regulations set forth at § 514.17, sponsors shall file with the Agency the following information:

(1) A summation of the results of an annual survey of all host family and au pair participants regarding satisfaction with the program, its strengths and weaknesses;

(2) A summation of all complaints regarding host family or au pair participation in the program, specifying the nature of the complaint, its resolution, and whether any unresolved complaints are outstanding.

(3) A summation of all situations which resulted in the placement of an au pair participant with more than one host family;

(4) A management audit report by a certified public accountant, conducted pursuant to a format designated by the Agency, attesting to the sponsor's compliance with the procedures and reporting requirements set forth in this subpart;

(5) A report detailing the name of the au pair, his or her host family placement, location, and the names of the local and regional organizational representatives; and

(6) A complete set of all promotional materials, brochures, or pamphlet distributed to either host family or au pair participants.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 99–9165 Filed 4–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

30 CFR Part 206

RIN 1010–AC09

Establishing Oil Value for Royalty Due on Federal Leases

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Supplementary Proposed rule; notice of extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The Minerals Management Service hereby gives notice that it is extending the public comment period on a supplementary proposed rule, which was published in the **Federal Register** on July 16, 1998, (63 FR 38355). The proposed rule amends the royalty valuation regulations for crude oil produced from Federal leases. In response to requests for additional time and to provide commenters adequate time to submit comments after the completion of the public workshops on April 7, 1999, MMS will extend the comment period 15 days.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 27, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments, suggestions, or objections about this supplementary proposed rule to: Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Publications Staff, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3021, Denver, Colorado 80225–0165. Courier address is Building 85, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225. E-mail address is RMP.comments@mms.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David S. Guzy, Chief, Rules and Publications Staff, telephone number (303) 231–3432, fax number (303) 231–3385, e-mail RMP.comments@mms.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: MMS received requests from industry representatives to extend the comment period of this supplementary proposed rule. This time extension is in response to those requests in order to provide commenters with adequate time to provide detailed comments that MMS can use to proceed in the rulemaking.

Dated: April 8, 1999.

Lucy Querques Denett,

Associate Director for Royalty Management.

[FR Doc. 99–9174 Filed 4–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[Docket 24–7004; FRL–6323–9]

Federal Rulemaking for the FMC Facility in the Fort Hall PM–10 Nonattainment Area; Notice of Correction of Proposed Rules

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On February 12, 1999, EPA published a proposed Federal Implementation Plan to control particulate matter air pollution emitted from an elemental phosphorous facility owned and operated by FMC Corporation (FMC). The facility is located within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in southeastern Idaho (FMC facility). The purpose of this document is to correct inadvertent minor typographical errors in the proposed rule language that could cause unnecessary confusion.

DATES: Written comments, identified by the docket control number ID 24–7004, must be received by EPA on or before May 13, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted (in duplicate if possible) to: Montel Livingston, SIP Manager, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality (OAQ–107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle Washington 98101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven K. Body, Office of Air Quality (OAQ–107), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, (206) 553–0782.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. How Can I Get Additional Information or Copies of Support Documents?

1. Electronically. You may obtain electronic copies of this document and the February 12, 1999, proposed rule from the internet at the following address: http://www.epa.gov/r10earth/ Once there, click on ''Events.'' You can also go directly to the ''**Federal Register**'' listings at *http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.*

2. In person or by phone. If you have any questions or need additional information about this action, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. In addition, the official record for this document, which is called the ''docket,'' has been established under docket control number ID 24–7004. The docket is available for public inspection and copying from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, Monday through Friday, at EPA's Central Docket Section, Office of Air and Radiation, Room 1500 (M–6102), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, and between 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, at EPA Region 10, Office of Air Quality, 10th Floor, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. A copy of the docket is also available for review at the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Office of Air Quality Program, Land Use Commission, Fort Hall Government Center, Agency and Bannock Roads, Fort Hall, Idaho 83203; the Shoshone-Bannock Library, Pima and Bannock, Fort Hall, Idaho, 83203; and the Idaho State University Library, Government Documents Dept., 850 South 9th Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho. A reasonable fee may be charged for copies.

B. How and to Whom do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments through the mail or in person. Be sure to identify the appropriate docket control number

(i.e., ''ID–24–7004'') in your correspondence.

