Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the "Attorney General's Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings" issued under the Executive Order. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q.

Dated: March 7, 2000.

#### A. Stanley Meiburg,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 4. [FR Doc. 00–6566 Filed 3–16–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[OH132-1; KY116-1; KY84-1; FRL-6562-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio and Kentucky; Reopening of the Public Comment Period

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; reopening of the public comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is reopening the public comment period for a proposed rule published on January 24, 2000 (65 FR 3630). In the January 24, 2000 proposed rule, EPA proposed to determine that the Cincinnati-Hamilton moderate ozone nonattainment area (Cincinnati-Hamilton area) has attained the public health based 1-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). EPA proposed to determine that certain attainment demonstration requirements, along with certain other

related requirements, of part D of Title 1 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) are not applicable to the Cincinnati-Hamilton area. The EPA proposed to approve the State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency's and the Commonwealth of Kentucky Natural Resources and **Environmental Protection Cabinet's** requests to redesignate the Cincinnati-Hamilton ozone nonattainment area to attainment of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS. EPA re-proposed to approve an exemption from the nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>X</sub>) requirements as provided for in section 182(f) of the CAA for the Kentucky portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton area. EPA solicited public comment on the Ohio and Kentucky requests and on EPA's proposed actions. At the request of the Ohio Chapter of the Sierra Club, EPA is reopening the comment period through March 24, 2000. All comments received before March 24, 2000, including those received between the close of the comment period on February 23, 2000 and the publication of this proposed rule, will be entered into the public record and considered by EPA before taking final action on the proposed rule.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before March 24, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to:

J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Kay Prince, Chief, Regulatory Planning Section, Air Planning Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William Jones, Environmental Scientist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886–6058, (jones.william@EPA.gov).

Karla L. McCorkle, Environmental Scientist, Regulatory Planning Section, Air Planning Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia, 30303, 404–562– 9043, (mccorkle.karla@epa.gov).

Dated: March 10, 2000.

### Jerri-Anne Garl,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5. [FR Doc. 00–6713 Filed 3–16–00; 8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

**Health Care Financing Administration** 

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

42 CFR Part 493

[HCFA-2233-N]

RIN 0938-AH35

# CLIA Program; Cytology Proficiency Testing

AGENCY: Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC),

**ACTION:** Withdrawal of proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces the withdrawal of a proposed rule on cytology proficiency testing that was published in the Federal Register November 30, 1995 (60 FR 61509). We published the proposed rule to comply with a court order that we revise the regulations to require that cytology proficiency testing (PT) be conducted, to the extent practicable, under normal working conditions," which the court interpreted to be at a pace corresponding to the maximum workload rate for individuals examining cytology slides. After the proposed rule was published, the appeals court overturned the lower court's ruling and remanded the regulation to us for completion of rulemaking or to provide our rationale for the original position we took with respect to cytology proficiency testing. This document withdraws the proposed rule and also contains a supplementary statement of rationale, in accordance with the appeals court ruling.

**DATES:** The proposed rule is withdrawn as of April 17, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rhonda S. Whalen (770) 488–8155. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### I. Background

On February 28, 1992, we published a final rule with comment period in the **Federal Register** (57 FR 7002) to implement the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA) (Pub. L. 100–578). One provision of CLIA, section 353(f)(4)(B)(i) of the Public Health Service Act (PHS Act), required the Department to establish a limit on the maximum number of cytology slides that an individual could examine daily, in order to ensure that he or she has sufficient time to adequately examine each slide. CLIA also required