

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## Minerals Management Service

## 30 CFR Part 218

RIN 1010-AC76

**Interest Rate Applicable to Late Payment or Underpayment of Monies Due on Solid Minerals and Geothermal Leases**

**AGENCY:** Minerals Management Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Minerals Management Service (MMS) is revoking its rulemaking published on March 29, 1994, regarding interest rates used to assess interest on late payment or underpayment of monies due on solid minerals and geothermal leases. A decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit invalidated the amendments promulgated in 1994. This rule reinstates the pre-1994 rule.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** This rule is effective September 13, 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

David S. Guzy, Chief, Rules and Publications Staff, Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3021, Denver, Colorado 80225-0165; telephone (303) 231-3432; FAX (303) 231-3385; e-mail David.Guzy@mms.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The principal authors of this final rule are Janet Lin and Geoffrey Heath of the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

**I. Background**

**1982 Rule.** On May 25, 1982, MMS promulgated a rule (47 FR 22524) that imposed interest charges for late payment and underpayment of royalties under Federal and Indian coal and geothermal leases (the 1982 rule). The 1982 rule specified that MMS would charge an interest rate at the Treasury Current Value of Funds Rate (CVF rate) for late payment and underpayment of royalties both for coal<sup>1</sup> and for geothermal resources.<sup>2</sup> The Treasury Department published the CVF rate on a quarterly basis. As a matter of practice, MMS applied the new CVF rate for each quarter to existing indebtedness

(hereinafter, this method is referred to as "shifting rates").

On April 28, 1986, MMS promulgated a rule (51 FR 15763) changing a subpart heading so that the provisions under it, including the late payment and underpayment rate provisions, applied to all solid minerals instead of only coal.

**1994 Rule.** On March 29, 1994, MMS promulgated a rule (59 FR 14559) (the 1994 rule) that revised the interest rate for late payment and underpayment of royalties for solid minerals<sup>3</sup> and for geothermal resources<sup>4</sup> from the CVF rate to the higher Internal Revenue Service underpayment rate prescribed at 26 U.S.C. 6621(a)(2) (IRS rate). The IRS rate is a "prime plus three percent" rate that shifts quarterly with changes in the prime rate. Under the associated provisions at 26 U.S.C. 6622, the rate is a daily compounded rate. The MMS rule imposing the higher rate became effective on April 1, 1994.

In promulgating the 1994 rule, MMS sought to more appropriately compensate the lessor for the lost time value of underpaid royalties and to make interest rates for solid minerals and geothermal resources consistent with those imposed on oil and gas under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA), section 111(a).<sup>5</sup> FOGRMA provides MMS with express statutory authority to assess interest at the IRS rate on underpaid oil and gas royalties. Since no such statutory provision exists for solid minerals or geothermal resources, the 1994 rule 19 relied on the Secretary's rulemaking authority under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA),<sup>6</sup> the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands,<sup>7</sup> the Indian mineral leasing laws,<sup>8</sup> and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970.<sup>9</sup>

The 1994 rule amended 30 CFR 218.202(c) and (d) and 30 CFR 218.302(c) and (d) with identical provisions that read as follows:

(c) The interest charge on late payments shall be at the underpayment rate established by section 6621(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 6621(a)(2).

(d) Interest will be charged only on the amount of the payment not received by the designated due date. Interest will be charged only for the number of days the payment is late.

*The Amax Decision.* Amax Land Company (Amax) is a Federal coal

lessee. The MMS assessed late payment interest on Amax for failure to timely pay royalties for the period January 1989 to July 1993. The MMS applied the IRS rate under the 1994 rule to Amax's late payment for those periods in which the indebtedness continued after the effective date of that rule. Amax administratively appealed the interest assessment. The MMS Director and the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management denied the appeal. Amax then sought judicial review in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia challenging the legality of the 1994 rule. The District Court held that MMS's application of the IRS rate to solid minerals was not a permissible exercise of MMS's rulemaking authority at 30 U.S.C. 189. *Amax Land Company v. Quarterman*, 1998 WL 306582, 6 (D.D.C. 1998).

