(2) Monitoring the issuance of such securities with a view to preventing unauthorized issuance;

(3) Registering the transfer of such securities;

(4) Exchanging or converting such securities; or

(5) Transferring record ownership of securities by book-keeping entry without physical issuance of securities certificates.

(e)(1) If you are a registered non-bank transfer agent that is not operationally capable because you have a material Year 2000 problem, you may, in addition to providing the Commission the notice required by paragraph (c) of this section, provide the Commission a certificate signed by your chief executive officer (or an individual with similar authority) stating:

(i) You are in the process of remediating your material Year 2000 problem;

(ii) You have scheduled testing of your affected mission critical systems to verify that the material Year 2000 problem has been remediated, and specify the testing dates;

(iii) The date (which cannot be later than October 15, 1999) by which you anticipate completing remediation of the Year 2000 problem and will therefore be operationally capable; and

(iv) Based on inquiries and to the best of the chief executive officer's knowledge, you do not anticipate that the existence of the material Year 2000 problem will impair your ability, depending on the nature of your business, to assure the prompt and accurate transfer and processing of securities, the maintenance of master securityholder files, or the production and retention of required records.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (d) of this section, you may continue to engage in transfer agent functions, if you have submitted a certificate to the Commission in compliance with paragraph (e)(1) of this section but only until the date specified in your certificate and in no event later than October 15, 1999. However, you must comply with the requirements of paragraph (d) of this section if you have been so ordered by the Commission or by a court as being in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(f) You must maintain a back-up copy of your database and file layouts for each business day, and you must store these records for five business days in a place easily accessible to Commission examiners beginning August 31, 1999, and ending March 31, 2000. This back-up copy of the database and file layouts must not be located with or held in the same computer system as the primary records. You may store these records on any electronic storage media.

(g) For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term *mission critical system* means any system that is necessary, depending on the nature of your business, to assure the prompt and accurate transfer and processing of securities, the maintenance of master securityholder files, and the production and retention of required records as described in paragraph (d) of this section;

(2) The term *customer* includes an issuer, transfer agent, or other person for which you provide transfer agent services;

(3) The term *registered non-bank transfer agent* means a transfer agent, whose appropriate regulatory agency is the Commission and not the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and

(4) The term *file layout* means the description and location of information contained in the database.

Dated: March 5, 1999.

By the Commission.

Margaret H.McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–6043 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 167

[USCS–1999–5198]

Port Access Route Study for Approaches to Los Angeles and Long Beach

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is conducting a study of port-access routes for the approaches to Los Angeles and Long Beach. The study will evaluate potential effects of recent port improvement projects on navigational safety and vessel traffic management efficiency in the study area and may recommend changes to existing vessel routing measures. The recommendations of the study may lead to future rulemaking. The Coast Guard asks for comments on the issued raised and questions listed in this document.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 10, 1999.

ADDRESSES: You may mail your comments to the Docket Management Facility, (USCG–1999–5198), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington DC 20590–0001, or deliver them to room PL–401 on the Plaza Level of the Nassif Building at the same address between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202–366–9329.

The Docket Management Facility maintains the public docket. Comments, and documents as indicated in this preamble, will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection or copying at room PL–401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building at the same address between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also access this docket on the Internet at http://dms.dot.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on this notice, contact Lieutenant Brian Tetreault, Vessel Traffic Management Officer, Eleventh Coast Guard District, telephone 510–437–2951; or Mike Van Houten, Aids to Navigation Section Chief, Eleventh Coast Guard District, telephone 510–437–2968. For questions on viewing, or submitting material to the docket, contact Dorothy Walker, Chief, Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202–366–9329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard encourages interested persons to respond to this notice by submitting written data, views, or arguments. Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this notice (USCG–1999–5198) and the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. Please submit all comments and attachments in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ inches by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES.** Persons wanting acknowledgment of receipt of comments should enclose stamped, self-addressed postcards or envelopes.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment period.

