

Submission of written statements in advance of the hearing will allow OSM officials to prepare adequate responses and appropriate questions.

The public hearing will continue on the specified date until all persons scheduled to speak have been heard. Persons in the audience who have not been scheduled to speak, and who wish to do so, will be heard following those who have been scheduled. The hearing will end after all persons scheduled to speak and persons present in the audience who wish to speak have been heard.

Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to speak at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. Persons wishing to meet with OSM representatives to discuss the proposed amendment may request a meeting by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. All such meetings will be open to the public and, if possible, notices of meetings will be posted at the location listed under **ADDRESSES**. A written summary of each meeting will be made a part of the Administrative Record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review)

Executive Order 12988

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) 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 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 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.

National Environmental Policy Act

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed 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 counterpart 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. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated 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 counterpart Federal regulations.

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 925

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: April 23, 1997.

Brent Wahlquist,

Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 97-10989 Filed 4-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52 and 81

[VA068-5018b and VA066-5018b; FRL-5817-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia: Reopening of the Public Comment Period on the Redesignation of the Hampton Roads Ozone Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of the comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is reopening the comment period for a notice of proposed rulemaking published on March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11405). In that document EPA proposed to approve the Commonwealth of Virginia's request to redesignate the Hampton Roads area from marginal ozone nonattainment to attainment. The document also proposed to approve, as a state implementation plan (SIP) revision, the 10 year maintenance plan and mobile emissions budget developed for the Hampton Roads area and submitted by the Commonwealth. EPA received adverse comments on the action and a request to extend the public comment period on the proposed rulemaking. EPA is, therefore, reopening the public comment period on the March 12, 1997 notice of proposed rulemaking on the redesignation of the Hampton Roads ozone nonattainment area for a period of two weeks.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing on or before May 13, 1997. Commenters are advised that EPA does not intend to grant additional extensions or reopenings of the comment period on the March 12, 1997 proposed rulemaking.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to David L. Arnold, Chief, Ozone/Carbon Monoxide & Mobile Sources Section, Mailcode 3AT21, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19107. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Air, Radiation, and Toxics Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Persons interested in examining these documents should contact the EPA staff person listed below at least 24 hours prior to visiting the Regional office. Copies of the documents relevant

to this action are also available at the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristeen Gaffney, Ozone/Carbon Monoxide and Mobile Sources Section (3AT21), USEPA—Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107, or by telephone at: (215) 566-2092. Questions may also be addressed via e-mail, at the following address:

Gaffney.Kristeen@epamail.epa.gov
[PLEASE note that only written comments can be accepted for inclusion in the docket.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 12, 1997, EPA published a direct final rule (62 FR 11334) approving the Commonwealth of Virginia's request to redesignate the Hampton Roads marginal ozone nonattainment area from nonattainment to attainment and the 10 year maintenance plan and mobile emissions budget submitted by the Commonwealth for the Hampton Roads area as revisions to the Virginia SIP. As stated in the March 12, 1997 rulemaking, EPA's action to approve the redesignation was based upon its review of the Commonwealth's submittal and its determination that all five of the Clean Air Act's criteria for redesignation have been met by and for the Hampton Roads area. The ambient air quality data monitored in the Hampton Roads area indicated that it had attained the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone for the years 1993-1995. Review of the data monitored in 1996 has indicated continued attainment of the ambient standard. EPA also determined that the Commonwealth had a fully approved Part D SIP for the Hampton Roads area, was fully implementing that SIP, and that the air quality improvement in the Hampton Roads area was due to permanent and enforceable control measures. In the same rulemaking, EPA approved the maintenance plan submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia as a SIP revision because it provides for maintenance of the ozone standard for 10 years and a mobile emissions budget for the Hampton Roads area.

In its March 12, 1997 direct final rulemaking, EPA stated that if adverse comments were received on the direct final rule within the 30 days of its publication, EPA would publish a document announcing the withdrawal of its direct final rulemaking action. In a companion notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Proposed Rules section of the same **Federal**

Register (62 FR 11405), EPA also proposed to approve the Hampton Roads redesignation request and maintenance plan and mobile emission budget SIP revisions. In this proposal, EPA clearly stated that interested parties should comment at that time (during the 30 days), and that EPA did not intend to institute a second comment period. Because EPA received adverse comments on the direct final rulemaking within the prescribed comment period from the Allies in Defense of Cherry Point and U.S. Senator Lauch Faircloth of North Carolina, EPA withdrew the March 12, 1997 final rulemaking action pertaining to the Hampton Roads nonattainment area. In their letter submitting adverse comments, the Allies in Defense of Cherry Point also indicated that they intended to submit additional adverse comments and requested that the comment period be extended. However, because the 30 day public comment period EPA provided on the proposed rule was due to close two days after receipt of their request, there was insufficient time for EPA to publish a document extending the comment period. In order, therefore, to provide additional time to the Allies in Defense of Cherry Point, EPA would have to reopen the public comment period.

Despite the fact that EPA's March 12, 1997 actions clearly stated that all interested parties should comment during the originally prescribed 30 days and that EPA did not intend to institute a second comment period, in the interest of full public participation, EPA is reopening the public comment period for two weeks.

In determining its final action on the Commonwealth's redesignation request and maintenance plan for the Hampton Roads area, EPA shall consider all comments received on its March 12, 1997 proposed action. All interested parties are advised that comments must be received by the EPA Regional office listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document by May 13, 1997.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone.

Dated: April 17, 1997.

W. T. Wisniewski,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 97-11124 Filed 4-25-97; 12:10 pm]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Part 67

[Docket No. FEMA-7219]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Technical information or comments are requested on the proposed base (1% annual chance) flood elevations and proposed base flood elevation modifications for the communities listed below. The base flood elevations are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

DATES: The comment period is ninety (90) days following the second publication of this proposed rule in a newspaper of local circulation in each community.

ADDRESSES: The proposed base flood elevations for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the following table.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frederick H. Sharrocks, Jr., Chief, Hazard Identification Branch, Mitigation Directorate, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-2796.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA or Agency) proposes to make determinations of base flood elevations and modified base flood elevations for each community listed below, in accordance with section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed base flood and modified base flood elevations, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, state or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management