

operated laboratory directed by the Government to fulfill the Government's obligations under a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) authorized by 15 U.S.C. 3710a, the Government may require the Contractor to try to negotiate an agreement with the CRADA collaborating party or parties over the rights to any subject invention the Contractor makes, solely or jointly, in the course of its work under the CRADA. The agreement shall be negotiated prior to the Contractor undertaking the CRADA work or, with the permission of the Government, upon the identification of a subject invention. In the absence of such an agreement, the Contractor agrees to grant the collaborating party or parties an option for a license in its inventions of the same scope and terms set forth in the CRADA for inventions made by the Government.

Kelly H. Carnes,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Technology Policy.

[FR Doc. 00-23080 Filed 9-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-18-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 50, 52 and 81

[FRL-6867-9]

RIN 2060-AJ05

Rescinding the Finding that the Pre-existing PM-10 Standards Are No Longer Applicable in Northern Ada County/Boise, ID

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice to reopen the comment period.

SUMMARY: Today, EPA is reopening the public comment period on EPA's notice of proposed rulemaking "Rescinding the Finding that the Pre-existing PM-10 Standards are No Longer Applicable in Northern Ada County/Boise, Idaho," published June 26, 2000 at 65 FR 39321. The original comment period was to close on July 26, 2000. We had previously extended the comment period to August 31, 2000 but due to the number of comments received so far, and the type of concerns expressed about the impact this decision may potentially have on the public, we feel it is appropriate to reopen the comment period and provide an additional 30 days for interested and affected parties to submit comments. The new closing date will be 30 days from the date of publication of this notice. You can find this notice, once it's published, and all **Federal Register** notices from 1995-2000 online at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/

aces140.html. All comments received by EPA during the public comment period will be considered in the development of a final rule.

In our June 26, 2000 proposal we also proposed to amend 40 CFR part 50. Specifically, we proposed to delete 40 CFR 50.6(d) in its entirety consistent with our decision that, in light of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit's opinion in American Trucking Association in which, among other things, the Court vacated EPA's revised PM-10 standards, the pre-existing PM-10 standards, as reflected in subsections (a) and (b) of 40 CFR 50.6, should continue to apply in all areas. The effect of this action would be that the pre-existing PM-10 standards, as codified at 40 CFR 50.6(a) and (b), would remain applicable to all areas. To date, we have not received any comments on this aspect of the June 26, 2000 proposal. Therefore, we are not reopening the comment period on this portion of the proposal. Instead, we will take final action on this portion of the proposal in a separate **Federal Register** document.

DATES: All comments regarding EPA's notice of proposed rulemaking issued on June 26, 2000 must be received by EPA on or before close of business on the last day of the new public comment period October 11, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to:

On paper. Send paper comments (in duplicate, if possible) to the Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention: Docket No. A-2000-13, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260-7548.

Electronically. Send electronic comments to EPA at: A-and-R-Docket@epa.gov. Avoid sending confidential business information (CBI). We accept comments as e-mail attachments or on disk. Either way, they must be in WordPerfect version 5.1, 6.1 or Corel 8 file format. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. You may file your comments on this proposed rule online at many Federal Depository Libraries. Be sure to identify all comments and data by docket number A-2000-13.

Public inspection. You may read the proposed rule (including paper copies of comments and data submitted electronically, minus anything claimed as CBI) at the Office of Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center located at 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460. They are available for public inspection from 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through

Friday, excluding legal holidays. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Questions about the proposal should be addressed to Gary Blais, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Air Quality Strategies and Standards Division, Integrated Policy and Strategies Group, MD-15, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, telephone (919) 541-3223 or e-mail to blais.gary@epa.gov. To ask about policy matters specifically regarding Northern Ada County/Boise, call Bonnie Thie, EPA Region 10, Office of Air Quality (OAQ-107), EPA, Seattle, Washington, (206) 553-1189.

Dated: August 31, 2000.

Henry C. Thomas,

Acting Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 00-23236 Filed 9-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 226-0226; FRL-6865-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing a limited approval to revisions to the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) portion of the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) concerning particulate matter (PM-10) (There are two separate national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for PM-10, an annual standard of 50 µg/m³ and a 24-hour standard of 150 µg/m³) emissions and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from incineration and from fuel burning equipment.

