FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eaton Weiler, Environmental Engineer, Permits and Grants Section (AR–18J), Air Programs Branch, Air and Radiation Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–6041.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, New source review, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Volatile Organic Compounds, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: December 6, 1999.

David A. Ullrich,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 99–32648 Filed 12–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 1815, 1819, and 1852

Elimination of Elements as a Category in Evaluations

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This rule proposes to amend the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) by eliminating the term ''elements'' as a category in evaluations. NASA does not numerically weight and score ''elements'' and therefore they have ceased to have significance in the evaluation and award of NASA's contracts.

DATES: Comments should be submitted on or before February 14, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit written comments to Paul Brundage, NASA Headquarters, Office of Procurement, Contract Management Division (Code HK), Washington, DC 20456. Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to paul.brundage@hq.nasa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Brundage, (202) 358–0481.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

NASA does not numerically weight and score ''elements'' and therefore they have ceased to have significance in the evaluation and award of NASA's contracts. This proposed change will eliminate the term ''element'' as a category in evaluations from NFS Parts 1815, 1819, and 1852.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

NASA certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) because the change modifies administrative procedures and does not impose any new requirements on offerors or contractors.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because the changes to the NFS do not impose record keeping or information collection requirements, or collections of information from offerors, contractors, or members of the public which require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*

Lists of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 1815, 1819, and 1852

Government procurement.

Tom Luedtke,

Associate Administrator for Procurement.

Accordingly, 48 CFR Parts 1815, 1819, and 1852 are proposed to be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 48 CFR Parts 1815, 1819, and 1852 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

PART 1815—CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION

2. In section 1815.303, paragraph (b)(i)(A) is amended by removing the words ''and elements,''.

3. In section 1815.304–70, paragraphs (a) and (b) are revised to read as follows:

1815.304–70 NASA evaluation factors.

(a) Typically, NASA establishes three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance. Evaluation factors may be further defined by subfactors. Evaluation subfactors should be structured to identify significant discriminators, or ''key swingers''—the essential information required to support a source selection decision. Too many subfactors undermine effective proposal evaluation. All evaluation subfactors should be clearly defined to avoid overlap and redundancy.

(b) Mission Suitability factor.

(1) This factor indicates the merit or excellence of the work to be performed or product to be delivered. It includes, as appropriate, both technical and management subfactors. Mission Suitability shall be numerically weighted and scored on a 1000-point scale.

(2) The Mission Suitability factor may identify evaluation subfactors to further define the content of the factor. Each Mission Suitability subfactor shall be weighted and scored. The adjectival rating percentages in 1815.305(a)(3)(A) shall be applied to the subfactor weight to determine the point score. The number of Mission Suitability subfactors is limited to five. The Mission Suitability evaluation subfactors and their weights shall be identified in the RFP.

(3) For cost reimbursement acquisitions, the Mission Suitability evaluation shall also include the results of any cost realism analysis. The RFP shall notify offerors that the realism of proposed costs may significantly affect their Mission Suitability scores.

* * * * *

4. In section 1815.370, paragraphs (b), (d)(4), and (h)(2) are revised; paragraphs (h)(3)(ii) is amended by removing ''elements,''; paragraph (i)(3) is amended by removing ''and elements,''; and paragraphs (i)(6)(ii) and (i)(7) are revised to read as follows:

1815.370 NASA source evaluation boards.

* * * * *

(b) The SEB assists the SSA by providing expert analyses of the offerors' proposals in relation to the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in the solicitation. The SEB will prepare and present its findings to the SSA, avoiding trade-off judgments among either the individual offerors or among the evaluation factors. The SEB will not make recommendations for selection to the SSA.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(4) An SEB committee functions as a factfinding arm of the SEB, usually in a broad grouping of related disciplines (e.g., technical or management). The committee evaluates in detail each proposal, or portion thereof, assigned by the SEB in accordance with the approved evaluation factors and subfactors and summarizes its evaluation in a written report to the SEB. The committee will also respond to requirements assigned by the SEB, including further justification or reconsideration of its findings. Committee chairpersons shall manage the administrative and procedural matters of their committees.

