

In order to ensure that ATF will have the full benefit of their views, even if time constraints limit an oral presentation, persons presenting oral comments are urged to supplement their oral statement with a more complete written statement. A written statement submitted to ATF at the time of presentation of the oral comment will be considered part of the hearing record.

After making an oral presentation, a person should be prepared to answer questions from the hearing panel on not only the topics presented but also on matters relating to any written comments which he or she has submitted. Other persons will not be permitted to question a commenter. However, questions may be submitted, in writing, to the hearing officer who will evaluate their relevance. If the hearing officer determines that elicitation of further discussion would be beneficial, they may be presented to a commenter for a response.

Persons will be scheduled, if possible, according to the date and time preferences mentioned in their letter notification to us. We will confirm by telephone the date and time a person is scheduled to present oral comments. Letter notifications received after the cutoff date, and up to two (2) working days preceding a scheduled hearing, will be honored to the extent practicable on a first-come-first-serve basis. Any scheduled commenter not present at a particular hearing when called will lose his or her place in the scheduled order, but could be recalled after all other scheduled commenters have been heard.

We will prepare an agenda listing the persons scheduled to comment at a particular hearing and copies will be available at the hearing. In addition, copies of the notice of proposed rulemaking and all received written comments in response to the notice will be available at each hearing for public inspection.

Other formats for holding the hearings are being considered. For example, the hearing officer would oversee testimony presented by a panel of several persons during a specified time period (*e.g.*, morning session) who share or represent similar views, *e.g.*, members of the medical profession, representatives from health care organizations, representatives of various industry trade organizations, and representatives from consumer advocacy organizations. We will determine the format for the hearings once we know the number of people interested in presenting oral testimony and the content of their testimony.

### Comments

Any person participating in the hearings or submitting written comments may present such data, views, or arguments as they desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views or suggestions presented will be particularly helpful in developing a reasoned regulatory decision on this matter. However, comments consisting of mere allegations or denials are counterproductive to the rulemaking process. We specifically request that commenters consider making comments on the following questions:

1. How do consumers perceive the two "directional" health-related statements approved by ATF?
2. Do consumers interpret the approved directional statements as actual substantive health claims about the benefits of alcohol consumption? Explain.
3. Do consumers interpret the Government's approval of the directional statements on labels as an endorsement of drinking? Explain.
4. Do directional health-related statements such as those approved by ATF tend to mislead consumers about the health consequences of alcohol consumption? Explain.
5. Do the negative consequences of alcohol consumption or abuse disqualify, as inherently misleading, any health-related statements on alcohol beverage labels, including directional statements? Explain.
6. The proposed regulations would prohibit any health claim in the labeling or advertising of alcohol beverages unless it is balanced, properly qualified, sufficiently detailed and specific, and outlines the categories of persons for whom any positive effects would be outweighed by the numerous negative health effects. Given the space limitations of an alcohol beverage label, what types of health claims would meet this standard? Explain.

### Drafting Information

The author of this document is James P. Ficaretta, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

### List of Subjects

#### 27 CFR Part 4

Advertising, Consumer protection, Customs duties and inspection, Imports, Labeling, Packaging and containers, and Wine.

#### 27 CFR Part 5

Advertising, Consumer protection, Customs duties and inspection, Imports,

Labeling, Liquors, and Packaging and containers.

#### 27 CFR Part 7

Advertising, Consumer protection, Customs duties and inspection, Imports, and Labeling.

### Authority and Issuance

This notice of hearing is issued under the authority of 27 U.S.C. 205.

Signed: February 22, 2000.

**Bradley A. Buckles,**  
Director.

[FR Doc. 00-4572 Filed 2-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Minerals Management Service

#### 30 CFR Part 206

#### RIN 1010-AC24

### Establishing Oil Value for Royalty Due on Indian Leases

**AGENCY:** Minerals Management Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Supplementary proposed rule; notice of extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Minerals Management Service hereby gives notice that it is extending the public comment period on a supplementary proposed rule, which was published in the **Federal Register** on January 5, 2000, (65 FR 403). The proposed rule amends the royalty valuation regulations for crude oil produced from Indian leases. MMS will grant a 14-day extension until March 20, 2000.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 20, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Mail comments, suggestions, or objections about this supplementary proposed rule to: Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Publications Staff, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3021, Denver, Colorado 80225-0165. Courier address is Building 85, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225. E-mail address is RMP.comments@mms.gov.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David S. Guzy, Chief, Rules and Publications Staff, telephone number (303) 231-3432, fax number (303) 231-3385, e-mail RMP.comments@mms.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In a February 18, 2000, **Federal Register** notice (65 FR 8442), we asked for comments concerning additional

information requirements identified in the January 5, 2000, supplementary proposed rule (65 FR 403) and the proposed rule, which MMS published on February 12, 1998 (63 FR 7089). We requested that written comments must be received by March 20, 2000, regarding these newly identified information requirements.