The intended effect of proposing a limited approval of these rules is to strengthen the federally approved SIP by incorporating this revision. EPA's final action on this proposal will incorporate these rules into the SIP. While strengthening the SIP, this revision contains deficiencies which the VCAPCD must address before EPA can grant full approval under section 110(k)(3).

We are also proposing full approval of a revision to the BAAQMD portion of the California SIP concerning nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions from boilers, steam generators, and process heaters.

We are following the CAA requirements for actions on SIP submittals, SIPs for national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards, and plan requirements for attainment and nonattainment areas.

DATES: Any comments must arrive by October 11, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to: Andrew Steckel, Chief, Rulemaking Office, AIR-4, Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

You can inspect copies of the submitted rule revisions and our technical support document (TSD) at our Region IX office from 8 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday. To see copies of the submitted rule revisions,

you may also go to the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Air Docket (6102), Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington D.C. 20460.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, 669 County Square Drive, Ventura, CA 93003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Petersen, Rulemaking Office (AIR-4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Telephone: (415) 744-1135.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, "we," "us" and "our" refer to EPA.

Table of Contents

- I. The State's Submittal
 - A. What rules did the State submit?
 - B. Are there other versions of these rules?
 - C. What are the purposes or changes in the submitted rules?
- II. EPA's Evaluation and Action
 - A. How is EPA evaluating the rules?
 - B. Do the rules meet the evaluation criteria?
 - C. What are the rule deficiencies?
 - D. EPA recommendations to further improve the rules
 - E. Proposed action and public comment
- III. Background Information
 - A. Why were these rules submitted?
- IV. Administrative Requirements

I. The State's Submittal

A. What Rules Did the State Submit?

Table 1 lists the rules addressed by this proposal with the dates that they were adopted by the local air agency and submitted to us by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

TABLE 1.—SUBMITTED RULES

Local agency	Rule No.	Rule title	Adopted	Submitted
BAAQMD	Manual of Procedures 1-5	Boiler, Steam Generator, and Process Heater Tuning Procedure.	09/15/93	07/23/96
VCAPCD	57	Combustion Contaminants—Specific	06/14/77	01/21/00
VCAPCD	68	Carbon Monoxide	06/14/77	01/21/00

On October 30, 1996, March 1, 2000, and March 1, 2000, respectively, these rule submittals were found to meet the completeness criteria in 40 CFR part 51 appendix V, which must be met before formal EPA review.

B. Are There Other Versions of These Rules?

There are no previous versions of BAAQMD Manual of Procedures, Volume I, Chapter 5 in the SIP.

We previously approved a version of VCAPCD Rule 57 into the SIP on August 15, 1977 (42 FR 41121).

We previously approved a version of VCAPCD Rule 68 into the SIP on September 22, 1972 (37 FR 19806).

C. What Are the Purposes or Changes in the Submitted Rules?

BAAQMD Rule Manual of Procedures Volume I, Chapter 5 is a step-wise procedure for tuning boilers, steam generators, and process heaters to provide sufficient oxygen for complete combustion, but not too much oxygen for minimization of NO_x formation. The tuning procedure is required by BAAQMD Rule 9-7, Nitrogen Oxides and Carbon Monoxide from Industrial, Institutional, and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters.

VCAPCD Rules 57 and 68 both add an exemption for jet engine and rocket engine test stands to the fuel burning equipment sections of the rules.

II. EPA's Evaluation and Action

A. How Is EPA Evaluating the Rules?

We evaluated these rules for enforceability and consistency with the CAA as amended in 1990, with 40 CFR part 51, and with EPA's RACT Guidance, NO_x policy, and PM-10 policy. BAAQMD is a NO_x attainment area and an ozone nonattainment area.¹ Ozone nonattainment areas must meet the requirements of RACT according to section 172(c)(1) of the CAA. VCAPCD is a PM-10 maintenance attainment area and a CO attainment area.

