

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 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 924**

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: July 15, 1999.

#### **Brent Wahlquist,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-18947 Filed 7-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-P

### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

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

[IN96-1b; FRL-6402-1]

#### **Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Indiana**

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is approving temporary revised opacity limits for two processes at ALCOA Warrick Operations, which were submitted by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) on December 8, 1998. ALCOA Warrick Operations is a primary aluminum smelter located in Newburgh, Indiana. The revised limits allow for higher opacity emissions during fluxing operations at two holding furnaces for a period of one year, ending May 1999. Mass emissions limits are not being changed.

**DATES:** EPA must receive written comments on this proposed rule by August 25, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** You should mail written comments to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

You may inspect copies of the State submittal and EPA's analysis of it at:

Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Pohlman, Environmental Scientist, Regulation Development Section, Regulation Development Branch (AR-18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-3299.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document, wherever "we", "us", or "our" are used we mean EPA.

#### **Table of Contents**

- I. What action is EPA taking today?
- II. Where can I find more information about this proposal and the corresponding direct final rule?

#### **I. What Action Is EPA Taking Today?**

We are proposing to approve temporary revised opacity limits for two processes at ALCOA Warrick Operations, which were submitted by IDEM on December 8, 1998. The revised limits allow for higher opacity emissions during fluxing operations at two holding furnaces for a period of one year, ending May 1999.

#### **II. Where can I Find More Information About This Proposal and the Corresponding Direct Final Rule?**

For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 9, 1999.

#### **Francis X. Lyons,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 99-18871 Filed 7-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

#### **40 CFR Part 300**

[FRL-6401-7]

#### **National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to delete the Mason County Landfill Superfund Site from the National Priorities List; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Region V announces its intent to delete the Mason County Landfill Site from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this action. The NPL constitutes appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which U.S. EPA promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) as amended. This action is being taken by U.S. EPA, because it has been determined that all Fund-financed responses under CERCLA have been implemented and U.S. EPA, in consultation with the State of Michigan, has determined that no further response is appropriate. It should be noted,