received in response to this proposed action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposal. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final approval will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final action based on this proposal. EPA will not institute a second public comment period on this document. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by August 6, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to: Steve Ringer, Permits Office (AIR–3), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

Copies of the rules and EPA's evaluation report for the rules are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours. Copies of the submitted rules are available for inspection at the following locations:

Permitting Office (AIR–3), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 ''L'' Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, 1947 Galileo Ct., Suite 103, Davis, CA 95616.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Ringer at (415) 744–1260.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA is proposing to approve the following rules into the SIP:

Rule 3.1—General Permit Requirement; Rule 3.2—Exemptions;

Rule 3.4—New Source review; Rule 3.14—Emission Reduction Credits; and Rule 3.15—Priority Reserve. Rule 3.1 was adopted by the District Board of Directors on February 23, 1994, and submitted to EPA as an amendment to the SIP on October 19, 1994. Rule 3.2 was adopted by the District on August 25, 1993, and submitted to EPA on March 29, 1994. Rule 3.4 was adopted by the District on December 11, 1996, and submitted to EPA on March 26, 1997. Rules 3.14 and 3.15 were adopted by the District on September 22, 1993, and submitted to EPA on March 29, 1994.

For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action which is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: June 4, 1997.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–17598 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 97–145, RM–9091]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Glen Rose and Stamford, TX

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Cleburne Radio, Inc., licensee of Station KCLE–FM, requesting the substitution of Channel 221C1 for Channel 221C2 at Glen Rose and modification of Station KCLE–FM's license accordingly. Petitioner also requests the substitution of Channel 295A for Channel 221C2 at Stamford, Texas, and modification of M & M Broadcasting's construction permit to specify the Class A channel. Channel 221C1 and Channel 295A can be allotted to Glen Rose and Stamford, Texas, respectively, in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements at the sites specified by Cleburne. The coordinates for Channel 221C1 at Glen Rose are 32–16–30 NL and 98–08–30 WL. The coordinates for Channel 295A at Stamford are 32–58–21 NL and 99–48–32 WL. In accordance with Section 1.420(g) of the Commission's Rules, we will not accept competing expressions of interest for the use of Channel 221C1 at Glen Rose or require petitioner to demonstrate the availability of an additional equivalent class channel.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before August 11, 1997, and reply comments on or before August 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 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 J. McVeigh, Bernstein and McVeigh, 1818 N Street, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036 (Counsel for petitioner).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 97–145, adopted June 11, 1997, and released June 20, 1997. 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, DC. 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, DC 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. 97–17570 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 4, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, and 53

[FAR Case 95–013]

RIN 9000–AH60

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Government Property

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The public comment period on the proposed rule, Government Property, which was published in the **Federal Register** at 62 FR 30186, June 2, 1997, is extended from August 1, 1997, through August 15, 1997. The rule

would amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to simplify procedures and eliminate requirements related to the management and disposition of Government property in the possession of contractors. It will replace FAR Parts 45 and 52.245 and makes conforming changes to FAR Parts 4, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 49, 51, 52, and 53. The comment period is extended in order to accommodate public requests for an extension.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rule should be submitted in writing to the FAR Secretariat at the address shown below on or before August 15, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVR), 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4035, Washington, DC 20405.

E–mail comments submitted over Internet should be addressed to farcase.95–013@gsa.gov. Please cite FAR case 95–013 in all correspondence related to this case.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Angelena Moy (703) 695–1097/1098 (E–Mail: moyac@acq.osd.mil), or Ms. Linda Klein at (202) 501–3775.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 4, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, and 53

Government procurement.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

Jeremy C. Olson,

Acting Director, Federal Acquisition Policy Division.

[FR Doc. 97–17626 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–EP–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 97–44; Notice 01]

RIN 2127–AG48

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Seat Belt Assemblies

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: In response to a petition from the Association of International Automobile Manufacturers, Inc. (AIAM), this document proposes to amend Standard No. 209, *Seat Belt Assemblies,* by deleting the requirement in S4.1(b) that the lap belt portion of a safety belt system be designed to remain on the pelvis under all conditions. The agency has tentatively determined that other provisions in Standard No. 209, and provisions in Standard No. 208, *Occupant Crash Protection*, and Standard No. 210, *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages,* provide adequate and more readily enforceable requirements for pelvic restraint. Therefore, the agency believes that deleting the pelvic restraint requirement in Standard No. 209 would cause no detriment to safety. This proposal is consistent with the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative, which directs Federal agencies to identify and eliminate unnecessary Federal Regulations.

DATES: *Comment Date:* Comments must be received by September 5, 1997.

Proposed Effective Date: If adopted, the proposed amendments would become effective September 1, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket and notice number of this notice and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. (Docket Room hours are 9:30 a.m.-4 p.m., Monday through Friday.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The following persons at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590:

For non-legal issues: Mr. John Lee, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, NPS–11, telephone (202) 366–4924, facsimile (202) 366–4329, electronic mail ''jlee@nhtsa.dot.gov''.

For legal issues: Mr. Edward Glancy, Office of the Chief Counsel, NCC–20, telephone (202) 366–2992, facsimile (202) 366–3820, electronic mail ''eglancy@nhtsa.dot.gov''.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 209, *Seat Belt Assemblies,* specifies requirements for seat belt assemblies, including the pelvic restraint and the upper torso restraint. Other requirements address the release mechanism, the attachment hardware, the adjustment, the webbing, the strap, and marking and other informational instructions. Standard No. 209 was patterned after an existing Department of Commerce standard, which was adopted from a Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) standard. (29 FR 16973, December 11, 1964)

In Standard No. 209, section S4.1(b) *Pelvic restraint* states:

> A seat belt assembly shall provide pelvic restraint whether or not upper torso restraint is provided, and the pelvic restraint shall be designed to remain on the pelvis under all conditions, including collision or roll-over of the motor vehicle. Pelvic restraint of a Type 2 seat belt assembly that can be used without upper torso restraint shall comply with requirement for Type 1 seat belt assembly in S4.1 to S4.4.

No National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) rulemaking proceeding, SAE, or Department of Commerce standard has discussed the rationale of S4.1 (b). The agency believes that the main purpose of having S4.1(b) is to ensure that the lap belt remains on the pelvis, to provide a strong, bony support for belt loads incurred during a crash, rather than imposing the loads on the soft, abdominal region or the femurs. The iliac crest of the pelvic bone provides a natural ''detent'' which helps to retain the belt on the pelvic bone.

Submarining which may occur in a crash tends to displace the lap belt from its optimum position on the pelvis and moves it to the more vulnerable, soft abdominal area.

In response to a letter from Mr. H. George Johannessen of the Automotive Occupant Restraint Council asking about the meaning of S4.1(b), NHTSA issued an interpretation letter dated August 11, 1991 that stated:

> * * * we believe that the requirement of S4.1(b) of Standard No. 209 means that safety belts must be designed to be capable of being properly adjusted and positioned on the pelvis of occupants ranging from 6-year-old children to 95th percentile adult males. The belts must also be capable of remaining on the pelvis of such occupants during collision or roll-over. A belt system that was not capable of being positioned on the pelvis and remaining there during crashes would not comply with S4.1(b).

II. Rulemaking Petition

On May 24, 1996, the Association of International Automobile Manufacturers, Inc. (AIAM) petitioned NHTSA to delete S4.1(b) of Standard No. 209. That organization stated that this provision was an appropriate candidate for deletion in accordance with the President's Regulatory Reinvention Initiative, which directed Federal agencies to identify rules that are unnecessary or that should be clarified.

AIAM stated that the phrase ''designed to remain on the pelvis under all conditions'' was redundant of other, more specific and more stringent requirements in Standard No. 208, *Occupant Crash Protection,* Standard No. 209, and Standard No. 210, *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages,* which already provide specific requirements about pelvic restraint. As an example,