

governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, E.O. 13084 requires EPA to provide to the Office of Management and Budget, in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of Indian tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities." Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. This action does not involve or impose any requirements that affect Indian Tribes. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of E.O. 13084 do not apply to this rule.

E. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) generally requires an agency to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements unless the agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and small governmental jurisdictions.

This final rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because part 70 approvals under section 502 of the Act do not create any new requirements but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because this approval does not create any new requirements, I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

F. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to the private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under Section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with

statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action promulgated does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either state, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new requirements. Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

G. Submission to Congress and the Comptroller General

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

H. Petitions for Judicial Review

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by August 14, 2000. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 70

Administrative practice and procedure, Air pollution control, Environmental protection, Intergovernmental relations, Operating permits, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: June 2, 2000.

Rebecca W. Hammer,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

40 CFR part 70, is amended as follows:

PART 70—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 70 continues to read as follows:

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

2. In appendix A to part 70 the entry for Montana is amended by adding paragraph (b) to read as follows:

Appendix A to Part 70—Approval Status of State and Local Operating Permits Programs

* * * * *

Montana

* * * * *

(b) The Montana Department of Environmental Quality submitted an operating permits program on March 29, 1994; effective on June 12, 1995; revised January 15, 1998, and March 17, 2000; full approval effective on August 14, 2000.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 00-14768 Filed 6-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 141 and 142

[FRL-6715-4]

Revisions to the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR), the Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1 DBPR) and Revisions to State Primacy Requirements to Implement the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: Because we received adverse comments, EPA is withdrawing the direct final rule regarding the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, the Stage 1 Disinfectant and Disinfection Byproducts Rule, and the Primacy Rule that published on April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20304).

In the direct final rule, we stated that if we received adverse comments by May 15, 2000, we would publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. EPA subsequently received adverse comments. We will address those comments in a final rule based

upon the proposed rule also published on April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20314).

Because of the degree of public interest in the rule, we are reopening the comment period on the proposed rule. For additional information, see the document that reopens the comment period, which is published in the "Proposed Rules" section of this issue of the **Federal Register**.

DATES: The direct final rule amending 40 CFR parts 141 and 142, published on April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20304), is withdrawn as of June 13, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Melch, Implementation and Assistance Division, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (MC-4606), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 260-7035. Information may also be obtained from the EPA Safe Drinking Water Hotline. Callers within the United States may reach the Hotline at (800) 426-4791. The Hotline is open Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays, from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EST.

Dated: June 8, 2000.

J. Charles Fox,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.

[FR Doc. 00-14886 Filed 6-12-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Chapter 301

[FTR Amendment 87]

RIN 3090-AH18

Federal Travel Regulation; Maximum Per Diem Rates and Other Travel Allowances; Correction

AGENCY: Office of Governmentwide Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects entries listed in the prescribed maximum per diem rates for locations within the continental United States (CONUS) contained in a final rule appearing in part III of the **Federal Register** of Thursday, December 2, 1999 (64 FR 67670). The rule, among other things, increased/decreased the maximum lodging amounts in certain existing per diem localities, added new per diem localities, and removed a number of previously designated per diem localities. A correction published on Friday, May 19, 2000 (65 FR 31823), corrected the seasonal dates and lodging rates for Aspen, Colorado but failed to show changes this caused in the

amounts of the maximum per diem rates.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 1, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joddy P. Garner, Office of Governmentwide Policy (MTT), Washington, DC 20405; telephone 202-501-4857.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In rule document 00-12340 beginning on page 31823 in the issue of Friday, May 19, 2000 make the following corrections:

Appendix A to Chapter 301 [Corrected]

On page 31825, under the State of Colorado, city of Aspen, the maximum per diem rates in column five are corrected as follows:

1. For the entry "April 1-May 31," correct "186" to read "114".
2. For the entry "June 1-December 31," correct "114" to read "186".

Page 31825, as corrected, reads as follows:

Appendix A to Chapter 301— Prescribed Maximum Per Diem Rates for CONUS

* * * * *

BILLING CODE 6820-34-P