

recent test data to the record. We welcome your comments on it.

C. Items Being Added to Both Records

Since the record closed, several documents have been published concerning the risk of dpm. This risk information is applicable to both coal's and metal and nonmetal's rulemakings.

The first item is a report by another Federal authority updating information discussed in the record. During the hearings and post-hearing comments, there was considerable discussion of an October 1998 report of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) reviewing an EPA Diesel Health Assessment Document. This committee has issued a new report ("Review of EPA's Health Assessment Document for Diesel Emissions" February 2000) on a revised EPA Diesel Health Assessment Document (EPA, Health Assessment Document for Diesel Emissions, Office of Research and Development, SAB Review Draft, EPA-600/8-90/057D, November 1999). Members of the mining community participated actively in the discussions leading to CASAC's newer report. Accordingly, we believe it would be appropriate to update our record to reflect any new information covered by the revised EPA assessment and the CASAC's review of it. Members of the mining community have requested that we reopen the record for this purpose.

The second item is a study by Saverin, R. *et al.*, "Diesel Exhaust and Lung Cancer Mortality in Potash Mining," *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 36:415-422 (1999). The unpublished version of the study was discussed at one of the hearings, and we already have the unpublished version of this study in the record. The published version which differs slightly from the earlier translation is now available and it is normal practice to refer to the published version of a study when that version is available. Accordingly, we are adding the published version to the record and welcome your comments on it.

The third item is an epidemiological study investigating the association of lung cancer with occupational exposures to diesel emissions in Germany. Bruske-Hohlfeld, I. *et al.*, "Lung Cancer Risk in Male Workers Occupationally Exposed to Diesel Motor Emissions in Germany," *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 36:405-414 (1999). The record of this rulemaking includes a lengthy and comprehensive list of relevant epidemiological studies. These were discussed in great detail by the mining community during the hearings and

comment period. As a result, we believe it would be inappropriate to leave this recent epidemiological study out of the record. Accordingly, we are adding this study to the record and welcome your comments on it.

The fourth item is a study concerning human response to acute dpm exposures. Salvi, Sundeeep, *et al.*, "Acute Inflammatory Responses in the Airways and Peripheral Blood After Short-Term Exposure to Diesel Exhaust in Health Human Volunteers," *Am. J. Respir. Care Med.* 159:702-709 (1999). Again, the record of this rulemaking includes a comprehensive list of relevant studies in this regard, and they were discussed by the mining community during the hearings and comment period. Since the Agency is opening the record, the addition of this recent study is appropriate. Accordingly, this study is being added to the record at this time.

Finally, in its review of the record, the agency noted certain comments suggesting that these commenters might not have been aware of certain studies that were part of the general scientific literature covered by reviews which are included and discussed in the record. Accordingly, the agency is placing copies of two such studies directly into the record under their own docket numbers, and will accept any comments on these studies. [Hou, S.M. *et al.*, "Relationship between hprt mutant frequency, aromatic DNA adducts and genotypes for GSTM1 and NAT2 in bus maintenance workers," *Carcinogenesis*, 16:1913-1917 (1995); and Ichinose, *et al.*, "Lung Carcinogenesis and Formation of 8-hydroxydeoxyguanosine in Mice by Diesel Exhaust Particles," *Carcinogenesis*, 18:185-192 (1997).]

The agency wants to reassure the mining community that since the agency's risk assessment covers information relevant to both underground coal mines and underground metal and nonmetal mines, any comments on the risk assessment filed in one record have also been placed in the other. In some cases, commenters placed the comments in both records just to be sure MSHA would consider them, but not all did so. The agency will follow this same policy with respect to any comments on the risk studies which are the subject of this notice.

D. Time for Response

The Agency is opening the rulemaking record for additional comment on only the specific items described above. The agency has determined that in light of the limited

scope of this reopening, and the extensive familiarity of the mining community with the existing record on the topics involved, the record will remain open for comments on these items for 30 days. The agency does not foresee any extensions will be needed. Accordingly, to facilitate comment by the mining community, the agency will be pleased to telefax or express mail copies of any of the items involved upon request.

Dated: June 27, 2000.

Robert A. Elam,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 00-16561 Filed 6-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-43-U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Parts 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147

[USCG-1998-3868]

RIN 2115-AF39

Outer Continental Shelf Activities

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is further extending the period for public comment on its notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on Outer Continental Shelf Activities. We are changing the deadline for receipt of comments from July 5, 2000, to November 30, 2000. Also, we are changing the deadline for receipt of comments by the Office of Management and Budget on the proposed collection-of-information requirements from July 5, 2000, to November 30, 2000.

DATES: Comments and related material must reach the Docket Management Facility on or before November 30, 2000. Comments sent to OMB on collection of information must reach OMB on or before November 30, 2000.