The Coast Guard does not plan to hold a public meeting. Persons may request a public meeting by writing to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES.** The request should include the reasons why a meeting would be beneficial. If we determine that the opportunity for oral

presentations will aid this study, we will hold a public meeting at a time and place announced in a later notice of the **Federal Register.**

Definitions

The following International Maritime Organization (IMO) definition should help you review this notice and provide comments:

1. *Internationally recognized vessel routing system* means any system of one or more routes or routing measures aimed at reducing the risk of casualties; it includes traffic separation schemes, two-way routes, recommended tracks, areas to be avoided, inshore traffic zones, roundabouts, precautionary areas, and deep-water routes.

2. *Traffic Separation Scheme* or *(TSS)* means a routing measure aimed at the separation of opposing streams of traffic by appropriate means and by the establishment of traffic lanes.

3. *Traffic lane* means an area within defined limits in which one-way traffic is established.

4. *Separation zone or line* means a zone or line separating the traffic lanes in which ships are proceeding in opposite or nearly opposite directions; or separating a traffic lane from the adjacent sea area; or separating traffic lanes designated for particular classes of ships proceeding in the same direction.

5. *Precautionary area* means a routing measure comprising an area within defined limits where ships must navigate with particular caution and within which the direction of traffic flow may be recommended.

6. *Inshore traffic zone* means a routing measure comprising a designated area between the landward boundary of a traffic separation scheme and the adjacent coast, to be used in accordance with the provision of Rule 10(d), as amended, of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (Collision Regulations).

7. *Deep-water route* means a route within defined limits which has been accurately surveyed for clearance of sea bottom and submerged obstacles as indicated on nautical charts.

Background and Purpose

Port Access Route Studs Requirements. Under the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA) [33 U.S.C. 1223(c)], the Secretary of Transportation may designate necessary fairways and Traffic Separation Schemes (TSS's) to provide safe access routes for vessels proceeding to and from U.S. ports. The Secretary delegated this authority to the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.46. The designation of fairways and TSS's recognizes the paramount right of navigation over all other uses in the designate areas.

The PWSA requires the Coast Guard to conduct a study of port-access routes before establishing or adjusting fairways or TSS's. Through the study process, we must coordinate with Federal, State, and foreign state agencies (as appropriate) and consider the views of maritime community representatives, environmental groups, and other interested stakeholders. A primary purpose of this coordination is, to the extent practicable, to reconcile the need for safe port-access routes with other reasonable waterway uses.

Previous port access route studies. The Coast Guard announced an initial port access route study for the coast of California, including Los Angeles/Long Beach, in the **Federal Register** on June 24, 1982 (47 FR 27430). The study recommended establishing a shipping safety fairway overlaying the Los Angeles/Long Beach precautionary area. This recommendation has not been implemented.

The Coast Guard announced another port access route study for the coast of California in the **Federal Register** on August 24,1 993 (58 FR 44634). this study evaluated the effects of oil tanker transits through the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and the adequacy of vessel traffic management measures along the California cost from San Francisco to Los Angeles. The Coast Guard published study results in the **Federal Register** on October 25,1996 (62 FR 55249). The study did not recommend any changes to the Los Angeles/Long Beach TSS at that time.

Why is a new port access route study necessary? A study of port-access routes is needed to evaluate the potential effects of port improvement projects on navigational safety and vessel traffic management efficiency and recommend changes, if necessary, to existing routing measures.

The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach began major port improvement projects in 1995. These projects should be completed soon (Long Breach—June 1999; Los Angeles—January 2000).

Port improvements include the following:

- Lengthening of the Los Angeles Approach Channel to extend 3.5 nautical miles beyond the Los Angeles breakwater.
- Deepening of the Los Angeles Approach Channel to a project depth of 81 feet.
- Slight eastward shift of the Long Beach Approach to a 355-degree true inbound course.
- Deepening of the Long Beach Approach Channel to a project depth of 69 feet.

Timeline, Study Area, and process of the new port access route study. The Coast Guard will begin the study immediately and should complete it by mid-May 1999.

