

anchorage area designation or change the dimensions of the anchorage area.

### Regulatory Evaluation

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (44 FR 11040, February 26, 1979). Due to the mainly administrative nature of this change, the Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this proposal to be so minimal that a full Regulatory Evaluation under paragraph 10(e) of the regulatory policies and procedures of Department of Transportation is unnecessary.

### Small Entities

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposed rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. "Small entities" may include small businesses and not-for-profit organizations that are not dominant in their respective fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations less than 50,000. For the same reasons set forth in the above Regulatory Evaluation, the Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on any substantial number of entities, regardless of their size.

### Assistance For Small Entities

In accordance with section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-121), the Coast Guard wants to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule so that they can better evaluate its effects on them and participate in the rule making process. If your small business or organization is affected by this rule and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact Lieutenant Commander Brian Tetreault, at the address contained in the paragraph entitled **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

### Collection of Information

This proposed regulation contains no collection of information requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

### Federalism

We have analyzed this rule under Executive Order 13132 and have determined that this rule does not have sufficient implications for federalism to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

### Environmental Assessment

The Coast Guard has considered the environmental impact of this proposed regulation and concluded that under Chapter 2.B.2. of Commandant Instruction M16475.1C, Figure 2-1, paragraph (34)(f), it will have no significant environmental impact and it is categorically excluded from further environmental documentation.

### Unfunded Mandates

Under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4), the Coast Guard must consider whether this proposed rule will result in an annual expenditure by state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate of \$100 million (adjusted annually for inflation). If so, the Act requires that a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives be considered, and that from those alternatives, the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objective of the rule be selected.

No state, local, or tribal government entities will be affected by this rule, so this rule will not result in annual or aggregate costs of \$100 million or more. Therefore, the Coast Guard is exempt from any further regulatory requirements under the Unfunded Mandates Act.

### Taking of Private Property

This proposed rule will not effect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under E.O. 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

### Civil Justice Reform

This proposed rule meets applicable standards in section 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of E.O. 12988, Civil Justice Reform, to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden.

### Protection of Children

We have analyzed this rule under E.O. 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks. This rule is not an economically significant rule and does not concern an environmental risk to health or risk to safety that may disproportionately affect children.

### List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 110

Anchorage grounds.

### Proposed Regulation

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend subpart A of part 110, Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

#### PART 110—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 110 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 471, 1221 through 1236, 2030, 2035, 2071; 49 CFR 1.46; and 33 CFR 1.05-1(g).

#### § 110.126 [Amended]

2. The "Note" following § 110.126a, is revised to read as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

**Note:** Mariners anchoring in the special anchorage area should consult applicable ordinances of the Richardson Bay Regional Agency and the County of Marin. These ordinances establish requirements on matters including the anchoring of vessels, placement of moorings, and use of anchored and moored vessels within the special anchorage area. Information on these local agency requirements may be obtained from the Richardson Bay Harbor Administrator.

Dated: December 10, 1999.

**T.H. Collins,**

*Vice Admiral, USCG, Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 00-586 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-15-U**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 34 CFR Chapter VI

#### Student Financial Assistance

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Correction.

**SUMMARY:** On December 30, 1999, we published a document in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 73458 through 73460) announcing our intention to establish negotiated rulemaking committees under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The document included a tentative schedule of negotiated rulemaking sessions. The dates for the first negotiated rulemaking sessions for both Committee I and Committee II have changed. This document corrects the dates for the first negotiated rulemaking sessions.

**DATES:** The first negotiated rulemaking session for Committee I will be February 3-4 and the first negotiated rulemaking session for Committee II will be February 7-8.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Beth Grebeldinger, U.S. Department of

Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW., ROB-3, Washington, DC 20202-5257. Telephone: (202) 205-8822. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) you may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

#### Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, in Text or Adobe portable document format (pdf) on the World Wide Web at any of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg/htm>

<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/HEA/rulemaking>

To use the pdf you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at the first of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing Office toll free at 1-888-293-6498.

**Note:** The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>.

**Program Authority:** 20 U.S.C. 1098a.

Dated: January 5, 2000.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number does not apply.)

**Richard W. Riley,**

*Secretary of Education.*

[FR Doc. 00-549 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[085-1085a; FRL-6517-8]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the state of Kansas. These revisions include revising and renumbering regulatory definitions, streamlining opacity requirements, expanding testing of gasoline delivery vehicles, and methods for calculating actual emissions.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments must be received in writing by February 10, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Christopher D. Hess, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Hess at (913) 551-7213 or [hess.christopher@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:hess.christopher@epamail.epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 29, 1999.

**Dennis Grams, P.E.,**

*Regional Administrator, Region VII.*

[FR Doc. 00-269 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AF56

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Notice of Reopening of Comment Period on the Proposed Rule To List the Alabama Sturgeon as Endangered

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

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

**SUMMARY:** We, the Fish and Wildlife Service, give notice that we are reopening the comment period on the proposed rule to list the Alabama sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus suttkusi*) as endangered. We are reopening the comment period to enter into the record

Dr. Stephen Fain's 1999 study, The Development of a DNA Procedure for the Forensic Identification of Caviar, and any comments we receive related specifically to the relationship of this study, as it pertains to the proposed listing of the Alabama sturgeon as endangered. We invite all interested parties to submit comments on this study as it relates to the proposed determination.

**DATES:** We will accept comments until February 10, 2000. We will consider any comments received by the closing date in the final decision on this proposal.

**ADDRESSES:** If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may mail or hand-deliver comments to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mississippi Field Office, 6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Jackson, Mississippi 39213. You may also comment via the Internet to [paulhartfield@fws.gov](mailto:paulhartfield@fws.gov). See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for comment procedures.

To obtain a copy of the aforementioned study, you can download or print one from <http://endangered.fws.gov/listing/index.htm> (under Announcements) or contact Kelly Bibb at 404/679-7132 (phone) or 404/679-7081 (facsimile) to receive a faxed or mailed copy.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul Hartfield (see **ADDRESSES** section), 601/321-1125; facsimile 601/965-4340.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

The Alabama sturgeon is a small freshwater sturgeon that was historically found only in the Mobile River Basin of Alabama and Mississippi. The Alabama sturgeon's historic range once included about 1,600 kilometers (km) (1,000 miles (mi)) of the Mobile River system in Alabama (Black Warrior, Tombigbee, Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa, Mobile, Tensaw, and Cahaba rivers) and Mississippi (Tombigbee River). Since 1985, all confirmed captures of this fish have been from a short, free-flowing reach of the Alabama River below Miller's Ferry and Claiborne Locks and Dams in Clarke, Monroe, and Wilcox counties, Alabama. The decline of the Alabama sturgeon is attributed to overfishing, loss and fragmentation of habitat as a result of historical navigation-related development, and water quality degradation. Current threats primarily result from its small population numbers and its inability to offset mortality rates with reproduction and recruitment.

On March 26, 1999, we published a rule proposing endangered status for the