

Dated: March 16, 2000.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations 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 MM—Oregon

2. Section 52.1970 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (131) to read as follows:

§ 52.1970 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(131) On December 3, 1998, the Director of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) submitted a revision to the definition section of the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), as effective October 14, 1998.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) OAR 340-028-0110, as effective October 14, 1998, except for the following: (16) Capture system, (25) Continuous compliance determination method, (27) Control device, (29) Data, (39)(b) Emission Limitation and Emission Standard, (47) Exceedance, (48) Excursion, (55) Inherent process equipment, (67) Monitoring, (86) Pollutant-specific emissions unit, (88) Predictive emission monitoring system (PEMS), Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3.

(B) Remove the following provision from the current incorporation by reference: OAR 340-028-0110, as effective October 6, 1995, except for Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3.

[FR Doc. 00-13070 Filed 5-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 271

[FRL-6704-7]

Minnesota: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Immediate final rule.

SUMMARY: Minnesota has applied to EPA for Final authorization of the changes to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery

Act (RCRA). EPA has determined that these changes satisfy all requirements needed to qualify for Final authorization, and is authorizing the State's changes through this immediate final action. EPA is publishing this rule to authorize the changes without a prior proposal because we believe this action is not controversial and do not expect comments that oppose it. Unless we get written comments which oppose this authorization during the comment period, the decision to authorize Minnesota's changes to their hazardous waste program will take effect as provided below. If we get comments that oppose this action, we will publish a document in the **Federal Register** withdrawing this rule before it takes effect and a separate document in the proposed rules section of this **Federal Register** will serve as a proposal to authorize the changes.

DATES: This Final authorization will become effective on August 23, 2000 unless EPA receives adverse written comment by June 26, 2000. If EPA receives such comment, it will publish a timely withdrawal of this immediate final rule in the **Federal Register** and inform the public that this authorization will not take effect.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments referring to Docket Number Minnesota ARA 8, to Gary Westefer, Minnesota Regulatory Specialist, U.S. EPA Region 5, DM-7J, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-7450. We must receive your comments by June 26, 2000. You can view and copy Minnesota's application from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm at the following addresses: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 520 Lafayette Road, North, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155, contact Nathan Cooley at (651) 297-7544; or EPA Region 5, contact Gary Westefer at the following address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Westefer, Minnesota Regulatory Specialist, U.S. EPA Region 5, DM-7J, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-7450.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?

States which have received final authorization from EPA under RCRA section 3006(b), 42 U.S.C. 6926(b), must maintain a hazardous waste program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal program. As the Federal program changes, States must change their programs and ask EPA to authorize the changes. Changes to State programs may be necessary when Federal or State

statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur. Most commonly, States must change their programs because of changes to EPA's regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 124, 260 through 266, 268, 270, 273 and 279.

B. What Decisions Have We Made in This Rule?

We conclude that Minnesota's application to revise its authorized program meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established by RCRA. Therefore, we grant Minnesota Final authorization to operate its hazardous waste program with the changes described in the authorization application. Minnesota has responsibility for permitting Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs) within its borders (except in Indian Country) and for carrying out the aspects of the RCRA program described in its revised program application, subject to the limitations of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). New federal requirements and prohibitions imposed by Federal regulations that EPA promulgates under the authority of HSWA take effect in authorized States before they are authorized for the requirements. Thus, EPA will implement those requirements and prohibitions in Minnesota, including issuing permits, until the State is granted authorization to do so.

C. What Is the Effect of Today's Authorization Decision?

The effect of this decision is that a facility in Minnesota subject to RCRA will now have to comply with the authorized State requirements instead of the equivalent federal requirements in order to comply with RCRA. Minnesota has enforcement responsibilities under its state hazardous waste program for violations of such program, but EPA maintains independent authority under RCRA sections 3007, 3008, 3013, and 7003, which include, among others, the authority to conduct inspections and require monitoring, tests, analyses or reports and to enforce RCRA requirements and suspend or revoke permits.

This action does not impose additional requirements on the regulated community because the regulations for which Minnesota is being authorized by today's action are already effective, and are not changed by today's action.

D. Why Wasn't There a Proposed Rule Before Today's Rule?

EPA did not publish a proposal before today's rule because we view this as a routine program change and do not expect comments that oppose this approval. We are providing an opportunity for public comment now. In addition to this rule, in the proposed rules section of today's **Federal Register**, we are publishing a separate document that proposes to authorize the state program changes.

