speak and persons present in the audience who wish to speak have been heard.

### Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to testify at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. Persons wishing to meet the 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 locations 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 the Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) and has determined that 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 the Federal regulations at 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 that 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.

### Executive Order 12630—Takings

This rule does not have takings implications. This determination is based on the analysis performed for the counterpart federal regulation.

### Executive Order 13132—Federalism

This rule does not have federalism implications. SMCRA delineates the roles of the federal and state governments with regard to the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations. One of the purposes of SMCRA is to "establish a nationwide program to protect society and the environment from the adverse effects of surface coal mining operations." Section 503(a)(1) of SMCRA requires that state laws regulating surface coal mining and reclamation operations be "in accordance with" the requirements of SMCRA, and section 503(a)(7) requires that state programs contain rules and regulations "consistent with" regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to SMCRA.

### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804(2), the Small Business

Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This rule:

- a. Does not have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million.
- b. Will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, federal, state, or local government agencies, or geographic regions.
- c. Does not have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S. based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises.

This determination is based upon the fact that the state submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart federal regulations for which an analysis was prepared and a determination made that the federal regulation was not considered a major rule.

### List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 931

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: October 11, 2000.

#### Peter A. Rutledge,

Acting Regional Director, Western Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 00–27163 Filed 10–20–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

### **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

#### Fish and Wildlife Service

# 50 CFR Part 20

RIN 1018-AH67

Migratory Bird Hunting; Temporary Approval of Tin Shot as Nontoxic for Hunting Waterfowl and Coots During the 2000–2001 Season

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service,

Interior.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or we) published in the September 25, 2000, Federal Register, a proposal to grant temporary approval of tin shot as nontoxic for hunting waterfowl and coots during the 2000–01 hunting season. Inadvertently, the deadline for public comment was stated as November 24, 2000. This correction amends the deadline for public comment to October 24, 2000.

**DATES:** Comments on the proposed rule published September 25, 2000 (65 FR 57586) must be received no later than October 24, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** You should submit comments on the proposed rule to the Chief, Office of Migratory Bird

Management (MBMO), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1849 C Street, NW., ms 634–ARLSQ, Washington, DC 20240. You may inspect comments during normal business hours in Room 634, Arlington Square Building, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jon Andrew, Chief, Office of Migratory Bird Management, (703) 358–1714.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We published in the September 25, 2000, Federal Register (65 FR 57586), a

proposal under the authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703–712 and 16 U.S.C. 742a–j) to grant temporary approval of tin shot as nontoxic for hunting waterfowl and coots during the 2000–01 hunting season. Inadvertently, the deadline for public comment was stated as November 24, 2000, which provides for a 60-day comment period. The correct deadline for public comment is October 24, 2000. In the proposed rule, we stated that the comment period for the

proposed rule had been shortened to 30 days. This timeframe will make it possible for tin shot, if temporarily approved, to be available for use by hunters during the 2000–01 hunting season, and will increase the number of nontoxic shot options available to hunters.

Dated: October 13, 2000. Marshall P. Jones, Jr., Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 00–27108 Filed 10–20–00; 8:45 am]  $\tt BILLING\ CODE\ 4310–55-P$