

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 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 State regulatory programs and program amendments must be based solely on a determination of 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*

This rule does not require an environmental impact statement since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on 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 corresponding 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. Therefore, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously published 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 corresponding Federal regulations.

#### *Unfunded Mandates*

OSM has determined and certifies under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1502 *et seq.*) that this rule will not impose a cost of \$100 million

or more in any given year on local, state, or tribal governments or private entities.

#### **List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 914**

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: August 6, 1999.

**Charles Sandberg,**

*Acting Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.*

[FR Doc. 99-21138 Filed 8-13-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

##### **40 CFR Part 52**

[MN48-01-7273b; FRL-6415-3]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Minnesota**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** We are proposing to approve a December 31, 1998, request from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for new air pollution control requirements for the Minnesota sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Marathon Ashland Petroleum LLC (Marathon). These requirements were submitted in the form of an Administrative Order (Order) and include revisions associated with the addition of a new stack, revised emission limits for numerous sources and other changes. The revisions result in an overall decrease in allowable SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the facility. The new requirements have been evaluated through a computerized modeling analysis and have shown that they will attain and maintain the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for SO<sub>2</sub>.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this action as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated, and the direct final rule will become effective. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn, and all public comments received during the 30-day comment period set forth below will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The

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.

**DATES:** We must receive comments by September 15, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randall Robinson, Meteorologist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353-6713.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the above address. (Please telephone Randall Robinson before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

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

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Sulfur dioxide.

Dated: July 22, 1999.

**Jerri-Anne Garl,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 99-21013 Filed 8-13-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

##### **40 CFR Part 52**

[R1-052-7211b; A-1-FRL-6417-4]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Connecticut on February 7, 1996 and February 18, 1999, providing that the national low emission vehicle (National LEV) is an acceptable compliance option for new motor vehicles sold in the State, which had previously adopted the California low emission vehicle (CAL LEV) program. Auto