

Drafting Information: The principal author of the regulations is Judith A. Lintz, Office of Assistant Chief Counsel (Income Tax & Accounting), Internal Revenue Service. However, other personnel from the IRS and Treasury Department participated in their development.

List of Subjects in 26 CFR Part 301

Employment taxes, Estate taxes, Excise taxes, Gift taxes, Income taxes, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Proposed Amendments to the Regulations

Accordingly, 26 CFR part 301 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 301—PROCEDURE AND ADMINISTRATION

Paragraph 1. The authority citation for part 301 continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 26 U.S.C. 7805 * * *

Par. 2. Section 301.7623-1 is revised to read as follows:

§ 301.7623-1 Rewards for information relating to violations of internal revenue laws.

[The text of this proposed revised section is the same as the text of § 301.7623-1T published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**.]

Michael P. Dolan,

Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

[FR Doc. 97-26859 Filed 10-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 946

[VA-111-FOR]

Virginia Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: OSM is announcing the receipt of a proposed amendment to the Virginia Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation (AMLR) Program (hereinafter referred to as the Virginia Program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA), 30 U.S.C. 1201 *et seq.*, as amended. The proposed amendment makes changes to the Ranking and

Selection section and to the AML Water Project Evaluation form. The proposed amendment is intended to revise the Virginia program to be consistent with SMCRA, and to improve the efficiency of the Virginia program.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before 4:00 p.m. on November 13, 1997. If requested, a public hearing on the proposed amendments will be held at 1:00 p.m. on November 10, 1997. Requests to present oral testimony at the hearing must be received on or before 4:00 p.m. on October 29, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests to testify at the hearing should be mailed or hand-delivered to Mr. Robert A. Penn, Director, Big Stone Gap Field Office at the first address listed below.

Copies of the Virginia program, the proposed amendment, a listing of any scheduled public meetings or hearing, and all written comments received in response to this notice will be available for public review at the address listed below during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays:

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement:

Big Stone Gap Field Office, P.O. Drawer 1217, Powell Valley Square Shopping Center, Room 220, Route 23, Big Stone Gap, Virginia 24219, Telephone: (703) 523-4303.

Virginia Division of Mined Land Reclamation, P.O. Drawer 900, Big Stone Gap, Virginia 24219, Telephone: (703) 523-8100.

Each requester may receive, free of charge, one copy of the proposed amendment by contacting the OSM Big Stone Gap Field Office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert A. Penn, Director, Big Stone Gap Field Office, Telephone: (703) 523-4303.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Virginia Program

On December 15, 1981, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Virginia program. Background on the Virginia program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval can be found in the December 15, 1981 **Federal Register** (46 FR 61085-61115). Subsequent actions concerning the conditions of approval and AMLR program amendments are identified at 30 CFR 946.20 and 946.25.

II. Discussion of the Proposed Amendment

By letter dated September 19, 1997 (Administrative Record No. VA-926), the Virginia Division of Mined Land Reclamation (DMLR) submitted a proposed Program Amendment to the Virginia Program. This amendment is intended to revise the Virginia program to be consistent with SMCRA at section 402(g)(6), and to improve the efficiency of the Virginia program.

The proposed amendments are as follows.

Ranking and Selection 884.13(c)(2)

In this section, Virginia proposes to change the heading of the paragraph titled "*Acid Mine Drainage Abatement—Treatment*" to read "*Set Aside Funds*," and to revise the language of that subsection to include the provisions of part A of section 402(g)(6) of SMCRA.

The revised language is as follows:

Set Aside Funds

In accordance with Section 402(g)(6) of SMCRA, Virginia may, without regard to the 3 year limitation referred to in Section 402(g)(91)(D) of SMCRA, receive and retain up to 10 percent of the total grants made annually under Section 402(g)(1) and (5) of SMCRA by the Secretary for deposit into either:

A. A special trust fund established under State law pursuant to which such amounts (together with all interest earned on such amounts) are expended by Virginia solely to achieve the priorities stated in section 403(a) of SMCRA after September 30, 1995, or

B. An acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund established under State law as provided for under 30 CFR Part 876. An interest bearing acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund will be utilized by Virginia, in consultation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, to implement acid mine drainage abatement-treatment plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

These plans shall provide for the comprehensive abatement of the causes and treatment of the effects of acid mine drainage within qualified hydrologic units affected by coal mining practices. The plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, each of the following:

(a) An identification of the qualified hydrologic unit.

(b) The extent to which acid mine drainage is affecting the water quality and biological resources within the hydrologic unit.

(c) An identification of the sources of acid mine drainage within the hydrologic unit.

(d) An identification of individual projects and the measures proposed to be undertaken to abate and treat the causes or effects of acid mine drainage within the hydrologic unit.

(e) The cost of undertaking the proposed abatement and treatment measures.

(f) An identification of existing and proposed sources of funding for such measures.

(g) An analysis of the cost-effectiveness and environmental benefits of abatement and treatment measures.

Under this program, the term qualified hydrologic unit means a hydrologic unit:

(a) In which the water quality has been significantly affected by acid mine drainage from coal mining practices in a manner which adversely impacts biological resources; and

(b) Which contains lands and water that are:

1. Eligible pursuant to Section 404 and include any of priorities stated in SMCRA paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of Section 403(a); and
2. Proposed to be the subject of the expenditures by the State from amounts available from the forfeiture of bonds required under Section 509 or from other State sources to mitigate acid mine drainage.

