

(j) If the ABCMR receives the request within 1 year of the ABCMR's action and if the ABCMR has not previously reconsidered the matter, the ABCMR staff will review the request to determine if it contains evidence (including, but not limited to, any facts or arguments as to why relief should be granted) that was not in the record at the time of the ABCMR's prior consideration. If new evidence has been submitted, the request will be submitted to the ABCMR for its determination of whether the new evidence is sufficient to demonstrate material error or injustice. If no new evidence is found, the ABCMR staff will return the application to the applicant without action.

(ii) If the ABCMR receives the request more than 1 year after the ABCMR's action or after the ABCMR has already considered one request for reconsideration, the ABCMR staff will review the request to determine if substantial relevant evidence is submitted showing fraud, mistake of law, mathematical miscalculation, manifest error, or the existence of substantial relevant new evidence discovered contemporaneously or within a short time after the ABCMR's original consideration. If the ABCMR staff finds such evidence, it will be submitted to the ABCMR for its determination of whether a material error or injustice exists and the proper remedy. If the ABCMR staff does not find such evidence, the application will be returned to the applicant without action.

(h) *Claims/Expenses.*—(1) *Authority.*

(i) The Army, by law, may pay claims for amounts due to applicants as a result of correction of military records.

(ii) The Army may not pay any claim previously compensated by Congress through enactment of a private law.

(iii) The Army may not pay for any benefit to which the applicant might later become entitled under the laws and regulations managed by the VA.

(2) *Settlement of claims.* (i) The ABCMR will furnish DFAS copies of decisions potentially affecting monetary entitlement or benefits. The DFAS will treat such decisions as claims for payment by or on behalf of the applicant.

(ii) The DFAS will settle claims on the basis of the corrected military record. The DFAS will compute the amount due, if any. The DFAS may require applicants to furnish additional information to establish their status as proper parties to the claim and to aid in deciding amounts due. Earnings received from civilian employment during any period for which active duty

pay and allowances are payable will be deducted. The applicant's acceptance of a settlement fully satisfies the claim concerned.

(3) *Payment of expenses.* The Army may not pay attorney's fees or other expenses incurred by or on behalf of an applicant in connection with an application for correction of military records under 10 U.S.C. 1552.

(i) *Miscellaneous Provisions.*—(1) *Special Standards.* (i) Pursuant to the November 27, 1979 order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *Giles v. Secretary of the Army* (Civil Action No. 77-0904), a former Army soldier is entitled to an honorable discharge if a less than honorable discharge was issued to the soldier on or before November 27, 1979 in an administrative proceeding in which the Army introduced evidence developed by or as a direct or indirect result of compelled urinalysis testing administered for the purpose of identifying drug abusers (either for the purposes of entry into a treatment program or to monitor progress through rehabilitation or follow-up).

(ii) Applicants who believe that they fall within the scope of paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section should place the term "CATEGORY G" in block 11b of DD Form 149. Such applications should be expeditiously reviewed by a designated official, who will either send the individual an honorable discharge certificate if the individual falls within the scope of paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section, or forward the application to the Discharge Review Board if the individual does not fall within the scope of paragraph (i)(1)(i) of this section. The action of the designated official will not constitute an action or decision by the ABCMR.

(2) *Public access to decisions.* (i) After deletion of personal information, a redacted copy of each decision will be indexed by subject and made available for review and copying at a public reading room at Crystal Mall 4, 1941 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia. The index will be in a usable and concise form so as to indicate the topic considered and the reasons for the decision. Under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), records created on or after November 1, 1996 will be available by electronic means.

(ii) Under the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a), the ABCMR will not furnish to third parties information submitted with or about an application unless specific written authorization is received from the applicant or unless

the Board is otherwise authorized by law.

**Karl F. Schneider,**

*Deputy, Assistant Secretary (Army Review Boards).*

[FR Doc. 00-8089 Filed 3-31-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[CGD01-00-014]

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Norwalk River, CT

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of temporary deviation from regulations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commander, First Coast Guard District, has issued a temporary deviation from the drawbridge operation regulations for the Washington Street S136 Bridge, mile 0.0, across the Norwalk River at Norwalk, Connecticut. This deviation from the regulations allows the bridge owner to keep the S136 Bridge in the closed position Tuesday through Thursday each week from March 28 through April 20, 2000. These closures are necessary to facilitate structural repairs at the bridge.

**DATES:** This deviation is effective March 28, 2000, through April 20, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Joe Arca, Project Officer, First Coast Guard District, at (212) 668-7165.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Washington Street S136 Bridge, mile 0.0, across the Norwalk River at Norwalk, Connecticut, has a vertical clearance of 9 feet at mean high water, and 16 feet at mean low water in the closed position. The bridge owner, Connecticut Department of Transportation, requested a temporary deviation from the operating regulations to facilitate structural repairs at the bridge. The existing operating regulations listed at 33 CFR 117.217 require the bridge to open on signal, except that, from 7 a.m. to 8:45 a.m., 11:45 a.m. to 1:15 p.m., and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays, the draw need not be opened for the passage of vessels that draw less than 14 feet of water.

This deviation to the operating regulations allows the owner of the bridge to keep the bridge in the closed position as follows:

March 28, 2000, through March 30, 2000;

April 4, 2000, through April 6, 2000; April 11, 2000, through April 13, 2000; April 18, 2000, through April 20, 2000.

