

Rulemaking issued on June 2, 1994 (59 FR 28501) and September 28, 1995 (60 FR 50146), respectively, entitled Appropriateness of Requested Single Location Bargaining Units in Representation Cases. The Board¹ has decided to take this action given that no action has been taken by the Board on either rulemaking proceeding for several years² and the Board's determination to focus its time and resources on reducing the backlog of adjudicated cases pending before the Board.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John J. Toner, Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street NW, Room 11600, Washington, D.C. 20570. Telephone: (202) 273-1940.

Dated: Washington, D.C., February 18, 1998.

By direction of the Board.

John J. Toner,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-4543 Filed 2-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7545-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 948

West Virginia Permanent Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; public comment period and opportunity for public hearing.

SUMMARY: OSM is proposing to clarify three final rule decisions, to remove a required amendment, and to vacate its retroactive approval of amendments to the West Virginia permanent regulatory program (hereinafter referred to as the West Virginia program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The clarifications concern West Virginia statutes pertaining to administrative appeals and the State Environmental Quality Board, and the required amendment pertains to termination of

¹ Members Fox, Liebman, Hurtgen and Brame. Chairman Gould agrees with his colleagues as to the notice of proposed rulemaking regarding standardized remedial orders in Board unfair labor practice decisions, but dissents from the withdrawal of the notice of proposed rulemaking regarding the appropriateness of single location bargaining units in representation cases.

² A Congressional rider attached to each of the NLRB's 1996, 1997, and 1998 appropriations bills has prohibited the Agency from expending any funds to promulgate a final rule regarding the appropriateness of single location bargaining units in representation cases.

jurisdiction. The proposed actions are intended to comply with a settlement agreement reached in *West Virginia Mining and Reclamation Association (WVMRA) v. Babbitt*, No. 2: 96-0371 (S.D. W.Va.).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before 4:00 p.m. on March 25, 1998. If requested, a public hearing on the proposed amendments will be held at 1:00 p.m. on March 20, 1998. Requests to present oral testimony at the hearing must be received on or before 4:00 p.m. on March 10, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests to speak at the hearing should be mailed or hand delivered to Mr. Roger W. Calhoun, Director, Charleston Field Office at the address listed below.

Copies of the West Virginia program, the program amendment decision that is the subject of this notice, and the administrative record on the West Virginia program are available for public review and copying at the addresses below, during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

Mr. Roger W. Calhoun, Director,
Charleston Field Office, Office of
Surface Mining Reclamation and
Enforcement, 1027 Virginia Street,
East, Charleston, West Virginia 25301
Telephone: (304) 347-7158
West Virginia Division of
Environmental Protection, 10
McJunkin Road, Nitro, West Virginia
25143, Telephone: (304) 759-0515.

In addition, copies of the amendments that are the subject of this notice are available for inspection during regular business hours at the following locations:

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Morgantown Area Office, 75 High Street, Room 229, P.O. Box 886, Morgantown, West Virginia 26507, Telephone: (304) 291-4004
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Beckley Area Office, 323 Harper Park Drive, Suite 3, Beckley, West Virginia 25801, Telephone: (304) 255-5265.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Roger W. Calhoun, Director, Charleston Field Office; Telephone: (304) 347-7158.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the West Virginia Program

On January 21, 1981, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the West Virginia program. Background information on the West Virginia program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of the approval can be found in the January 21, 1981,

Federal Register (46 FR 5915-5956). Subsequent actions concerning the West Virginia program and previous amendments are codified at 30 CFR 948.10, 948.12, 948.13, 948.15 and 948.16.

II. Discussion of the Proposed Amendment

In a series of three letters dated June 28, 1993, and July 30, 1993 (Administrative Record Nos. WV-888, WV-889 and WV-893), the West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) submitted an amendment to its approved permanent regulatory program that included numerous revisions to the West Virginia Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Act (referred to herein as "the Act", WVSCMRA § 22A-3-1 *et seq.*) and the West Virginia Surface Mining Reclamation Regulations (CSR § 38-2-1 *et seq.*). OSM approved the proposed revisions on durable rock fills on August 16, 1995, (60 FR 42437-42443) and approved with exceptions, the proposed revisions on bonding on October 4, 1995, (60 FR 51900-51918). OSM approved, with exceptions, the remaining amendments on February 21, 1996, (61 FR 6511-6537). See 30 CFR 948.15 for the provisions that were partially approved by OSM. See 30 CFR 948.16 for required amendments.

On April 18, 1996, the WVMRA, the West Virginia Coal Association, and the Tri-State Coal Operators Association, Inc. filed an appeal, pursuant to section 526(a)(1) of SMCRA, 30 U.S.C. 1276(a)(1), challenging certain OSM decisions contained in the February 21, 1996, *Federal Register* Notice, including the decision to make approval of the amendment retroactive. (Administrative Record Number WV-1027) On October 29, 1997, the parties reached a settlement agreement with respect to six of the seven counts contained in the above referenced case. (Administrative Record Number WV-1077). The other count, pertaining to the use of passive treatment systems after final bond release, was decided by the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia in OSM's favor. See *WVMRA v. Babbitt*, No. 2: 96-0371 (S.D. W.Va. July 11, 1997) (Administrative Record Number WV-1072). This rulemaking is proposed in order that OSM may fulfill its obligations with respect to five of the six counts of the appeal which are addressed by settlement agreement. The remaining count addressed in the settlement agreement, pertaining to the

windrowing of materials on the downslope in steep slope areas, is the subject of another proposed rulemaking, announced in the June 10, 1997, **Federal Register**. See 62 FR 31543, 32545.

1. Proposed Clarifications

Section 22B-1-7(d) Administrative Appeals

As announced in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR at 6516, 6536) OSM did not approve language at § 22B-1-7(d) concerning allowing temporary relief where the appellant demonstrates that the executed decision appealed from will result in the appellant suffering an "unjust hardship." OSM stated that the provision was disapproved because the exception is inconsistent with SMCRA section 514(d) and 525(c). Further, OSM required, at 30 CFR 948.16(nnn), that § 22B-1-7(d) be amended to be consistent with SMCRA sections 514(d) and 525(c). In accordance with the settlement agreement in *WVMRA v. Babbitt, supra*, OSM is proposing to clarify its February 21, 1996, decision by stating that § 22B-1-7(d) is not approved only to the extent that it includes unjust hardship as a criterion to support the granting of temporary relief from an order or other decision issued under Chapter 22, Article 3 of the West Virginia Code, which is the West Virginia counterpart to SMCRA. OSM is also proposing to revise the required amendment at 30 CFR 948.16(nnn) to require West Virginia to amend its program to remove unjust hardship as a criterion to support the granting of temporary relief from an order or other decision issued under Chapter 22, Article 3 of the West Virginia Code.

Section 22B-1-7(h) Administrative Appeals

As announced in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR at 6516, 6536), OSM did not approve language at § 22B-1-7(h) to the extent that the provision would allow the West Virginia Surface Mining Board to decline to order an operator to treat or control discharges due to economic considerations. In addition, OSM required, at 30 CFR 948.16(ooo), that the State further amend § 22B-1-7(h) to be no less stringent than SMCRA section 515(b)10 and no less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 816.42 by requiring that discharges be controlled or treated without regard to economic feasibility.

In accordance with the settlement agreement in *WVMRA v. Babbitt, supra*, OSM is proposing to clarify that § 22B-1-7(h) is approved only to the extent

that it references Article 3, Chapter 22 of the West Virginia Code. OSM is also proposing to revise the required amendment, at 30 CFR 948.16(ooo), to require West Virginia to amend its program by removing the reference, in § 22B-1-7(h), to Article 3, Chapter 22.

Section 22B-3-4 Environmental Quality Board

As announced in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR at 6517), OSM approved the provisions at § 22B-3-4 concerning the Environmental Quality Board's rulemaking authority. Under the State's S.B.287, the Board is authorized, with certain restrictions, to promulgate procedural rules granting site-specific variances for water quality standards for coal remining operations. In approving the provision, OSM also stated that any such procedural rules that grant variances must be submitted to OSM for approval prior to their implementation.

In accordance with the settlement agreement in *WVMRA v. Babbitt, supra*, OSM is proposing to clarify that it does not have approval authority over rules developed by the Environmental Quality Board under the authority of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, OSM is stating that the Environmental Quality Board is not required to submit to OSM for approval procedural rules for the implementation of site specific variances for water quality standards for remining operations.

2. Proposed Amendment Findings Revisions

CSR 38-2-1.2(c)(1) Termination of Jurisdiction

As announced in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR at 6517, 6536), OSM found § 38-2-1.2(c)(1) to be less effective than the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 700.11(d)(1)(i) to the extent that subsection (c)(1) does not require compliance with the Federal initial program regulations at Subchapter B or the West Virginia permanent regulatory program as a prerequisite to the termination of jurisdiction over an initial program site. In addition, OSM required, at 30 CFR 948.16(ppp), that the State further amend subsection (c)(1) to require compliance with the Federal initial program regulations at Subchapter B or the West Virginia permanent regulatory program regulations as a prerequisite to the termination of jurisdiction over an initial program site.

By letter dated December 12, 1996 (Administrative Record Number WV-1052), the West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP)

stated its commitment to require that initial program sites in West Virginia meet the West Virginia program's permanent program requirements as a precondition of the termination of regulatory jurisdiction over such sites.

In recognition of the acknowledgment contained in the December 12, 1996, WVDEP letter, and in accordance with the settlement agreement in *WVMRA v. Babbitt, supra*, OSM is proposing to accept the WVDEP December 12, 1996 letter as satisfying the requirements of 30 CFR 700.11(d)(1)(i), and is proposing to delete the required amendment codified at 30 CFR 948.16(ppp).

3. Vacating Retroactive Approval of Amendments

As published in the **Federal Register** on February 21, 1996 (61 FR 6533), OSM stated that with respect to laws and regulations being approved in the notice, that OSM was making the effective date of the approval retroactive to the date upon which each provision took effect in West Virginia for purposes of State law. However, as stated in the settlement agreement in *WVMRA v. Babbitt, supra*, OSM has agreed to vacate the retroactive effect of its approval of the program amendment which was the subject of the February 21, 1996, **Federal Register** notice. Therefore, OSM is hereby announcing its intention to vacate the retroactive approval of the amendments discussed and approved in the February 21, 1996, **Federal Register** notice, 61 FR 6511, 6535. In addition, OSM is proposing to change the effective dates of all the amendments approved in the February 21, 1996 notice to February 21, 1996.

III. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the provisions of 30 CFR 732.17(h), OSM is now seeking comments on the proposed clarifications, the proposed removal of the required amendment codified at 30 CFR 948.16(ppp), and the proposed change of the effective dates of the amendments currently codified at 30 CFR 948.15(p)(1) to February 21, 1996. Comments should address whether the proposed clarifications, the proposed deletion of the required amendment at 30 CFR 948.16(ppp), and the change of the effective dates of the amendments codified at 30 CFR 948.15(p)(1) to February 21, 1996, satisfy the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. If the clarifications, deletion of the required amendment, and change of the effective date of approval are deemed adequate, they will become part of the West Virginia program.

Written Comments

Written comments should be specific, pertain only to the issues proposed in this notice and include explanations in support of the commenter's recommendations. Comments received after the time indicated under **DATES** or at locations other than the OSM Charleston Field Office will not necessarily be considered in the final rulemaking or included in the Administrative Record.

Public Hearing

Persons wishing to testify at the public hearing should contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by the close of business on March 10, 1998. If no one requests an opportunity to testify at the public hearing by that date, the hearing will not be held.

Filing of a written statement at the time of the hearing is requested as it will greatly assist the transcriber. Submission of written statements in advance of the hearing will allow OSM officials to prepare adequate remarks and appropriate questions.

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

Public Meeting

If only one person or group requests to testify 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 clarification, removal of the required amendment, or change in the effective dates of the approval may request a meeting at the OSM Charleston Field Office listed under **ADDRESSES** 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 in advance at the locations listed under **ADDRESSES**. A written summary of each public 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 the 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 948

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: February 12, 1998.

Allen D. Klein,

Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 98-4471 Filed 2-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 501

Manufacture, Distribution, and Use of Postage Meters

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposal would clarify and expand the sources of and uses of applicant information derived from PS Form 3601-A and PS Form 3601-C, both printed and electronic versions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 25, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed or delivered to the Manager, Metering Technology Management, U.S. Postal Service, Room 8430, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW Washington DC 20260-2444. Copies of all written comments will be available at the above address for inspection and photocopying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nicholas S. Stankosky, (202) 268-5311.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To provide greater specificity regarding uses of the information derived from the meter license applications received by the United States Postal Service ("Postal Service") from meter users and authorized meter manufacturers. Such information is hereafter referred to as "Applicant Information." Applicant information is derived from postal forms, both printed and electronic versions.

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

Appropriate amendments to 39 CFR part 501 to reflect these changes will be published if the proposal is adopted.

Although exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(b, c.)) regarding proposed