IV. Procedural Determinations

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 12866—Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12988—Civil Justice Reform

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 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 because each 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.

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.

Executive Order 13211—Regulations That Significantly Affect The Supply, Distribution, Or Use Of Energy

On May 18, 2001, the President issued Executive Order 13211 which requires agencies to prepare a Statement of Energy Effects for a rule that is (1) considered significant under Executive Order 12866, and (2) likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Because this rule is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 and is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule does not require an environmental impact statement because 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 certifies 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 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. 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.

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; and (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.

Unfunded Mandates

This rule will not impose an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector of $100 million or more in any given year. 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 did not impose an unfunded mandate.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 948

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: September 13, 2002.

Vann Weaver,

Acting Regional Director, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 02–28202 Filed 11–5–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IA 159–1159; FRL–7403–6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to approve the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the state of Iowa. This revision pertains to orders and permits issued by the state to control particulate matter (PM_{10}) emissions from Holnam, Inc., and Lehigh Portland Cement Company, at Mason City (Cerro Gordo County), Iowa.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the state's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision amendment and anticipates no relevant adverse comments to this action. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this action. If EPA receives

relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed action. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on part of this rule and if that part can be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those parts of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

DATES: Comments on this proposed action must be received in writing by December 6, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Royan Teter, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Planning and Development Branch, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Royan Teter at (913) 551–7609.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the direct final rule which is located in the rules section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: October 23, 2002.

William W. Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 7.

[FR Doc. 02–27839 Filed 11–5–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 82

[FRL–7407–8]

RIN 2060–AK48

Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2003

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: With this action, EPA is proposing to allocate essential-use allowances for import and production of class I stratospheric ozone depleting substances (ODSs) for calendar year 2003. Essential use allowances permit a person to obtain controlled ODSs as an exemption to the January 1, 1996 regulatory phase-out of production and import of these chemicals. EPA allocates essential-use allowances for exempted production or import of a specific quantity of class I ODS solely for the designated essential purpose. EPA is proposing to allocate essential-use allowances for production and import of ODSs for use in medical devices and the Space Shuttle and Titan Rockets.

DATES: Written comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before December 6, 2002, unles a public hearing is requested. Comments must then be received on or before 30 days following the public hearing. Any party requesting a public hearing must notify the contact listed below by 5 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on November 16, 2002. If a hearing is held, EPA will publish a document in the **Federal Register** announcing the hearing information.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this rulemaking should be submitted in duplicate to: Erin Birgfeld, Essential Use Program Manager, Global Programs Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (6205J), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. If you send comments using courier services or overnight express, please address comments to 501 3rd Street NW., Washington, DC 20001. Comments will be filed in EPA Air docket number A–93–39. Comments that contain confidential business information should be submitted in two versions, one clearly marked ''Public'', to be filed in the public docket, and the other clearly marked ''Confidential'' to be reviewed by authorized government personnel only. If the comments are not marked, EPA will assume they are public and contain no confidential information.

Materials relevant to this rulemaking are contained in Docket No. A–93–39. The Docket is located at 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room B108; *Mail Code:* 6102T Washington, DC 20460. The materials may be inspected from 8 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. EPA may charge a reasonable fee for copying docket materials.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Erin Birgfeld, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Global Programs Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, 6205J, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC, 20460; (202) 564–9079; *birgfeld.erin@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Background
II. Essential Use Allowances for Medical Devices
A. How were essential-use allowances for medical devices nominated and approved by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol?
B. How does the Clean Air Act authorize essential-use allowances?
C. What was the allocation process for essential-use allowances for medical devices?
D. How were the decisions on the amounts of essential-use allowances for each company made?
E. Will the amounts actually allocated in the final rule be the same as the amounts listed in this proposed rule?
III. Exemption for methyl chloroform for use in the Space Shuttle and Titan Rockets
IV. Allocation of essential-use allowances for medical devices and the Space Shuttle and Titan Rockets for calendar year 2003
V. Administrative requirements
A. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
B. Executive Order 12866
C. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
D. Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments)
E. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (SBREFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et. seq.*
F. Applicability of Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
G. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
H. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)
I. Executive Order 13211 (Energy Effects)

I. Background

The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Protocol) is the international agreement to reduce and eventually eliminate production and consumption [1] of all stratospheric ozone depleting substances (ODSs). The elimination of production and consumption is accomplished through adherence to phase-out schedules for production and consumption of specific class I ODSs including chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, methyl chloroform, hydrochlorofluorocarbons, and methyl bromide. As of January 1996, production and import of class I ODSs [2] were phased out in all developed countries including the United States. However, the Protocol and the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) provide exemptions which allow for the continued import and/or production of class I ODS for specific uses. Under the Montreal Protocol, exemptions are granted for uses that are determined by the Parties to be ''essential.'' Decision IV/25, taken by the Parties in 1992, established criteria for determining

[1] ''Consumption'' is defined as the amount of a substance produced in the United States, plus the amount imported, minus the amount exported to Parties to the Montreal Protocol (*see* Section 601(6) of the Clean Air Act). Stockpiles of class I ODSs produced or imported prior to the 1996 phaseout can continue to be used for purposes not expressly banned at 40 CFR part 82.

[2] Class I ozone depleting substances are defined at 40 CFR Part 82, subpart A, appendix A.