

172(c)(9) and 189(a) and 57 FR 13543–13544.

Idaho has presented an adequate demonstration that it has met the requirements applicable to the area under section 110 and Part D. The Part D NSR rules for PM–10 nonattainment areas in Idaho were approved by EPA on July 23, 1993 (58 FR 39445) and amended provisions were approved by EPA on January 16, 2003 (68 FR 2217). The Clean Air Act requires that contingency measures take effect if the area fails to meet reasonable further progress requirements or fails to attain the NAAQS by the applicable attainment date. The Portneuf Valley PM–10 nonattainment area attained the NAAQS for PM–10 by the applicable attainment date of December 31, 1996. Therefore, contingency measures no longer are required under section 172(c)(9) of the Act. Contingency measures are also required for maintenance plans under section 175A(d). Idaho has provided contingency measures in the maintenance plan for the Portneuf Valley PM–10 nonattainment area. The contingency measures in the maintenance plan are discussed in section III above.

B. What Do We Conclude About the Request for Redesignation?

Based on our review of the nonattainment area plan, the maintenance plan, and the request for redesignation request submitted for the Portneuf Valley PM–10 nonattainment area on June 30, 2004, we conclude that all the requirements for redesignation in section 107(d)(3)(E) have been met. Therefore, we are proposing to redesignate the Portneuf Valley PM–10 nonattainment area to attainment.

V. 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 (Public Law 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 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

40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

40 CFR Part 81

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

Dated: May 10, 2005.

Julie M. Hagensen,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 05–10149 Filed 5–19–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 76

[MB Docket No. 05–181; FCC 05–92]

Implementation of Section 210 of the Satellite Home Viewer Extension and Reauthorization Act of 2004 To Amend Section 338 of the Communications Act

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a Notice of proposed rulemaking summary that was published in the **Federal Register** at 70 FR 24350, May 9, 2005. In this document, the Commission corrects the **DATES** section of the preamble to reflect correct comment due dates.

DATES: Comments for this proceeding are due on or before June 6, 2005; reply comments are due on or before June 20, 2005. Written comments on the proposed information collection requirements contained in this document must be submitted by the public, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and other interested parties on or before July 8, 2005.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by MB Docket No. 05–181, 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 or phone: 202-418-0530 or TTY: 202-418-0432.

For detailed instructions for submitting comments and 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 Eloise Gore, Eloise.Gore@fcc.gov of the Media Bureau, Policy Division, (202) 418-2120. For additional information concerning the Paperwork Reduction Act information collection requirements contained in this *NPRM*, contact Cathy Williams, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th St., SW., Room 1-C823, Washington, DC 20554, or via the Internet to Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov. If you would like to obtain or view a copy of this revised information collection, OMB Control Number 3060-0980, you may do so by visiting the FCC PRA web page at: <http://www.fcc.gov/omd/prs>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In FR Doc. 05-9290 on page 24350 published in the **Federal Register** on Monday, May 9, 2005 make the following corrections: On page 24350 in the second column, in the **DATES** section, the first sentence is corrected to read as follows: Comments for this proceeding are due on or before June 6, 2005; reply comments are due on or before June 20, 2005.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05-10227 Filed 5-19-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90-Day Finding on a Petition To List the Pygmy Rabbit as Threatened or Endangered

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce a 90-day finding on a petition to list the pygmy rabbit (*Brachylagus idahoensis*) as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. We find the petition does not provide substantial information

indicating that listing the pygmy rabbit may be warranted. Therefore, we will not be initiating a further status review in response to this petition. We ask the public to submit to us any new information that becomes available concerning the status of the species or threats to it.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made May 20, 2005. You may submit new information concerning this species for our consideration at any time.

ADDRESSES: The complete file for this finding is available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Suite 234, Reno, NV 89502. Submit new information, materials, comments, or questions concerning this species to us at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert D. Williams, Field Supervisor, Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office (see **ADDRESSES**) (telephone 775/861-6300; facsimile 775/861-6301).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), requires that we make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. We are to base this finding on information provided in the petition. To the maximum extent practicable, we are to make this finding within 90 days of our receipt of the petition, and publish our notice of this finding promptly in the **Federal Register**.

Our standard for substantial information within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) with regard to a 90-day petition finding is "that amount of information that would lead a reasonable person to believe that the measure proposed in the petition may be warranted" (50 CFR 424.14(b)). If we find that substantial information was presented, we are required to promptly commence a review of the status of the species, if one has not already been initiated under our internal candidate assessment process.

In making this finding, we relied on information provided by the petitioners and evaluated that information in accordance with 50 CFR 424.14(b). Our process of coming to a 90-day finding under section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Act and section 424.14(b) of our regulations is limited to a determination of whether

the information in the petition meets the "substantial information" threshold.

On April 21, 2003, we received a formal petition, dated April 1, 2003, from the Committee for the High Desert, Western Watersheds Project, American Lands Alliance, Oregon Natural Desert Association, Biodiversity Conservation Alliance, Center for Native Ecosystems, and Mr. Craig Criddle, requesting that the pygmy rabbit (*Brachylagus idahoensis*) found in California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming be listed as threatened or endangered in accordance with section 4 of the Act.

Action on this petition was precluded by court orders and settlement agreements for other listing actions that required nearly all of our listing funds for fiscal year 2003. On May 3, 2004, we received a 60-day notice of intent to sue, and on September 1, 2004, we received a complaint regarding our failure to carry out the 90-day and 12-month findings on the status of the pygmy rabbit. On March 2, 2005, we reached an agreement with the plaintiffs to submit to the **Federal Register** a completed 90-day finding by May 16, 2005, and to complete, if applicable, a 12-month finding by February 15, 2006 (*Western Watersheds Project et al. v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service* (CV-04-0440-N-BLW)).

This finding does not address our prior listing of the Columbia Basin distinct population segment (DPS) of the pygmy rabbit. On November 30, 2001, we published an emergency listing and concurrent proposed rule to list this DPS of the pygmy rabbit as endangered (66 FR 59734 and 66 FR 59769, respectively). We listed the Columbia Basin DPS of the pygmy rabbit as endangered in our final rule dated March 5, 2003 (68 FR 10388).

Species Information

The pygmy rabbit is a member of the family Leporidae, which includes rabbits and hares. This species has been placed in various genera since its type specimen was described in 1891 by Merriam (1891), who classified the "Idaho pygmy rabbit" as *Lepus idahoensis*. Currently, the pygmy rabbit is generally placed within the monotypic genus *Brachylagus* and classified as *B. idahoensis* (Green and Flinders 1980a; WDFW 1995); this is the taxonomy accepted by the Service. The analysis of blood proteins (Johnson 1968, cited in Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) 1995) suggests that the pygmy rabbit differs greatly from species within both the *Lepus* or *Sylvilagus* genera. Halanych and Robinson (1997) supported the