established in 40 CFR Part 68, EPA ICR No. 1956.01. This is a new collection.

Abstract: On June 20, 1996, EPA published risk management regulations mandated under the accidental release prevention provisions under the Clean Air Act Section 112(r)(7), 42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(7). These regulations were codified in 40 CFR Part 68. The intent of Section 112(r) is to prevent accidental releases to the air and mitigate the consequences of such releases by focusing prevention measures on chemicals that pose the greatest risk to the environment. The chemical accident prevention rule required owners and operators of stationary sources subject to the rule to submit a risk management plan by June 21, 1999 to EPA. The Office of Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention (OCEPP), Superfund Division, Region 5, is responsible for implementing and enforcing the Risk Management Program. In order to fulfill its responsibilities as the implementing office, OCEPP will collect information from major stationary sources of air emissions to determine whether or not these sources are in compliance with the risk management program regulations. The information will be requested through certified mail and pursuant to Section 114(a) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7414(a). Therefore, response to the information collection is mandatory.

Any information submitted to EPA for which a claim of confidentiality is made will be safeguarded according to the Agency policies set forth in Title 40, Chapter 1, Part 2, Subpart B—Confidentiality of Business Information (see 40 CFR 2; 41 FR 36902, September 1, 1976; amended by 43 FR 40000, September 8, 1978; 43 FR 42251, September 20, 1978; 44 FR 17674, March 23, 1979). An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15. The information collected will include the names of the regulated substances used, produced, or stored on-site; amount of the regulated substances; copies of inventory records; copies of Material Safety Data Sheets; capacity of the container which stores or handles the regulated substance; and the number of employees.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Burden Statement: EPA estimates that a total of 2,000 respondents will receive the request for information. The total burden for the respondents for this collection of information is estimated to be 3,000 hours with an average of 1.5 hours per response and a labor cost of $49. The responses will be one-time, and do not involve periodic reporting or recordkeeping. No capital or start-up expenses will be required 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. This 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.

Dated: April 28, 2000.

William Muno,

Director, Superfund Division.

[FR Doc. 00–11568 Filed 5–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6603–6]

Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to Proposed State Operating Permit for Exxon Chemical Americas' (Exxon) Polypropylene Unit Baton Rouge Polyolefins Plant Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of final order on petition to object to State operating permit.

SUMMARY: This notice announces that the EPA Administrator has denied a petition to object to a proposed state operating permit issued by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality for Exxon's Chemical Americas proposed polypropylene unit at its Polyolefins Plant in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (Act), the petitioners may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this decision under section 307 of the Act.

ADDRESSES: You may review copies of the final order, the petition, and other supporting information at EPA, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733. If you wish to examine these documents, you should make an appointment at least 24 hours before visiting day. The final order is also available electronically at the following address: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/t5pfpr.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jole Luehrs, Chief, Air Permitting Section, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, EPA, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7250, or e-mail at luehrs.jole@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Act affords EPA a 45-day period to review, and object to as appropriate, operating permits proposed by State permitting authorities. Section 505(b)(2) of the Act authorizes any person to petition the EPA Administrator within 60 days after the expiration of this review period to object to State operating permits if EPA has not done so. Petitions must be based only on objections to the permit that were raised with reasonable specificity during the public comment period provided by the State, unless the petitioner demonstrates that it was impracticable to raise these issues during the comment period or the grounds for the issues arose after this period.

Ms. Marylee Orr, Executive Director of the Louisiana Environmental Action Network (LEAN) submitted a petition to the Administrator on December 30, 1998, seeking EPA's objection to the title V operating permit issued for Exxon's proposed polypropylene unit at Exxon's polyolefins plant in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The petition was submitted on behalf of the North Baton Rouge Environmental Association and LEAN (Petitioners). The petition objects to issuance of the Exxon permit on two grounds: (1) Alleged discrimination under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; and (2) the Baton Rouge ozone

nonattainment area is not making reasonable further progress towards attainment, and that the additional emissions from the proposed polypropylene unit will adversely affect the ozone situation. Ms. Orr also submitted a letter supplementing the petition on behalf of LEAN on January 5, 1999, and another letter on March 1, 1999, requesting that the Exxon permit be reopened. The Region 6 Regional Administrator also addressed the second issue in a separate letter to the Petitioners.