The Government appealed. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reversed the District Court's decision in part and affirmed it in part. *Amax Land Company v. Quarterman*, 181 F. 3d 1356 (D.C. Cir. 1999) (*Amax* decision). The D.C. Circuit concluded that MMS's adoption of the IRS interest rate under the MLA's rulemaking authority was reasonable only if MMS could show that the particular regulations were "necessary and proper" under 30 U.S.C. 189.<sup>10</sup> The D.C. Circuit remanded the question of whether MMS action was "necessary and proper" in this case to the District Court.<sup>11</sup>

The D.C. Circuit agreed with the District Court's conclusion that the Debt Collection Act (DCA)<sup>12</sup> and the Federal Claims Collection Standards<sup>13</sup> prevent MMS from using shifting or compounding interest rates in situations in which the DCA applies.<sup>14</sup> However, the D.C. Circuit further held that these DCA prohibitions do not apply to contracts executed before October 25, 1982.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, for leases issued before October 25, 1982, the DCA does not bar shifting or compound rates.

Under the *Amax* decision, MMS would first have to show that use of the higher rate is "necessary and proper" under the MLA<sup>16</sup> before it could assess interest at the IRS rate on underpayments under any solid mineral leases. However, under the D.C. Circuit's opinion, even if MMS makes

<sup>1</sup> 30 CFR 211.67(c), later redesignated as 30 CFR 218.202(c).

<sup>2</sup> 30 CFR 270.91(c), later redesignated as 30 CFR 218.302(c).

<sup>3</sup> 30 CFR 218.202(c) and (d).

<sup>4</sup> 30 CFR 218.302(c) and (d).

<sup>5</sup> 30 U.S.C. 1721(a).

<sup>6</sup> 30 U.S.C. 189.

<sup>7</sup> 30 U.S.C. 359.

<sup>8</sup> 30 U.S.C. 396 and 396(d).

<sup>9</sup> 30 U.S.C. 1023.

<sup>10</sup> 181 F. 3d at 1366.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 1367.

<sup>12</sup> 31 U.S.C. 3717(c)(2).

<sup>13</sup> 4 CFR 102.13.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 1367.

<sup>15</sup> 31 U.S.C. 3717(g)(2); *Id.* at 1369.

<sup>16</sup> 30 U.S.C. 189.

the necessary showing to impose the IRS rate, it could only use an IRS rate that neither shifts nor compounds for leases issued after October 25, 1982. For pre-October 25, 1982, leases, MMS could impose a shifting and compounding IRS rate unless the lessee shows that use of shifting or compound rates is not "necessary and proper" in the particular case.<sup>17</sup> This holding created an issue of fact that would have to be adjudicated in every case, which effectively nullified the uniform applicability of the rule even as to pre-October 25, 1982, leases, and made its provisions at best contingent.

Although *Amax* challenged the interest provision only with regard to coal leases, the *Amax* decision affects the validity of the same provision as it applies to other solid mineral leases and of an identical provision that applies to leases of geothermal resources.

The practical effect of the *Amax* decision is that MMS is left to defend an interest rate provision that is very different from the rule it promulgated in 1994. As explained above, MMS promulgated the 1994 rule to make interest rates for late payment and underpayment consistent with those imposed under FOGRMA, among other reasons.<sup>18</sup> The preamble to the 1994 rule summarized the effect of the rule as moving from a simple interest rate under the old rule (CVF rate) to a compounding rate under the new rule (IRS rate).<sup>19</sup> Instead of making rates for solid minerals and geothermal resources consistent with fluid minerals, the *Amax* decision would result in a patchwork of possible rates. Under the *Amax* decision, MMS simply cannot assess interest for solid minerals and geothermal resources under the IRS rate prescribed in the 1994 rule. Instead, MMS would have to assess different interest rates in each case, depending on the type of lease at issue and the outcome of the further proceedings that the Court identified were lacking during the rulemaking process. For these reasons, the *Amax* decision has the substantive effect of invalidating the 1994 rule as promulgated.