1. By mail. Submit written comments to: Montel Livingston, SIP Manager, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air quality (OAQ–107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

2. In person or by courier. Deliver written comments to: Montel Livingston, SIP Manager, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air quality (OAQ–107), 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

II. What Are the Corrections?

On February 12, 1999, EPA published a proposed *Federal Rulemaking for the FMC Facility in the Fort Hall PM–10 Nonattainment Area. See* 64 FR 7308 (February 12, 1999). This proposed rulemaking is known as a Federal Implementation Plan or ''FIP.'' In summary, the FIP proposes air pollution control requirements for particulate matter emitted from FMC that would require FMC to install and operate reasonably available control technology in their production of phosphorus. In addition, the FIP proposes comprehensive requirements for compliance monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting.

In the preamble to the proposal, EPA asked for comment on two alternatives for dealing with exceedences of emission limits due to scheduled events, such as startup, shutdown, or scheduled maintenance, as well as unscheduled events, such as equipment failure, power loss, furnace upsets, or accidents (known as upset, breakdown, or emergency conditions). 64 FR 7328. These alternatives are briefly summarized as follows:

Alternative One: Exceedences of emission limits caused by scheduled events or upset/breakdown conditions would not be excused under any circumstance. However, EPA could exercise its discretion in deciding whether to penalize FMC for violations caused by scheduled events or upset/breakdown/emergency.

Alternative Two: Exceedences of emission limits would be excused from penalty under two circumstances:

(A) Excess emissions caused by pre-scheduled startup, shutdown, or scheduled maintenance would be excused, provided FMC gives EPA prior notice, takes measures to reduce excess emissions, and meets other stringent requirements; and

(B) Excess emissions caused by unforeseen ''emergency'' upset/breakdown situations would be excused, provided FMC gives EPA prompt notice, takes measures to reduce excess emissions, and meets other stringent requirements.

A heading in the proposed rule language contains an error which may could cause unnecessary confusion. At 64 FR 7346, proposed § 52.676(c)(8) is labeled ''Alternative One'' and proposed § 52.676(c)(9) is labeled ''Alternative Two.'' Although the language in the proposed rule is itself correct, the labels are in error.

As shown above and as discussed in more detail in the preamble to the proposal, Alternative One is providing no excuse from penalty for startup, shutdown, scheduled maintenance, upset, breakdown, or emergency. *See* 64 FR 7328 (column one). Thus, neither proposed paragraph 52.676(c)(8) nor paragraph 52.676(c)(9) would be included in the final rule if EPA adopts Alternative One. Alternative Two provides an excuse from penalty under two different circumstances. *See* 64 FR 7328 (bottom of column one and column two). The first circumstance (scheduled events) is contained in proposed paragraph 52.676(c)(8). The second circumstance (upset/breakdown/emergency) is contained in proposed paragraph 52.676(9). Therefore, if EPA adopts Alternative Two, both paragraphs 52.676(c)(8) and 52.676(c)(9) would be included in the final rule.

Language regarding excess emissions in another section of the proposed rule also contains a minor typographical error. At 64 FR 7352, proposed paragraph 52.676(g)(5) currently contains three subparts. Proposed paragraph 52.676(g)(5)(ii) states ''If alternative one or two for paragraph (c)(8) is adopted''. That language should read ''If paragraphs 52.676(c)(8) and (c)(9) are adopted as part of the final rule,'' and that language is not intended to be part of the rule. Rather, it is explanatory. Proposed paragraph 52.676(g)(5)(iii), if included in the final rule, would be renumbered to 52.676(g)(5)(ii).

The proposed rule also contains two other minor typographical errors in cross-referencing other portions of the proposed rule. The cross reference at 64 FR 7346 in proposed paragraph 52.676(c)(5)(ii)(B)(2) to ''paragraph (c)(4)(ii)(B)'' should be to ''paragraph (c)(5)(ii)(B)(1).'' The cross reference at 64 FR 7348 in proposed paragraph 52.676(e)(2) to ''Column II of Table A'' should be to ''Column II of Table 1.''

III. Do Any of the Regulatory Assessment Requirements Apply to this Action?

No. This action merely provides minor typographical corrections to the proposed rule. This action does not impose any new requirements. As such, this action does not require review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866, entitled Regulatory Planning and Review (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, or Executive Order 13045, entitled Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997). This action does not impose any enforceable duty, contain any unfunded mandate, or impose any significant or unique impact on small governments as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4). Nor does it require prior consultation with State, local, and tribal government officials as specified by Executive Order 12875, entitled Enhancing Intergovernmental Partnerships (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993) and Executive Order 13084, entitled Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments (63 FR 27655, May 19, 1998). This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104–113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note). In addition, since this action is not subject to notice-and-comment requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). EPA's compliance with these statutes and Executive Orders for the underlying proposed rule, is discussed in the preamble to the proposed rule (see 64 FR 7308, February 12, 1999).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 1, 1999.

Chuck Clarke,

Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 99–9205 Filed 4–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P