* * * * *

(h) * * *

(2) The presentation shall focus on the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses found in the proposals, the probable cost of each proposal, and any significant issues and

problems identified by the SEB. This presentation must explain any applicable special standards of responsibility; evaluation factors and subfactors; the significant strengths and significant weaknesses of the offerors; the Government cost estimate, if applicable; the offerors' proposed cost/price; the probable cost; the proposed fee arrangements; and the final adjectival ratings and scores to the subfactor level.

(i) * * *

(6) * * *

(ii) Directly relate the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses to the evaluation factors and subfactors.

* * * * *

(7) *Final Mission Suitability Ratings and Scores.* Summarizes the evaluation subfactors, the maximum points achievable, and the scores of the offerors in the competitive range.

* * * * *

PART 1819—SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

5. In section 1819.7206, paragraph (a) is amended by removing the words ''or element''.

PART 1852—SOLICITATION PROVISIONS AND CONTRACT CLAUSES

6. In section 1852.217–71, ''(OCTOBER 1998)'' is revised to read ''(MONTH/YEAR)'', and paragraph (g) is amended by removing the words ''and elements''.

7. In section 1852.217–72, ''(OCTOBER 1998)'' is revised to read ''(MONTH/YEAR)'', and paragraph (g) is amended by removing the words ''and elements''.

[FR Doc. 99–32658 Filed 12–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AF34

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reopening of Comment Period on Proposed Threatened Status for the Santa Ana Sucker

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: We, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), reopen the comment period on the proposal to list the Santa Ana Sucker (Catostomus santaanae) as a threatened species. The comment period is extended to accommodate the public notice requirement of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (Act) and to consider new scientific information. In addition, reopening of the comment period will allow further opportunity for all interested parties to submit comments on the proposal, which is available (see **ADDRESSES** section). We are seeking comments or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested parties concerning the proposed rule. Comments already submitted on the proposed rule need not be resubmitted as they will be fully consider in the final determination.

DATES: The reopened comment period closes January 3, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments and materials concerning this proposed rule should be sent to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad, California, 92008. Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Glen Knowles, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office (see **ADDRESSES** section) at (760) 431–9440.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 26, 1999, the Service published a rule proposing threatened status for the Santa Ana Sucker (Catostomus santaanae) in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 3915). The original comment period closed on March 29, 1999. Section 4(b)(5)(D) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) requires us to ''publish a summary of the proposed regulation in a newspaper of general circulation in each area of the United States in which the species is believed to occur.'' To accommodate this requirement, we are reopening the comment period for this proposal to list the Santa Ana sucker as a threatened species. The comment period now closes on January 3, 2000. Written comments should be submitted to the Service (see ADDRESSES section).

The Santa Ana Sucker was once one of the most common fish species in southern California. Today, the species is reduced to approximately 25 percent of its former range. These declines occurred coincident with the urbanization of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The species is threatened by potential habitat destruction, natural and human-induced changes in streamflows, urban development and related land-use practices, intensive recreation, the introduction of non-native competitors and predators, and demographics associated with small populations. Comments from the public regarding the accuracy of this proposed rule are sought, especially regarding:

(1) Biological, commercial trade, or other relevant data concerning any threat (or lack thereof) to this species;

(2) The location of any additional occurrences of this species and the reasons why any habitat should or should not be determined to be critical habitat pursuant to section 4 of the Act;

(3) Additional information concerning the range, distribution, and population size of this species;

(4) Current or planned activities in the subject area and their possible impacts on the Santa Ana Sucker or its habitat;

(5) Information regarding the introduction of the Santa Clara River population and the role it may play in the recovery of this species.

Comments previously submitted during the first comment period need not be resubmitted, as they will be fully considered in the final determination.

Author: The primary author of this notice is Glen Knowles (see **ADDRESSES** section).

Authority: The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: December 10, 1999.

Elizabeth H. Stevens,

Deputy Manager, California/Nevada Operations Office, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. 99–32576 Filed 12–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P