## II. Reinstatement of the 1982 Rule

In the event that a court finds a regulatory change invalid, the prior regulations are reinstated. The D.C. Circuit, in *Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.*, 821 F. 2d 750 (D.C. Cir. 1987), *aff'd*, 488 U.S. 204 (1988), stated that "[t]his circuit has previously held that the effect of invalidating an agency rule

is to 'reinstat[e] the rules previously in force.'" In that case, the D.C. Circuit held that when the District Court vacated a rule, it reinstated the prior regulations. The D.C. Circuit came to a similar conclusion when it vacated a regulation in *Action on Smoking & Health v. CAB*, 713 F.2d 795, 797 (D.C. Cir. 1983).<sup>20</sup>

As discussed above, the *Amax* decision effectively invalidates the 1994 rule. It follows that the 1982 rule is reinstated for the periods beginning April 1, 1994. By this notice in the **Federal Register**, the text of the rule as it read before the 1994 amendment is reinstated.

Although the *Amax* decision did not address the 1982 rule, the D.C. Circuit held that the DCA and 4 CFR 102.13(c) prohibit MMS from assessing interest on the basis of shifting interest rates for leases issued after October 25, 1982.<sup>21</sup> The 1982 rule does not specify whether a shifting rate applies. In past practice, before the 1994 rule was adopted, MMS applied a shifting CVF interest rate under the 1982 rule to all solid minerals and geothermal royalty underpayments, regardless of when the lease was issued. Consistent with the D.C. Circuit's ruling, MMS will now apply the restored pre-1994 rule language to use a constant CVF interest rate for all post-October 25, 1982, leases in accordance with the *Amax* decision, but will continue to calculate interest on the basis of shifting CVF interest rates for pre-October 25, 1982, leases. Since the text of the 1982 rule that is reinstated does not specify whether the CVF rate shifts, the earlier rule language is reinstated without change, and constant rates will be used for underpayments for post-October 25, 1982, leases, as a matter of interpretation compelled by the *Amax* decision. In other words, for underpayments for leases issued after October 25, 1982, the CVF rate in effect at the time the underpayment occurs will remain the rate at which interest continues to accrue until the unpaid royalties are paid.

The Department of the Interior finds good cause to issue this final rule without notice and opportunity for public comment under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B). This final rule is a direct result of a judicial decision invalidating the 1994 rule, and public comment

<sup>20</sup> See also *Mason General Hospital v. Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services*, 809 F.2d 1220 (6th Cir. 1987); *Abington Memorial Hospital v. Heckler*, 750 F.2d 242, 244 (3d Cir. 1985); *Menorah Medical Center v. Heckler*, 768 F.2d 297 (8th Cir. 1985); *Cumberland Medical Center v. Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 781 F.2d 536, 538 (6th Cir. 1986).

<sup>21</sup> 181 F.3d at 1367.

therefore is unnecessary. For the same reasons, a 30-day period is not required between publication of a final rule and its effective date under 5 U.S.C. 553(d).

## III. Procedural Matters

### 1. Summary Cost and Benefit Data

This rule reinstates the lower interest rates contained in the 1982 rule beginning April 1, 1994. Consequently, this rule imposes the following costs or benefits to the four affected groups: industry, the Federal Government, State and local governments, and Indian tribes and allottees.

#### A. Industry

We estimate that the solid minerals and geothermal industries will pay approximately 40 percent less late-payment interest on Federal leases under the reinstated 1982 interest rates. Under the 1994 rates, MMS would have billed solid mineral and geothermal payors approximately \$2 million per year in late payment interest. Under the reinstated 1982 rates, billed interest will decrease to approximately \$1.2 million, for a \$800,000 net benefit to industry.

#### B. Federal Government

The Federal Government will collect approximately \$800,000 less late-payment interest annually (see discussion in section A. Industry). Approximately 50 percent or \$400,000 would have been retained by the U.S. Treasury.

#### C. State and Local Governments

The Federal Government will collect approximately \$800,000 less late-payment interest annually (see discussion in section A. Industry). Approximately 50 percent or \$400,000 would have been paid to States. Those States are primarily the largest solid mineral producing States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Montana, and New Mexico.

#### D. Indian Tribes

Most solid mineral revenues are paid directly to the Indian recipients, so MMS does not know the exact receipt dates. Consequently, MMS must estimate the revenue loss to Indian tribes and allottees by extrapolation from Federal payments. Indian solid mineral revenues are 15 percent of Federal solid mineral revenues so we estimate that the revenue loss to Indian tribes and allottees will be 15 percent of \$800,000 or \$120,000 annually.

The cost and benefit information in this Item 1 of Procedural Matters is used as the basis for the departmental certifications in Items 2–10.

