

## The Proposal

The FAA is considering an amendment to 14 CFR part 71 to establish Class E airspace at Siskiyou County Airport, Montague, CA. The original Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) proposed an amendment to the aforementioned airspace. The existing Class E airspace does not require an amendment. The establishment of additional Class E airspace 1,200 feet or more above ground level (AGL) is necessary to provide controlled airspace or IFR operations, specifically the departure procedure from runway 35 for Siskiyou County Airport. The original proposal is being modified to accurately describe the required Class E airspace. The FAA published an NPRM on this proposal on January 8, 1996, (61 FR 550). Since issuance of the NPRM, the FAA has discovered errors in the proposal. Changes to the proposal to correct these errors are significant enough to warrant issuance of a SNPRM and reopening of the comment period.

Comments received in response to the original NPRM and this SNPRM would be addressed in the final disposition of the rule. The area would be depicted on appropriate aeronautical charts. Class E airspace designations for airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth are published in Paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.9F dated September 4, 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 involves 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 4, 1998, and effective September 16, 1998, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth*

\* \* \* \* \*

#### AWP CA E5 Montague, CA [New]

Montague, Siskiyou County, Airport, CA  
(Lat. 41°46'54" N, long. 122°28'05" W)

Montague NDB

(Lat. 41°43'38" N, long. 122°28'55" W)

Klamath Fall VORTAC

(Lat. 42°09'12" N, long. 121°43'39" W)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.1 mile radius of Siskiyou County Airport. That airspace extending upward from 1,200 feet above the surface within 8.3 miles east and 5.2 miles west of the 356° and 176° bearings from the Montague NDB, extending from 7 miles north to 1 mile south of the NDB and within 8.3 miles east and 5.2 miles west of the 180° bearing from the Montague NDB, extending from the NDB to 16.5 miles south of the NDB, and from lat. 41°52'23" N, long. 122°24'32" W, thence clockwise along the 34.8 mile radius of Klamath Falls VORTAC to lat. 42°13'00" N, long. 122°30'00" W, to lat. 42°11'00" N, long. 122°16'30" W, to lat. 41°51'20" N, long. 122°22'00" W and thence counterclockwise along the 6.1 mile radius of the Siskiyou County Airport to the point of beginning.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Los Angeles, California on June 4, 1999.

**John Clancy,**

*Manager, Air Traffic Division, Western Pacific Region.*

[FR Doc. 99–15385 Filed 6–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

### 17 CFR Parts 1 and 30

#### Access to Automated Boards of Trade

**AGENCY:** Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rules; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** On March 24, 1999, the Commission issued proposed rules to permit the use in the United States of automated trading systems providing access to foreign electronic boards of trade. The Commission has decided to withdraw these proposed rules.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David M. Battan, Chief Counsel, Lawrence B. Patent, Associate Chief Counsel, or Charles T. O'Brien, Attorney Advisor, Division of Trading and Markets, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581. Telephone (202) 418–5450.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission had first sought public comment on these matters in a concept release published July 24, 1998, followed by the proposed rules published in March. After an extension was granted at the request of a number of industry participants, the comment period on the proposed rules closed on April 30, 1999. During the comment period, the Commission held a Public Roundtable as well as a meeting of its Global Markets Advisory Committee ("GMAC") to discuss these matters.

On June 2, 1999, the Commission issued an order withdrawing the proposed rules and instructing the staff "to begin immediately processing no-action requests from foreign boards of trade seeking to place terminals in the United States, and to issue responses where appropriate, pursuant to general guidelines included in the Eurex (DTB) no-action process,<sup>1</sup> or other guidelines issued by the Commission, to be reviewed and applied as appropriate on a case-by-case basis." See Order of the Commission (June 2, 1999). In the same order, the Commission determined to "commit to simultaneously initiate processes to address the comparative regulatory levels between U.S. and foreign electronic systems so as not to

<sup>1</sup> In February 1996, the Commission's Division of Trading and Markets ("Division") issued a no-action letter to the Deutsche Terminborse ("DTB" or "Eurex"), an all-electronic futures and option exchange headquartered in Frankfurt, Germany, in which the Division agreed, subject to certain conditions, not to recommend enforcement action to the Commission if Eurex placed computer terminals in the U.S. offices of its members.

provide one with a competitive advantage." *Id.*

As with the rapid developments in technology overtaking other industries, the growth of electronic exchanges and the placement of cross-border futures and option trading systems in the United States raise some of the most basic and fundamental issues facing the Commission and the futures industry. Among the critically important questions that need to be addressed are what role intermediation will play when technological developments make access to global markets far easier than before; what the future relationships will be between and among customers, futures commission merchants, exchanges, technology providers, and regulators; and how to provide a level-playing field and foster fair competition in the context of electronic trading systems between domestic and foreign market participants and between exchanges and FCMs while maintaining the protection of customers and the safety and soundness of larger and faster global markets.

