

Also, we seek comment on possible methods to improve information sharing among licensees and the level of burden increase such information sharing might entail. We also note that we have discussed possible changes to the likelihood of needing environmental evaluations as a result of our proposed actions in Section E of this IRFA, *infra*.

#### 5. Steps Taken To Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

69. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant, specifically small business, alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): “(1) The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.”

70. In addition to our discussion of compliance burdens, *supra*, we have noted in this *FNPRM* that radiated power limit increases may impact licensee’s administrative burden in making filings required for proper evaluation of transmission sites in regard to environmental compliance. We have sought comment on this issue. We note that wireless systems, including broadband PCS systems, are subject to environmental evaluation with respect to human exposure of RF radiation for non-building mounted antennas when the antenna height above ground level is less than 10 meters and the total power of all channels is greater than 2000 watts ERP and for building mounted antennas when the total power from all channels is greater than 2000 watts ERP. Otherwise, these systems are categorically excluded from such environmental evaluation. Although we are not proposing any change to RF exposure standards, we seek comment as to whether adoption of higher radiated power limits would increase the number of facilities requiring full environmental evaluation rather than being categorically excluded, and whether adoption of higher radiated power limits would outweigh any possible increased administrative burden.

6. Federal Rules That May Duplicate, Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules

71. None.

#### D. Initial Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 Analysis

72. This document does not contain proposed information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden “for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,” pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, see 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

73. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in §§ 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before December 19, 2005, and reply comments on or before January 17, 2006. Comments and reply comments should be filed in both WT Docket Nos. 03–103 and 05–42. All relevant and timely comments will be considered by the Commission before final action is taken in this proceeding.

74. Regardless of whether parties choose to file electronically or by paper, they should also send one copy of any documents filed, either by paper or by e-mail, to each of the following: (1) Best Copy & Printing, Inc., Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, facsimile (202) 488–5563, or e-mail at [http://www.fcc@bcpiweb.com](mailto:http://www.fcc@bcpiweb.com); and (2) Wilbert E. Nixon, Jr., Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554, or e-mail at [Wilbert.Nixon@fcc.gov](mailto:Wilbert.Nixon@fcc.gov).

#### IV. Ordering Clauses

75. *It is further ordered* that the commission’s Consumer Information Bureau, Reference Information Center, shall send a copy of this *FNPRM*, including the Final Regulatory Flexibility Certification and the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

#### List of Subjects

##### 47 CFR Part 22

Communications common carriers, Radio.

##### 47 CFR Part 24

Personal communications services, Radio.

##### 47 CFR Part 27

Wireless communications services.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 05–20928 Filed 10–18–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 05–2517; MB Docket No. 05–273, RM–11273]

### Radio Broadcasting Services; Charleston, TN

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document sets forth a proposal to amend the FM Table of Allotments, Section 73.202(b) of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR 73.202(b). The Audio Division requests comment on a petition filed by Claire Giannasi, proposing the allotment of Channel 250A at Charleston, Tennessee as that community’s first local service. The proposed coordinates for Channel 250A at Charleston, Tennessee, are 35–19–11 NL and 84–37–00 WL. The allotment will require a site restriction of 13.4 km (8.3 miles) east of Charleston.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 18, 2005, and reply comments on or before December 5, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for the petitioner as follows: Kris R. Kendrick, Esq., Post Office Box 82032, Athens, Georgia 30608–2032.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Deborah A. Dupont, Media Bureau (202) 418–7072.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission’s Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MB Docket No. 05–273, adopted September 23, 2005, and released September 27, 2005. The full text of this Commission document 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 contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY–B402, Washington, DC 20554, (800) 378–3160, or via the company’s Web site, <http://www.bcpiweb.com>. This document does not contain proposed information

collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden “for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees,” pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107–198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4).

The 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, Radio broadcasting.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

#### PART 73—RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES

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

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 154, 303, 334 and 336.

##### § 73.202 [Amended]

2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under Tennessee, is amended by adding Charleston, Channel 250A.

Federal Communications Commission.

**John A. Karousos,**

*Assistant Chief, Audio Division, Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 05–20844 Filed 10–18–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

#### 48 CFR Parts 2, 4, and 52

[FAR Case 2005–007]

RIN 9000–AK33

#### Federal Acquisition Regulation; Central Contractor Registration – Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) Validation

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Civilian Agency Acquisition Council and the Defense Acquisition Regulations Council (Councils) are proposing to amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to include the process of validating a Central Contractor Registration (CCR) registrant’s taxpayer identification number (TIN) with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to improve data accuracy in the Federal procurement system. Additionally, the proposed amendment removes outdated language requiring modifications of contracts prior to December 31, 2003, regarding CCR.

**DATES:** Interested parties should submit written comments to the FAR Secretariat on or before December 19, 2005 to be considered in the formulation of a final rule.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments identified by FAR case 2005–007 by any of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- Agency Web Site: <http://www.acqnet.gov/far/ProposedRules/proposed.htm>. Click on the FAR case number to submit comments.

- E-mail: [farcase.2005-007@gsa.gov](mailto:farcase.2005-007@gsa.gov). Include FAR case 2005–007 in the subject line of the message.

- Fax: 202–501–4067.

- Mail: General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (VIR), 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4035, ATTN: Laurieann Duarte, Washington, DC 20405.

**Instructions:** Please submit comments only and cite FAR case 2005–007 in all correspondence related to this case. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.acqnet.gov/far/ProposedRules/>

*proposed.htm*, including any personal and/or business confidential information provided.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The FAR Secretariat at (202) 501–4755 for information pertaining to status or publication schedules. For clarification of content, contact Mr. Michael O. Jackson, Procurement Analyst, at (202) 208–4949. Please cite FAR case 2005–007.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Background

Vendor registration in the CCR as a pre-requisite for being awarded a contract has been required in the Department of Defense since 1998, for Civilian Agencies since 2003. Since CCR’s inception, validation of registrants’ TINs with the IRS has been contemplated in order to improve data accuracy throughout the Federal procurement system. This capability, although actively pursued, was never implemented as the Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) restricts disclosure of TINs without the taxpayer’s consent, which due to technology at the time, would have been costly and inefficient to pursue. However, in its Fall 2004 “Report to Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations,” the Federal Contractor Tax Compliance Task Force (which included the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Treasury, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Department of Justice, and the IRS) recommended that “. . . a consent-based TIN validation under I.R.C. § 6103 should be instituted.” The capability for a near real-time/real-time, web-based solution integrating the CCR with an IRS validation is now able to be pursued due to advancements in technology. The FAR was recommended to be updated to specifically identify the validation of the TINs as a part of CCR registration.

Additionally, Subpart 4.11, Central Contractor Registration, contains language that was included when this subpart was implemented in the FAR in 2003. This outdated language required modifications of contracts by December 31, 2003, to include CCR registration requirements. As this date is past, the case removes the associated language.

The rule is proposing to amend the FAR by—

1. Modifying FAR 2.101 to indicate that the validation requirement for “registered in CCR” includes TIN matching.

2. Removing FAR 4.1103(a)(3)(i) thru 4.1103(a)(3)(ii) and a part of 4.1104 to