ADDRESSES: To make sure your comments and related material are not entered more than once in the docket, please submit them by only one of the following methods:

(1) By mail to the Docket Management Facility, (USCG-1998-3868), U.S. Department of Transportation, room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

(2) By hand to room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC,

between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The telephone number is 202-366-9329.

(3) By fax to the Docket Management Facility at 202-493-2251.

(4) Electronically through the Web Site for the Docket Management System at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

You may also mail comments on collection of information to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, ATTN: Desk Officer, U.S. Coast Guard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions on this proposed rule, call Mr. James M. Magill, Vessel and Facility Operating Standards Division (G-MSO-2), telephone 202-267-1082 or fax 202-267-4570. For questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Ms. Dorothy Beard, Chief of Dockets, Department of Transportation, telephone 202-366-9329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Request for Comments

The notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on Outer Continental Shelf Activities, published on December 7, 1999 (64 FR 68416), encouraged interested persons to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments by April 5, 2000. It also invited comments on collection-of-information requirements to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) by February 7, 2000. We received a request to extend both of those dates to July 5, 2000, and did so by a notice of extension (65 FR 14226, March 16, 2000). As a result of several requests since that notice of extension, we are again extending both dates until November 30, 2000.

Persons submitting comments should include their names and addresses, identify this docket (USCG-1998-3868) and the specific section of the NPRM to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by mail, hand delivery, fax, or electronic means to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**; but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope.

The Coast Guard will consider all comments received during the comment

period. It may change this NPRM in view of them.

Dated: June 27, 2000.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Director of Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 00-16658 Filed 6-29-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CT-062-7221; A-1-FRL-6727-7]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Post-1996 Rate-of-Progress Plans

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the State of Connecticut. The revisions establish post-1996 rate-of-progress plans, including minor adjustments to the 1990 base year inventory, for the Greater Hartford serious ozone nonattainment area, and for the Connecticut portion of the New York, New Jersey, Connecticut (NY-NJ-CT) severe ozone nonattainment area. The intended effect of this action is to propose approval of these SIP revisions as meeting the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before July 31, 2000. Public comments on this document are requested and will be considered before taking final action on this SIP revision.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to David B. Conroy, Chief, Air Quality Planning Unit (mail code CAQ), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, Boston, MA 02114-2023. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours, by appointment at the Office of Ecosystem Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, 11th floor, Boston, MA, and at the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Management, 79 Elm Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert McConnell, (617) 918-1046.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This Supplementary Information section is organized as follows:

A. What action is EPA taking today?

B. Why was Connecticut required to reduce its emissions of ozone forming pollutants?

C. Which specific air pollutants are targeted by Connecticut's plans?

D. What are the sources of these pollutants?

E. What harmful effects can these pollutants produce?

F. Should I be concerned if I live near an industry that emits a significant amount of these pollutants?

G. To what degree do Connecticut's plans reduce emissions?

H. What changes were made to Connecticut's base year inventory?

I. How will Connecticut achieve these emission reductions?

J. Have these emission reductions improved air quality in Connecticut?

K. Connecticut is downwind of many large metropolitan areas. Do pollutants emitted in other States affect air quality in Connecticut?

L. EPA recently required 22 eastern states, including Connecticut, to develop plans that will significantly reduce nitrogen oxide emissions. Given that requirement, why is approval of these plans needed?

M. Has Connecticut met its contingency measure obligation?

N. Are conformity budgets contained in these plans?

A. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?

EPA is proposing approval of post-1996 rate-of-progress (ROP) emission reduction plans, and minor revisions to the 1990 base year inventory, submitted by the State of Connecticut for the Greater Hartford serious ozone nonattainment area, and the Connecticut portion of the NY-NJ-CT severe ozone nonattainment area, which is a multi-state ozone nonattainment area, as revisions to Connecticut's SIP. Connecticut did not enter into an agreement with New York and New Jersey to do a multi-state ROP plan, and therefore submitted a plan to reduce emissions only in the Connecticut portion of this area. EPA is proposing action today only on the Connecticut portion of the NY-NJ-CT post-1996 plan.

The post-1996 ROP plans document how Connecticut complied with the provisions of section 182(c)(2) of the Federal Clean Air Act (the Act). These sections of the Act require states containing certain ozone nonattainment areas develop strategies to reduce emissions of the pollutants that react to form ground level ozone.

B. Why Was Connecticut Required To Reduce Its Emissions of Ozone Forming Pollutants?

Connecticut was required to develop plans to reduce ozone precursor emissions because it contains ozone nonattainment areas. A final rule published by EPA on November 6, 1991 (56 FR 56694) designated portions of