dynamic so that the Forest Service can respond rapidly to issues and opportunities identified through discussions with the public, monitoring, broad-scale or local assessments, new laws and policies, etc.

The scale of Forest Service planning would be based on the scale of the topic to be considered rather than Forest Service administrative boundaries. For example, two, three, or twenty national forest might work together to address a certain issue. Issues extending beyond national forest and grassland boundaries would also be addresses, while respecting private property boundaries. Land management plans are based on realistic funding levels so that they do not create expectations that cannot be fulfilled. Plans become a collection of decisions, like a loose-leaf notebook, that stay current and continue to guide decisions rather than a weighty book that gathers dust on the shelf once it is completed.

Theme 4: Collaboration

The theme of collaboration is an especially important aspect of the proposed rule, and we would like some specific advice from you on this subject. Collaboration means actively engaging the public, interested organizations, and federal, tribal, state and local governments in solving problems that affect national forests and grasslands.

Under the proposed rule, the Forest Service would: (1) Actively engage its partners in Forest Service activities; (2) convene, facilitate, and participate in efforts aimed at solving problems, defining future goals and opportunities, and addressing issues that affect national forests and grasslands; (3) partner with other governments, agencies, companies, and individuals to address issues that are common across a shared landscape; and (4) make future planning processes transparent.

We know that your time and energy are valuable, and given that government entities like the Forest Service have specific duties and responsibilities they must fulfill. The Forest Service, for example cannot give up its final decisionmaking authority. Given this information, what are some general guidelines the Forest Service should follow in working with others in addressing natural resources issues? What are some things the Forest Service can do to best take advantage of your expertise and the skills of other people interested in the future of our national forests and grasslands?

Dated: December 7, 1999.

Hilda Diaz-Soltero,

Associate Chief for Natural Resources.

[FR Doc. 99–32146 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA–217–0204–EC; FRL –6505–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District; Reopening of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of the comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is reopening the comment period for a proposed rule published October 28, 1999 (64 FR 58008). On October 28, 1999, EPA proposed a limited approval and limited disapproval of revisions to the California State Implementation Plan for the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). This revision concerns SJVUAPCD Rule 4354 which controls oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions from glass melting furnaces. In response to a request from the California Environmental Associates, EPA is reopoening the comment period for 30 days.

DATES: The comment period is reopened until December 29, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to: Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office (AIR–4), Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karen Irwin at (415) 744–1903.

Dated: December 1, 1999.

Alexis Strauss,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 99–32180 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 226

[Docket No.991116305–9305–01; I.D. No.110599D]

RIN 0648–AL82

Designated Critical Habitat: Re-Proposed Critical Habitat for Johnson's Seagrass

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of hearing; request for comments; correction.

SUMMARY: In the proposed rule on designating critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass, published on December 2, 1999, the Figures beginning on page 67542 did not have complete latitude and longitude designations. This document corrects the proposed rule.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this proposed designation of critical habitat should be addressed to the Mr. Charles Oravetz, Assistant Regional Administrator, Protected Resources Division, NMFS, Southeast Regional Office, 9721 Executive Center Drive North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33702–2432. Comments may be sent via facsimile (fax) to 727–570–5517. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or Internet. A public hearing on this proposal will be held at the South Florida Water Management District auditorium, 3301 Gun Club Road, West Palm Beach, Florida, 33416–4680 (see **DATES**).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Layne Bolen, Southeast Region, Protected Resources Division, NMFS, 727–570–5312, layne.bolen@noaa.gov or Marta Nammack, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 301–713–1401, marta.nammack@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Need for Correction

In the December 2, 1999 issue of the **Federal Register**, in proposed rule FR Doc. 99–31304, (64 FR 67536), the figures on pages 67542 (Figure 1), 67543 (Figure 2), 67544 (Figure 3), 67545 (Figure 4), 67546 (Figure 5), 67547 (Figure 6), 67549 (Figure 8) and 67550 (Figure 9) had incomplete latitude and longitude designations. This document corrects the latitude and longitude designations as follows:

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P