

disclosed and the public interest and the protection of investors, it may require refile of the amendment pursuant to paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this Rule.

(c) *Information required in an options disclosure document.* An options disclosure document shall contain the following information, unless otherwise provided by the Commission, with respect to the options classes covered by the document:

- (1) A glossary of terms;
- (2) The mechanics of buying, writing and exercising the options, including settlement procedures;
- (3) The risks of trading the options;
- (4) The uses of the options;
- (5) The market for the options;
- (6) Transaction costs for the options;
- (7) Applicable margin requirements;
- (8) The tax consequences of trading the options;
- (9) Identification of the issuer of the options;
- (10) Identification of the instrument or instruments underlying the options class; and
- (11) The registration of the options on Form S-20 and the availability of the prospectus and the information in Part II of the registration statement; and
- (12) Such other information as the Commission may specify.

(d) *Broker-dealer obligations.* (1) No broker or dealer shall accept an order from a customer to purchase or sell an option contract relating to an options class that is the subject of an options disclosure document, or approve the customer's account for the trading of such option, unless the broker or dealer furnishes or has furnished to the customer the options disclosure document.

(2) If an options disclosure document is amended, each broker and dealer shall promptly send the information contained in the definitive amendment to each customer whose account is approved for trading the options class(es) to which the options disclosure document relates.

The Commission finds with respect to its delegation to the Division of Market Regulation, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A) and 5 U.S.C. 553(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act, that the delegation relates solely to agency organization, procedure, or practice and that notice and public procedures in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553 are not necessary, pursuant to subsection (b) thereof and that, in view of the foregoing, good cause exists for dispensing with the normal 30-day delay in effectiveness.

Statutory Authority

These amendments are being adopted pursuant to Sections 2, 7, 10, and 19(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and Sections 9, 15 and 23(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

(Sec. 2, 7, 10, 19(a), 48 Stat. 74, 78, 81, 85; secs. 201, 205, 209, 210, 48 Stat. 905, 906, 908; secs. 1-4, 8, 68 Stat. 683, 685; sec. 12(a), 73 Stat. 143; sec. 7(a), 74 Stat. 412; sec. 27(a), 84 Stat. 1433; sec. 308(a)(2), 90 Stat. 57; sec. 505, 94 Stat. 2292; secs. 9, 15, 23(a), 48 Stat. 889, 895, 901; sec. 230(a), 49 Stat. 704; secs. 3, 8, 49 Stat. 1377, 1379; sec. 2, 52 Stat. 1075; secs. 6, 10, 78 Stat. 570-574, 580; sec. 11(d), 84 Stat. 121; sec. 18, 89 Stat. 155; sec. 204, 91 Stat. 1500; 15 U.S.C. 77b, 77g, 77j, 77s(a), 78i, 78o, 78w(a))

Dated: September 16, 1982.

By the Commission.

George A. Fitzsimmons,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 82-26177 Filed 9-22-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9010-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[CCGD8-82-10]

Safety Zone, Calcasieu Channel, Industrial Canal, Calcasieu River, Lake Charles, LA

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: On March 2, 1981, Trunkline LNG Company submitted an application to the USCG Captain of the Port, Marine Safety Office, Port Arthur, Texas, requesting a safety zone be established around their waterfront facility. The Trunkline LNG facility is located in the Industrial Canal, Calcasieu River, Lake Charles, LA. A permanent safety zone would be established around the facility, and a moving safety zone would be established around a non-gas free LNG vessel while transiting to and from the Trunkline facility. The safety zone is established to insure the safety of the port and security of the facility. The proposed rule requires permission from the Captain of the Port or the District Commander to enter the safety zone.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This amendment becomes effective on September 23, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lt M. H. Simpson, Project Officer, c/o Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, Federal Building/Customhouse, Port Arthur, TX 77640. Tel: (713) 983-8239.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 13, 1982, the Coast Guard published a

notice of proposed rule making in the *Federal Register* for these regulations (47 FR 20634). Interested persons were requested to submit comments and one comment was received.

Drafting Information

The principal persons involved in drafting this rule are LT M. H. Simpson, Project Officer, c/o Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office, Federal Building/Customhouse, Port Arthur, Texas 77640, Tel: (713) 983-8239, and LT J. C. Helfrich, Project Attorney, c/o Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District (d1), Hale Boggs Federal Building, 500 Camp Street, New Orleans, LA 70130, Tel: (504) 589-6188.

Discussion of Comments

The one comment to the public notice offered no objection to the proposed regulation. Submitted by Trunkline LNG Company, the applicant requesting the safety zone, the comment addressed some minor inaccuracies contained in the Supplementary Information of the proposed rule making. The fenced area of the terminal is approximately 125 acres rather than the 170.46 acres noted in the proposed rule. Also in error was the statement concerning permanent private aids to navigation (flashing green lights, 2.5 seconds period; flash length .5 second) fixed to four mooring dolphins adjacent to the shoreline of the facility. These aids are actually installed on each of two end mooring dolphins and on each of two end breasting dolphins. A third inaccuracy noted by the applicant addressed the location of the facility corners in reference to the aid to navigation lights. In the proposed rule, the reference of 19 feet north and 360 feet north for the west and east corners respectively should both be the same distance, only south of the lights.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 165

Harbors, Marine safety, Waterways.

