For valuation dates occurring in the month—

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{September 2001} & \text{0.630} & \text{1–20} & \text{0.625} \\
\end{array}
\]

The values of \(i\) are:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{for } t \leq 20 & \text{N/A} & \text{for } t > 20 & \text{N/A} \\
\end{array}
\]
Because the above State regulations have the same meaning as the corresponding Federal regulations, we find that they are no less effective than the Federal regulations.

B. Sections 761.5 Definitions and 761.15 Public Buildings

Due to an apparent error, the Arkansas regulations contain two different definitions for "public buildings;" one in section 761.5 Definitions, the other in section 761.15 Public Buildings. This occurred when the State was revising the definition of "public buildings" and inadvertently inserted a new section (section 761.15 Public buildings) instead of modifying the existing definition of "public buildings" at section 761.5 Definitions. Arkansas proposed to eliminate this redundancy and to avoid confusion by removing section 761.15 "Public buildings," and by replacing the definition of "public buildings" in section 761.5 with the definition of "public buildings" that was found in section 761.15. We are approving this revision because it only changes the number of the regulation and will not alter the approved language in the section.

D. Section 764.15 Procedures: Initial Processing, Recordkeeping, and Notification Requirements

Arkansas proposed to revise Section 764.15(a)(7) by changing the name of the hearing from an "informal conference" to that of a "legislative public hearing." We are approving this revision because it only changes the name of the hearing and does not change the meaning or the intent of the regulation.

E. Section 786.14 Legislative Public Hearing

Arkansas proposed to revise Section 786.14(c) by replacing the reference citation to 761.12(d) with a reference citation to newly added section 761.14(c). Arkansas also proposed to revise this regulation to reflect that the legislative public hearings may be used to meet the requirement of a public hearing if one is requested under section 761.14(c) where the applicant proposes to relocate or close a public road or to conduct surface coal mining operations within 100 feet, measured horizontally, of the outside right-of-way line of a public road. The revised section reads as follows:

(c) Legislative Public Hearings held in accordance with this Section may be used by the Director as the public hearing required under Section 761.14(c) where the applicant proposes to relocate or close a public road or conduct surface coal mining operations within 100 feet, measured horizontally, of the outside right-of-way line of a public road.

We are approving the revision that replaces the reference citation to 761.12(d) with a reference citation to newly added section 761.14(c) because the provisions contained in old section...
761.12(d) remain unchanged and have been reorganized and are now recodified in newly added section 761.14(c). We are also approving the revision to section 761.14 that reflects that the public hearings, if requested, may be used to meet the public hearing requirement under section 761.14(c) where the applicant proposes to relocate or close a public road or to conduct surface coal mining operations within 100 feet, measured horizontally, of the outside right-of-way line of a public road. We are approving this revision because it is consistent with the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 761.14(c) and (c)(1)–(c)(2) that require the regulatory authority or a public road authority that it designates to determine that the interests of the public and affected landowners will be protected. These Federal regulations also require that the regulatory authority must, among other things, provide opportunity to request a public hearing in the locality of the proposed operation before making this determination.

F. Section 786.19 Criteria for Permit Approval or Denial

Arkansas proposed to delete sections 786.19(d)(4) and (d)(5) and to redesignate sections 786.19(d)(6) through (d)(8) as sections 786.19(d)(4) through (d)(6). We are approving the deletion of sections 786.19(d)(4) and (d)(5) because the provisions contained in these sections are contained in revised section 786.19(d)(1) via a reference to section 761.11. We are also approving the redesignation of sections 786.19(d)(6) through (d)(8) as sections 786.19(d)(4) through (d)(6) because it will not render the Arkansas regulations less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 773.15(c).

G. Name Change of the Arkansas Regulatory Authority and the Recodification of the Arkansas Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act

In a letter dated April 2, 1999, Arkansas notified us that the “Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology” had its name changed to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality,” effective March 31, 1999. Along with the name change, the general powers and responsibilities previously assigned to the “Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology” were transferred to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.” In a letter dated June 9, 1999, we notified the State that it must amend its approved program to reflect these changes. Because of the administrative nature of the change, we requested that Arkansas change the references to the “Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology” to references to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality” in its regulations and/or statutes the next time the State proposed to amend its approved program. Arkansas responded in a letter dated June 23, 1999, that the State had already replaced all references to the “Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology” with references to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality” in its regulations. Arkansas further responded that on April 6, 1999, the Arkansas Legislature passed Act 1164 approving the agency’s name change to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality” and revising all Arkansas statutes to reflect the name change.

