the formula provided in the standard. Other indirect costs attributable to respondents would include the cost of observer certification. It was assumed in this analysis that of the 34 by-product recovery plants only 10% would be required to implement the work practice procedures, specified in the work practice plan, which is require following the second independent exceedance of an applicable visible emission limitation for an emission point. It was also assumed in the analysis that 10% of the 34 by-product plants would experience a venting episode where emissions are released through bypass/bleeder stacks without flaring and, therefore, require to submit a notification and written report to EPA. The nonrecovery plants are not required to use a certified observer to monitor the oven pressure to control emissions from coke oven doors. However, nonrecovery plants are subject to work practices for charging operations for which they need to keep records.

Other specific assumptions made in calculating the burden estimate analysis include: (1) One plant per year will submit a notification for construction or reconstruction, use of new recovery technology, and startup of cold-idle batteries; (2) the enforcement agency will receive requests for an alternative door standard; (3) 1 plant would permanently close batteries and would be required to submit a notification; (4) 1 plant will submit a compliance certification, all existing plants have already submitted by the required date initial compliance certifications; (5) all plants will submit semiannual compliance certifications; (6) 20% of the 35 existing plants had initially selected to comply with the LAER extension compliance track or to straddle both the MACT and LAER compliance track, and would have to submit by January 1998 a notification on whether they want to continue this extension track until the end of the allowable period or comply with the 1995 MACT limits and residual risk standards; (7) no requests for an alternative control system would be submitted to the enforcement agency; and (8) 2 of the 35 existing plants may experience malfunction and, therefore are required to submit a notification and a written report to the enforcement agency.

Dated: August 6, 1999.

Ken Gigliello,

Acting Director, Manufacturing Energy, and Transportation Division.

[FR Doc. 99–21167 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6418–4]

Public Water System Supervision Program Revision for the State of South Dakota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Public notice is hereby given in accordance with the provisions of section 1413 of the Safe Drinking Water Act as amended, 42 U.S.C. 300g–2, and 40 CFR part 142, subpart B-Primary Enforcement Responsibility, that the State of South Dakota has revised its Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) Primacy Program. South Dakota's PWSS program, administered by the Drinking Water Program of the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), has adopted regulations for lead and copper in drinking water that correspond to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) in 40 CFR part 141, subpart I (56 FR 26460–26564, June 7, 1991). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed its review of South Dakota's primacy revisions and has determined that they are no less stringent than the NPDWRs. EPA therefore proposes to approve South Dakota's primacy revisions for the Lead and Copper Rule. Today's approval action does not extend to public water systems in Indian Country as that term is defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. Please see Indian Country section.

DATES: Any interested parties are invited to submit written comments on this determination, and may request a public hearing on or before September 15, 1999. If a public hearing is requested and granted, this determination shall not become effective until such time following the hearing that the Regional Administrator issues an order affirming or rescinding this action.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests for a public hearing should be addressed to: William P. Yellowtail, Regional Administrator, c/o Linda Himmelbauer (8P–W–MS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202–2466.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Himmelbauer, Municipal Systems Unit, EPA Region 8 (8P–W–MS), 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202–2466 telephone 303–312–6263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Frivolous or insubstantial requests for a hearing may be denied by the Regional Administrator. However, if a substantial request is made within thirty (30) days after this document, a public hearing will be held.

Any request for a public hearing shall include the following: (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the individual, organization, or other entity requesting a hearing; (2) a brief statement of the requesting person's interest in the Regional Administrator's determination and of information that the requesting person intends to submit at such hearing; and (3) the signature of the individual making the request, or, if the request is made on behalf of an organization or other entity, the signature of the responsible official of the organization or other entity.

Notice of any hearing shall be given not less than fifteen (15) days prior to the time scheduled for the hearing. Such notice will be made by the Regional Administrator in the **Federal Register** and in newspapers of general circulation in the State of South Dakota. A notice will also be sent to the person(s) requesting the hearing as well as to the State of South Dakota. The hearing notice will include a statement of purpose, information regarding time and location, and the address and telephone number where interested persons may obtain further information. A final determination will be made upon review of the hearing record.

Should no timely and appropriate request for a hearing be received, and the Regional Administrator does not elect to hold a hearing on his own motion, EPA will publish a final on the primacy revision. Please bring this notice to the attention of any persons known by you to have an interest in this determination.

All documents relating to this determination are available for inspection at the following locations: (1) U.S. EPA Region VIII, Municipal Systems Unit, 999 18th Street (4th floor), Denver, Colorado 80202–2466; (2) South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Drinking Water Program, 523 East Capital Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota 57501.

Indian Country

EPA has been consulting with the affected Tribes and has had discussions with the State regarding the extent of Indian country in South Dakota. Based on these discussions, we propose the following language. Recognizing that the affected parties may have differing opinions, we invite comment from the Tribes, the State and others.

EPA's decision to approve this primacy revision for the South Dakota PWSS Program does not include any land that is, or becomes after the date of this authorization, ''Indian country,'' as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151, including:

1. Land within formal Indian reservations located within or abutting the State of South Dakota, including the:
   a. Cheyenne River Indian Reservation,
   b. Crow Creek Indian Reservation,
   c. Flandreau Indian Reservation,
   d. Lower Brule Indian Reservation,
   e. Pine Ridge Indian Reservation,
   f. Rosebud Indian Reservation,
   g. Standing Rock Indian Reservation,
   h. Yankton Indian Reservation.
2. Any land held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe,
3. Any other land, whether on or off a reservation, that qualifies as Indian country.

