adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

Today's proposed rule contains no Federal mandates (under the regulatory provisions of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. The proposed rule would impose no enforceable duty on any State, local or tribal governments or the private sector. This proposed rule would apply to gasoline refiners, blenders and importers. Today's proposed action suggests changes that would provide regulated parties with more flexibility with respect to compliance with the RFG requirements.

*G. Executive Order 13045: Children's Health Protection*

Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental health Risks and Safety Risks (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) applies to any rule that: (1) is determined to be economically significant as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that are based on health or safety risks, such that the analysis required under section 5–501 of the Order has the potential to influence the regulation. This proposed rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045, entitled ''Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks'' (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it does not involve decisions on environmental health risks or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. This proposed rule would merely extend the deadline for use of alternative test methods under the RFG program and would not have an adverse effect on air quality.

*H. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA)*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law No. 104–113, 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note) directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA directs EPA to provide Congress, through OMB, explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

This proposed rule would provide an extension of deadline for use of certain analytical test methods for the RFG program until such time as a notice-and-comment rulemaking to establish performance-based analytical test methods is completed. Today's proposed action does not establish new technical standards or analytical test methods, although it does update existing alternative ASTM test methods to their current versions. To the extent that this proposed action would allow the use of standards developed by voluntary consensus bodies (such as ASTM) this action would further the objectives of the NTTAA. The Agency plans to address the objectives of the NTTAA more broadly in the upcoming rulemaking to establish performance-based analytical test methods.

*I. Statutory Authority*

Sections 114, 211, and 301(a) the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7414, 7545, and 7601(a)).

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 80**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Reformulated gasoline.

Dated: August 15, 2000.

**Carol M. Browner,**

*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 00–22381 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## 40 CFR Part 146

**[FRL–6863–4]**

**RIN 2040–AD40**

## Revision to the Federal Underground Injection Control (UIC) Requirements for Class I-Municipal Wells in Florida

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; Extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** EPA is extending the comment period for the proposed rule Revision to the Federal Underground Injection Control (UIC) Requirements for Class I-Municipal Wells in Florida which was published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 2000 at 65 FR 42234. The extension of the comment period is for 45 days to provide interested parties additional time to submit written comments on the proposal.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before October 20, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Nancy H. Marsh: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4; 61 Forsyth St., SW, Atlanta, GA, 30303. Comments may be submitted electronically to *marsh.nancy@epa.gov*. For additional information see Additional Docket information in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For technical inquiries, contact Nancy H. Marsh, Ground Water & UIC Section, EPA Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303 (phone: 404–562–9450; E-mail: *marsh.nancy@epa.gov*) or Howard Beard, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,Washington, DC 20460 (phone: 202–260–8796; E-mail: *beard.howard@epa.gov*). For general information, contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, phone 800–426–4791. The Safe Drinking Water Hotline is open Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Eastern daylight-saving time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Additional Docket Information**

When submitting written comments (see **ADDRESSES** section earlier) please submit an original and three copies of your comments and enclosures (including any references). For an acknowledgment that we have received your information, please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope. EPA will not accept facsimiles (faxes).

The record is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Eastern daylight-saving time, Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4 Library (9th Floor), Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth St., SW., Atlanta, GA 30303–8960. For information on how to access Docket materials, please call (404) 562–8190 and refer to the Florida UIC docket.

EPA is also making the docket available to interested parties at EPA's South Florida Office in West Palm Beach. A copy of the docket will be available in Florida until the end of the comment period, October 20, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at the following location: Environmental Protection Agency, South Florida Office, 400 N. Congress Ave., Suite 120, West Palm Beach, Florida 33401, for information call (651) 615–4557. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Twin Towers Office Building, 2600 Blair Stone Road, Tallahassee, FL 32399–2400, for information call (850) 921–9417.

Dated: August 22, 2000.

**J. Charles Fox,**

*Assistant Administrator for Water.*

[FR Doc. 00–22519 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

## 49 CFR Part 565

**[Docket No. NHTSA 98–3949; Notice 2]**

**RIN 2127–AH69**

## Low-Speed Vehicles

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Response to petitions for reconsideration.