Also, in its June 23, 1999, letter Arkansas advised us that the “legislative version” of the Arkansas Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act (Act 134 of 1979), as amended by Act 647 of 1979 has not existed, per se, since the effective date of Act 267 of 1987, which created and adopted the Arkansas Code. Effective December 31, 1987, Act 267 codified all existing Arkansas statutes into the Arkansas Code Annotated (ACA) without changing the substance or meaning of any provision of the statutes. All the provisions of the Arkansas Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act are codified at ACA Title 15, Chapter 58, Subchapters 1 through 5.

We are approving the name change of the Arkansas regulatory authority from the “Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology” to the “Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.” We are also approving the recodification of the Arkansas statutes from the “legislative version” to the “annotated version.” We find that the changes are administrative in nature and do not render the Arkansas regulations less effective than the Federal regulations. Nor do the changes render the Arkansas statutes less stringent than the Federal statutes.

IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments

Federal Agency Comments

On March 14 and May 3, 2001, under section 503(b) of SMCRA and 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(i) of the Federal regulations, we requested comments on the amendment from various Federal agencies with an actual or potential interest in the Arkansas program (Administrative Record Nos. AR–567.05 and AR–567.09, respectively). We did not receive any comments.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Under 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(i), we are required to obtain the written concurrence of the EPA for those provisions of the program amendment that relate to air or water quality standards issued under the authority of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.). None of the revisions that Arkansas proposed to make in this amendment pertain to air or water quality standards. Therefore, we did not ask the EPA for its concurrence.

Under 30 CFR 732.17(h)(11)(i), we requested comments on the amendment from the EPA (Administrative Record Nos. AR–567.05 and AR–567.09). The EPA did not respond to our request.

State Historical Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)

Under 30 CFR 732.17(h)(4), we are required to request comments from the SHPO and ACHP on amendments that may have an effect on historic properties. On March 14 and May 3, 2001, we requested comments on Arkansas’ amendment (Administrative Record Nos. AR–567.05 and AR–567.09, respectively), but neither entity responded to our request.

Public Comments

We asked for public comments on the amendment, but did not receive any.

V. Director’s Decision

Based on the above findings, we approve the amendment as sent to us by Arkansas on March 1, 2001, and as revised on April 19, 2001. We approve the regulations that Arkansas proposed with the provision that they be published in identical form to the regulations sent to and reviewed by OSM and the public.

To implement this decision, we are amending the Federal regulations at 30 CFR Part 904, which codifies decisions about the Arkansas program. We find that good cause exists under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) to make this final rule effective immediately. Section 503(a) of SMCRA requires that the State’s program demonstrate that the State has the capability of carrying out the provisions of the Act and meeting its purposes. Making the regulations effective immediately will expedite that process and will encourage Arkansas to bring its program into conformity with the Federal standards. SMCRA requires consistency of State and Federal standards.
VI. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866—Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12630—Takings

This rule does not have takings implications. This determination is based on the analysis performed for the counterpart Federal regulations.

Executive Order 13132—Federalism

This rule does not have federalism implications. SMCRA delineates the roles of the Federal and State governments with regard to the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations. One of the purposes of SMCRA is to “establish a nationwide program to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations.” Section 503(a)(1) of SMCRA requires that State laws regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations be “in accordance with” the requirements of SMCRA, and section 503(a)(7) requires that State programs contain rules and regulations “consistent with” regulations issued by the Secretary under SMCRA.

Executive Order 12988—Civil Justice Reform

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 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 because 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(b)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States 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.

Executive Order 13211—Regulations That Significantly Affect the Supply, Distribution, or Use of Energy

On May 18, 2001, the President issued Executive Order 13211 which requires agencies to prepare a Statement of Energy Effects for a rule that is (1) considered significant under Executive Order 12866, and (2) likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Because this rule is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 and is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required.

National Environmental Policy Act

Section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that a decision on a proposed State regulatory program provision does not constitute a major Federal action within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). A determination has been made that such decisions are categorically excluded from the NEPA process (516 DM 8.4.A).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget 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 analysis was prepared and a determination made that the Federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

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 904

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.


