

(iv) The collateral consists entirely of cash items, Government Securities or other securities that at the time the repurchase agreement is entered into are rated in the highest rating category by the Requisite NRSROs; and

(v) Upon an Event of Insolvency with respect to the seller, the repurchase agreement would qualify under a provision of applicable insolvency law providing an exclusion from any automatic stay of creditors' rights against the seller.

(2) *Event of Insolvency* means, with respect to a person:

(i) An action of insolvency, the application by the person for the appointment of a trustee, receiver, rehabilitator, or similar officer for all or substantially all of its assets, a general assignment for the benefit of creditors, the filing by the person of a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or application for reorganization or an arrangement with creditors; or

(ii) The institution of similar proceedings by another person which proceedings are not contested by the person; or

(iii) The institution of similar proceedings by a government agency responsible for regulating the activities of the person, whether or not contested by the person.

(3) *Government Security* means any "Government Security" as defined in section 2(a)(16) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(16)).

(4) *Refunded Security* means a debt security the principal and interest payments of which are to be paid by Government Securities ("deposited securities") that have been irrevocably placed in an escrow account pursuant to an agreement between the issuer of the debt security and an escrow agent that is not an "affiliated person," as defined in section 2(a)(3)(C) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(3)(C)), of the issuer of the debt security, and, in accordance with such escrow agreement, are pledged only to the payment of the debt security and, to the extent that excess proceeds are available after all payments of principal, interest, and applicable premiums on the Refunded Securities, the expenses of the escrow agent and, thereafter, to the issuer or another party; *provided that*:

(i) The deposited securities shall not be redeemable prior to their final maturity;

(ii) The escrow agreement shall prohibit the substitution of the deposited securities unless the substituted securities are Government Securities; and

(iii) At the time the deposited securities are placed in the escrow

account, or at the time a substitution of the deposited securities is made, an independent certified public accountant shall have certified to the escrow agent that the deposited securities will satisfy all scheduled payments of principal, interest and applicable premiums on the Refunded Securities; *provided, however*, an independent public accountant need not have provided the certification described in this paragraph (c)(4)(iii) if the security, as a Refunded Security, has received a rating from an NRSRO in the highest category for debt obligations (within which there may be sub-categories or gradations indicating relative standing).

(5) *NRSRO* means any nationally recognized statistical rating organization, as that term is used in paragraphs (c)(2)(vi)(E), (F) and (H) of § 240.15c3-1 of this chapter, that is not an "affiliated person," as defined in section 2(a)(3)(C) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(3)(C)), of the issuer of, or any insurer or provider of credit support for, the security.

(6) *Requisite NRSROs* means:

(i) Any two NRSROs that have issued a rating with respect to a security or class of debt obligations of an issuer; or

(ii) If only one NRSRO has issued a rating with respect to such security or class of debt obligations of an issuer at the time the investment company acquires the security, that NRSRO.

(7) *Resale Price* means the acquisition price paid to the seller of the securities plus the accrued resale premium on such acquisition price. The accrued resale premium shall be the amount specified in the repurchase agreement or the daily amortization of the difference between the acquisition price and the resale price specified in the repurchase agreement.

4. Section 270.12d3-1 is amended by removing the appended Note.

By the Commission.

Dated: September 23, 1999.

**Margaret H. McFarland,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-25253 Filed 9-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

#### 27 CFR Part 9

RIN 1512-AA07

[Notice No. 882]

#### Diamond Mountain Viticultural Area (99R-223P)

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) has received a petition proposing the Diamond Mountain viticultural area. This petition was submitted by Rudy von Strasser of Von Strasser Winery on behalf of the Diamond Mountain Appellation Committee, whose 15 growers and vintners represent 87 percent of the total vineyard holdings in the proposed area. The Diamond Mountain proposed viticultural area is located entirely within the Napa Valley viticultural area. The proposed viticultural area encompasses approximately 5,000 acres, of which approximately 450 acres are planted to vineyards.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by November 29, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, P.O. Box 50221, Washington, DC 20091-0221 (Attn: Notice No. 882). Copies of the petition, the proposed regulations, the appropriate maps, and any written comments received will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at the ATF Reading Room, Office of Public Affairs and Disclosure, room 6480, 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20226

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas B. Busey, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, 650 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20226 (202) 927-8199.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 23, 1978, ATF published Treasury Decision ATF-53 (43 FR 37672, 54624) revising regulations in 27 CFR Part 4. These regulations allow the establishment of definitive viticultural areas. The regulations allow the name of an approved viticultural area to be used as an appellation of origin on wine labels and in wine advertisements. On

October 2, 1979, ATF published Treasury Decision ATF-60 (44 FR 56692) which added a new Part 9 to 27 CFR, for the listing of approved American viticultural areas, the names of which may be used as appellations of origin.

