

applies to any rule that: (1) is determined to be “economically significant” as defined under E.O. 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. This proposed rule is not subject to E.O. 13045 because it does not involve decisions intended to mitigate environmental health or safety risks.

#### D. Executive Order 13084

Under Executive Order 13084, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal governments, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 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 proposed rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments. 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 proposed rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because disapprovals of SIP revisions under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not affect any existing requirements applicable to small entities. Federal disapproval of the State SIP submittal will not affect State-enforceability. Moreover, EPA’s disapproval of the submittal would not impose any new Federal requirements. Therefore, 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 annual costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to 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 proposed disapproval action does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated annual costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. The proposed disapproval will not change existing requirements 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. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

Section 12 of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to evaluate existing technical standards when developing new regulations. To comply with NTTAA, the EPA must consider and use “voluntary consensus standards” (VCS) if available and applicable when developing programs and policies unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical.

EPA believes that VCS are inapplicable to this proposed action. Today’s proposed action does not require the public to perform activities conducive to the use of VCS.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur dioxide, Volatile organic compounds.

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

Dated: June 5, 2000.

**Felicia Marcus,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

[FR Doc. 00–15032 Filed 6–13–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 141 and 142

[FRL–6715–5]

**RIN 2040-AA97**

### National Primary Drinking Water Regulations; Ground Water Rule

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for the Proposed Ground Water Rule.

**SUMMARY:** Today, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is providing notice to extend the public comment period for the proposed Ground Water Rule (GWR). The proposed GWR was published in the **Federal Register** on May 10, 2000 (65 FR 30194). The proposed GWR requirements provide a meaningful opportunity to reduce public health risk associated with the consumption of waterborne pathogens from fecal contamination for a substantial number of people served by ground water sources.

**DATES:** EPA must receive public comments, in writing, on the proposed regulations by August 9, 2000. Comments provided electronically will be considered timely if they are submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. (Eastern time), August 9, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send written comments to the GWR, W–98–23 Comments Clerk, Water Docket (MC–4101); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460. Comments may be hand-delivered to the Water Docket, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M Street, SW., East Tower

Basement, Washington, DC 20460. Comments may be submitted electronically to *ow-docket@epamail.epa.gov*. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII, WP6.1, or WP8 file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic comments must be identified by the docket number W-98-23. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WP6.1, WP8, or ASCII format. Electronic comments on this action may be filed online at many Federal Depository libraries.

Please submit a copy of any references cited in your comments. Facsimiles (faxes) cannot be accepted. EPA would appreciate one original and three copies of your comments and enclosures (including any references). Commenters who would like EPA to acknowledge receipt of their comments should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

The proposed rule and supporting documents, including public comments, are available for review in the Water Docket at the address listed previously. For information on how to access Docket materials, please call (202) 260-3027 between 9 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For technical inquiries regarding the proposed regulations, contact the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (mailcode 4607), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington DC, 20460. Phone: (202) 260-3309. 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 Time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On May 10, 2000 EPA published the proposed GWR, 40 CFR parts 141 and 142 (65 FR 30194). The May 10, 2000 notice provided a deadline of 60 days from the date of publication for receipt of public comments. Since the publication date, EPA has received requests to extend the comment period to allow sufficient time for all parties potentially impacted by this proposal to consider and provide comprehensive comments. In response to these requests, EPA has decided to extend the public comment period by an additional 30 days to August 9, 2000.

Dated: June 8, 2000.

**J. Charles Fox,**

*Assistant Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 00-15031 Filed 6-13-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-U**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### 47 CFR Part 15

[ET Docket No. 98-153; FCC 00-163]

### Revision of the Rules Regarding Ultra-Wideband Transmission Systems

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document is proposing regulations that would permit the operation of ultra-wideband (UWB) radio systems on an unlicensed basis under the Commission's rules. Comments are requested on the standards and operating requirements that are proposed to be applied to UWB systems to prevent interference to other radio services.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before September 12, 2000, and reply comments on or before October 12, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** All filings must be sent to the Commission's Secretary, Magalie Roman Salas, Office of Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John A. Reed, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 418-2455.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket No. 98-153, adopted May 10, 2000, and released May 11, 2000. The complete text of this Notice of Proposed Rule Making is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc., (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

### Summary of the Notice of Proposed Rule Making

1. This Notice of Proposed Rule Making responds to an earlier Notice of Inquiry in this proceeding, 63 FR 50184, September 21, 1998. We are proposing to amend 47 CFR 15 to permit products incorporating ultra-wideband (UWB) technologies. While comprehensive tests have not been completed, UWB devices appear to be able to operate on spectrum already occupied by existing radio services without causing interference. This would permit scarce spectrum resources to be used more efficiently. Further testing and analysis

is needed before the risks of interference are completely understood. Such testing is being planned by a number of organizations, and an ample opportunity will be provided to ensure that the test results are submitted into the record for public comment.

2. Most near-term applications involve relatively low powers and short operating ranges. Further, it appears that UWB devices are intended to be mass marketed to businesses and consumers such that individual licensing of each device would be impractical. Accordingly, it is proposed that UWB devices be regulated under part 15 of the rules.

3. *UWB definition.* We propose to employ the definition established by the OSD/DARPA UWB radar review panel with some modifications. The OSD definition states that the -20 dB fraction bandwidth of an UWB emission must be at least 0.25, *i.e.*, the -20 dB bandwidth must be at least 25% of the center frequency. We propose to define a UWB device as any device where the -10 dB fractional bandwidth is greater than 0.25 or the -10 dB bandwidth is greater than 1.5 GHz. The center frequency is proposed to be defined as the average of the upper and lower -10 dB points. We also propose that the bandwidth be determined using the antenna designed to be used with the UWB device. Comments are requested on the following: (1) Should the fractional bandwidth be changed to account for the narrower bandwidth that would be measured using the -10 dB emission points instead of the -20 dB points. (2) Should some other method be used to determine the emission bandwidth, such as a calculated bandwidth based on pulse width. (3) Should UWB be defined as limited to devices that solely use pulsed emissions where the bandwidth is directly related to the narrow pulse width. (4) Should extremely high speed data systems that comply with the UWB bandwidth requirements only because of the high data rate employed, as opposed to meeting the definition solely from the narrow pulse width, be permitted. (5) What alternative definitions should be considered?

4. *Frequency bands of operation.* We observe that ground penetrating radars (GPRs) must operate at frequencies below 2 GHz in order to obtain the penetration depth and resolution necessary to detect and obtain the images of buried objects. GPRs can neither avoid nor notch out the restricted frequency bands. However, it appears that the risk of interference from GPRs is negligible because the overwhelming majority of their energy