AML Water Project Evaluation Form

The AML Water Project Evaluation form is currently part of the approved Virginia program. Virginia is proposing to change four sections and has provided the following rationale for the changes.

Appropriate Project Costs (Cost Per Connection)

This was revised to more realistically reflect the cost/hook-ups being experienced. most cost/hook-ups now reflect a 10,000–20,000 range. This is because of the high cost for construction due to the distance between households, and the mountainous terrain.

Affordability

“Costs for 4,200 gal. of treated water” was changed to read “Costs for 3,500 gal. of treated water” to show the average use and to match usage rates used by other funding agencies as reflected in the review manual application.

Level of Commitment of Non-AML Funds

The points award were modified to encourage local funding and leverage AML funding to the maximum extent possible.

AML Bonus Award

This new review category is meant to promote and encourage awards to proposed projects which incorporate regionalization and consolidated management. Regionalization of water systems reduces costs and promotes efficiency in providing water to the greatest number of households. Points awarded for this will be between 1–5, and a total perfect score will now be 105. The average score on projects is 60–80.

In addition to the above changes to the form, Virginia requested that the AML Water Project Evaluation form—figure 2 be removed from the AML State Reclamation Plan and placed into the Administrative Record since additional changes to the form may be necessary in the future.

The full text of proposed program amendment submitted by Virginia is available for public inspection at the addresses listed above. The Director now seeks public comment on whether the proposed amendment is no less effective than the Federal regulations. If approved, the amendment will become part of the Virginia program.

III. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the provisions of 30 CFR 884.15, OSM is now seeking comment on whether the amendment proposed by Virginia satisfies the applicable requirements for the approval of State AMLR program amendments. If the amendment is deemed adequate, it will become part of the Virginia program.

Written Comments

Written comments should be specific, pertain only to the issues proposed in this rulemaking, and include explanations in support of the commenter's recommendations. Comments received after the time indicated under **DATES** or at locations other than the Big Stone Gap Field Office will not necessarily be considered in the final rulemaking or included in the Administrative Record.

Public Hearing

Persons wishing to comment at the public hearing should contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by close of business on October 29, 1997. If no one requests an opportunity to comment at a public hearing, the hearing will not be held.

Filing of a written statement at the time of the hearing is requested as it will greatly assist the transcriber. Submission of written statements in advance of the hearing will allow OSM

officials to prepare adequate responses and appropriate questions.

The public hearing will continue on the specified date until all persons scheduled to comment have been heard. Persons in the audience who have not been scheduled to comment and who wish to do so will be heard following those scheduled. The hearing will end after all persons who desire to comment have been heard.

Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to comment at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. Persons wishing to meet with OSM representatives to discuss the proposed amendments may request a meeting at the Big Stone Gap Field Office by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. All such meetings will be open to the public and, if possible, notices of the meetings will be posted in advance at the locations listed above under **ADDRESSES**. A summary of meeting will be included in the Administrative Record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review).

Executive Order 12988

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) and has determined that, to the extent allowed by law, this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15 and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States must be based solely on a determination whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

National Environmental Policy Act

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA [30 U.S.C. 1292(d)] provides that agency decisions on

proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose a cost of \$100 million or more in any given year on any governmental entity or the private sector.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 946

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: October 2, 1997.

Allen D. Klein,

Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 97-27066 Filed 10-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[VA 5026b; FRL-5904-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia: Approval of VOC RACT Determinations for Individual Sources

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve six State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia for the purpose of establishing volatile organic compound (VOC) reasonably available control technology (RACT) for six major sources of VOCs located in Virginia. In the Final Rules section of this Federal Register, EPA is approving the Commonwealth's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule and the accompanying technical support document. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. 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 on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If adverse comments are received that do not pertain to all documents subject to this rulemaking action, those documents not affected by the adverse comments will be finalized in the manner described here. Only those documents that receive adverse comments will be withdrawn.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing by October 29, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to David L. Arnold, Chief, Ozone/CO and Mobile Sources Section, Mailcode 3AT21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107; and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia, 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristeen Gaffney, (215) 566-2092, at the EPA Region III office or via e-mail at gaffney.kristeen@epamail.epa.gov. While information may be requested via e-mail, comments must be submitted in writing to the above Region III address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Refer to the information pertaining to this

action, VOC RACT determinations for individual sources located in Virginia, provided in the Direct Final action of the same title located in the Rules and Regulations Section of this **Federal Register**.

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

Dated: September 27, 1997.

William T. Wisniewski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 97-27128 Filed 10-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[VA 5029b; FRL-5904-4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia: VOC RACT for Phillip Morris, Hercules, Virginia Power Station and the Hopewell Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve six State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia for the purpose of establishing volatile organic compound (VOC) reasonably available control technology (RACT) for six major sources located in Virginia. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the Commonwealth's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial SIP revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule and the accompanying technical support document. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. 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 on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If adverse comments are received that do not pertain to all documents subject to this rulemaking action, those documents not affected by the adverse comments will be finalized in the manner described here. Only those documents that receive adverse comments will be withdrawn.