Section 4.25a(e)(1), title 27, CFR, defines an American viticultural area as a delimited grape-growing region distinguishable by geographic features, the boundaries of which have been delineated in Subpart C of Part 9.

Section 4.25a(e)(2) outlines the procedure for proposing an American viticultural area. Any interested person may petition ATF to establish a grape-growing region as a viticultural area. The petition should include:

(a) Evidence that the name of the proposed viticultural area is locally and/or nationally known as referring to the area specified in the petition;

(b) Historical or current evidence that the boundaries of the viticultural area are as specified in the petition;

(c) Evidence relating to the geographical characteristics (climate, soil, elevation, physical features, etc.) which distinguish the viticultural features of the proposed area from surrounding areas;

(d) A description of the specific boundaries of the viticultural area, based on features which can be found on United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) maps of the largest applicable scale; and

(e) A copy (or copies) of the appropriate U.S.G.S. map(s) with the boundaries prominently marked.

#### **Petition**

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) has received a petition proposing a new viticultural area to be called Diamond Mountain. The proposed viticultural area is located entirely in Napa County, California. The proposed area encompasses approximately 5,000 acres, of which approximately 450 acres are planted to vineyards.

#### **Evidence That the Name of the Area is Locally or Nationally Known**

According to the petitioner, Diamond Mountain has been home to vineyards and wineries since the 1860's. The petitioner presented evidence that a Mr. Joseph Schram planted his first vines as early as 1863 and had a hundred acres of vineyards by 1892.

According to the petitioner, the evolution of Diamond Mountain into a Napa Valley regional name began in the early decades of the 20th century, with Diamond Mountain School and Diamond Mountain Road being the first

features in the region to bear the name. The naming of the school took place in 1909, with the major access road in the region designated as Diamond Mountain Road shortly thereafter.

The petitioner has also presented substantial evidence that the Diamond Mountain region began to gain national renown in the early 1970's, as expanding consumer interest in California wines resulted in new vineyards, new wineries and a greater awareness of regional wine character. As evidence for this national name the petitioner includes an excerpt from the second edition of *The Wines of America* by Leon Adams that states, "Diamond Mountain, like Mt. Veeder and Spring Mountain also on the west side of Napa Valley, is regarded as a viticultural district separate from the rest of Napa Valley."

#### **Historical or Current Evidence That the Boundaries of the Viticultural Area Are as Specified in the Petition**

According to the petitioner, precise boundaries for the region being proposed have never been delineated. The petitioner does, however, state that Diamond Mountain's viticultural history and identity are associated almost exclusively with the Napa Valley, in Napa County. For this reason, the boundaries of the proposed viticultural area are entirely within Napa County. According to the petitioner, the petition takes a conservative approach to establishing boundaries for Diamond Mountain. The petitioner states that special care has been taken to assure that the boundaries encompass only those lands that meet both the historic and geographic criteria for inclusion in the proposed viticultural area. Also, the boundaries have been drawn to respect neighboring regions with separate names, histories, geographic features and political boundaries.

The petitioner cites the Fourth Edition of "The Connoisseurs' Handbook of the Wines of California and the Pacific Northwest" for a description of the proposed area "... a portion of the Napa Valley's western hills between St. Helena and Calistoga". This citation is accompanied by a map which shows the rough limits of the region: Spring Mountain to the south, the 400 foot elevation that generally parallels Highway 29 to the east, Petrified Forest Road to the north and the Napa-Sonoma County line to the west.

The petitioner claims that the 400 foot contour line for the northeastern boundary accurately reflects the lowest elevation of vineyards historically associated with Diamond Mountain.

The petitioner also claims that the southwestern boundary acknowledges the historic association of the proposed Diamond Mountain viticultural area with Napa County and Napa Valley, and also recognizes the differences in history and geography that distinguish Diamond Mountain from adjacent slopes of the Mayacama Mountains in Sonoma County.

#### **Evidence Relating to the Geographical Features (Climate, Soil, Elevation, Physical Features, Etc.) Which Distinguish Viticultural Features of the Proposed Area From Surrounding Areas**

According to the petitioner, the geographical features in the proposed Diamond Mountain viticultural area clearly distinguish it from surrounding areas. The Diamond Mountain region is situated in the Napa Valley on the eastern slope of the Mayacamas Mountains. The region consists entirely of residual upland soils derived from volcanic parent material. According to the petitioner, these soils are very different from the alluvial soils on the floor of the Napa Valley to the east and northeast and are also significantly different from the sedimentary upland soils prevalent in the Spring Mountain viticultural area to the south. The petitioner also emphasizes that these soils are significantly different from the shallow, dry soils in Sonoma County to the west and southwest.