Charles E. Sandberg,
Acting Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR Part 904 is amended as set forth below:

PART 904—ARKANSAS

1. The authority citation for Part 904 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.

2. Section 904.15 is amended in the table by adding a new entry in chronological order by “Date of final publication” to read as follows:

| § 904.15 Approval of Arkansas regulatory program amendments. |
| * * * * * |
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
30 CFR Part 914
[SPATS No. IN–151–FOR]
Indiana Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior.
ACTION: Final rule; decision on amendment.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is not approving an amendment to the Indiana regulatory program (Indiana program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA or the Act). Indiana proposed the addition of a statute concerning post mining land use changes as nonsignificant permit revisions. Indiana intended to revise its program to improve operational efficiency.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
I. Background on the Indiana Program
II. Submission of the Amendment
III. Director’s Findings
IV. Summary and Disposition of Comments
V. Director’s Decision
VI. Procedural Determinations

I. Background on the Indiana Program

Section 503(a) of the Act permits a State to assume primacy for the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations in accordance with the requirements of the Act and “rules and regulations consistent with regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to the Act. See 30 U.S.C. 1253(a)(1) and (7). On the basis of these criteria, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Indiana program on July 29, 1982. You can find background information on the Indiana program, including the Secretary’s findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval in the July 26, 1982, Federal Register (47 FR 32107). You can find later actions on the Indiana program at 30 CFR 914.10, 914.15, 914.16, and 914.17.

II. Submission of the Amendment

By letter dated May 14, 1998 (Administrative Record No. IND–1606), Indiana submitted a proposed amendment to OSM in accordance with SMCRA. The proposed amendment concerned revisions of and additions to the Indiana Code (IC) made by House Enrolled Act (HEA) No. 1074. Indiana intended to revise its program to incorporate the additional flexibility afforded by SMCRA and to provide the guidelines for permit revisions, including incidental boundary revisions. We announced receipt of the proposed amendment in the May 29, 1998, Federal Register (63 FR 29365), and invited public comment on its adequacy. The public comment period for the amendment closed June 29, 1998. During our review of the proposed amendment, we identified concerns relating to the proposed amendment. We notified Indiana of these concerns by letter dated September 15, 1998 (Administrative Record No. IND–1621). By letter dated December 21, 1998 (Administrative Record No. IND–1627), Indiana responded to our concerns by submitting additional explanatory information. Because Indiana did not make any substantive revisions to the amendment, we did not reopen the public comment period. On March 16, 1999, we approved Indiana’s proposed amendment, with three exceptions (64 FR 28990). Specifically, we did not approve the amendment at IC 14–34–5–7(a) concerning guidance for permit revisions; the amendment at IC 14–34–5–8.2(4) concerning postmining land use changes; and the amendment at IC 14–34–5–8.4(c)(2)(K) concerning minor field revisions for temporary cessation of mining. On May 26, 1999, at Indiana’s request, we provided clarification of our decision on Indiana’s amendment (64 FR 28362).

On May 14, 1999, the Indiana Coal Council (ICC) filed a complaint in the United States District Court, Southern District of Indiana, to challenge our decision not to approve the proposed Indiana program amendments at IC 14–34–5–7(a) and IC 14–34–5–8.2(4). Indiana Coal Council v. Babbitt, No. IP 99–0705–C–M/S, (S. D. Ind.). On September 25, 2000, the Court issued its decision on the ICC’s complaint. The Court found that, in the case of IC 14–34–5–7(a) concerning guidance for permit revisions, OSM was not arbitrary and capricious in not approving the amendment. Therefore, the Court upheld our decision. However, in the case of IC 14–34–5–8.2(4) concerning postmining land use changes, the Court found that our decision was arbitrary and capricious, and remanded the matter to OSM for “further consideration.” In accordance with the Court’s ruling, we opened the public comment period for section IC 14–34–5–8.2(4) of Indiana’s proposed amendment submitted on May 14, 1998, in the January 11, 2001, Federal Register (66 FR 2374). In the same document, we provided an opportunity for a public hearing or meeting on the adequacy of the amendment. The public comment period closed on February 12, 2001. We received comments from two industry groups and one Federal agency. However, because no one requested a public hearing or meeting, we did not hold one.

III. Director’s Findings

Following, under SMCRA and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 732.15 and 732.17, are the Director of OSM’s findings concerning the proposed amendment to the Indiana program.