E. What Happens If EPA Receives Comments That Oppose This Action?

If EPA receives appropriate comments that oppose this authorization, we will withdraw this rule by publishing a document in the **Federal Register** before the rule becomes effective. EPA will base any further decision on the authorization of the state program changes on the proposal mentioned in the previous paragraph. We will then address all public comments in a later final rule. You may not have another

opportunity to comment. If you want to comment on this authorization, you 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 this rule, but the authorization of the program changes that the comments do not oppose will become effective on the date specified above. The **Federal Register** withdrawal document will specify which part of the authorization will become effective, and which part is being withdrawn.

F. What Has Minnesota Previously Been Authorized For?

Minnesota initially received Final authorization on January 28, 1985, effective February 11, 1985 (50 FR 3756), to implement the RCRA hazardous waste management program. We granted authorization for changes to their program on July 20, 1987, effective September 18, 1987 (52 FR 27199), on April 24, 1989, effective June 23, 1989

(54 FR 16361), amended June 28, 1989 (54 FR 27170), on June 15, 1990, effective August 14, 1990 (55 FR 24232), on June 24, 1991, effective August 23, 1991 (56 FR 28709), on March 19, 1992, effective May 18, 1992 (57 FR 9501), on March 17, 1993, effective May 17, 1993 (58 FR 14321), and on January 20, 1994, effective March 21, 1994 (59 FR 2998).

G. What Changes Are We Authorizing With Today's Action?

On March 7, 2000, Minnesota submitted a final complete program revision application, seeking authorization of program changes in accordance with 40 CFR 271.21. EPA reviewed Minnesota's application, and we now make an immediate final decision, subject to receipt of adverse written comments that oppose this action, that Minnesota's hazardous waste program revision satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for Final authorization. Therefore, we grant Minnesota Final authorization for the following program changes:

Description of Federal requirement	Federal Register date and page [and/or RCRA statutory authority]	Analogous State authority
Petroleum Refinery Primary and Secondary Oil/Water/Solids Separation Sludge Listings (F037 and F038) Checklist 81 as amended Checklist 81.1.	November 2, 1990, 55 FR 46354 December 17, 1990, 55 FR 51707	Minnesota Rules 7045.0135, 7045.0139; effective March 1, 1994.
Wood Preserving Listings Checklist 82	December 6, 1990, 55 FR 50450	Minnesota Rules 7045.0020, 7045.0120, 7045.0135, 7045.0139, 7045.0141, 7045.0145, 7045.0292, 7045.0528, 7045.0541, 7045.0552, 7045.0623, 7045.0628, 7045.0644; effective January 31, 1994, as amended October 2, 1995.
Organic Air Emission Standards for Process Vents and Equipment Leaks; Technical Amendment Checklist 87.	April 26, 1991, 56 FR 19290	Minnesota Rules 7001.0625, 7001.0626, 7045.0547, 7045.0548, 7045.0564, 7045.0584, 7045.0647, 7045.0648; effective March 1, 1994.
Revision to F037 and F038 Listings Checklist 89.	May 13, 1991, 56 FR 21955	Minnesota Rules 7045.0135 effective March 1, 1994.
Wood Preserving Listing: Technical Correction Checklist 92.	July 1, 1991, 56 FR 30192	Minnesota Rules 7001.0623 7045.0120, 7045.0145, 7045.0292, 7045.0541, 7045.0644; effective January 31, 1994 as amended October 2, 1995.
Second Correction to the Third Third Land Disposal Restrictions Checklist 102.	March 6, 1992, 57 FR 8086	Minnesota Rules 7045.0458, 7045.0564, 7045.1305, 7045.1355, 7045.1360; effective March 1, 1994.
Hazardous Debris Case-by-Case Capacity Variance Checklist 103.	May 15, 1992, 57 FR 20766	Minnesota Rules 7045.1335; effective March 1, 1994.
Lead-Bearing Hazardous Materials Case-by-Case Capacity Variance Checklist 106.	June 26, 1992, 57 FR 28628	Minnesota Rules 7045.1335; effective March 1, 1994.
Wood Preserving: Amendments to Listings and Technical Requirements Checklist 120.	December 24, 1992, 57 FR 61492	Minnesota Rules 7045.0541, 7045.0644; effective January 31, 1994, as amended October 2, 1995.