Guidance and policy documents that we used to evaluate the rules are as follows:

¹ On July 10, 1998 (63 FR 37258), EPA published the final rule redesignating the San Francisco Bay Area to nonattainment with the federal 1-hour ozone NAAQS. The redesignation was authorized under the general nonattainment provisions of subpart 1 of the Act. The Bay Area, therefore, does not have a subpart 2 classification. When comparing air quality in the Bay Area to the traditional subpart 2 classification system, the Bay Area's design value is equivalent to that of a moderate area.

- *PM-10 Guideline Document* (EPA-452/R-93-008).
- *Sourcebook: NO_x Control Technical Data* (EPA-600/2-91-029).
- *Issues Relating to VOC Regulation Cutpoints, Deficiencies, and Deviations, Clarification to Appendix D of November 24, 1987 Federal Register* (52 FR 45044) (The Blue Book).

B. Do the Rules Meet the Evaluation Criteria?

BAAQMD Manual of Procedures, Volume I, Chapter 5 meets the evaluation criteria.

The adoption of revised VCAPCD Rules 57 and 68 improves the SIP by bringing the SIP into conformance with long historical practice in the District. Although, the addition of an exemption may, under certain circumstances, lessen the stringency of the SIP, approval of the revised Rules VCAPCD 57 and 68 is not inconsistent with sections 110(l) and 193 of the CAA for the following reasons:

- There are two sources of jet engine and rocket engine test stand PM-10 emissions in the VCAPCD that are regulated by permit and are allowed to emit up to 2.13 and 5.44 tons/year PM-10, respectively. These small uncontrolled sources are included in the

air quality management plan for the District without any credit taken for controls. Therefore, exempting these small sources from Rule 57 will not cause a violation of the NAAQS for PM-10.

- There are two sources of jet engine and rocket engine test stand CO emissions in the VCAPCD that are regulated by permit are allowed to emit up to 839 and 17 tons/year CO, respectively. These uncontrolled sources are included in the air quality management plan for the District without any credit taken for controls. In a letter from CARB to EPA Region IX dated May 7, 1979, CARB concluded that the exemption to Rule 68 would not prevent attainment or maintenance of the NAAQS for CO. Therefore, we do not expect these sources to cause a violation of the NAAQS for CO.

C. What Are the Rule Deficiencies?

VCAPCD Rules 57 and 68 have the following deficiencies that prevent full approval:

- The enforceability is limited, because EPA-approved test methods are not included in the rules.
- The enforceability is limited, because monitoring is not required by the rules.
- The enforceability is limited, because recordkeeping is not required by the rules.

D. EPA Recommendations To Further Improve the Rules

The TSD for VCAPCD Rule 68 describes an additional rule revision that does not affect EPA's current action but is recommended for the next time the local agency modifies the rules.

E. Proposed Action and Public Comment

As authorized in sections 110(k)(3) and 301(a) of the Act, we are proposing

a limited approval of VCAPCD Rules 57 and 68 to improve the SIP. If finalized, this action would incorporate the submitted rules into the SIP. No sanctions under section 179 are associated with this proposed action.

As authorized in section 110(k) of the Act, we are proposing a full approval of BAAQMD Manual of Procedures, Volume I, Chapter 5 to improve the SIP.

We will accept comments from the public on the proposed full approval and proposed limited approvals for the next 30 days.

III. Background Information

A. Why Were These Rules Submitted?

PM-10 harms human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control PM-10 emissions. Table 2 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of local agency PM-10 rules.

TABLE 2.—PM-10 NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of total suspended particulate (TSP) nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
July 1, 1987	EPA replaced the TSP standards with new PM standards applying only up to 10 microns in diameter (PM-10). 52 FR 24672.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted, Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.
November 15, 1990	PM-10 areas meeting the qualifications of section 107(d)(4)(B) of the CAA were designated nonattainment by operation of law and classified as moderate or serious pursuant to section 189(a). States are required by section 110(a) to submit rules regulating PM-10 emissions in order to achieve the attainment dates specified in section 188(c).

CO harms human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control CO emissions. Table 3 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of local agency CO rules.

TABLE 3.—CO NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1978	EPA promulgated a list of CO nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1977. 40 CFR 81.305.
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted, Pub. L. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.
November 15, 1990	CO areas meeting the qualifications of section 107(d)(4)(A) of the CAA were designated nonattainment by operation of law and classified as moderate or serious pursuant to section 186(a). States are required by section 110(a) to submit rules regulating CO emissions in order to achieve the attainment dates specified in section 186(a)(1).

NO_x helps produce ground-level ozone, smog and particulate matter, which harm human health and the environment. Section 110(a) of the CAA requires states to submit regulations that control NO_x emissions. Table 4 lists some of the national milestones leading to the submittal of these local agency NO_x rules.

TABLE 4.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES

Date	Event
March 3, 1987	EPA promulgated a list of ozone nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. 43 FR 8964; 40 CFR 81.305.
May 26, 1988	EPA notified Governors that parts of their SIPs were inadequate to attain and maintain the ozone standard and requested that they correct the deficiencies (EPA's SIP-Call). See section 110(a)(2)(H) of the pre-amended Act.

TABLE 4.—OZONE NONATTAINMENT MILESTONES—Continued

Date	Event
November 15, 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted. Pub. L. 101–549, 104 Stat. 2399, codified at 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.
May 15, 1991	Section 182(a)(2)(A) requires that ozone nonattainment areas correct deficient RACT rules by this date.

IV. Administrative Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

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

B. Executive Order 13045

Executive Order 13045, entitled 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 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.

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

C. 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 OMB 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 proposed rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this proposed rule.

D. Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132, entitled Federalism (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) revokes and replaces Executive Orders 12612, Federalism and 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership. Executive Order 13132 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 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 proposed rule will not 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, as specified in

Executive Order 13132, because it merely acts on a state rule implementing a federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this proposed rule.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements 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 not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because SIP actions under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements but simply act on requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP action does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the Clean Air Act, preparation of flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. *Union Electric Co. v. U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

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 proposed action 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 proposed Federal action acts on 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.

G. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing a new regulation. To comply with NTTAA, EPA must consider and use "voluntary consensus standards" (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to today's proposed action because it does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxide, Ozone, and Particulate matter.

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

Dated: August 23, 2000.

Nora McGee,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 00-22976 Filed 9-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-2031, MM Docket No. 00-163, RM-9934]

Digital Television Broadcast Service; Thief River Falls, MN

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Red River Broadcast Company, LLC, licensee of station KBRR(TV), NTSC Channel 10, Thief River Falls, Minnesota, requesting substitution of DTV Channel 32 for station KBRR(TV)'s assigned DTV Channel 57. DTV Channel 32 can be allotted to Thief River Falls, Minnesota, in compliance with the principle community coverage requirements of Section 73.625(a) at reference coordinates (48-01-19 N. and 96-22-12 W.). However, since the community of Thief River Falls is located within 400 kilometers of the U.S.-Canadian border, concurrence by the Canadian government must be obtained for this proposal. As requested, we propose to allot DTV Channel 32 to Thief River Falls with a power of 1000 and a height above average terrain (HAAT) of 183 meters.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before October 30, 2000, and reply comments on or before November 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: John T. Scott, III, Crowell & Moring LLP, 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20004 (Counsel for Red River Broadcast Company).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 00-163, adopted September 7, 2000, and released September 8, 2000. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center 445 12th Street, S.W., 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. 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.

Federal Communications Commission.

Barbara A. Kreisman,

Chief, Video Services Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 00-23272 Filed 9-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[DA 00-2030, MM Docket No.00-162, RM-9948]

Digital Television Broadcast Service; Fresno, CA

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Fisher Broadcasting-Fresno, L.L.C., licensee of Station KJEO(TV), NTSC Channel 47, Fresno, California, requesting the substitution of DTV Channel 34 for Station KJEO(TV)'s assigned DTV Channel 14. DTV Channel 34 can be allotted to Fresno, California, in compliance with the principle community coverage requirements of Section 73.625(a) at reference coordinates (37-04-14 N. and 119-25-31 W.). As requested, we propose to allot DTV Channel 34 to Fresno with a power of 330 and a height above average terrain (HAAT) of 597 meters.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before October 30, 2000, and reply comments on or before November 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Clifford M. Harrington, Brendan Holland, Shaw Pittman, 2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20006 (Counsel for Fisher Broadcasting-Fresno, L.L.C.).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-1600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 00-162, adopted September 7, 2000, and