(3) Notification of revocation of a registration by a State shall indicate the effective date of revocation, and shall state the reasons for revocation.

(4) The Agency may request, when appropriate, that a State submit any data used by the State to determine that unreasonable adverse effects will not be caused.

The Agency has 90 days to determine whether the SLN registration should be disapproved. If the SLN is disapproved, the State is responsible for notifying the affected registrant.

*Burden:* Under the PRA, ''burden'' means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. For this collection it includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

The ICR provides a detailed explanation of this estimate, which is only briefly summarized in this notice. The annual public burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12.5 hours per response. The following is a summary of the estimates taken from the ICR:

*Respondents/Affected Entities:* States.

*Estimated Total Number of Potential Respondents:* 349.

*Frequency of Response:* Determined by the state.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 24,604.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Costs:* $2,360,287.

## III. Are There Changes in the Estimates From the Last Approval?

Yes. The overall respondent burden hours associated with this collection has decreased from 38,775 to 24,604.5 hours per year. This change is due to the decrease of the number of applications made by the states since the renewal of the last ICR from 550 to 349. Costs have increased due to current labor rates as supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. No regulatory changes have been made in the requirements for Section 24(c) applications.

## IV. What Is the Next Step in the Process for This ICR?

After providing a 30 day opportunity for additional comments from the public, OMB will review and take action on the Agency's request. Periodically, EPA publishes a notice in the **Federal Register** listing recent OMB actions on the Agency's ICR submittals. If you have any questions about this ICR or the approval process, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Dated: July 1, 1999.

**Richard T. Westlund,**

*Acting Director, Regulatory Information Division.*

[FR Doc. 99–17348 Filed 7–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[FRL–6371–9]**

## Notice of Approval of Extension of Prevention of Significant Air Quality Deterioration (PSD) and New Source Review (NSR) Permit to Muht-Hei, Inc. (NSR 4–4–10, SD 92–02)

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that on May 3, 1999 the Environmental Protection Agency issued an extension of the prevention of significant deterioration/new source review (PSD/NSR) permit to the applicant named above. Extension of the PSD/NSR permit grants approval to Muht-Hei, Inc. to construct and operate a solid waste landfill on the tribal lands of the Campo Band of Mission Indians.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Copies of the permit are available for public inspection upon request; please address the request to: Steve Branoff (AIR–3), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 744–1290.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 18, 1996, EPA issued a PSD/NSR permit to Mid-American Waste Systems, Inc. for the construction and operation of a solid waste landfill on the tribal lands of the Campo Band of Mission Indians. The 1996 permit specified that this permit would expire if construction did not commence within 18 months after its issuance. Prior to the date of permit expiration, Muht-Hei, Inc. applied to EPA for a transfer of ownership of the proposed project, and for an extension of the PSD/NSR permit. EPA has extended the approval to construct and operate the proposed landfill to the new owners for a period of 18 months from May 3, 1999 until November 2, 2000.

The PSD/NSR permit requires the application of Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for fine particulate matter ($PM_{10}$). The permit also requires Muht-Hei to provide emission offsets for all direct and fugitive emissions of VOCs. LAER requirements for this permit include construction of the landfill with low permeability composite liners, installation and maintenance of a landfill gas (LFG) collection system, and destruction of all collected LFG in a flaring system that will achieve a minimum VOC destruction removal efficiency (DRE) of 99.6% by weight.

BACT requirements for particulate emissions include paving, vacuum-sweeping, and watering of roads. In addition, the LFG flare is subject to certain emission limits, including allowable emission rates as follows: 0.06 lbs/mmBtu of $NO_X$, 0.15 lbs/mmBtu of CO, and 0.005 lbs/mmBtu of $PM_{10}$.

**DATES:** The issuance of a PSD/NSR permit is reviewable under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR 124.19(f)(1) in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. A petition for review must be filed by September 7, 1999. EPA did not receive an appeal to the Administrator or the Environmental Appeals Board for review of this permit decision within thirty (30) days from the date the final permit was issued.

Dated: June 28, 1999.

**Kenneth Bigos,**

*Acting Director, Air Division, Region 9.*

[FR Doc. 99–17209 Filed 7–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[AMS–FRL–6374–4]**

## Contractor Access to Confidential Business Information (CBI); Office of Mobile Sources, National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory, Ann Arbor, MI

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with 40 CFR 2.301(h)(2), EPA has determined that one contractor requires access to Confidential Business Information (CBI). This access is under the terms of the

contract. The contractor and contract are the Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) with EPA Contract 68–W–99–002, Task Order 05.