According to the petitioner, the proposed viticultural area's topography and aspect contribute to a special microclimate. Hillside topography and valley temperature inversions combine to give the region an unusually moderate temperate regime during a growing season, with lower maximum temperatures and higher minimum temperatures than nearby locations on the floor of the Napa Valley. The petitioner states that the microclimate of the Diamond Mountain region is clearly distinctive when compared to the surrounding areas. The region's microclimate is slightly warmer than that of the Spring Mountain District to the south, but somewhat similar due to comparable upland locations, northeastern (eastern, in Spring Mountain's case) aspects, and cooling influence of marine breezes from the Pacific Ocean. The microclimate is significantly cooler than the floor of the Napa Valley to its northeast and north, due to various tempering influences primarily associated with its upland location. So too is it cooler than adjacent land to the west in Sonoma County, due to its predominantly northeastern aspect which provides

oblique sun and shade in the afternoon, while the western aspect of the Mayacamas Mountains adjacent to the region in Sonoma County is clearly hotter and drier.

#### Proposed Boundaries

The proposed viticultural area is located in Napa County, California. The approved USGS maps for determining the boundary of the proposed Diamond Mountain viticultural area are, "Mark West Springs, Calif.", 7.5 minute series, edition of 1993, and the "Calistoga, Calif.", 7.5 minute series, edition of 1993.

The northeastern boundary follows the 400 foot contour line from Ritchey Creek northwest to the Petrified Forest Road and the northern boundary follows the Petrified Forest Road west from the 400 foot contour line to the Napa-Sonoma county line. The southwestern boundary follows the official boundary line between Napa and Sonoma counties southeast from Petrified Forest Road to the east-west boundary between Sections 18 and 19 in Township 8 North, Range 6 West, Mount Diablo Range and Meridian. The southern boundary follows the boundary between Sections 18 and 19, Sections 17 and 20 and Ritchey Creek east from the Napa-Sonoma county line to the 400 foot elevation line. It also corresponds with the Northern Boundary of the Spring Mountain District viticultural area.

#### Public Participation—Written Comments

ATF requests comments from all interested persons. Comments received on or before the closing date will be carefully considered. Comments received after that date will be given the same consideration if it is practical to do so. However, assurance of consideration can only be given to comments received on or before the closing date.

ATF will not recognize any submitted material as confidential and comments may be disclosed to the public. Any material which the commenter considers to be confidential or inappropriate for disclosure to the public should not be included in the comments. The name of the person submitting a comment is not exempt from disclosure.

Comments may be submitted by facsimile transmission to (202) 927-8602, provided the comments: (1) Are legible; (2) are 8½" × 11" in size, (3) contain a written signature, and (4) are three pages or less in length. This limitation is necessary to assure reasonable access to the equipment. Comments sent by FAX in excess of

three pages will not be accepted. Receipt of FAX transmittals will not be acknowledged. Facsimile transmitted comments will be treated as originals.

Any person who desires an opportunity to comment orally at a public hearing on the proposed regulation should submit his or her request, in writing, to the Director within the 60-day comment period. The Director, however, reserves the right to determine, in light of all circumstances, whether a public hearing will be held.

#### Paperwork Reduction Act

The provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR Part 1320, do not apply to this notice because no requirement to collect information is proposed.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Act

It is hereby certified that this proposed regulation will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The establishment of a viticultural area is neither an endorsement nor approval by ATF of the quality of wine produced in the area, but rather an identification of an area that is distinct from surrounding areas. ATF believes that the establishment of viticultural areas merely allows wineries to more accurately describe the origin of their wines to consumers, and helps consumers identify the wines they purchase. Thus, any benefit derived from the use of a viticultural area name is the result of the proprietor's own efforts and consumer acceptance of wines from that area.

No new requirements are proposed. Accordingly, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

#### Executive Order 12866

It has been determined that this proposed regulation is not a significant regulatory action as defined by Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, this proposal is not subject to the analysis required by this Executive Order.

*Drafting Information.* The principal author of this document is Thomas B. Busey, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

#### List of Subjects in 27 CFR Part 9

Administrative practices and procedures, Consumer protection, Viticultural areas, and Wine.