<sup>17</sup> 181 F. 3d at 1369.

<sup>18</sup> 60 FR 14557.

<sup>19</sup> 60 FR 14558.

2. *Regulatory Planning and Review (E.O. 12866)*

This document is not a significant rule and is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

(1) This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities.

(2) This rule will not create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency.

(3) This rule does not alter the budgetary effects of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights or obligations of their recipients.

(4) This rule does not raise novel legal or policy issues.

3. *Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Department of the Interior certifies that this document will not have a significant adverse effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

Your comments are important. The Small Business and Agricultural Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and 10 Regional Fairness Boards were established to receive comments from small businesses about Federal agency enforcement actions. The Ombudsman will annually evaluate the enforcement activities and rate each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on the enforcement actions in this rule, call 1-888-734-3247.

4. *Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Act (SBREFA)*

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 or more.

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.

5. *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

This rule does not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of more than \$100 million per year. The

rule does not have a significant or unique effect on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector. A statement containing the information required by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is not required.

6. *Takings (E.O. 12630)*

In accordance with Executive Order 12630, this proposed rule does not have significant takings implications. This rule does not impose conditions or limitations on the use of any private property; consequently, a takings implication assessment is not required.

7. *Federalism (E.O. 13132)*

In accordance with Executive Order 13132, this proposed rule does not have Federalism implications. This rule does not substantially or directly affect the relationship between the Federal and State governments or impose costs on States or localities.

8. *Civil Justice Reform (E.O. 12988)*

In accordance with Executive Order 12988, the Office of the Solicitor has determined that this rule does not unduly burden the judicial system and meets the requirements of sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of the Order.

9. *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995*

This proposed rule does not contain an information collection, as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act, and the submission of Office of Management and Budget Form 83-I is not required.

10. *National Environmental Policy Act*

This rule does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. A detailed statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is not required.

**List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 218**

Coal, Continental shelf, Electronic funds transfers, Geothermal energy, Government contracts, Indian lands, Mineral royalties, Natural gas, Penalties, Petroleum, Public lands—Mineral resources, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: September 5, 2000.

**Sylvia V. Baca,**

*Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management.*

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR part 218 is amended as follows:

**PART 218—COLLECTION OF ROYALTIES, RENTALS, BONUSES AND OTHER MONIES DUE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

1. The authority citation for part 218 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 301 *et seq.*; 25 U.S.C. 396 *et seq.*, 396a *et seq.*, 2101 *et seq.*; 30 U.S.C. 181 *et seq.*, 351 *et seq.*, 1001 *et seq.*, 1701 *et seq.*; 31 U.S.C. 3716; 3720A, 9701; 43 U.S.C. 1301 *et seq.*, 1331 *et seq.*, and 1801 *et seq.*

**Subpart E—Solid Minerals—General**

2. In § 218.202, paragraphs (c) and (d) are revised and republished to read as follows:

**§ 218.202 Late payment or underpayment charges.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) Late payment charges are calculated on the basis of a percentage assessment rate. In the absence of a specific lease, permit, license or contract provision prescribing a different rate, this percentage assessment rate is prescribed by the Department of the Treasury as the "Treasury Current Value of Funds Rate."

(d) This rate is available in the Treasury Fiscal Requirements Manual Bulletins that are published prior to the first day of each calendar quarter for application to overdue payments or underpayments in the new calendar quarter. The rate is also published in the Notices section of the **Federal Register** and indexed under "Fiscal Service/ Notices/Funds Rate; Treasury Current Value."

\* \* \* \* \*

**Subpart F—Geothermal Resources**

3. In § 218.302, paragraphs (c) and (d) are revised and republished to read as follows:

**§ 218.302 Late payment or underpayment charges.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) Late payment charges are calculated on the basis of a percentage assessment rate. In the absence of a specific lease, permit, license or contract provision prescribing a different rate, this percentage assessment rate is prescribed by the Department of the Treasury as the "Treasury Current Value of Funds Rate."

(d) This rate is available in the Treasury Fiscal Requirements Manual Bulletins that are published prior to the first day of each calendar quarter for application to overdue payments or

underpayments in the new calendar quarter. The rate is also published in the Notices section of the **Federal Register** and indexed under "Fiscal Service/ Notices/Funds Rate; Treasury Current Value."