H. Where Are the Revised State Rules Different From the Federal Rules?

In the changes currently being made to Minnesota's program, we consider the following State requirement to be more stringent than the Federal requirements:

- Minnesota Rules 7001.0623, because the State does not allow for an

exemption to Subpart F of 40 CFR part 264, as provided for in 40 CFR 270.26(b), making the State requirements more stringent.

More stringent rules are part of Minnesota's authorized program and are Federally enforceable.

Broader-in-scope requirements are not part of the authorized program and EPA cannot enforce them. Although you must comply with these requirements in accordance with state law, they are not RCRA requirements. There are no broader-in-scope provisions in these changes.

I. Who Handles Permits After This Authorization Takes Effect?

Minnesota will issue permits for all the provisions for which it is authorized, and will administer the permits that it issues. EPA will continue to administer any RCRA hazardous waste permits, or portions of permits, that we issued prior to the effective date of this authorization until they expire or are terminated. We will not issue any more new permits or portions of permits for the provisions listed in the Table above after the effective date of this authorization. EPA will continue to implement and issue permits for HSWA requirements for which Minnesota is not yet authorized.

J. How Does Today's Action Affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. 1151) in Minnesota?

Minnesota is not authorized to carry out its hazardous waste program in Indian country within the State, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. This includes:

1. All lands within the exterior boundaries of the following Indian Reservations, located within or abutting the State of Minnesota:
 - a. Bois Forte Indian Reservation
 - b. Fond Du Lac Indian Reservation
 - c. Grand Portage Indian Reservation
 - d. Leech Lake Indian Reservation
 - e. Lower Sioux Indian Reservation
 - f. Mille Lacs Indian Reservation
 - g. Prairie Island Indian Reservation
 - h. Red Lake Indian Reservation
 - i. Shakopee Mdewakanton Indian Reservation
 - j. Upper Sioux Indian Reservation
 - k. White Earth Indian Reservation

2. Any land held in trust by the U.S. for an Indian tribe, and

3. Any other land, whether on or off a reservation that qualifies as Indian country.

Therefore, this action has no effect in Indian country where EPA will continue to implement and administer the RCRA program in these lands.

K. What Is Codification and Is EPA Codifying Minnesota's Hazardous Waste Program as Authorized in This Rule?

Codification is the process of placing the State's statutes and regulations that comprise the State's authorized hazardous waste program into the Code of Federal Regulations. We do this by referencing the authorized State rules in 40 CFR part 272. The authorized Minnesota RCRA program was incorporated by reference into 40 CFR part 272 on May 15, 1989, effective July 14, 1989 (54 FR 20851). Minnesota's

Incorporation by Reference was amended on March 16, 1990, effective May 15, 1990 (55 FR 9880), on October 15, 1992, effective December 14, 1992 (57 FR 47265), and on September 6, 1994, effective November 7, 1994 (59 FR 45986).

We reserve the amendment of 40 CFR part 272, subpart Y for this authorization of Minnesota's program changes until a later date.

L. Regulatory Analysis and Notices

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures to State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. Before promulgating an EPA rule for which a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

EPA has determined that section 202 and 205 requirements do not apply to today's action because this rule does not contain a Federal mandate that may result in annual expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and/or

tribal governments in the aggregate, or the private sector. Costs to State, local and/or tribal governments already exist under the Minnesota program, and today's action does not impose any additional obligations on regulated entities. In fact, EPA's approval of State programs generally may reduce, not increase, compliance costs for the private sector. Further, as it applies to the State, this action does not impose a Federal intergovernmental mandate because UMRA does not include duties arising from participation in a voluntary federal program.

The requirements of section 203 of UMRA also do not apply to today's action because this rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Although small governments may be hazardous waste generators, transporters, or own and/or operate TSDFs, they are already subject to the regulatory requirements under the existing State laws that are being authorized by EPA, and, thus, are not subject to any additional significant or unique requirements by virtue of this program approval.

Certification Under the 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 economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

For purposes of assessing the impacts of today's action on small entities, small entity is defined as: (1) a small business as specified in the Small Business Administration regulations; (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 this authorization on small entities, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This action does not impose any new requirements on small entities because small entities that are hazardous waste

generators, transporters, or that own and/or operate TSDFs are already subject to the regulatory requirements under the State laws which EPA is now authorizing. This action merely authorizes, for the purpose of RCRA section 3006, those existing State requirements.

Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

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. The 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 today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Compliance With Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of Executive Order 12866.

Compliance With Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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."