The Commission's July 1998 concept release was by necessity of a general nature, and the resulting comments were not able to address with specificity all of these difficult issues. Only with the release of the proposed rules have all of the interested parties focused fully on all of the specific questions at hand. Moreover, even in just the past few months, the technology and the business relationships among the various constituents in the futures industry have changed substantially, and continue to do so. In any event, the result of all this, as evidenced by the comments received on the proposed rules, and by the wide-ranging positions outlined at the recent Roundtable and GMAC meetings on these issues, is that further consensus among the various affected parties must be sought before rules or guidelines may be finalized in this area. In this environment, the Commission determined to withdraw its proposed rules and defer adoption of final rules or guidelines pending further consideration of these issues by the Commission.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on June 11, 1999 by the Commission.

**Jean A. Webb,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

#### **U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission**

*Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW, Washington, DC 20581*

June 2, 1999.

#### **Order of the Commission**

It is hereby ordered that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall, effective immediately:

Lift the moratorium and instruct the staff to begin immediately processing no-action requests from foreign boards of trade seeking to place trading terminals in the United States, and to issue responses where appropriate, pursuant to the general guidelines included in the Eurex (DTB) no-action process, or other guidelines established by the Commission, to be reviewed and applied as appropriate on a case-by-case basis;

Commit to simultaneously initiate processes to address the comparative regulatory levels between U.S. and foreign electronic trading systems so as not to provide one with a competitive advantage; and

Withdraw the proposed rules regarding access to automated boards of trade and proceed expeditiously toward adoption of rules and/or guidelines.

Dated: June 2, 1999.

Commissioner Barbara P. Holum.

Dated: June 2, 1999.

Commissioner David D. Spears.

Dated: June 2, 1999.

Commissioner James E. Newsome.

[FR Doc. 99-15441 Filed 6-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-M

## **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

### **Food and Drug Administration**

#### **21 CFR Part 111**

**[Docket No. 96N-0417]**

#### **Dietary Supplements; Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition; Public Meeting**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing a public meeting to solicit comments that will assist the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN) to understand the economic impact that any proposal to establish current good manufacturing practices (CGMP's) regulations for dietary supplements may

have on small businesses in the dietary supplement industry. This meeting is intended to give interested persons, including small businesses, an opportunity to comment on the economic impact that such a proposal may have on small businesses.

**DATES:** The public meeting will be held on Monday, July 12, 1999, from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. You must register by July 7, 1999. You may submit written comments until August 12, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** The public meeting will be held at the Flamingo Hotel, The Carson City II Room, 3555 Las Vegas Blvd., Las Vegas, NV. Submit written comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305), Docket No. 96N-0417, Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. Two copies of any comments are to be submitted, except that individuals may submit one copy.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Peter J. Vardon, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS-726), Food and Drug Administration, 330 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-205-5329, FAX 202-260-0794, or e-mail [pvardon@bangate.fda.gov](mailto:pvardon@bangate.fda.gov).

If you would like to attend the public meeting, you should register by July 7, 1999, by faxing or e-mailing your name, title, firm name, address, and telephone number to Peter Vardon (address above).

There is no registration fee for this public meeting, but early registration is suggested because space may be limited.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This public meeting will provide an opportunity for an open discussion of the manufacturing practices of small businesses in the dietary supplement industry. The meeting is intended to be one of a series intended to give all interested parties an opportunity to comment on the economic effects of a possible proposed regulation on CGMP's in the dietary supplement industry. This public meeting is also intended to fulfill part of the outreach requirement of Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. The agenda will include topics regarding the small business entities' manufacturing practices and standard operating procedures for: (1) Personnel, (2) buildings and facilities, (3) equipment, (4) lab operations, (5) production and process controls, and (6) warehousing, distribution and post-distribution of raw, intermediate and final products. The meeting will also include a discussion about the verification of the identity, purity, and composition of dietary supplements and dietary supplement ingredients.