What Is EPA's Concluding Statement of Approval?

Our review of this material indicates that the SIP revision meets the minimum requirements of the Act and Federal I/M rules. Based upon the discussion contained in the analysis section of the proposal, the technical support document, and review of the DPS final I/M rules and updated MOU, we conclude that the State's submittal represents an acceptable approach to the I/M requirements and meets the requirements for approval. Therefore, EPA is proposing approval of the Louisiana I/M SIP revision.

EPA's Rulemaking Action

The EPA is proposing approval of the State's I/M SIP revision.

Administrative Requirements

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, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 13, 2002.

Sam Becker,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 02–16461 Filed 7–01–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–02–11707]

RIN 2127–AI34

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: NHTSA has received two petitions asking the agency to extend the comment period for a proposal to amend the Federal safety standard for child restraint systems pursuant to the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability and Documentation Act of 2000. Under the proposal, the standard would be revised to incorporate improved test dummies and updated procedures used to test child restraints, new or revised injury criteria to assess the dynamic performance of child restraints, and extended to apply to child restraints recommended for use by children up to 65 pounds. The comment period for the proposal closes July 1, 2002. To provide parties more time to assess various aspects of the proposal, the agency is extending the deadline by one month.

DATES: Written comments must be received by July 31, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may submit your comments in writing to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Alternatively, you may submit your comments electronically by logging onto the Docket Management System website at http://dms.dot.gov. Click on ''Help & Information'' or ''Help/Info'' to view instructions for filing your comments electronically. Regardless of how you submit your comments, you should mention the docket number of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For non-legal issues, you may call Mike Huntley of the NHTSA Office of Crashworthiness Standards, at (202) 366–0029.

For legal issues, you may call Deirdre Fujita of the NHTSA Office of Chief Counsel, at (202) 366–2992.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 14(a) of the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation (TREAD) Act, Pub. L. 106–414 mandated that the agency

''initiate a rulemaking for the purposes of improving the safety of child restraints, including minimizing head injuries from side impact collisions.'' Section 14(b) identifies specific elements that the agency must consider in its rulemaking. The Act directed the agency to complete the rulemaking by November 1, 2002. Pursuant to the TREAD Act, the agency published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on Wednesday, May 1, 2002 (67 FR 21806). A 60-day comment period was provided.

The Juvenile Products Manufacturers Association (JPMA), representing manufacturers of child restraint systems, and ARRCA, Incorporated, petitioned for an extension of the comment period on the NPRM (*see* Docket No. NHTSA–02–11707). JPMA said that it was requesting an extension so that it can complete testing designed to generate data that will enable it to better analyze the NPRM. JPMA's testing is intended to assess what differences, if any, result from dynamically testing child restraints on a test seat assembly that incorporates the changes proposed in the NPRM, as compared to tests on the current seat assembly.

ARCCA petitioned for an extension of time to comment on the NPRM to fully evaluate a technical report on a test program performed for NHTSA by the U.S. Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division at Patuxent River, Maryland. This report assesses the seat geometry and crash pulses of vehicles. The report was placed in the docket on June 19, 2002. ARCCA wanted more time to review and comment on the report and the proposals to which the report pertained.

In considering the petitions, NHTSA weighed the statutory deadline, the complexity and importance of this rulemaking, and the basis for the requests. The agency supports efforts to develop useful technical information on the proposal that do not unduly delay the rulemaking. Extending the comment period for a month will provide the time needed for the petitioners to obtain test data and other analyses that could help NHTSA decide whether and how to proceed with the rulemaking. Accordingly, the comment closing date is extended to July 31, 2002. However, given the statutory deadline of the TREAD Act, NHTSA does not anticipate granting any further extensions of the comment period in this proceeding. The agency will consider comments submitted after July 31, 2002, but only to the extent that it is possible to do so without causing additional delay.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 322, 30111, 30115, 30117, and 30166; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 49 CFR 501.8.

Issued: June 26, 2002.

Stephen R. Kratzke,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 02–16632 Filed 6–27–02; 2:48 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P