

perform a mid-course review to December 31, 2004. EPA proposes to approve this revised commitment.

#### 8. Summary of Conclusions and Proposed Action

This revision is being proposed under a procedure called parallel processing, whereby EPA proposes rulemaking action concurrently with the State's procedures for amending its regulations. If the proposed revision is substantially changed in areas other than those identified in this document, EPA will evaluate those changes and may publish another notice of proposed rulemaking. If no substantial changes are made other than those areas cited in this document, EPA will publish a final rulemaking on the revisions. The final rulemaking action by EPA will occur only after the SIP revision has been adopted by New Jersey and submitted formally to EPA for incorporation into the SIP.

EPA is proposing to approve New Jersey's proposed SIP revision submitted on January 31, 2003. This submittal revises New Jersey's 1996, 2005, and 2007 motor vehicle emission inventories and 2005 and 2007 motor vehicle emissions budgets using MOBILE6, modifies the planned date to complete the State's mid-course review to December 31, 2004, and updates the general conformity emissions budgets for McGuire Air Force Base. New Jersey has demonstrated that its revised 1-Hour Attainment Demonstration SIP for the Northern New Jersey NAA and the Trenton NAA continues to demonstrate attainment with the revised MOBILE6 inventories.

#### 9. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this proposed action is not a "significant regulatory action" and therefore is not subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget. For this reason, this action is also not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This proposed action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this proposed 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.*). Because this rule proposes to approve pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable

duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-4).

This proposed rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely proposes to approve a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA's role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This proposed rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Oxides of Nitrogen, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: April 22, 2003.

**Jane M. Kenny,**

*Regional Administrator, Region 2.*

[FR Doc. 03-10999 Filed 5-2-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 146

[FRL-7488-7]

### Underground Injection Control Program—Revision of Underground Injection Control Requirements for Class I Municipal Wells in Florida; Notice of Data Availability

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of data availability.

**SUMMARY:** On July 7, 2000, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed revisions to the Underground Injection Control (UIC) regulations that would allow for continued wastewater injection by existing Class I municipal wells that have caused or may cause the movement of fluid into or between underground sources of drinking water (USDWs) in specific areas of South Florida. The revisions would provide owners and operators of such wells with an alternative for compliance with the existing UIC regulations, which prohibit such fluid movement, by allowing them to continue using their wells provided the injection does not endanger USDWs. Also in 2000, in a separate but related initiative, Congress directed EPA to conduct a relative risk assessment of four management options for treated municipal wastewater in South Florida: deep (Class I municipal) well injection, ocean disposal, surface discharge, and aquifer recharge. A separate document in today's **Federal Register** announces the availability and summarizes the findings of this relative risk assessment required by Congress. In this notice of data availability, EPA solicits public comment on how information on deep (Class I municipal) well injection in the relative risk assessment should inform the Agency's action on the July 7, 2000, proposed rule.

**DATES:** Comments on this notice of data availability must be in writing and either postmarked or received by the docket by July 7, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to: Nancy H. Marsh, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, GA 30303-8960. Comments may be submitted