and industrial facilities with coal-fired boilers; and (4) radionuclide releases to all media from coal and coal ash piles at utility and industrial facilities with coal-fired boilers. All background materials and public comments related to the November 30, 1992 proposal are available for inspection in Docket Number 102RQ–RN–1 located at the U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office (address provided above in the "Document Viewing" section).

After evaluating the public comment letters received on the November 30, 1992 proposal, the Agency decided to issue a supplemental proposal, which was published on August 4, 1995 (60 FR 40042), to request information and comment on expanded reporting exemptions for radionuclide releases. In the August 4, 1995 proposal, EPA proposed to grant reporting exemptions for releases of naturally occurring radionuclides associated with (1) land disturbance incidental to extraction activities at certain kinds of mines, and (2) coal and coal ash piles at all kinds of sites. The Agency also requested comments on two alternatives to these exemptions.

The three comment letters received to date that requested a 60-day extension to the comment period for the August 4, 1995 proposed rule cited a number of factors contributing to their request: (1) The volume and complexity of the technical information EPA used to support the proposed exemptions; (2) the need to address the basis not only for the proposed expanded reporting exemptions, but also for the two alternatives as well as other aspects of the proposal; and (3) the need to review two different rulemaking dockets (one for the August 4, 1995 proposal and one for the November 30, 1992 proposal) to prepare more thorough comments.

EPA recognizes that additional time may be warranted to prepare public comments on the August 4, 1995 proposal, based on the factors described above. In addition, the Agency does not believe that the temporary delay in the schedule for finalizing the exemptions will pose a threat to public health, welfare, or the environment. Thus, in today's action, EPA is granting a 60-day extension to the comment period for the August 4, 1995 proposal.

Elaine Davies,

Acting Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response.

[FR Doc. 95–24581 Filed 10–2–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

# NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

#### 48 CFR Parts 32 and 52

[FAR Case 91–118]

#### RIN 9000-AG49

#### Federal Acquisition Regulation; Payment by Electronic Fund Transfer

**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 are considering changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to address the use of electronic fund transfers for Federal contract payments. This regulatory action was subject to Office of Management and Budget review under Executive Order 12866 dated September 30, 1993.

**DATES:** *Comment Due Date:* To be considered in the formulation of a final rule, comments should be submitted to the address given below on or before December 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to: General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (VRS), 18th & F Streets NW, Room 4037, Washington, DC 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jeremy F. Olson at (202) 501–3221 in reference to this FAR case. For general information, contact the FAR Secretariat, Room 4037, GS Building, Washington, DC 20405 (202) 501–4755. Please cite FAR case 91–118.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### A. Background

The Councils are committed to advancing the use of electronic fund transfers (EFT) as the standard method of payment under Federal contracts and believe that the use of EFT will ultimately reduce the administrative burden currently associated with contract invoice or financing payments made by check. The Councils also believe that many of the banks used by Federal contractors are not currently capable of properly handling the complex data transmissions used for many Government contract payments. Similarly, many Government offices involved in certifying invoices and disbursing contract payments are not currently capable of using EFT as the standard method of payment. In drafting the proposed rule, the Councils tried to avoid committing the Government to the routine use of EFT capabilities it does not yet possess. This does not lessen the Councils' commitment to the use of EFT as a contract payment method but recognizes that, as new computer systems and attendant EFT procedures develop in both the public and private sectors, the use of EFT as a normal payment practice will also expand.

The proposed rule amends FAR Subpart 32.9 to provide guidance concerning the use of electronic fund transfers (ĔFT) as a method of contract payment. The rule also adds solicitation provisions and contract clauses at FAR section 52.232 to implement the guidance. The rule establishes a requirement for contractors to provide certain information which would enable the Government to make payments under the contract by electronic fund transfer rather than by check. The information necessary to make the EFT transaction is specified in two new clauses at section 52.232-00, Mandatory Information for Electronic Fund Transfer Payment, and section 52.232-01, Optional Information for Electronic Fund Transfer Payment. Under section 52.232–00, the contractor is required to provide the information, prior to the submission of the first request for payment, as a condition of payment under the contract. The clause at section 52.232-01 is used if EFT may become a viable method of payment during the period of contract performance and if the contractor consents and provides the necessary data to enable payment by EFT.

#### B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The proposed FAR changes may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq., because the changes are intended to advance the use of EFT as a method of contract payment and reduce the current administrative burden associated with payments made by check. Under the proposed regulations, any business which enters into a contract with the Government would be required to submit certain information which would enable the Government to make contract payments by EFT rather than by check. This requirement may have a significant impact on a substantial number of small businesses because it is expected that the majority of small businesses will receive