

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 25, 2010. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 11, 2010.

A. Stanley Meiburg,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart S—Kentucky

■ 2. Section 52.920(e), is amended by adding a new entry for the “Paducah 8-Hour Ozone Attainment/1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Section 110(a)(1)” at the end of the table to read as follows:

§ 52.920 Identification of plan.

* * * * *
(e) * * *

EPA-APPROVED KENTUCKY NON-REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Name of SIP provision	Applicable geographic or nonattainment area	State submittal date/effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
Paducah 8-Hour Ozone Attainment/1-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Section 110(a)(1).	Marshall and Livingston Counties.	May 27, 2008	August 26, 2010 [insert citation of publication].	

[FR Doc. 2010-21107 Filed 8-25-10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0113-200709(c); FRL-9193-5]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: State Implementation Plan Revision; Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: On February 9, 2010, EPA published a direct final rule approving revisions to the Georgia State Implementation Plan submitted by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division on September 26, 2006, with a clarifying revision submitted on November 6, 2006. This action corrects a typographical error in the regulatory text in Table (c) of the aforementioned **Federal Register** notice.

DATES: This action is effective August 26, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documentation used in the action being corrected are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-

8960. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through Friday, 8:30 to 4:30, excluding federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Lynorae Benjamin, Regulatory Development Section, Air Planning Branch, Air, Pesticides and Toxics Management Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-8960. Ms. Benjamin can be reached at 404-562-9040, or via electronic mail at benjamin.lynorae@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action corrects a typographical error in the regulatory language for an entry that appears in Table (c) of Georgia’s Identification of Plan section at 40 CFR 52.570. The direct final action which approved the addition of new rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(rrr), “NO_x Emissions from Small Fuel-Burning Equipment,” was approved by EPA on February 9, 2010 (75 FR 6309). However, EPA inadvertently listed new rule (rrr) as being revised, rather than added as a new entry, in Table (c). Therefore, EPA is correcting this typographical error by clarifying that rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(rrr) is being added as a new entry to Table (c)—EPA Approved Georgia Regulations.

EPA has determined that today’s action falls under the “good cause” exemption in section 553(b)(3)(B) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) which, upon finding “good cause,” authorizes agencies to dispense with

public participation where public notice and comment procedures are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. Public notice and comment for this action are unnecessary because today’s action to clarify the addition of new rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(rrr), in Table (c) of the rulemaking, has no substantive impact on EPA’s February 9, 2010, approval of this regulation. In addition, EPA can identify no particular reason why the public would be interested in being notified of the correction of this table entry, or in having the opportunity to comment on the correction prior to this action being finalized, since this correction action does not change the meaning of EPA’s analysis or action to approve the addition of rule 391-3-1-.02(2)(rrr) to the Georgia SIP.

EPA also finds that there is good cause under APA section 553(d)(3) for this correction to become effective on the date of publication of this action. Section 553(d)(3) of the APA allows an effective date less than 30 days after publication “as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule.” 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3). The purpose of the 30-day waiting period prescribed in APA section 553(d)(3) is to give affected parties a reasonable time to adjust their behavior and prepare before the final rule takes effect. Today’s rule, however, does not create any new regulatory requirements such that affected parties would need time to prepare before the rule takes effect. Rather, today’s rule merely corrects a typographical error in

Table (c) of a prior rule by clarifying the addition, rather than the revision, of rule 391–3–1–.02(2)(rrr), which EPA approved on February 9, 2010. For these reasons, EPA finds good cause under APA section 553(d)(3) for this correction to become effective on the date of publication of this action.

Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this 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 action merely corrects a typographical error in Table (c) of a prior rule by identifying the addition of new rule 391–3–1–.02(2)(rrr), in a regulation which EPA approved on February 9, 2010, and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this 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 merely corrects an inadvertent error in Table (c) of a prior rule, 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 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 rule 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 rule merely corrects a typographical error in Table (c) of a prior rule by identifying the addition of new rule 391–3–1–.02(2)(rrr), in a regulation which EPA approved on February 9, 2010, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act (CAA). This 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 addition, this rule does not involve technical standards, 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 rule also does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United

States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 25, 2010. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See CAA section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: August 16, 2010.

J. Scott Gordon,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4.

■ 40 CFR part 52 is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

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

Subpart L—Georgia

■ 2. Section 52.570(c) is amended by adding an entry for “391–3–1–.02(2)(rrr)” to read as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

EPA APPROVED GEORGIA REGULATIONS

State citation	Title/subject	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
391–3–1–.02(2)(rrr)	NO _x Emissions from Small Fuel-Burning Equipment.	3/27/06	8/26/10 [Insert citation of publication].	
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2010-21114 Filed 8-25-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 95

[ET Docket No. 06-135; FCC 10-128]

Spectrum Requirements for Advanced Medical Technologies

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document addresses a petition for reconsideration (petition) filed by Medtronic, Inc. (Medtronic) regarding rules for the Medical Device Radiocommunication (MedRadio) service. The Commission grants reconsideration to the extent of amending the MedRadio rules to permit the submission of average power transmitter measurements, and making editorial corrections or clarifications to several provisions concerning the frequency monitoring criteria and permissible communications for “listen-before-talk” (LBT) and non-LBT devices. The Commission denies reconsideration in all other respects and otherwise affirms certain provisions of the MedRadio rules questioned by Medtronic.