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 00-23402 Filed 9-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### 36 CFR Part 242

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### 50 CFR Part 100

### Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart D; Emergency Closures—Yukon River Closures and Adjustments

**AGENCIES:** Forest Service, USDA; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Emergency closures and adjustments.

**SUMMARY:** This provides notice of the Federal Subsistence Board's emergency closures to protect fall chum salmon escapement in the Yukon River drainage and adjustments to allow the taking of coho salmon. These closures and adjustments provide an exception to the Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, published in the **Federal Register** on January 8, 1999. Those regulations redefined the area subject to the subsistence priority for rural residents of Alaska under Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, and also established regulations for seasons, harvest limits, methods, and means relating to the taking of fish and shellfish for subsistence uses during the 2000 regulatory year.

**DATES:** The first Yukon River drainage restrictions were effective August 11, 2000, through October 10, 2000. The second Yukon River drainage restrictions (total closure) superceded the first restrictions and are effective August 23, 2000, through October 22, 2000. The third Yukon River adjustment (allowing the taking of salmon in the lower Yukon River with rod and reel and beach seine) is effective August 27, 2000, through October 26, 2000. The fourth Yukon River adjustment (allowing the taking of coho salmon in the upper Yukon River with live chute-equipped fishwheels) is effective

September 2, 2000, through November 1, 2000.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas H. Boyd, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, telephone (907) 786-3888. For questions specific to National Forest System lands, contact Ken Thompson, Subsistence Program Manager, USDA—Forest Service, Alaska Region, telephone (907) 786-3592.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) (16 U.S.C. 3111-3126) requires that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretaries) implement a joint program to grant a preference for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources on public lands, unless the State of Alaska enacts and implements laws of general applicability that are consistent with ANILCA and that provide for the subsistence definition, preference, and participation specified in Sections 803, 804, and 805 of ANILCA. In December 1989, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled that the rural preference in the State subsistence statute violated the Alaska Constitution and, therefore, negated State compliance with ANILCA.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture (Departments) assumed, on July 1, 1990, responsibility for implementation of Title VIII of ANILCA on public lands. Consistent with Subparts A, B, and C of these regulations, as revised January 8, 1999 (64 FR 1276), the Departments established a Federal Subsistence Board to administer the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The Board's composition includes a Chair appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture; the Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the Alaska Regional Director, U.S. National Park Service; the Alaska State Director, U.S. Bureau of Land Management; the Alaska Regional Director, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs; and the Alaska Regional Forester, USDA Forest Service. Through the Board, these agencies participate in the development of regulations for Subparts A, B, and C, and the annual Subpart D regulations.

Because this rule relates to public lands managed by an agency or agencies in both the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, identical closures and adjustments would apply to 36 CFR part 242 and 50 CFR part 100.

Subpart D regulations for the 2000 fishing seasons and harvest limits, and

methods and means were published on January 8, 1999 (64 FR 1276).

These emergency closures and adjustments are necessary because of extremely weak returns of fall-run chum salmon in the Yukon River drainage. These emergency actions are authorized and in accordance with 50 CFR 100.19(c) and 36 CFR 242.19(c).

#### Yukon River Drainage—First Restriction

As of August 1, 2000, the fall chum salmon run status was less than half the average and projections continued to drop with each passing day. The expectation for the 2000 fall chum salmon return was projected to be well below 600,000, the number required by the ADF&G Yukon River Drainage Fall Chum Salmon Management Plan to meet escapement and subsistence needs. Based on the Yukon River Drainage Fall Chum Salmon Management Plan, this projection was at the level that recommends subsistence fishing closures. Federal and State Managers and many subsistence users in the region had strong concerns that not enough fall chum salmon would reach their spawning grounds or meet minimum escapement needs. There was also strong concern that the Yukon River fall chum salmon run will be too low to support unrestricted subsistence fishing.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game issued Emergency Orders closing sport and personal use fishing for chum salmon in the Yukon drainage and restricting subsistence fishing to certain times each week in the various fishing districts along the river. The commercial fishery for fall chum salmon in the Yukon River was never opened.