Final Regulations

PART 165—REGULATED NAVIGATION AREAS AND LIMITED ACCESS AREAS

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 165 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended by adding § 165.805 to read as follows:

§ 165.805 Calcasieu Channel and Industrial Canal, Calcasieu River, Lake Charles, LA.

(a) The waters within the following boundaries are a safety zone: The area extending 150 feet out into the Industrial Canal, Calcasieu River, Lake Charles, LA, along the shoreline of the Trunkline LNG Company's waterfront property,

from position 30°06'31.9" N., 93°18'22.8" W. to the end of the turning basin and to include an area 50 feet out from any LNG ships while moored to the Trunkline LNG facility.

(b) The waters within the following boundaries are a safety zone while a non-gas free LNG vessel is transiting within the Calcasieu River ship channel and between buoy "CC" and the Trunkline LNG facility: The area 2 miles ahead, 1 mile astern, and to either side of an LNG vessel to the width of the ship channel. Meeting, crossing, or overtaking situations are not permitted within the safety zone unless specifically authorized by the USCG Captain of the Port.

(c) Notice of transiting LNG vessels will be provided by Broadcast and/or Local Notice to Mariners.

(92 Stat. 1475, 1477 [33 U.S.C. 1225, 1231]; 49 CFR 1.46 (n))

Dated: August 25, 1982.

J. J. Wicks,

Captain, USCG, Captain of the Port.

[FR Doc. 82-26238 Filed 9-22-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

34 CFR Part 674

National Direct Student Loan, College Work-Study, and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Programs

Correction

In FR Doc. 82-20658 appearing on page 33228 in the issue for Friday, July 30, 1982, make the following changes:

1. On page 33229, third column, thirteenth line from the bottom of the page, "or" should read "of".
2. On page 33230, third column, sixth line from the top of the page, "than" should read "that".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[A-1-FRL 2174-6]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, Connecticut; Revisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Regulatory and narrative revisions to the Connecticut State Implementation Plan (SIP) were

submitted to EPA by the Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on April 8, 1982. Under EPA's new, parallel processing procedures, EPA proposed approval of a draft form of these revisions on November 17, 1981 (46 FR 56461).

In this notice, EPA is approving these revisions, which will change parts of the SIP narrative, strengthen state regulation 19-508-18(d) to reduce the total suspended particulate (TSP) emission limits for fuel oil burning equipment, and revise state regulation 19-508-18(f) to reduce the allowable TSP emissions from iron foundries and hot mix asphalt plants. These changes will satisfy the conditions for approval of Connecticut's primary standard attainment plan for TSP, specified at 45 FR 84781 and 84787 (December 23, 1980).

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 23, 1982.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Connecticut document which is incorporated by reference, comments received, and EPA's response to comments are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, Air Compliance Unit, State Office Building, Hartford, Connecticut 06115. Copies of the material submitted by Connecticut are also available at the Office of the Federal Register, 1100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20408.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sarah Simon, Air Management Division, EPA Region I, Room 1903, J.F.K. Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203, (617) 223-4448.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Connecticut DEP has adopted revisions to Regulation 19-508-18, governing TSP emissions, which strengthen the existing SIP by tightening the emission limits for certain categories of sources. These SIP revisions, including parts of the TSP narrative, were submitted by the Commissioner of the DEP on April 8, 1982.

A discussion of these revisions, the TSP attainment plan conditions these revisions were designed to meet, and EPA's review were presented in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (46 FR 56461, November 17, 1981) and will not be repeated here. With the approval of these revisions, Connecticut will have a completely approved primary TSP attainment plan.

EPA received letters from five commenters dealing with various parts of the revisions. Several of these letters requested a comment period extension.

Region I allowed an additional 30 days and then prepared memoranda responding to the issues raised.

The complete memorandum is available at the EPA addresses listed above.

Industry comments included the following issues:

(1) The process weight limits for foundry sand operations will be difficult to enforce because they are not appropriate for all operations, it may be difficult to aggregate emissions from multiple operations, and the term "tons of material cast" is unclear.

(2) The term "tons of iron produced" in the cupola furnace regulation is unclear.

(3) The proposed foundry regulations do not adequately consider economic impacts, as they may cause plant closures and do not differentiate between foundries on the basis of size and operating hours.

Brief summaries of EPA's responses appear below. More detail can be found in the supporting memoranda.

(1) The State decided to withdraw the process weight limit for foundry sand processes from its SIP revision. This resolves the problems concerning applicability, aggregation of emissions, and the definition of material cast. The State regulation includes two emission limits, a 90% reduction requirement and the questioned process weight limit. Since only the 90% requirement is in the SIP revision, only that compliance method will be used for federal enforcement purposes. The narrative submittals that accompanied the TSP RACT regulations have been expanded to clarify the State's intended enforcement scheme. EPA believes that the 90% removal requirement will adequately control TSP emissions from sand operations.