Under section 6 of Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State

law unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This authorization does not have federalism implications. It will not have a substantial direct effect on 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, because this rule affects only one State. This action simply approves Minnesota's proposal to be authorized for updated requirements of the hazardous waste program that the State has voluntarily chosen to operate. Further, as a result of this action, newly authorized provisions of the State's program now apply in Minnesota in lieu of the equivalent Federal program provisions implemented by EPA under HSWA. Affected parties are subject only to those authorized State program provisions, as opposed to being subject to both Federal and State regulatory requirements. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply.

Compliance With Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks," applies to any rule that: (1) the Office of Management and Budget determines is "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 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.

EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5-501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it authorizes a State program.

Compliance With Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, 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 with 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."

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13084 because it does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Minnesota is not authorized to implement the RCRA hazardous waste program in Indian country. This action has no effect on the hazardous waste program that EPA implements in the Indian country within the State.

Paperwork Reduction Act

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, Federal agencies must consider the paperwork burden imposed by any information request contained in a proposed rule or a final rule. This rule will not impose any information requirements upon the regulated community.

National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 ("NTTAA"), Public Law 104-113, 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

This action does not involve technical standards. Therefore, EPA did not consider the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 271

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Confidential business information, Hazardous waste, Hazardous waste transportation, Indian lands, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: This action is issued under the authority of sections 2002(a), 3006 and 7004(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6912(a), 6926, 6974(b).

Dated: May 3, 2000.

Elissa Speizman,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 00-12953 Filed 5-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Part 102-36

[FPMR Amendment H-205]

RIN 3090-AF39

Disposition of Excess Personal Property; Correction

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects an error contained in a final rule appearing in Part III of the **Federal Register** of Tuesday, May 16, 2000 (64 FR 31218). The rule revised the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR) by moving coverage on the disposition of excess personal property into the Federal Management Regulation (FMR) and adding a cross-reference to the FPMR to direct readers to the coverage in the FMR.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 30, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Caswell, Director, Personal Property Management Policy Division (MTP), 202-501-3828.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In rule document 00-11921 beginning on page 31218 in the issue of Tuesday, May 16, 2000, make the following correction:

§ 102-36.170 [Corrected]

1. On page 31225, in the first column, in the second line, "in" should read "is".

Dated: May 19, 2000.

Sharon A. Kiser,

Federal Acquisition Policy Division, Office of Governmentwide Policy.

[FR Doc. 00-13147 Filed 5-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-24-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-866; MM Docket No. 90-466; RM-7327, RM-7987, RM-7988, RM-8705].

Radio Broadcasting Services; Pleasanton, Bandera, Hondo, Hollywood Park, and Dilley, Texas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: The Commission dismisses as moot the Application for Review filed by Reding Broadcasting Company, requesting reconsideration of a dismissal of its proposal to substitute Channel 252A for Channel 253C2 at Pleasanton, TX, substitute Channel 253A for Channel 290A at Hondo, TX and Channel 252A for Channel 276A at Bandera, TX. Petitioner received requested relief in MM Docket No. 98-55.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victoria M. McCauley, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Order, MM Docket No. 90-466 adopted April 12, 2000, and released April 14, 2000. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC 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 contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

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

[FR Doc. 00-13138 Filed 5-24-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-945; MM Docket No. 99-83; RM-9500; RM-9722]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Saranac Lake and Westport, NY

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission, at the request of Dana Puopolo, allots Channel 296A to Saranac Lake, NY, as the community's third local FM service. *See* 64 FR 14422, March 25, 1999. At the request of Westport Broadcasting, the Commission substitutes Channel 275A for Channel 273A at Westport, NY, and modifies the license of Station WCLX to specify the alternate Class A channel. Channel 296A can be allotted to Saranac Lake in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements, with respect to all domestic allotments, without the imposition of a site restriction, at coordinates 44-19-48 NL; 74-08-00 WL. Channel 275A can be allotted to Westport in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements, with respect to all domestic allotments, with a site restriction of 4.6 kilometers (2.9 miles) northeast, at coordinates 44-13-16 NL; 73-24-42 WL, to accommodate WB's desired transmitter site. Both Saranac Lake and Westport are located within 320 kilometers (200 miles) of the U.S.-Canadian border and thus Canadian concurrence in the allotments is required. *See* **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.**

DATES: Effective June 12, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie K. Shapiro, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Report and Order, MM Docket No. 99-83, adopted April 19, 2000, and released April 28, 2000. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. In addition, Channel 296A at Saranac Lake will be short-spaced to Station CITE-FM, Channel 297C1, Montreal, Quebec,