We are granting an extension of 14 days to receive comments on the supplementary proposed rule to match the March 20, 2000, closing date for comments on new information collection requirements. Furthermore, we received a number of requests to extend the comment period beyond March 6, 2000, the closing date of the current comment period.

MMS believes this extension of time until March 20, 2000, will allow the public sufficient time to make additional comments on all aspects of the supplementary proposed rule, including any comments regarding information collection requirements.

We will review and carefully consider all comments received on the final Indian oil rule.

Dated: February 22, 2000.

**Lucy Querques Denett,**

*Associate Director for Royalty Management.*

[FR Doc. 00-4561 Filed 2-25-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P**

**NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION**

**36 CFR Part 1260**

**RIN 3095-AA67**

**Records Declassification; Correction**

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

**SUMMARY:** NARA published in the *Federal Register* of February 17, 2000, a proposed revision to our rules concerning records declassification. The zip code in the **ADDRESSES** section contained a typographical error. This document provides the correct zip code. **DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 17, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Regulation Comment Desk, NPLN, Room 4100, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, Maryland, 20740-6001. You may also fax comments to (301) 713-7270.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nancy Allard or Shawn Morton at (301) 713-7360.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** NARA published in the *Federal Register* of

February 17, 2000, a proposed revision to 36 CFR 1260—Declassification. The zip code in the **ADDRESSES** section contained a typographical error. This document provides the correct zip code.

In the document FR 00-3358, published on February 17, 2000 (65 FR 8077), make the following change. On page 8077, in the second column, change the zip code in the **ADDRESS** section from “10740” to “20740.”

Dated: February 23, 2000.

**Nancy Y. Allard,**

*Federal Register Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 00-4683 Filed 2-25-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7515-01-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[NM39-2-7452; FRL-6542-7]**

**Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Approval of Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget; Albuquerque/ Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Carbon Monoxide**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing approval of a revision to the Albuquerque/ Bernalillo County carbon monoxide (CO) State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Governor of New Mexico requested EPA approval of the revision on February 4, 1999. The Governor requested approval of a CO motor vehicle emissions budget for the year 2010. This action proposes to approve only the CO Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget for 2010. This CO Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget is for transportation conformity purposes.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 29, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** You should address comments on this action to Mr. Thomas Diggs, EPA Region 6, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, Texas 75202. Copies of all materials considered in this rule making, including the technical support document may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations: EPA Region 6 offices, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202, and the Albuquerque Environmental Health Department, Air Pollution Control Division, One Civic Plaza Room 3023, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102. If you plan to view the documents at either location, please call

48 hours ahead of the time you plan to arrive.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Matthew Witosky of the EPA Region 6 Air Planning Section, at (214) 665-7214, or WITOSKY.MATTHEW@EPA.GOV,

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Overview**

The information in this section is organized as follows:

1. What action is the EPA taking today?
2. Why must the EPA approve an additional MVEB?
3. Why is Albuquerque setting a budget for a year beyond the current maintenance plan?
4. Do other emissions grow in the same time period? a. Why are projected highway mobile emissions in Table 2 different than the MVEB in Table 1?
5. How is Albuquerque protecting air quality, if they are increasing the amount of mobile emissions allowed in the region?
6. Under what authority does Albuquerque revise the plan?
7. How is this action related to the direct final rule, published December 20, 1999, revising the MVEB and CO maintenance plan?

*1. What Action Is the EPA Taking Today?*

The EPA proposes approval of a revision to the Albuquerque and Bernalillo County CO SIP. Hereafter, Albuquerque and Bernalillo County will be referred to as “Albuquerque.” Albuquerque requested approval of a motor vehicle emissions budget (MVEB) for the year 2010. The EPA proposes approval of this budget of 222.46 tpd. This budget is applicable for 2010, four years beyond the end of the current maintenance plan. This budget is an addition to the MVEB’s approved in the maintenance plan.

**TABLE 1—ALBUQUERQUE APPROVED CO MOTOR VEHICLE Emissions Budget (MVEB)**

[In tons per day]	
Year	2010
MVEB .....	222.46

*2. Why Must the EPA Approve an Additional MVEB?*

The Federal Clean Air Act as Amended in 1990 (the Act), and the conformity rules, provide that the EPA must approve MVEB’s for areas in maintenance. Albuquerque received redesignation to attainment and entered the maintenance period in 1996. Their