

1. To allow interested parties a means to identify and locate documents for participating in the rulemaking process; and

2. To serve as the record in case of judicial review. The EPA will consider any comments received by March 2, 1995.

B. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant" regulatory action as one that is likely to lead to a rule that may:

1. Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or state, local, or tribal governments or communities;

2. Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

3. Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligation of recipients thereof; and

4. Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order."

It has been determined that this rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of Executive Order 12866 and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), Federal agencies must obtain the OMB clearance for collection of information from 10 or more non-Federal respondents.

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

Interim approvals under section 502 of the Act do not create any new requirements, but simply approve

requirements that the state is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal operating permits program approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on any small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-state relationship under the Act, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning operating permits programs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256-66 (S.Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2). If the interim approval is converted to a disapproval, it will not affect any existing LLCHD requirements applicable to small entities. Federal disapproval of the submittal does not affect its state enforceability. Moreover, EPA's disapproval of the submittal does not impose a new Federal requirement. Therefore, EPA certifies that this disapproval action does not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because it does not remove existing LLCHD requirements nor does it substitute a new Federal requirement.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 70

Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Operating permits, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: January 6, 1995.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-2335 Filed 1-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 95-12, RM-8559]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Hudson, Texas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Phil Parr proposing the allotment of Channel 242A to Hudson, Texas, as the community's first local aural transmission service. Channel 242A can be allotted to Hudson in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements

without the imposition of a site restriction. The coordinates for Channel 242A at Hudson are 31-23-50 and 94-46-15.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before March 20, 1995, and reply comments on or before April 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Phil Parr, 1604 Southwood, Lufkin, Texas 75905 (Petitioner).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 634-6530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, MM Docket No. 95-12, adopted January 18, 1995, and released January 26, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-2364 Filed 1-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 95-13, RM-8566]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Tower Hill, Illinois

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed by Randal J. Miller, requesting the allotment of Channel 252A to Tower Hill, Illinois, as that community's first local transmission service. Channel 252A can be allotted to Tower Hill in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements with a site restriction of 9 kilometers (5.6 miles) south. The coordinates for Channel 252A at Tower Hill are North Latitude 39-18-27 and West Longitude 88-59-22.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before March 20, 1995, and reply comments on or before April 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Randal J. Miller, 111 West Main Cross, P.O. Box 169, Taylorville, Illinois 62568 (Petitioner).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy J. Walls, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, MM Docket No. 95-13, adopted January 18, 1995, and released January 26, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1919 M Street, NW, Room 246, or 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95-2363 Filed 1-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

48 CFR Parts 1516 and 1552

[FRL-5147-4]

Acquisition Regulation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document proposes to amend the EPA Acquisition Regulation (EPAAR) coverage on cost-plus-award fee (CPAF) contracts. The proposed rule is necessary to update and clarify EPA policy regarding CPAF contracts, and to give Contracting Officers greater flexibility in tailoring award fee plans to individual contracts.

DATES: Written comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before March 2, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Acquisition Management (3802F), 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460, Attn: Louise Senzel (202) 260-6204.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

This proposed rule replaces sections 1516.404-270 through 1516.404-274 and deletes 1516.404-275 through 1516.404-2710 of the EPAAR. EPA has determined that codification of the Agency's procedures for the award fee process is unnecessary since these procedures are internal to EPA. Consequently, EPA will include these internal procedures in an Agency Directive. Internal procedures are those which encompass any aspect of preparing, establishing, modifying, and administering the award fee plan. The revised EPAAR will only state the Agency's general policy and objectives in using award fee contracts.

Award fee may be earned only when the contractor's performance is rated above satisfactory or excellent. No award fee may be earned if performance is rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory. This approach to cost-plus-award-fee contracts is designed to motivate contractors to achieve excellent performance and to improve cost-plus-award-fee contracting at EPA.

Section 1516.405 is revised and § 1552.216-75 is added to address base and award fee limitations in accordance with the FAR. Section 1552.216-70 is revised to clarify EPA's policy on the payment of fee under CPAF contracts.

B. Executive Order 12866

This is not a major rule as defined in Executive Order 12866; therefore, no review is required by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposed rule does not contain any recordkeeping or information collection requirements that require the approval of OMB under 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The proposed rule will not have an impact on small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* since it does not impose any new requirements on contractors, large or small. The EPA certifies that this rule will not impact small entities. Therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 1516 and 1552

Government procurement.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, parts 1516 and 1552 of title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations are proposed to be amended as set forth below:

1. The authority citation for parts 1516 and 1552 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Sec 205(c), 63 Stat. 390, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 486(c).

PART 1516—TYPES OF CONTRACTS

2. Subpart 1516.4 is amended by revising sections 1516.404-270 through 1516.404-274 to read as follows and by removing sections 1516.404-275 through 1516.404-2710.

1516.404-270 Scope.

This subsection establishes the EPA policy for cost-plus-award-fee (CPAF) type contracts.

1516.404-271 Applicability.

Contracting Officers shall consider all contract actions conforming to the limitations of FAR 16.404-2(c) as candidates for award as a CPAF contract.

1516.404-272 Definitions.

(a) *Performance Evaluation Board (PEB).* Group of Government officials responsible for assessing the quality of