(2) The State clarified its definition of "tons of iron produced."

(3) EPA has found no evidence that foundries will close. A foundry industry consultant informed EPA that most foundries are already meeting the new emission limit. EPA also believes that Connecticut considered factors such as foundry size and hours of operation in developing its RACT limits.

The Connecticut Fund for the Environment (CFE) submitted detailed comments concerning a wide range of issues. For example, CFE claims that:

(1) The State's revisions are not as strict as EPA's RACT recommendations and do not meet the conditions for approval of the Part D TSP attainment plan.

(2) The State and EPA did not reevaluate the impact of revised sulfur

dioxide (SO₂) limits on the entire TSP attainment plan and that TSP levels in Connecticut are increasing.

EPA's responses to all of CFE's comments are available in the response memorandum mentioned above. Due to their length, they will not be included in full in this notice. To summarize our response briefly:

(1) EPA notes that its RACT recommendations were intended to serve only as guidance. Connecticut is tightening its TSP limits in this revision, and our review has found that these limits are RACT in Connecticut.

(2) The State found that its revised SO₂ limits would not have significant impact on TSP levels. EPA concurs and finds that the State's revision to its sulfur-in-fuel limitations was not a part of the State's Part D plan for TSP. Thus, the change in SO₂ limits did not require a re-evaluation of the TSP plan. In addition, ambient air quality data show that TSP levels in many areas of Connecticut are improving.

EPA has determined that these revisions are acceptable for inclusion in the SIP and that the RACT revisions and submittals satisfy the conditions of approval for Connecticut's TSP Primary Attainment Plan, specified at 45 FR 84781 and 84787 (12-23-80).

Action

After evaluation of the state's submittal, the Administrator has determined that these Connecticut revisions meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR Part 51. Accordingly, they are approved as revisions to the Connecticut SIP.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of Section 3 of Executive Order 12291. The Agency finds that good cause exists for making this action effective immediately since these implementation plan revisions are already in effect under state law and EPA approval imposes no additional regulatory burden.

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 (60 days from today). This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements.

(See sec. 307(b)(2))

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen oxides, Lead,

Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations.

(Secs. 110(a), 172, and 301(a), Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7410(a), 7502, and 7601(a)))

Dated: September 16, 1982.

Anne M. Gorsuch,
Administrator.

Note.—Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of Connecticut was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

Subpart H—Connecticut

1. Section 52.370 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(22) as follows:

§ 52.370 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) The plan revisions listed below were submitted on the dates specified.

* * * * *

(22) Revisions to the narrative and State Regulation 19-508-18, subparts (d), f(1), f(2), and part of f(3), governing total suspended particulate emissions, submitted by the Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection on April 8, 1982.

2. Section 52.373 is amended by adding paragraph (b) as follows:

§ 52.373 Approval status.

* * * * *

(b) The Administrator approves the total suspended particulate regulation for foundry sand processes as submitted and identified under paragraph (c)(22) of this section. This includes *only* the requirement to remove ninety percent of the particulate matter and *not* the requirement to emit not more than 0.75 pounds of particulate per ton of material cast, a provision which may be found in state regulation 19-508-18(f)(3).

§ 52.380 [Amended]

3. Section 52.380 is amended by removing and reserving paragraphs (c)(4) and (c)(5).

[FR Doc. 82-26251 Filed 9-22-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Parts 244, 245, and 246

[SW-FRL-2169-4]

Solid Waste Management; Guidelines for Beverage Containers; Resource Recovery Facilities Guidelines; Source Separation for Materials Recovery Guidelines

Correction

In FR Doc. 82-22836, appearing on page 36602, on Friday, August 20, 1982, in the third column, in the third line of the introductory text of § 244.203, "October 20, 1987" should be corrected to read "October 20, 1977."

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Ch. 101

[FPMR Temp. Reg. D-67]

Locating Federal Facilities in Central Business Areas

AGENCY: General Services Administration.

ACTION: Temporary regulation.

SUMMARY: This regulation temporarily suspends GSA's regulations concerning the assignment and use of space that require priority consideration be given to locating Federal agencies in central business areas (CBA). The regulations are suspended as requested by the Office of Management and Budget memo order to GSA dated May 11, 1982.

DATES: Effective date: September 23, 1982. Expiration date: June 30, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul H. Herndon III, Director, Space Management Division (202-566-1875).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The General Services Administration has determined that this rule is not a major rule for the purposes of Executive Order 12291 of February 17, 1981, because it is not likely to result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; a major increase in costs to consumers or others; or have significant adverse effects. The General Services Administration has based all administrative decisions underlying this rule on adequate information concerning the need for, and consequences of, this rule; has determined that the potential benefits to society from this rule outweigh the potential costs and has