

applicable 1-hour ozone standard budgets for the Bay Area.

#### IV. Administrative Requirements

##### A. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order (E.O.) 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review.

##### B. Executive Order 12875

Under Executive Order 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute and that creates a mandate upon a State, local or tribal government, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected State, local and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, copies of any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of State, local and tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant unfunded mandates." Today's rule does not create a mandate on State, local or tribal governments. The rule does not impose any enforceable duties on these entities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 1(a) of E.O. 12875 do not apply to this rule.

##### C. Executive Order 13045

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under E.O. 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency. This rule is not subject to E.O. 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to

mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

##### D. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget, in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities." Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of E.O. 13084 do not apply to this rule.

##### E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1990 requires federal agencies to identify potentially adverse impacts of federal regulations upon small entities. In instances where significant impacts are possible on a substantial number of these entities, agencies are required to perform a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (RFA).

EPA has determined that today's regulation will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. This regulation affects federal agencies and metropolitan planning organizations, which by definition are designated only for metropolitan areas with a population of at least 50,000. These organizations do not constitute small entities.

Therefore, as required under section 605 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, I certify that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

##### F. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under Section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

##### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: September 27, 1999.

**Felicia Marcus,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 99-26556 Filed 10-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6449-7]

### Washington: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** Washington has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). We propose to

grant final authorization to Washington. In the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register**, we are authorizing the changes without a prior proposal because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. The Agency has explained the reasons for this authorization in the preamble to the immediate final rule. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the immediate final rule will become effective, and the Agency will not take further action on this proposal. If we get comments that oppose this action, EPA will withdraw the immediate final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will then address public comments in a later final rule based on this proposal. EPA may not provide further opportunity for comment. Any parties interested in commenting on this action must do so at this time.

If we receive comments that oppose only the authorization of a particular change to the State hazardous waste program, we will withdraw that part of today's authorization rule. However, the authorization of the program changes that are not opposed by any comments will become effective on the date specified in the immediate final rule. The **Federal Register** withdrawal document will specify which part of the authorization will become effective, and which part is being withdrawn.

**DATES:** Send your written comments by November 12, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Nina Kocourek U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, WCM-122, Seattle WA, 98101. Phone: (206) 553-6502. You can examine copies of the materials submitted by Washington during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 10 Library, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle WA, 98101, (206) 553-1259; and the Washington Department of Ecology, 300 Desmond Drive, Lacey, WA 98503, contact Patricia Hervieux at (360) 407-6756.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nina Kocourek, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Avenue, WCM-122, Seattle, WA 98101. Phone: (206) 553-6502.

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

Dated: September 24, 1999.

**Chuck Clarke,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 10.*

[FR Doc. 99-25560 Filed 10-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA No. 99-1881, MM Docket No. 99-284, RM-9697]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Galveston and Missouri City, TX

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document requests comments on a petition filed by KQQK License, Inc., proposing the reallocation of Channel 293C from Galveston, Texas, to Missouri City, Texas, as that community's first local service and modification of its license for Station KQQK to specify Missouri City as its community of license. The coordinates for Channel 293C at Missouri City are 29-16-03 and 95-10-09. In accordance with Section 1.420(i) of the Commission's Rules, we shall not accept competing expressions of interest in the use of Channel 293C at Missouri City.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 8, 1999, and reply comments on or before November 23, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: Lawrence Roberts, May L. Plantamura, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, 1155 Connecticut Ave., NW, suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen Scheuerle, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 99-284, adopted September 8, 1999, and released September 17, 1999. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the Commission's Reference Center, 445 Twelfth Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Services, Inc., 1231 20th Street, NW.,

Washington, DC 20036, (202) 857-3800, facsimile (202) 857-3805.

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* contact.

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. 99-26423 Filed 10-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 99-1882, MM Docket No. 99-285, RM-9717]

#### Radio Broadcasting Services; Keeseville, NY

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by John Anthony Bulmer seeking the allotment of Channel 250A to Keeseville, NY, as the community's first local aural service. Channel 250A can be allotted to Keeseville in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements, with respect to domestic allotments, without the imposition of a site restriction, at coordinates 44-30-18 North Latitude and 73-28-50 West Longitude. Keeseville is located within 320 kilometers (200 miles) of the U.S.-Canadian border and will result in a short-spacing to Station CHOM-FM, Channel 249C1, Montreal, Quebec. Therefore, concurrence in the allotment by the Canadian Government, as a specially negotiated short-spaced allotment, must be obtained.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 8, 1999, and reply comments on or before November 17, 1999.