changes in their networks or new network services. Section 276(b)(1)(C) directs the Commission to “prescribe a set of nonstructural safeguards for BOC payphone service to implement the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), which safeguards shall, at a minimum, include the nonstructural safeguards equal to those adopted in the Computer Inquiry-III (CC Docket No. 90–623) proceeding.” The Computer Inquiry-III network information disclosure requirements specifically state that the disclosure would occur at two different points in time. First, disclosure would occur at the make/buy point: When a BOC decides to make for itself, or procure from an unaffiliated entity, any product whose design affects or relies on the network interface. Second, a BOC would publicly disclose technical information about a new service 12 months before it is introduced. If the BOC can introduce the service within 12 months of the make/buy point, it would make a public disclosure at the make/buy point. No event, however, would the public disclosure occur less than six months before the introduction of the service. Without provision of this information, the industry would be unable to ascertain whether the BOCs are designing new network services or changing network technical specifications to the advantage of their own payphones, or in a manner that might disadvantage BOC payphone competitors. These requirements ensure that BOCs comply with their obligations under the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Federal Communications Commission.

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

[FR Doc. 2015–10603 Filed 5–5–15; 8:45 am]
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FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[OMB 3060–0214]

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, and as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collections. Comments are requested concerning: 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; the accuracy of the Commission’s burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; 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 ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

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

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before July 6, 2015. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all PRA comments to Cathy Williams, FCC, via email PRA@fcc.gov and to Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Cathy Williams at (202) 418–2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0214. Title: Sections 73.3526 and 73.3527, Local Public Inspection Files; Sections 76.1701 and 73.1943, Political Files. Form Number: Not applicable. Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection. Respondents/Affected Parties: Business or other for-profit entities; Not for-profit institutions; Individuals or households. Number of Respondents and Responses: 24,558 respondents; 63,234 responses. Estimated Time per Response: 1 hour to 104 hours. Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement; Recordkeeping requirement; Third party disclosure requirement. Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory...