

Dated: December 13, 2000.
Patricia D. Hull,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.
 40 CFR part 70 is amended as follows:

PART 70—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 70 continues to read as follows:

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

2. In appendix A to part 70 the entry for Montana is amended by adding paragraph (b) to read as follows:

Appendix A to Part 70—Approval Status of State and Local Operating Permits Programs

* * * * *

Montana

* * * * *

(b) The Montana Department of Environmental Quality submitted an operating permits program on March 29, 1994; effective on June 12, 1995; revised January 15, 1998, and March 17, 2000; full approval effective on January 22, 2001.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-32558 Filed 12-21-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6921-6]

Arizona: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of Immediate Final Rule.

SUMMARY: We are withdrawing the immediate final rule for Arizona, the Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions published on October 27, 2000, which approved revisions to Arizona's hazardous waste rules. We stated in the immediate final rule that if we received comments that oppose authorization of the revision, we would publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. Subsequently, we received comments that oppose the authorization. We will address the comments received during the comment period in a subsequent final action based on the proposed rule also published on October 27, 2000, at 65 FR 64403.

DATES: As of December 22, 2000, we withdraw the immediate final rule published on October 27, 2000, at 65 FR 64369.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa McClain-Vanderpool, U.S. EPA, Waste Management Division, 75 Hawthorne Street (mailcode WST-3) San Francisco, CA 94105.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because we received comments that oppose this authorization, we are withdrawing the immediate final rule for Arizona, the Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions published on October 27, 2000, which approved revisions to Arizona's hazardous waste rules. We stated in the immediate final rule that if we received comments that oppose authorization of the revision, we would publish a timely notice of withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. Subsequently, we received comments that oppose the authorization. We will address the comments received during the comment period in a subsequent final action based on the proposed rule also published on October 27, 2000, at 65 FR 64403. We will not provide for additional public comment during the final action.

Laura Yoshii,
Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 9.
 [FR Doc. 00-32668 Filed 12-21-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-2779; MM Docket No. 00-15; RM-9804]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Susquehanna and Hallstead, PA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission, at the request of Tammy M. Celenza, allots Channel 227A at Susquehanna, Pennsylvania, as the community's second local FM transmission service. See 65 FR 12155, March 8, 2000. We also dismiss the counterproposal filed by Montrose Broadcasting Corporation to allot Channel 227A at Hallstead, Pennsylvania, as the community's first local aural transmission service as being technically defective. Channel 227A can be allotted at Susquehanna in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements with a site restriction of 6.3 kilometers (3.9 miles) east to avoid a short-spacing to the licensed sites of WBZD-FM, Channel 227B1, Muncy, Pennsylvania, and Station WKXZ(FM),

Channel 230B, Norwich, New York. The coordinates for Channel 227A at Susquehanna are 41-55-44 North Latitude and 75-31-50 West Longitude. See Supplementary Information, *infra*.

DATES: Effective January 22, 2001. A filing window, will not be opened at this time. Instead, the issue of opening a filing window for this channel will be addressed by the Commission in a subsequent order.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sharon P. McDonald, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MM Docket No. 00-15, adopted November 29, 2000, and released December 8, 2000. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center (Room CY-A257), 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1231 20th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Since Susquehanna is located within 320 kilometers (200 miles) of the U.S.-Canadian border, Canadian concurrence for the allotment of Channel 227A at Susquehanna has been requested, but not yet received. Therefore, if a construction permit is granted prior to the receipt of formal concurrence in the allotment by the Canadian government, the construction permit will include the following condition: "Operation with the facilities specified herein is subject to modification, suspension or termination without right to a hearing, if found by the Commission to be necessary in order to conform to the USA-Canadian FM Broadcast Agreement."

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Part 73 of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 73—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 54, 303, 334, 336.

§ 73.202 [Amended]

2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under Pennsylvania, is amended by adding Channel 227A at Susquehanna.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

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

[FR Doc. 00-32676 Filed 12-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

48 CFR PART 1501 and 1502

[FRL-6920-7]

Acquisition Regulation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is issuing this rule to amend the Agency definition of "Chief of the Contracting Office" for the purpose of granting limited ratification approval authority for acquisitions of \$2,500 or less.

DATES: This rule is effective on March 22, 2001, without further notice, unless EPA receives adverse comments by January 22, 2001. If we receive adverse comments, we will, before the rule's effective date, publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register** informing the public that this rule will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Larry Wyborski, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Acquisition Management (3802R), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, Ariel Rios Building, NW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Larry Wyborski, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Acquisition Management (3802R), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20460, (202) 564-4369, wyborski.larry@epamail.epa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background Information

EPAAR 1502.100 currently defines Chief of the Contracting Office (CCO) as the Office of Acquisition Management Division Directors at Headquarters, Research Triangle Park and Cincinnati. One of the two CCOs at Headquarters has overall management responsibility for the Superfund/RCRA Regional Procurement Operations Division. This CCO therefore has ratification authority for ten (10) nationwide Regional Contracting Offices. This one CCO is responsible for approval of a potentially substantial number of ratification actions. Also, EPA Service Center

Managers will be given similar authority to allow for more timely processing of small dollar ratification actions in the absence of the CCO. Therefore, EPA is broadening its definition of CCO for purposes of review of ratifications only. To avoid the need for ratification actions to the maximum extent practicable, EPA has an active training program both for contracting officials and program officials who use the purchase card. In addition, EPA reports ratification actions to the Chief Financial Officer. CCOs given ratification authority by this rule will also be required to provide notice of ratification actions to the CCO that would otherwise have reviewed the ratification action. This will ensure that the appropriate management level is kept informed of the volume and nature of agency ratification actions on an ongoing basis.

B. Executive Order 12866

This is not a significant regulatory action for purposes of Executive Order 12866; therefore, no review is required at the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, within the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because this rule does not contain information collection requirements for the approval of OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501, et. seq.)

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq.

The RFA generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute unless the Agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of assessing the impact of this rule on small entities, small entity is defined as: (1) A small business that meets the definition of a small business found in the Small Business Act and codified at 13 CFR 121.201; (2) a small governmental jurisdiction that is a government of a city, county, town, school district or special district with a population of less than 50,000; and (3) a small organization that is any not-for-profit enterprise which is independently

owned and operated and is not dominant in its field.

After considering the economic impacts of today's direct final rule on small entities, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In determining whether a rule has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the impact of concern is any adverse economic impact on small entities, since the primary purpose of the regulatory flexibility analyses is to identify and address regulatory alternatives "which minimize any significant economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities." 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Thus, an agency may certify that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities if the rule relieves regulatory burden, or otherwise has a positive economic effect on all of the small entities subject to the rule. This direct final rule does not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The requirements under the rule impose no reporting, record-keeping, or compliance costs on small entities.

E. Unfunded Mandates

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) Public Law 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess their regulatory actions on State, local and Tribal governments and the private sector. This direct final rule does not contain a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or the private sector in any one year. Any private sector costs for this action relate to paperwork requirements and associated expenditures that are far below the level established for UMRA applicability. Thus, the rule is not subject to the requirements of sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA.

F. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (6 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), applies to any rule that: (1) Is determined to be economically significant as defined under Executive Order 12866; and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have 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