On August 11, 2000, the Federal Subsistence Board instituted the following adjustments for the Yukon River drainage:

During any commercial salmon fishing season closure of greater than five days in duration, you may take salmon only during the following periods in the following districts:

(A) In Districts 1, 2, and 3, salmon may be taken from 3:00 p.m. until 9:00 p.m. each Saturday;

(B) In District 4, salmon may be taken from 6:00 p.m. Friday until 6:00 p.m. Saturday;

(C) In Subdistrict 5C, salmon may be taken from 8:00 p.m. Saturday until 8:00 a.m. Sunday and from 8:00 p.m. Thursday until 8:00 a.m. Friday;

(D) In District 5D, salmon may be taken from 6:00 p.m. Saturday until 6:00 p.m. Sunday;

(E) In District 6, salmon may be taken from 6:00 p.m. Monday until 6:00 a.m. Wednesday.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## Minerals Management Service

## 30 CFR Part 218

RIN 1010—AB83

**Interest Rate Applicable to Late Payment or Underpayment of Monies Due on Solid Minerals and Geothermal Leases**

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule amends the interest rate applicable to late payments or underpayments of royalties and other monies due under solid minerals and geothermal leases to require the same interest rates and calculation methodology used for oil and gas leases. The MMS believes consistency for late payment and underpayment charges for all mineral leases at the rate applicable under section 6621 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is appropriate and serves as an effective deterrent to discourage late and underpayment.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1994.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David S. Guzy, Chief, Rules and Procedures Staff, Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, P.O. Box 25165, Mail Stop 3901, Denver, Colorado 80225-0165, telephone (303) 231-3432

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed rulemaking published on June 17, 1993, 58 FR 33413, provided for a 60-day public comment period which ended August 16, 1993. All comments received during that time period are addressed in this section. The principal author of this rule is Dennis C. Whitcomb, Office of the Deputy Associate Director for Audit, Royalty Management Program, Minerals Management Service.

Comments were received from two coal companies, two industry associations as joint commenters, and the State and Tribal Royalty Audit Committee. In general, the comments were not in favor of increasing the interest rate.

(a) Two comments were critical of the lengthy administrative appeals process which results in the lessee owing more interest when the appellant posts a surety in lieu of payment and does not prevail in its appeal.

*Response:* This issue is beyond the scope of this rulemaking. However, currently the MMS is streamlining and improving its appeal procedures to shorten the time required for appeals to

the MMS Director. The appeals streamlining includes a common tracking system, simplified review and surname of field reports, definitive time frames for appeal processing, standardized language and formats for field reports, and establishing appeals coordinators in each MMS division.

When the MMS decision is appealed, the MMS has no control over the Interior Board of Land Appeals process.

(b) Two other commenters on the appeals process observed that MMS does not pay interest on monies refunded when an appellant prevails in its appeal.

*Response:* In the absence of a statute or contract, the United States cannot pay interest on overpayments. *United States v. Louisiana*, 446 U.S. 253(1980). The MMS has not been given statutory authority to pay interest on any overpayments made by appellants. However, the MMS now accepts surety instruments for amounts under appeal which bear interest in the appellant's favor. For complete information refer to 57 FR 44991, September 30, 1992, codified at 30 CFR 243.2 (1993).

(c) Two commenters stated that the application of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (FOGRMA) rate to solid minerals would be illegal. One comment stated the Debt Collection Act does not authorize MMS to charge the higher Internal Revenue Service (IRS) rate.

*Response:* As explained in the preamble to the proposed rule, this rule is not being promulgated under FOGRMA or the Debt Collection Act, but under the Secretary of the Interior's (Secretary) plenary authority to establish necessary and appropriate rules pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 189), Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 359), the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1023), and the Indian mineral leasing laws (25 U.S.C. 396, and 25 U.S.C. 396 a-g). The rate proposed is the same as that authorized by FOGRMA, i.e., the rate applicable under section 6621(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as amended. The MMS considers the increase in the interest rate to be justified to fairly compensate the Federal Government or Indian lessor for the lost time value of money. The MMS believes this rate is necessary to encourage the prompt and proper payment of royalties.

(d) Several commenters stated that the proposed rule is short-sighted, displays unreasonable punishment for trustworthy reporters, will unduly penalize marginal and temporary underpayments, does not demonstrate a higher rate will assure timely collection

of royalty, and seeks merely to generate additional revenue.

