

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

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, 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 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 7400.9G, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated September 1, 1999, and effective September 16, 1999, is amended as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

*Paragraph 6002 Class E airspace designated as a surface area.*

\* \* \* \* \*

##### AGL MN E2 Minneapolis, Anoka County-Blaine Airport, MN [New]

Anoka County-Blaine Airport, MN (Lat. 45°08'42" N., long 93° 12' 41" W.)

Within a 3.9-mile radius of the Minneapolis, Anoka County-Blaine Airport. This Class E airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on March 22, 2000.

**Christopher R. Blum,**

*Manager, Air Traffic Division.*

[FR Doc. 00–8970 Filed 4–11–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–M**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Internal Revenue Service

#### 26 CFR Part 1

[REG–208254–90]

RIN 1545–A072

#### Source of Compensation for Labor of Personal Services; Hearing Cancellation

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Cancellation of notice of public hearing on proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document provides notice of cancellation of a public hearing on proposed regulations under section 861 describing the appropriate basis for determining the source of income from labor or personal services performed partly within and partly without the United States.

**DATES:** The public hearing originally scheduled for Wednesday, April 19, 2000, at 10 a.m., is cancelled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** LaNita Van Dyke of the Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate), (202) 622–7190 (not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing that appeared in the **Federal Register** on Friday, January 21, 2000 (64 FR 3401), announced that a public hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, April 19, 2000, at 10 a.m., in room 2615, Internal Revenue Building, 1111 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The subject of the public hearing is proposed regulations under section 861 of the Internal Revenue Code. The public comment period for these proposed regulations expired on Wednesday, March 29, 2000. The outlines of topics to be addressed at the hearing were due on Wednesday, March 29, 2000.

The notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing, instructed those interested in testifying at the public hearing to submit a request to speak and an outline of the topics to be addressed. As of Wednesday, April 5, 2000, no one has requested to speak. Therefore, the public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, April 19, 2000, is cancelled.

**Cynthia Grigsby,**

*Chief, Regulations Unit, Assistant Chief Counsel (Corporate).*

[FR Doc. 00–9004 Filed 4–11–00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4830–01–U**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Occupational Safety and Health Administration

#### 29 CFR Part 1910

[Docket No. S–777]

RIN 1218–AB36

#### Ergonomics Program Standard Informal Public Hearings

**AGENCY:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), U.S. Department of Labor.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; extension of informal public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is extending the dates of the informal public hearing on the proposed Ergonomics Program standard (64 FR 65768, November 23, 1999) in Portland, Oregon. OSHA has added two additional days to the Portland hearing, which will now be held from April 24, 2000 through May 5, 2000.

**DATES:** *Informal Public Hearing:* The hearing in Washington, DC, began at 9:30 a.m., March 13, 2000, at the Frances Perkins Building, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. The hearing in Washington is scheduled to run through April 7, 2000. The hearing will continue in Chicago, Illinois, from April 11, 2000 through April 21, 2000. In Portland, the hearing will run from April 24, through May 5, 2000. The hearings will begin at 8:30 a.m. each day in Chicago and Portland.

*Notice of Intention To Appear at the Informal Public Hearing:* Notices of intention to appear at the informal public hearing were required to have been postmarked to January 24, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** The informal public hearing in Washington, DC, is being held in the Auditorium of the Frances Perkins Building, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. In Chicago, the hearing will be held at the State of Illinois Building, James R. Thompson Center (Assembly Hall), 100 West Randolph Street. In Portland, the hearing is being held at the Mark Hatfield Federal Court House, 1000 Southwest 3rd Avenue.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** OSHA's Ergonomics Team at (202) 693–2116, or visit the OSHA Homepage at [www.osha.gov](http://www.osha.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The amended schedule, as well as any additional updates, is available on OSHA's web site, <http://www.osha.gov>. Participants whose scheduled

presentation times have changed have already received notification of these changes.

**Authority:** This document was prepared under the direction of Charles N. Jeffress, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. It is issued under sections 4, 6, and 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653, 655, 657), Secretary of Labor's Order No. 6-96 (62 FR 111), and 29 CFR part 1911.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 5th day of April, 2000.

**Charles N. Jeffress,**

*Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.*

[FR Doc. 00-9000 Filed 4-11-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-26-M**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 2

[FRL-6575-5]

### Revised Freedom of Information Act Regulations

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) proposes to revise its regulations implementing the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). EPA is streamlining and condensing its regulations, in accordance with the principles of the National Performance Review, and is using simpler language whenever possible. The regulations also reflect the principles established by President Clinton and Attorney General Reno in their FOIA Policy Memoranda dated October 4, 1993, as well as Attorney General Reno's recent restatement of those principles in a FOIA Policy Memorandum dated September 3, 1999. In addition, the regulations contain new provisions implementing the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996, reflect developments in case law under the FOIA, and update cost figures for calculating and charging fees.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 12, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send any comments on this proposed rule to Jeralene B. Green, Office of Environmental Information (2822), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460.

Public comments on this proposed rule will be available for review at

EPA's Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center (6102), Attention Docket Number FOIA-2000-01, 401 M Street, SW., Room M-1500, Waterside Mall (ground floor), Washington, DC 20460. This Docket is available for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, or by calling (202) 260-7548. A reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Jeralene B. Green, (202) 260-1050.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### I. Description of Proposed Rule

EPA is proposing this comprehensive revision to 40 CFR part 2, subpart A, to add new provisions to implement the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996, Public Law 104-231, to update the fee schedule, and to incorporate changes to the language and structure of the regulations. New provisions implementing the amendments are found at § 2.101(c) (electronic availability of records), § 2.104(b) (timing of responses), § 2.104(f) (expedited processing), § 2.104(g) (deletion marking), § 2.104(i)(3) (volume estimation), § 2.106(b)(3) (format of disclosure), and § 2.106(b)(8) (electronic searches).

Proposed changes to the Agency's fee schedule are found at § 2.106(c) and (d). The duplication charge will remain the same at fifteen (15) cents per page, while document search and review charges will increase to \$4.00, \$7.00, and \$10.25 per quarter hour for clerical, professional, and managerial time, respectively. The amount at or below which the Agency will not charge a fee will be \$14.00.

#### II. Statutory Authority

EPA is proposing this rule under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301, 552 (as amended), and 553.

#### III. Regulatory Flexibility Act, as Amended

The Regulatory Flexibility Act, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute 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 organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions.

EPA has determined that this proposed rule will have only a small economic impact on the small entities that submit FOIA requests to EPA for records. Under the FOIA, agencies may recover only the direct costs of searching for, reviewing, and duplicating the records processed for requesters. EPA's proposed fees are nominal and have been calculated to recover only the direct costs of processing a FOIA request. The revision to the fee schedule is minimal and reflects a more specific breakdown of direct costs by the kind of EPA employee involved in processing a FOIA request. Therefore, under 5 U.S.C. 605(b), I certify that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### IV. Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule does not impose any reporting or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* It pertains solely to the dissemination of information under the FOIA.

#### V. Environmental Impact

This proposed rule is expected to have no environmental impact. It pertains solely to the dissemination of information under the FOIA.

#### VI. Executive Order 12866

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)), EPA must determine whether this proposed rule is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may:

(1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;

(2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

(3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or

(4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

EPA has determined that this proposed rule is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of