

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 7, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Manager, Airspace Branch, ANM-520, Federal Aviation Administration, Docket No. 99-ANM-03, 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Renton, Washington, 98055-4056.

The Official docket may be examined in the office of the Assistant Chief Counsel for the Northwest Mountain Region at the same address.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours in the office of the Manager, Air Traffic Division, Airspace Branch, at the address listed above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis Ripley, ANM-520.6, Federal Aviation Administration, Docket No. 99-ANM-03, 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Renton, Washington, 98055-4056; telephone number: (425) 227-2527.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data views, or arguments, as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy related aspects of this proposal. Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Airspace Docket No. 99-ANM-03." The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination at the address listed above both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM's

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Airspace Branch, ANM-520, 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Renton, Washington, 98055-4056. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also request a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11-2A, which describes the application procedure.

The Proposal

The FAA is considering an amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 71 (14 CFR part 71) to remove Class E airspace at Oak Harbor, WA. This amendment would revoke airspace no longer meeting the requirements of a Class E surface area. The weather reporting requirements for a surface area dictate that weather observations must be taken by a Federally Certified Weather Observer and/or a Federally Commissioned Weather Observing System during the times and dates the surface area is designated. These weather observations routinely are not being met as required at the Oak Harbor Air Park. Attempts to have interested personnel fix the reporting problem were unsuccessful. The intended effect of this proposal is designed to provide efficient and safe use of the navigable airspace.

The coordinates for this airspace docket are based on North American Datum 83. Class E airspace areas extending upward from the surface of the earth, are published in Paragraph 6002 of FAA Order 7400.9F dated September 10, 1998, and effective September 16, 1998, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designation listed in this document would be published subsequently in the Order.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involve an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore, (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule, when promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a

substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, CLASS B, CLASS C, CLASS D, AND CLASS E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIRWAYS; ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959-1963 Comp., p. 389.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9F, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 10, 1998, effective September 16, 1998, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6002 Class E airspace designated as a surface area for an airport.

* * * * *

ANM WA E2 Oak Harbor, WA [Remove]

* * * * *

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on April 9, 1999.

Daniel A. Boyle,

Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division, Northwest Mountain Region.

[FR Doc. 99-10091 Filed 4-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 259

Request for Comment on the Guide Concerning Fuel Advertising for New Automobiles

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission ("Commission") requests public comment on the overall costs and benefits and the continuing need for its Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles ("Fuel Economy Guide" or "Guide"), 16 CFR Part 259, as part of the Commission's systematic review of all

current Commission regulations and guides.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until June 21, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Mailed comments should be directed to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580. Mailed comments should be identified as "Fuel Guide, 16 CFR Part 256—Comment." E-Mail comments will be accepted at [FuelGuide@ftc.gov]. Those who comment by e-mail should give a mailing address to which an acknowledgment can be sent.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Willie L. Greene, Investigator, Federal Trade Commission, Cleveland Regional Office, Cleveland, OH 44114, telephone number (216) 236-3406.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Commission adopted the Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles in 1975 to prevent deceptive fuel economy advertising and to facilitate the use of fuel economy in advertising. Since its enactment, the Guide has advised marketers to disclose the established fuel economy of the vehicle as determined by EPA's Automobile Information Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 2206) in advertisements that make representations regarding the fuel economy of a new vehicle. These EPA fuel economy numbers also appear on window labels attached to new automobiles.

In 1978 and 1995, the Commission amended the Guide to make it consistent with EPA Information Disclosure Act changes regarding fuel economy disclosures. 43 FR 55757 (November 29, 1978); 60 FR 56230 (Nov. 8, 1995).

II. Regulatory Review Program

The Commission has determined to review all current Commission rules and guides periodically. These reviews seek information about the cost and benefits of the Commission's rules and guides and their regulatory and economic impact. The information obtained assists the Commission in identifying rules and guides that warrant modification or rescission. Therefore, the Commission solicits comments on, among other things, the economic impact of and the continuing need for the Guide concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles; possible conflict between the Guide and state, local or other federal laws; and the effect on the Guide of any technological, economic, or other industry changes.

III. Request for Comment

The Commission solicits written public comments on the following questions:

(1) Is there a continuing need for the Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles?

(a) What benefits has the Guide provided to purchasers of the product affected by the Guide?

(b) Has the Guide imposed costs on purchasers?

(2) What changes, if any, should be made to the Guide to increase the benefits of the Guide to purchasers? How would these changes affect the costs the Guide imposes on firms who conform to its advice? How would these changes affect the benefits to purchasers?

(3) What significant burdens or costs, including costs of compliance, has the Guide imposed on firms who conform to its advice? Has the Guide provided benefits to such firms? If so, what benefits?

(4) What changes, if any, should be made to the Guide to reduce the burdens or costs imposed on firms who conform to its advice? How would these changes affect the benefits provided by the Guide?

(5) Does the Guide overlap or conflict with other federal, state, or local laws or regulations?

(6) Since the Guide was issued, what effects have changes in relevant technology or economic conditions had on the Guide? Do sellers of automobiles use E-mail or the Internet to promote or sell by using fuel economy advertisements? Does the use of this new technology affect consumers' rights or advertisers' responsibilities under the Guide?

(7) Are there any abuses occurring in the promotion or advertising of fuel economy that are not covered by the Guide? If so, what mechanisms should be explored to address such abuses (*e.g.*, consumer education, industry self-regulation, revisions to the Guide)?

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 259

Advertising, Fuel economy, Trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 41-58.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-9842 Filed 4-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 5

Fees for Applications for Contract Market Designation

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Proposed reduction of schedule of fees.

SUMMARY: The staff reviews periodically the Commission's actual costs of processing applications for contract market designation (17 CFR Part 5, Appendix B) and adjusts its schedule of fees accordingly. As a result of the most recent review, the Commission is proposing to establish reduced fees for a limited class of simultaneously submitted multiple contract designation application filings.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 24, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons should submit their views and comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary of the Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581. In addition, comments may be sent by facsimile transmission to facsimile number (202) 418-5521, or by electronic mail to *secretary@ctfc.gov*. Reference should be made to Designation Fee Proposal.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Shilts, Division of Economic Analysis, (201) 418-5275, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. History

On August 23, 1983, the Commission established a fee for contract market designation (48 FR 38214). The fee was based upon a three-year moving average of the actual costs and the number of contracts reviewed by the Commission during that period of time. The formula for determining the fee was revised in 1985. At that time, most of the designation applications were for futures contracts rather than option contracts, and the same fee was applied to both futures and option designation applications.

In 1992, the Commission reviewed its data on the actual costs for reviewing designation applications for both futures and option contracts and determined that the cost of reviewing a futures contract designation application was much higher than the cost of reviewing an option contract designation. It also determined that, when designation