

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 275–0378d; FRL–7483–3]

**Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District; Proposed Rule; Correction****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document corrects preamble errors in the March 24, 2003 notice of proposed rulemaking pertaining to revisions of local gasoline tank vapor recovery rules in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District portions of the California State Implementation Plan.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Al Petersen, EPA Region IX, (415) 947–4118.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On March 24, 2003 (68 FR 14174), EPA proposed revisions to local gasoline tank vapor recovery rules in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District portions of the California State Implementation Plan. The notice of proposed rulemaking accurately identified the rules being revised in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** portion of the notice, but incorrectly referenced Imperial County and Monterey County Air Pollution Control Districts in the title and summary of the rule.

The correct title for the March 24, 2003 notice should read, “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District.”

The Summary section should read:

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve revisions to Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD), and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD) portions of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The BAAQMD revision concerns the

emission of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from the transfer of gasoline to stationary storage tanks and motor vehicle fuel tanks. The SMAQMD and SJVUAPCD revisions concern the emission of VOCs from the transfer of gasoline to motor vehicle fuel tanks. We are proposing approval of local rules that regulate these emission sources under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act).

Today’s notice does not otherwise change the remaining portions of the March 24, 2003 notice of proposed rulemaking.

Dated: April 3, 2003.

**Alexis Strauss,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 03–9208 Filed 4–14–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 271**

[FRL–7482–2]

**Hazardous Waste Management Program: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions for State of Texas****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA (also, “the Agency” in this preamble) is proposing to grant final authorization to the hazardous waste program revisions submitted by the State of Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission for its hazardous waste program revisions, specifically, revisions needed to meet the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Clusters VII through X, which contain Federal rules promulgated between July 1, 1995 to June 30, 2000. In the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register** (FR), EPA is authorizing the State’s program revisions as an immediate final rule without prior proposal because the EPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. The Agency has explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. If EPA does not receive adverse written comments, the immediate final rule will become effective and the Agency will not take further action on this proposal. If EPA receives adverse written comments, a second **Federal Register** document will be published before the time the immediate final rule takes effect. The

second document may withdraw the immediate final rule or identify the issues raised, respond to the comments and affirm that the immediate final rule will take effect as scheduled. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before May 15, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail written comments to Alima Patterson, Region 6, Regional Authorization Coordinator, Grants and Authorization Section (6PD-G), Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, at the address shown below. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by the State of Texas during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, (214) 665–6444; or Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, 12100 Park S. Circle, Austin TX 78753–3087, phone (512) 239–1121.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Alima Patterson (214) 665–8533.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, please see the immediate final rule published in the “Rules and Regulations” section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 27, 2003.

**Lawrence E. Starfield,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.*

[FR Doc. 03–9043 Filed 4–14–03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION****47 CFR Part 73**

[DA 03–1013; MB Docket No. 03–87, RM–10686]

**Radio Broadcasting Services; Dilley and Pearsall, TX****AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Pearsall RadioWorks, Ltd proposing the reallocation of Channel 237A from Pearsall to Dilley, Texas, and the modification of Station WVWG–FM’s license accordingly. Petitioner also requests the allotment of Channel 227A at Pearsall as a replacement service. Channel 237A can be reallocated to Dilley in compliance with the Commission’s minimum distance separation requirements with a site restriction of 2.7 kilometers (1.7 miles) east at petitioner’s requested site. Additionally,