

when it is most economical to do so. With the implementation of the renewable fuels standard also contained in the Energy Act, the blending of ethanol, in particular, into gasoline is expected to increase considerably, not decrease. Therefore, despite this action to remove the oxygenate mandate in RFG, when viewed in the context of companion energy legislation, overall use of oxygenates is expected to increase in the future. This rule also would allow gasoline retailers to commingle certain compliant gasolines which otherwise would be prohibited from being commingled. This also may have a positive effect on gasoline supplies.

#### *I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 ("NTTAA"), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (*e.g.*, materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

This proposed rule does not establish new technical standards within the meaning of the NTTAA. Therefore, EPA did not consider the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

#### **VI. Statutory Provisions and Legal Authority**

The statutory authority for the actions in today's proposed rule comes from sections 211(c), 211(k) and 301(a) of the CAA.

#### **List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 80**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Fuel additives, Gasoline, Motor vehicle pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 14, 2006.

**Stephen L. Johnson,**  
*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 06-1611 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 73**

[DA 06-271; MB Docket No. 04-410, RM-11109]

#### **Radio Broadcasting Services; Woodson, TX**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; dismissal.

**SUMMARY:** The Audio Division dismisses a Petition for Rule Making filed by Charles Crawford, requesting the allotment of Channel 298A at Woodson, Texas, as the community's first local aural transmission service. Charles Crawford withdrew his petition for rulemaking. Katherine Pyeatt filed a timely counterproposal to this petition, proposing to allot Channel 248A at three communities, Woodson, Chillicothe and Henrietta, Texas, with a channel substitution at Archer City, Texas. Subsequently, Katherine Pyeatt also withdrew her counterproposal. See 69 FR 67882, November 11, 2004. No other party filed comments supporting the allotment of Channel 298A at Woodson, Texas. It is the Commission's policy to refrain from making a new allotment or reservation to a community absent an expression of interest.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Victoria M. McCauley, Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MB Docket No. 04-410, adopted February 2, 2006, and released February 6, 2006. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during regular business hours at the FCC's Reference Information Center, Portals II, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Room CY-A257, and Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20054, telephone 1-800-378-3160 or <http://www.BCPIWEB.com>. This document is not subject to the Congressional Review Act. (The Commission, is, therefore, not required to submit a copy of this Report and Order to GAO, pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, see 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) because the proposed rule was dismissed.

Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**  
*Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 06-1518 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## **FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

### **47 CFR Part 73**

[DA 06-272; MB Docket No. 06-19; RM-11288]

#### **Radio Broadcasting Services; Hattiesburg and Sumrall, MS**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document requests comments on a Petition for Rule Making filed by Unity Broadcasting requesting to upgrade Channel 226A, FM Station WGDQ, to Channel 226C3 and to reallocate Channel 226C3 to Sumrall, Mississippi, as that community's second local aural transmission service. To accommodate this allotment, Petitioner requested the reclassification of FM Station WUSW, Channel 279C, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, to specify operation on Channel 279C0 pursuant to the reclassification procedures adopted by the Commission. See 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Streamlining of Radio Technical Rules in Parts 73 and 74 of the Commission's Rules, 65 FR 79773 (December 20, 2000). The licensee of Station WUSW did not respond to an Order to Show Cause why Station WUSW should not be downgraded from Channel 279C to Channel 279C0. Therefore, the Commission has reclassified Station WUSW to Channel 279C0. Channel 226C3 can be allotted with a site restriction of 19.5 kilometers (12.1 miles) northeast of Sumrall, at reference coordinates of 31-33-15 NL and 89-24-50 WL.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before March 30, 2006, and reply comments on or before April 14, 2006. Any counterproposal filed in this proceeding need only protect FM Station WUSW, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Channel 279C, as a Class C0 allotment.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 Twelfth Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel as follows: Jerrold Miller, Esq, Miller and Neely, P.C.; 6900 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 704; Bethesda, Maryland 20815.