On April 12, 2000, the Administrator issued an order denying the petition. The order explains the reasons for denying the Petitioners' claims.

Dated: April 28, 2000.

Carl E. Edlund,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 00–11567 Filed 5–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6602–7]

Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (''CERCLA''), Union Pacific Railroad Wallace-Mullan Branch

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 122(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i), notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement with the Union Pacific Railroad Company for recovery of certain response costs concerning the Union Pacific Railroad Wallace-Mullan Branch in northern Idaho. The settlement requires Union Pacific to pay a total of $650,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund. The settlement includes a limited covenant not to sue pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9607(a) and provides for contribution protection pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9622(h). This administrative settlement will be superseded upon entry of a consent decree lodged on December 23, 1999, by the United States, State of Idaho, Coeur d'Alene, and Union Pacific, Case No. 99–606–N–EJL (D. Idaho), or will otherwise terminate three months from the effective date of the administrative settlement, unless otherwise agreed by the parties to this settlement. EPA will consider public comments on the proposed administrative settlement for thirty days. EPA may withdraw from or modify this proposed settlement should such comments disclose facts or considerations which indicate this proposed settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

DATES: Written comments must be provided on or before June 8, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Clifford J. Villa, Assistant Regional Counsel, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, 1200 Sixth Ave., ORC–158, Seattle, Washington 98101 and refer to In the Matter of Union Pacific Railroad Wallace-Mullan Branch Notice of Proposed Administrative Settlement.

Copies of the proposed settlement are available from: Clifford J. Villa, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Office of Regional Counsel, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98101, (206) 553–1185.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clifford J. Villa at (206) 553–1185.

Authority: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(i).

Sheila M. Eckman,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 10.

[FR Doc. 00–11570 Filed 5–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6604–1]

Public Water System Supervision Program Revision for the State of South Dakota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The State of South Dakota has revised its Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) Primacy Program. South Dakota's PWSS program, administered by the Drinking Water Program of the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), has adopted regulations for lead and copper in drinking water that correspond to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) in 40 CFR part 141 Subpart I (56 FR 26460–26564). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a proposed primacy revision on August 16, 1999 at 64 FR 44521 and provided for public comment. The EPA also held a public hearing on December 2, 1999, in Badlands National Park, South Dakota (64 FR 61109). No comments were received regarding PWSS program issues. The EPA has completed its review of South Dakota's primacy revisions and has determined that they are no less stringent than the NPDWR. EPA therefore approves South Dakota's primacy revisions for the Lead and Copper Rule.

Today's approval action does not extend to public water systems in Indian Country as that term is defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. Please see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION,** Item B.

DATES: This primacy revision approval will be effective June 8, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda Himmelbauer, Municipal Systems Unit, EPA Region 8 (8P–W–MS), 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202–2466, telephone 303–312–6263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?

States which have received primacy from EPA under the SDWA must maintain a safe drinking water program that is equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal program. As the Federal program changes, States must change their program and ask EPA to approve the revisions to their programs. Changes to State programs may be necessary when Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority is modified or when certain other changes occur.

B. How Does Today's Action Affect Indian Country (18 U.S.C. Section 1151) in South Dakota?

South Dakota is not authorized to carry out its Public Water System Supervision program in Indian country, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151. This includes, but is not limited to: Lands within the exterior boundaries of the following Indian Reservations located within the State of South Dakota:

a. Cheyenne River Indian Reservation.
b. Crow Creek Indian Reservation.
c. Flandreau Indian Reservation.
d. Lower Brule Indian Reservation.
e. Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.
f. Rosebud Indian Reservation.
g. Standing Rock Indian Reservation.
h. Yankton Indian Reservation.

EPA held a public hearing on December 2, 1999, in Badlands National Park, South Dakota, and accepted public comments on the question of the location and extent of Indian country within the State of South Dakota. In a forthcoming **Federal Register** notice, EPA will respond to comments and more specifically identify Indian country areas in the State of South Dakota.