DATES: Effective September 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Settle, (202) 418-1569 or Gary Thayer, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 418-2290, Mark.Settle@fcc.gov or Gary.Thayer@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission’s *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, ET Docket No. 06-135, adopted July 15, 2010, and released July 26, 2010. The full text of this document is available on the Commission’s Internet site at <http://www.fcc.gov>. It is also available for inspection and copying during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room CY-A257), 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554. The full text of this document also may be purchased from the Commission’s duplication contractor, Best Copy and Printing Inc., Portals II, 445 12th St., SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554; telephone (202) 488-5300; fax (202) 488-5563; e-mail FCC@BCPIWEB.COM.

Summary of the Memorandum Opinion and Order

1. The Commission addresses a petition for reconsideration (petition) filed by Medtronic, Inc. (Medtronic) regarding rules for the Medical Device Radio-communication (MedRadio) service. The Commission granted reconsideration to the extent of amending the MedRadio rules to permit the submission of average power transmitter measurements, and making editorial corrections or clarifications to several provisions concerning the frequency monitoring criteria and permissible communications for “listen-before-talk” (LBT) and non-LBT devices. The Commission denied reconsideration in all other respects and otherwise affirmed certain provisions of the MedRadio rules questioned by Medtronic.

2. The Commission established the MedRadio service under part 95 of the rules by *Report and Order (MedRadio Order)*, see 74 FR 22696, May 14, 2009. Altogether, the MedRadio service provides a total of five megahertz of contiguous spectrum for advanced wireless medical radiocommunication devices serving a diverse range of diagnostic and therapeutic purposes in humans. In the *MedRadio Order*, the Commission also adopted service and technical rules governing the operation of medical radiocommunication devices used in the MedRadio service. Building upon the former Medical Implant Communications Service (MICS)—which limited operation to implanted medical devices—the more flexible MedRadio rules accommodate body-worn as well as implanted medical devices, including those using either LBT or non-LBT spectrum access methods. The MedRadio service incorporates the MICS “core” band at 402–405 MHz—which continues to be limited to implanted devices—and also includes two megahertz of newly designated spectrum in the adjacent “wing” bands at 401–402 MHz and 405–406 MHz—in which both body-worn and implanted devices are permitted. The MedRadio service continues to incorporate many of the licensing and technical requirements that applied to the legacy MICS.

3. Medtronic requests that the new MedRadio rules be amended to permit transmitter power measurements to be made using average power instrumentation techniques that were formerly allowed under the MICS rules. The former MICS rules stated that compliance with the maximum transmitter power limits shall be based upon measurements using a peak

detector function or, alternatively, the instrumentation techniques set forth in a particular American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard referenced in the rule. That standard has been modified by ANSI since adoption of the MICS rules in 1999 and no longer includes the specific average power instrumentation techniques cited by Medtronic. As adopted in the *MedRadio Order*, the new rules set forth a compliance requirement in terms of a “Commission-approved peak power technique.” Medtronic argues that the Commission did not propose to delete these provisions of the MICS rules in the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (MedRadio NPRM)* that preceded the adoption of the MedRadio rules, see 71 FR 43682, August 2, 2006. Medtronic further asserts that the peak power requirement as set forth in the rule adopted in the *MedRadio Order* would, in effect, prohibit the use of average power instrumentation techniques that were acceptable within the scope of the former MICS rule. It contends that the inability to rely upon these average power techniques for compliance would require MedRadio devices to reduce power, and that this, in turn, would be detrimental to the reliable operation of existing equipment and adversely affect the development of new generation devices. To remedy this concern, Medtronic recommends that the Commission reinstate the former MICS rule provision or, in the alternative, restore the intent of the prior rule by substituting text that would permit the use of average power measurement techniques. St. Jude Medical agrees with Medtronic, stating that the effect of the peak power measurement rule will be to sharply reduce the range available to some systems. Biotronik opposes Medtronic’s request, stating that the peak power approach adopted in the *MedRadio Order* is a more appropriate technique for MedRadio transmitters because average power measurements would allow higher power devices in the band and, thus, increase the potential for interference in the band.

4. As a threshold matter, the Commission addresses Medtronic’s suggestion that it failed to provide sufficient notice for modifying the power measurement provisions. While the Commission acknowledges that the *MedRadio NPRM* did not explicitly request comment on whether the power measurement provisions should be modified, changes to these measurement provisions are a logical outgrowth of issues in the *MedRadio NPRM* that we did present for comment. More specifically, the Commission