These repairs are being performed during the time period that there have been few requests to open the bridge. Vessels that can pass under the bridge without an opening may do so at all times.

In accordance with 33 CFR 117.35(c), this work will be performed with all due speed in order to return the bridge to normal operation as soon as possible. This deviation from the operating regulations is authorized under 33 CFR 117.35.

Dated: March 22, 2000.

**G.N. Naccara**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, First Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 00-8139 Filed 3-31-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915-15-U-P**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

### **40 CFR Part 52**

**[FRL-6566-5]**

#### **Finding of Failure To Submit a Required State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide; Fairbanks, Alaska**

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

**ACTION:** Finding of Failure to Submit.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is taking final action in making a finding, under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act), that Alaska failed to make a carbon monoxide (CO) nonattainment area State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal required for Fairbanks under the Act. Under certain provisions of the Act, states are required to submit SIPs providing for, among other things, reasonable further progress and attainment of the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in areas classified as serious. The deadline for submittal of this plan for Fairbanks was October 1, 1999. This action triggers the 18-month time clock for mandatory application of sanctions and 2-year time clock for a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) under the Act. This action is consistent with the CAA mechanism for assuring SIP submissions.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This action is effective as of April 3, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to: Ms. Debra Suzuki, Office of Air Quality (OAQ-107), EPA, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Pavitt, U.S. EPA, Region 10, Alaska Operations Office, 222 W. 7th Avenue, #19, Anchorage, Alaska, 99513-7588, Telephone (907) 271-5083.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **I. Background**

The CAA Amendments of 1990 were enacted on November 15, 1990. Under Section 107(d)(1)(c) of the amended CAA, each CO area designated nonattainment prior to enactment of the 1990 Amendments, such as the Fairbanks area, was designated nonattainment by operation of law upon enactment of the 1990 Amendments. Under section 186(a) of the Act, each CO area designated nonattainment under section 107(d) was also classified by operations of law as either "moderate" or "serious" depending on the severity of the area's air quality problem. CO areas with design values between 9.1 and 16.4 parts per million (ppm), such as the Fairbanks area, were classified as moderate. These nonattainment designations and classifications were codified in 40 CFR part 81. See 56 FR 56846 (November 6, 1991).

(1) The CO nonattainment area is the "Fairbanks Area, Fairbanks Election District (part), Fairbanks nonattainment area boundary." 40 CFR 81.302.

States containing areas that were classified as moderate nonattainment by operation of law under section 107(d) were required to submit SIPs designed to attain the CO NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable but no later than December 31, 1995.

(2) The moderate area SIP requirements are set forth in section 187(a) of the Act and differ depending on whether the area's design value is below or above 12.7 ppm. The Fairbanks area has a design value below 12.7 ppm. 40 CFR 81.302.

On February 27, 1998 EPA made a final finding that the Fairbanks CO nonattainment area did not attain the CO NAAQS under the CAA mandated attainment date of December 31, 1995 for moderate nonattainment. As a result of that finding, which went into effect on March 30, 1998, (63 FR 9945 February 27, 1998) the Fairbanks, Alaska CO nonattainment area was reclassified as serious. The State had 18 months or until October 1, 1999 to submit a new State Implementation Plan (SIP) demonstrating attainment of the CO NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable but no later than December 31, 2000, the CAA attainment date for serious areas. The Fairbanks area continues to exceed the CO standard with three exceedances in 1997, three in

1998, two in 1999 and, based upon preliminary review of the data, at least one in 2000. Notwithstanding significant efforts by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation to complete their CO SIP, the state has failed to meet the October 1, 1999 deadline for the required SIP submission. EPA is therefore compelled to find that the State of Alaska has failed to make the required SIP submission for Fairbanks. The CAA established specific consequences if EPA finds that a State has failed to meet certain requirements of the CAA. Of particular relevance here is CAA section 179(a)(1), the mandatory sanctions provisions. Sections 179(a) sets forth four findings that form the basis for applications of a sanction. The first finding, that a State has failed to submit a plan required under the CAA, is the finding relevant to this rulemaking.

If Alaska has not made the required complete submittal by October 3, 2001, pursuant to CAA section 179(a) and 40 CFR 52.31, the offset sanction identified in CAA section 179(b) will be applied in the affected area. If the State has still not made a complete submission by April 3, 2002, then the highway funding sanction will apply in the affected area, in accordance with 40 CFR 52.31. In addition, CAA section 110(c) provides that EPA must promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP).

(3) In a 1994 rulemaking, EPA established the Agency's selection of the sequence of these two sanctions: the offset sanction under section 179(b)(2) shall apply at 18 months, followed 6 months later by the highway sanction under section 179(b)(1) of the Act. EPA does not choose to deviate from this presumptive sequence in this instance. For more details on the timing and implementation of the sanctions, see 59 FR 39832 (August 4, 1994), promulgating 40 CFR 52.31, "Selection of sequence of mandatory sanctions for findings made pursuant to section 179 of the Clean Air Act."

The sanctions will not take effect if, before October 3, 2001, EPA finds that the State has made a complete submittal of a plan addressing the serious area CO requirements for Fairbanks. In addition, EPA will not promulgate a FIP if the State makes the required SIP submittal and EPA takes final action to approve the submittal before April 3, 2002, (section 110(c)(1) of the Act). EPA encourages the responsible parties in Alaska to continue working together on the CO Plan which can eliminate the need for potential sanctions and FIP.