**SUMMARY:** This document responds to petitions for reconsideration of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 500, *Low-Speed Vehicles* (LSV). We are treating most of the requests in the petitions as petitions for rulemaking. The request that we are granting is either to immediately adopt performance requirements for the parking brake, mirrors, and lighting equipment required by the standard, or, in the alternative, allow States to set their own requirements. In response to that request, we have reviewed our decision at the time of Standard No. 500's issuance to assert preemption. We have decided that, until we can establish performance requirements for parking brake, mirrors, and lighting equipment installed on LSVs, we will not assert preemption. Thus, States may establish or maintain their own performance requirements for these equipment items.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

*For legal issues:* Taylor Vinson, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA, Room 5219, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone 202–366–5263; fax 202–366–3820).

*For technical issues:* Richard Van Iderstine, Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, NHTSA, Room 5307, 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone 202–366–4931; fax 202–366–4329).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**The Final Rule: Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 500, Low-Speed Vehicles**

On June 17, 1998, we published a final rule establishing Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 500, *Low-Speed Vehicles* (63 FR 33194), effective on that date. This standard was based upon an NPRM published on January 8, 1997 (62 FR 1077). We are now responding to the petitions for reconsideration of Standard No. 500 that we received.

In the Standard, we defined a ''low-speed vehicle'' (LSV) as a 4-wheeled motor vehicle, other than a truck, whose speed attainable in 1.6 km (1 mi) is more than 32 km/h (20 mph), but not more than 40 km/h (25 mph) on a paved level surface. The definition reflected the intent of the rule which was to relieve LSVs of the legal obligation to comply with Federal motor vehicle safety standards more appropriate for faster vehicles, and to adopt a Federal standard tailored to the more modest speed capabilities of LSVs.

We based the substance of Standard No. 500 upon the requirements of Palm Desert, California, which has been licensing ''golf carts'' as defined under state law for use on certain streets since 1993. In parallel with Palm Desert's specifications, Standard No. 500 requires LSVs to be equipped with headlamps, front and rear turn signal lamps, taillamps, stop lamps, reflex reflectors, rearview mirrors, and a parking brake. We were more specific than Palm Desert in specifying that a windshield be provided that is of AS–1 or AS–5 composition, and that seat belt assemblies be either Type 1 (lap) or Type 2 (lap and shoulder) complying with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 209, *Seat Belt Assemblies*. We also decided to require that LSVs be equipped with a Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) meeting the specifications of 49 CFR Part 565. However, we did not specify any performance requirements for the lighting equipment, mirrors, or parking brake, saying that we would consider the possibility of proposing performance requirements for them, as well as other requirements that might be appropriate for slow-moving small vehicles, in response to our monitoring the safety record of LSVs (63 FR 33212).

In the final rule, we also addressed several matters concerning the effect of Standard No. 500 on state and local laws (63 FR 33197). First, we stated that the final rule did not affect the ability of states and local governments to decide for themselves whether to permit on-road use of golf cars and LSVs. Second, we advised that state and local governments could supplement Standard No. 500 by requiring the installation and performance of equipment not required by Standard No. 500, such as a horn. However, we stated that state and local governments were preempted from specifying performance requirements for lighting equipment, mirrors, and parking brake because we had not specified performance requirements for them. Finally, we noted that the decision whether to require retrofitting of faster golf cars in use at the time of the final rule, and which would have been LSVs if manufactured on or after that time, remained in the domain of state and local law. We also noted that the final rule had no effect on other aspects of state or local regulation of golf cars and Neighborhood Vehicles (NVs) ''including classification for taxation, vehicle and operator registration, and conditions of use upon their state and local roads.'' (63 FR 33216).

**Petitions for Reconsideration**

We received petitions for reconsideration of Standard No. 500 from the Department of Motor Vehicles of the State of Connecticut (''Connecticut''), the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles of the State of Florida (''Florida''), American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (''AAMVA'') and