Moreover, in the context of these principles, a more detailed discussion for three reservations follows.

Rosebud Sioux Reservation

In the September 16, 1996, FR notice, EPA noted that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Rosebud Sioux Tribe* v. *Kneip*, 430 U.S. 584 (1977), determined that three Congressional acts diminished the Rosebud Sioux Reservation and that it no longer includes Gregory, Tripp, Lyman and Mellette Counties. Accordingly, EPA proposes to approve the primacy revision for the South Dakota PWSS program for all land in Gregory, Tripp, Lyman and Mellette Counties that was formerly within the 1889 Rosebud Sioux Reservation boundaries and does not otherwise qualify as Indian country under 18 U.S.C. 1151. This proposed approval does not include any trust or other land in Gregory, Tripp, Lyman and Mellette Counties that qualifies as Indian country.

Lake Traverse (Sisseton-Wahpeton) Reservation

In the September 16, 1996, FR notice, EPA noted that the U.S. Supreme Court in *DeCoteau* v. *District County Court*, 420 U.S. 425 (1975), determined that an Act of Congress disestablished the Lake Traverse (Sisseton-Wahpeton) Reservation. Therefore, EPA proposes to approve the South Dakota PWSS program for all land that was formerly within the 1867 Lake Traverse Reservation boundaries and does not otherwise qualify as Indian country under 18 U.S.C. 1151. This proposed approval does not include any trust or other land within the former Lake Traverse Reservation that qualifies as Indian country.

Yankton Sioux Reservation

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *South Dakota* v. *Yankton—Sioux Tribe*, 522 U.S. 329 (1998), found that the Yankton Sioux Reservation has been diminished by the unallotted, ''ceded'' lands, that is, those lands that were not allotted to Tribal members and that were sold by the Yankton Sioux Tribe to the United States pursuant to an Agreement executed in 1892 and ratified by the United States Congress in 1894. Accordingly, EPA proposes to approve the South Dakota PWSS program for unallotted, ceded lands that were ceded as a result of the Act of 1894, 28 Stat. 286 and do not otherwise qualify as Indian country under 18 U.S.C. 1151. This proposed approval does not include any trust or other land within the original boundaries of the Yankton Sioux Reservation that qualifies as Indian country under 18 U.S.C. 1151. EPA acknowledges that there may be further interpretation of land status by the final federal court decision in *Yankton Sioux Tribe* v. *Gaffey*, Nos. 98–3893, 3894, 3986, 3900. If Indian country status changes as a result of Gaffey, EPA will act to modify this authorization as appropriate.

Dated: August 4, 1999.

Jack W. McGraw,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 8.

[FR Doc. 99–21006 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6417–7]

U.S.-Mexico Border Grants; Request for Proposals

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is requesting grant proposals from U.S. nongovernment organizations, municipalities, federally recognized tribes, communities, higher education facilities, and schools for projects within the U.S.-Mexico Border region, that area within 100 km on either side of the inland and maritime U.S.-Mexico border as defined in the La Paz Agreement (1983).

DATES: The original proposal plus one (1) copy must be mailed to the appropriate regional contact (see below) for the state in which the project will occur no later than October 22, 1999. Proposals received after that date will not be considered for funding. EPA expects to announce grant awards in January 2000. Applicants should anticipate project start dates no earlier than March 1, 2000. Grants will be managed separately by EPA staff in Region 6 and Region 9.

ADDRESSES: Grant Applications should be submitted to: Region 6 (TX, NM): Gina Weber, U.S.-Mexico Border Coordinator (6WQ–D); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6; 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Dallas, TX 75202–2733; Telephone: 214–665–8188; Email: weber.gina@epa.gov.

Region 9 (CA, AZ): Wendy Laird-Benner, U.S.-Mexico Border Coordinator (WTR4); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9; 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901; Telephone: 415–744–1168; Email: laird-benner.wendy@epa.gov.

Additional copies of this grant application can also be obtained through the EPA Border Liaison Offices located in El Paso (915–533–7273) or San Diego (619–235–4765). Or call 1–800–334–0741.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Region 6 (TX, NM): Gina Weber, U.S.-Mexico Border Coordinator (6WQ–D); Telephone: 214–665–8188; Email: weber.gina@epa.gov

Region 9 (CA, AZ): Wendy Laird-Benner, U.S.-Mexico Border Coordinator (WTR4); Telephone: 415–744–1168; Email: laird-benner.wendy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

This is a regionally managed grants program whose goals and objectives directly relate to and are linked with the Border XXI Program. Successful grant applications will meet objectives of the Border XXI Program as outlined in the U.S.-Mexico Border XXI Program Framework Document and/or the annual Implementation Plans (1996, 1997–1998, 1998). The mission of the Border XXI Program is to protect public health and natural resources, and encourage sustainable development along the U.S.-Mexico border. For purposes of this grants program, sustainable development is defined as ''conservation oriented social and economic development that emphasizes the protection and sustainable use of resources, while addressing both current and future needs, and present and future impacts of human actions as defined in the Border XXI environmental program developed by U.S. and Mexican authorities' (for further information see the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission Project Certification Criteria). This definition is based on the