

## IX. 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 action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Redesignation of an area to attainment under section 107(d)(3)(e) of the Act does not impose any new requirements on small entities. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new regulatory requirements on sources. Redesignation of an area to attainment under section 107(d)(3)(E) of the Act does not impose any new requirements on small entities. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new regulatory requirements on sources. 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 (Pub. L. 104–4). Because this action affects the status of a geographical area or allows the state to avoid adopting or implementing other requirements and because this action does not impose any new requirements on sources, this proposed rule also does 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), nor will it 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), because it merely

proposes to approve a state rule implementing a Federal requirement, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Act. This proposed rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the 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 Act. Redesignation is an action that affects the status of a geographical area and does not impose any new requirements on sources. 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. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this proposed rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1988) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the “Attorney General’s Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings” issued under the executive order.

This rule, proposing to approve the redesignation of the Clearfield/Indiana Area to attainment for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS, the associated maintenance plan, the 2002 base-year inventory, and the MVEBs identified in the maintenance plan, 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

#### 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

#### 40 CFR Part 81

Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

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

Dated: July 9, 2008.

**Donald S. Welsh,**

*Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. E8–16639 Filed 7–22–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### 42 CFR Parts 5 and 51c

**RIN 0906–AA44**

### Designation of Medically Underserved Populations and Health Professional Shortage Areas

**AGENCY:** Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; status.

**SUMMARY:** The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) received many substantive comments on the proposed rule and will consider these comments carefully. Based on a preliminary review of the comments, it appears that HRSA will need to make a number of changes in the proposed rule. Instead of issuing a final regulation as the next step, HHS will issue a new Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for further review and public comment prior to issuing a final rule.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andy Jordan, 301–594–0197.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 29, 2008, HHS published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, “Designation of Medically Underserved Populations and Health Professional Shortage Areas” (73 FR 11232). The initial notice provided a 60-day comment period. Due to the level of interest in the proposed rule, two 30-day extensions of the comment period were published in the **Federal Register**, one on April 21, 2008 (73 FR 21300) and the second on June 2, 2008 (73 FR 31418). The latest comment period closed on June 30, 2008.

Dated: July 17, 2008.

**Elizabeth M. Duke,**

*Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration.*

[FR Doc. E8–16831 Filed 7–22–08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4165–15–P**