The study area includes the navigable waters of Los Angeles, and Long Beach Harbors, the Los Angeles/Long Beach TSS and all waters bound by the coastline and the following coordinates:

Latitude	*Longitude*
33°–47.00′ N	118°–25.40′ W
33°–47.00′ N	118°–38.60′ W
33°–15.50′ N	118°–38.60′ W
33°–15.50′ N	117°–52.70′ W
33°–35.30′ N	117′–52.70′ W

During the study, we will consult with Federal and State agencies and will consider the views of representatives of the maritime community, port and harbor authorities or associations, environmental groups and other interested parties. We will also consider previous studies and experience in the areas of vessel traffic management, navigation, ship handling, and the effects of weather, and review prior analyses of the traffic density. We encourage you to participate in the study process by submitting comments in response to this notice.

We will publish the results of this port access route study in the **Federal Register**. It is possible that the study may validate continued applicability of existing vessel routing measures and conclude that no changes are necessary. It is also possible that the study may recommend one or more changes to enhance navigational safety and vessel traffic management efficiency. Study recommendations may lead to future rulemaking.

Questions

To help us conduct the port access route study, we request comments on the following questions, although comments on related issues under the broad category of vessel routing are welcome.

1. What navigational hazards do vessels operating in the study area face? Please describe (consider issues such as port and waterway configurations, variations in local geography, climate, and other similar factors). Will there be additional navigational hazards once port improvement projects are completed? If so, please describe.

2. Are there strains on the current vessel routing system (increasing traffic density, for example)? If so, please describe. Will there be additional strains once port improvement projects are

completed? (We are particularly interested in information on vessel characteristics and trends, including traffic volume, the size and types of vessels involved, potential interference with the flow of commercial traffic, the presence of any unusual cargoes, etc.).

3. Are modifications to existing vessel routing measures needed to address existing or future hazards and strains and improve traffic management efficiency in the study area? If so, please describe. What positive and negative impacts would changes to existing routing measures or new routing measures have on the study area (consider proximity of fishing grounds, oil and gas drilling and production operations, environmental impact, affect on local practices, or any other potential or actual conflicting activity)?

4. Do you have any specific recommendations regarding aids to navigation design for the lengthened approach channels? If so, please describe.

Dated: March 4, 1999.

R.C. North,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 99–6015 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–15–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[DE041–1019b; FRL–6238–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware—Definitions of VOCs and Exempt Compounds

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing approval of revisions to the Delaware State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions amend the definitions of the terms ''volatile organic compounds'' (VOCs) and ''exempt compounds.'' EPA is proposing to approve these revisions because they make Delaware's definitions consistent with the federal definition of VOCs. In the ''Rules and Regulations'' section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments, EPA will not take further action on this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, EPA will withdraw the direct final rule and it will not take effect. EPA will address all public comments 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 April 12, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to David L. Arnold, Chief, Ozone and Mobile Sources Branch, Mailcode 3AP21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air Protection Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103; and the Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control, 89 Kings Highway, Dover, Delaware 19901.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rose Quinto, (215) 814–2182, at the EPA Region III address above, or by e-mail at quinto.rose@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action with the same title that is located in the ''Rules and Regulations'' section of this **Federal Register** publication.

Dated: February 25, 1999.

Thomas J. Maslany,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 99–5664 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IA 058–1058b; FRL–6308–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Iowa pertaining to a sulfur dioxide (SO_2) control strategy for the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, area. Approval of this SIP revision will make Federally enforceable source emission reduction requirements and achieve attainment and maintenance of the SO_2 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, the 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 action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If the 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. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by April 12, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Wayne Kaiser, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne Kaiser at (913) 551–7603.

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

Dated: February 25, 1999.

Diane K. Callier,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VII.

[FR Doc. 99–5825 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

43 CFR Part 428

RIN 1006–AA38

Information Requirements for Certain Farm Operations In Excess of 960 Acres and the Eligibility of Certain Formerly Excess Land

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, DOI.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation is reopening the comment period on our proposed rule entitled ''Information Requirements for Certain Farm Operations In Excess of 960 Acres and the Eligibility of Certain Formerly Excess Land.''