#### Authority and Issuance

Title 27, Code of Federal Regulations, part 9, American Viticultural Areas, is proposed to be amended as follows:

#### PART 9—AMERICAN VITICULTURAL AREAS

**Paragraph 1.** The authority citation for part 9 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 27 U.S.C. 205.

**Par. 2.** Subpart C is amended by adding Section 9.166 to read as follows

#### Subpart C—Approved American Viticultural Areas

\* \* \* \* \*

#### § 9.166 Diamond Mountain.

(a) *Name.* The name of the viticultural area described in this section is "Diamond Mountain."

(b) *Approved map.* The appropriate maps for determining the boundary of the Diamond Mountain viticultural area are two 1:24,000 Scale U.S.G.S. topography maps. They are titled:

- (1) Mark West Springs, CA 1993
- (2) Calistoga, CA 1993

(c) *Boundary.* The proposed viticultural area is located in Napa County, California. The beginning point is where the boundary between Napa and Sonoma counties intersects Petrified Forest Road in Section 3 of Township 8 North, Range 7 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian on the Mark West Springs map;

(1) Then north and east along Petrified Forest Road approximately 1.9 miles to the point where it intersects the 400 foot contour just east of Section 35 of Township 9 North, Range 7 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the Mallacomes land grant;

(2) Then generally east southeast along the 400 foot contour approximately 6.5 miles to the point where it intersects Ritchey Creek in Section 3 of Township 8 North, Range 6 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian;

(3) Then west southwest along Ritchey Creek approximately 2.2 miles to the point where it intersects the boundary between Sections 17 and 20 of Township 8 North, Range 6 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian;

(4) Then due west in a straight line along the section boundary approximately 0.8 miles to the point where it intersects the boundary between Napa and Sonoma Counties between Sections 18 and 19 of Township 8 North, Range 6 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian;

(5) Then generally northwest along the boundary between Napa and

Sonoma Counties approximately 4.2 miles to the point where it intersects Petrified Forest Road, to the point of beginning.

Signed: September 21, 1999.

**John W. Magaw,**  
*Director.*

[FR Doc. 99-25286 Filed 9-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[NH-038-7165b; A-1-FRL-6445-3]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Stage II Comparability and Clean Fuel Fleets

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA is proposing to approve two State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions that the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services submitted to EPA: New Hampshire's Stage II comparability demonstration submitted on July 9, 1998 and Clean Fuel Fleets opt out submitted on June 7, 1994. In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittals as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views these as noncontroversial submittals and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before October 29, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Susan Studlien, Deputy Director, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Boston, MA 02114-2023. Copies of the State's submittal and EPA's technical support document 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 Air Resources Division, Department of Environmental Services, 64 North Main Street, Caller Box 2033, Concord, NH 03302-2033.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Anne E. Arnold, (617) 918-1047, for Stage II Comparability and Matthew B. Cairns, (617) 918-1667, for Clean Fuel Fleets.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: September 17, 1999.

**John P. DeVillars,**  
*Regional Administrator, Region I.*

[FR Doc. 99-25157 Filed 9-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA-1893, MM Docket No. 99-289, RM-9668]

#### Digital Television Broadcast Service; Champaign, IL

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Midwest Television, Inc., licensee of station WCIA(TV), NTSC 3, Champaign, Illinois, proposing the substitution of DTV Channel 5 for station WCIA(TV)'s assigned DTV Channel 48. DTV Channel 5 can be substituted and allotted to Champaign, Illinois, as proposed, in compliance with the principle community coverage requirements of Section 73.625(a) at reference coordinates 40-06-23 N. and 88-26-59 W. As requested, we also propose to modify WCIA(TV)'s authorization to specify operation on the alternate DTV Channel 5 at Champaign, Illinois, with a power of 4.5 (kW) and a height above average terrain (HAAT) of 287 meters.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before November 9, 1999, and reply comments on or before November 24, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Jonathan D. Blake, Mary Newcomer Williams, Covington & Burling, 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue,

NW, Post Office Box 7566, Washington, DC 20044-7566 (Counsel for Midwest Television, Inc.).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418-1600.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 99-289, adopted September 17, 1999, and released September 20, 1999. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 1231 20th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Barbara A. Kreisman,**  
*Chief, Video Services Division, Mass Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 99-25150 Filed 9-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 73

[DA 99-1942, MM Docket No. 99-291, RM-9665]

#### Digital Television Broadcast Service; Reno, NV

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission requests comments on a petition filed by Sarkes Tarzian, Inc., licensee of station KTVN(TV), NTSC 2, Reno, Nevada, proposing the substitution of DTV Channel 13 for station KTVN(TV)'s assigned DTV Channel 32. DTV Channel 13 can be substituted and allotted to Reno, Nevada, as proposed, in