**DATES:** SAIC will have access to this data from until September 30, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard Parsons, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, OMS/VPCD, 2000 Traverwood, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48105–2195 is the contact person for Contract 68–W–99–002, Task Order 05.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) as the prime contractor and Dyncorp and Indus as subcontractors, will have access to Confidential Business Information (CBI) to develop and maintain the Certification and Fuel Economy Information System (CFEIS) under EPA's new Mission Oriented Systems Engineering Support (MOSES) II contract, Task Order 05. CFEIS handles the information flow associated with the certification process and its companion fuel economy process. Production problems referred for analysis often entail access to CBI data. Their address (applies to prime and all subcontractors): Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) @EPA's Systems Development Center (SDC) 200 N. Glebe Road Suite 300, Arlington, VA 22203 Phone: 703–292–6000, Fax 703–292–6388.

Dated: June 29, 1999.

**Robert Brenner,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 99–17349 Filed 7–7–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[PB–402404LS–US/PB–402404–LS; FRL–6068–6]**

## Lead-Based Paint Activities in Target Housing and Child-Occupied Facilities; Authorization of the Upper Sioux Community's and Lower Sioux Indian Community's Lead-Based Paint Activities Program

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

**ACTION:** Notice; final approval.

**SUMMARY:** On April 14, 1998, both the Upper Sioux Community (Upper Sioux) and Lower Sioux Indian Community (Lower Sioux) submitted applications for EPA approval to administer and enforce training and certification requirements, training program accreditation requirements, and work practice standards for lead-based paint activities in target housing and child-occupied facilities under section 404 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Notice of the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux applications, a solicitation for public comment regarding the applications, and background information supporting the applications were published in the **Federal Register** of October 2, 1998. Today's notice announces the approval of the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux Indian Communities' applications, and the authorization of the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux Communities' lead-based paint program to apply on the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux Reservations respectively effective May 7, 1999, in lieu of the corresponding Federal program under section 402 of TSCA.

**DATES:** Lead-based paint activities program authorization was granted to the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux Indian Communities effective on May 7, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Emma Avant, Project Officer, Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, DT-8J, 77 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, telephone: (312) 886–7899, e-mail address: avant.emma@epamail.epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

Pursuant to Title IV of TSCA, Lead Exposure Reduction, 15 U.S.C. 2681-2692, and regulations promulgated thereunder, States and Tribes that choose to apply for lead-based paint activities program authorization must submit a complete application to the appropriate Regional EPA office for review. Complete, final applications will be subject to a public comment period, and reviewed by EPA within 180 days of receipt. To receive EPA approval, a State or Tribe must demonstrate that its program is at least as protective of human health and the environment as the Federal program, and provides for adequate enforcement, section 404(b) of TSCA. As determined by EPA's review and assessment, the Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux's applications successfully demonstrated that the Tribes' lead-based paint activities programs achieve the protectiveness and enforcement criteria, as required for Federal authorization. Furthermore, no public comments were received regarding any aspect of Upper Sioux and Lower Sioux's applications. EPA announced solicitation for public comment regarding the applications in the **Federal Register** of October 2, 1998 (63 FR 53051) (FRL–6018–9).

### II. Federal Overfiling

TSCA section 404(b), 15 U.S.C. 2684(b), makes it unlawful for any person to violate, or fail or refuse to comply with, any requirement of an approved State or Tribal program. Therefore, EPA reserves the right to exercise its enforcement authority under TSCA against a violation of, or a failure or refusal to comply with, any requirement of an authorized State or Tribal program.

### III. Withdrawal of Authorization

Pursuant to TSCA section 404(c), 15 U.S.C. 2684(c), the Administrator may withdraw a State or Tribal lead-based paint activities program authorization, after notice and opportunity for corrective action, if the program is not being administered or enforced in compliance with standards, regulations, and other requirements established under the authorization. The procedures EPA will follow for the withdrawal of an authorization are found at 40 CFR 745.324(i).

### IV. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

*A. Certain Acts and Executive Orders*

EPA's actions on State or Tribal lead-based paint activities program applications are informal adjudications, not rules. Therefore, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), Executive Order 12866 (''Regulatory Planning and Review,'' 58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), and Executive Order 13045 (''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks,'' 62 FR 1985, April 23, 1997), do not apply to this action. This action does not contain any Federal mandates, and therefore is not subject to the requirements of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1531-1538). In addition, this action does not contain any information collection requirements and therefore does not require review or approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

*B. Executive Order 12875*

Under Executive Order 12875, entitled ''Enhancing Intergovernmental Partnerships'' (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute and that creates a mandate upon a State, local, or Tribal government, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must