*Response:* The MMS regulations that assess interest on late and underpayments are not punitive, but account for the lost time value of money. Late payments from payors cause States, Indian tribes and allottees, and other recipients to receive monies due to them later than they would be paid if the lessee had paid on time. Thus, these recipients also are compensated for the lost time value of money because late payment interest is shared with those recipients in the same manner as principal lease revenues.

(e) Two commenters suggested that MMS should offer discounts for prompt payment and should not charge interest if a payment is within 5 percent of a final amount due.

*Response:* The MMS is not authorized to offer discounts on royalty due for prompt payment nor allow any variation of gross proceeds accruing to the Government. The various mineral leasing laws and lease terms require that royalty shall not be less than a certain percentage of the value. If a discount were offered for prompt payment, MMS would receive royalties below the amount provided for by statute and lease term. Thus, MMS does not have authority to provide for such discounts.

The MMS also believes that waiving the interest charge for small underpayments would foster incorrect payment. Thus, this proposal has not been adopted. The MMS mission is to timely and properly collect and distribute all royalty, rent, and other payments due on Federal and Indian leases.

(f) One commenter stated that the MMS should follow IRS timetables if it charges IRS interest rates. The commenter pointed out the IRS deadlines for filing tax returns after the taxable year ends.

*Response:* The MMS will not accept this proposal because it is inconsistent with existing regulations and lease terms. If this comment were followed, the result would be a loss of millions of dollars in time value of money for the United States, States and Indian tribes and allottees. The reporting and payment cycle for royalties established in the leases generally is monthly which also reflects industry accounting practice. In contrast to Federal income taxes, lease royalty payments and reports are due at the end of the month following the month of production unless the lease terms expressly provide otherwise.

(g) One commenter stated that no compelling governmental interest exists

that would justify charging the higher rate.

*Response:* The MMS is following the guidance found in the Federal Claims Collection Standards at 4 CFR 102.13 (c) which states "An agency may assess a higher rate of interest if it reasonably determines that a higher rate is necessary to protect the interests of the United States." Congress believed that for late royalty payments for oil and gas leases, the IRS 6621(a)(2) rate was appropriate. There is no reason to establish any lower rate for solid minerals or geothermal leases.

(h) The same commenter stated MMS has not met its threshold burden of proving that assessing the higher rate is necessary to deter underpayments and assure the timely collection of royalties.

*Response:* Under the various mineral leasing laws the Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the requirements of accounting for and collecting royalty. The MMS believes the increased rate is neither arbitrary nor inconsistent with the statutes or statutory purposes.

(i) The same commenter stated MMS misidentifies the reasons for outstanding payments and its proposed solution is counterproductive to administrative efficiency.

*Response:* The MMS does not agree because experience indicates MMS's policies have proven effective. The rule provides for fair and consistent compensation for the lost time value of money.

(j) One commenter stated that MMS used excessive interpretation of the agency's general rulemaking authority that is contrary to law and existing constitutional principles. The commenter believes that FOGRMA expands the authorities and responsibilities of the Secretary only for Federal oil and gas management.

*Response:* The MMS may promulgate necessary and appropriate rules and regulations for royalty collection under 30 U.S.C. 189 and 1023 and other mineral leasing laws for all minerals to meet its responsibilities to disburse royalties timely to States and Indian tribes and allottees.

(k) One commenter stated that the interest rate is too high because MMS says that the revenue gains from a higher rate would be small.

*Response:* The rule is not intended to increase revenue but to encourage the prompt and proper payment of revenues and to provide compensation for the lost time value of money. In fact, under a perfect system, all royalties would be timely paid, and MMS would not receive any monies pursuant to the late payment charge regulations.

(l) Two commenters (based on an OIG report entitled "Assessments on Late and Underpaid Royalties for Solid Minerals and Geothermal Leases") stated that the OIG concludes that the present rules provide an incentive for companies to underpay and that the proposed rule is based on fallacious conclusions in the OIG report.

*Response:* The OIG's conclusions are consistent with this rulemaking, but the OIG's report is not the authority for the rule. However, the OIG's conclusion that the current interest rate for solid minerals royalty late payments made it more attractive not to pay in some circumstances appears to be reasonable, and nothing in the comments demonstrates otherwise.

(m) Two commenters stated that virtually all coal and solids royalties are paid timely and rarely are coal companies in an underpayment status with MMS.

*Response:* As of August 31, 1993, MMS had 249 outstanding Bills for Collection for solid mineral payors in the amount of \$81,249,067.78. Therefore, the increase in the interest rate is justified to compensate for the lost time value of monies at a fair rate.

(n) The State and Tribal Royalty Audit Committee supports the rule as proposed. They endorsed the proposed rule as governmental action which will adequately protect the interests of all citizens and sustain the efficient conduct of private enterprise for the benefit of all concerned.

*Response:* The MMS is adopting the rule as proposed to increase the interest rate applicable to underpayment on solid mineral and geothermal leases. The rate will be the same as that applicable for underpayment on oil and gas leases—under section 6621(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The effective date of April 1, 1994, is appropriate inasmuch as interest rates are normally updated at the beginning of calendar quarters by both the IRS and the U.S. Treasury.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the United States Department of the Interior finds that there is good cause to make this rule effective April 1, 1994.

On all payments due MMS prior to March 31, 1994, interest will be calculated at the Current Value of Funds Rate (CVF) through March 31, 1994, and the IRS rate from April 1, 1994, through the date paid. The IRS rate is compounded daily, as contrasted to the CVF rate which is calculated as simple interest. For example, if a payment was due February 28, 1994, and was not paid until April 30, 1994, then late payment interest would be calculated on the principal for 31 days (March

1994) at the CVF rate and calculated on the principal plus accrued interest for 30 days (April 1, 1994) at the IRS rate. The new rate is applicable to any and all outstanding amounts on the effective date.

## Procedural Matters

### *The Regulatory Flexibility Act*

The Department certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

The rule is necessary to provide consistency in the existing regulations in applying the same interest rate for late payment or underpayment of monies due on solid minerals, geothermal, and oil and gas mineral leases.

### *Executive Order 12630*

The Department certifies that the rule does not represent a governmental action capable of interference with constitutionally protected property rights. Thus, a Takings Implication Assessment need not be prepared under Executive Order 12630, "Government Action and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights."

### *Executive Order 12778*

The Department has certified to the Office of Management and Budget that these final regulations meet the applicable standards provided in sections 2(a) and 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778.

### *Executive Order 12866*

This document has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866 and is not a significant regulatory action.

### *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980*

This rule does not contain information collection requirements which require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

### *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*

It is hereby determined that this rulemaking does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment and a detailed statement pursuant to paragraph (2)(C) of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) is not required.

### List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 218

Coal, Continental shelf, Electronic funds transfers, Geothermal energy,

Government contracts, Indian lands, Mineral royalties, Natural gas, Penalties, Petroleum, Public lands—Mineral resources, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

be charged only for the number of days the payment is late. \*

[FR Doc. 94—7302 Filed 3-28-94; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

Dated: February 18, 1994.  
Bob Armstrong,  
*Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management.*

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 30 CFR part 218 is amended as set forth below:

**PART 218—COLLECTION OF ROYALTIES, RENTALS, BONUSES, AND OTHER MONIES DUE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

1. The authority citation for part 218 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301 et seq.; 25 U.S.C. 396 et seq.; 25 U.S.C. 396a et seq.; 25 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.; 30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.; 30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.; 30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.; 30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.; 31 U.S.C. 3716; 31 U.S.C. 3720A; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 43 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.; and 43 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

**Subpart E—Solid Minerals—General**

2. Section 218.202 is amended by revising paragraphs (c) and (d) to read as follows:

**§218.202 Late payment or underpayment charges.**

\* \* \* \*

(c) The interest charge on late payments shall be at the underpayment rate established by section 6621(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. 6621(a)(2).

(d) Interest will be charged only on the amount of the payment not received by the designated due date. Interest will be charged only for the number of days the payment is late.  
\* \* \* \*

**Subpart F—Geothermal Resources**

3. Section 218.302 is amended by revising paragraphs (c) and (d) to read as follows:

**§218.302 Late payment or underpayment charges.**

\* \* \* \*

(c) The interest charge on late payments shall be at the underpayment rate established by section 6621(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. 6621(a)(2).

(d) Interest will be charged only on the amount of the payment not received by the designated due date. Interest will