allegations have arisen of possible falsification of data by some test laboratories so that some vehicles tested therein may be in violation of emission requirements. EPA monitoring of such situations is difficult. Such falsification, if it exist, can result in an unfair and costly situation for laboratories and importers who adhere to the requirements of the law. EPA requests factual information as follows:

1. Under the curent procedures and policies, what have been the effects on consumers with respect to prices of both certified and uncertified vehicles, service and availability of models?

2. What have been the quantitative effects, if any, on air quality?

3. What problems have consumers experienced under these procedures with importing nonconforming vehicles?

Option C. Tighter Restrictions than NPRM

This option would require individual and commercial importers of vehicles to certify all vehicles to meet air pollution requirements prior to entry into the United States. Exemptions and/or exclusions would apply only to vehicles falling into a special listed category (e.g., diplomatic and test vehicles). No personal use exemptions would be permitted

This option has some potential for imposing hardships on individuals who purchase vehicles overseas and then discover that they cannot import them into the U.S. EPA specifically requests factual information and comments as follows:

1. What would be the specific effects, in terms of sales and availability of vehicle models, on U.S. dealerships, commercial importers and on consumers?

2. Are there any data to indicate that this option would have a beneficial effect on air quality?

3. Should the small volume certification procedures with respect to commercial importers be modified? If so, how and on what basis?

Option D. Combine NPRM and Certain Current Procedures

This option would require individual and commercial importers of vehicles after a specified effective date to certify all vehicles to meet air pollution requirements *prior* to entry into the United States, with a "one time" exemption for vehicles at least five model years old imported by individuals. Exemptions and/or exclusions may also apply to vehicles falling into a special listed category (e.g., diplomatic and test vehicles.)

This option would implement the proposal in the NPRM to abolish the modification and testing procedures of the current regulations. In lieu of an unlimited personal use exemption, however, it would formalize in the regulations the current policy of allowing individuals to import one vehicle for personal use provided it was at least five model years old at the time of importation. Commercial importers for resale would be allowed to certify vehicles so consumers would still be permitted to purchase vehicles normally not available in the U.S. As with the other options, EPA solicits factual comments as follows:

1. What are the likely effects on this option on U.S. dealerships, commercial importers, model availability, test laboratories, service facilities and consumers?

2. What would be the magnitude of any possible effect on air quality?

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 85

Imports, Labeling, Motor vehicle pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Research, Warranties.

Dated: October 26, 1983.

Richard D. Wilson,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air, Noise and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 83-30034 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 421

[OW-FRL-2464-8]

Nonferrous Metals Manufacturing Point Source Category; Effluent Limitations Guidelines Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of data availability and request for comment.

SUMMARY: EPA proposed effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the nonferrous metals manufacturing category, on February 17, 1983 (48 FR 7032). Since the close of the comment period EPA has obtained additional data and information which will become part of the administrative record for the final regulation. EPA is now making these data and information available for public inspection and comment.

DATES: Comments must be submitted by November 25, 1983.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Mr. James R. Berlow, Effluent Guidelines Division (WH-552), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Attention: EGD Docket Clerk. The supporting information is available for inspection and copying at the EPA Public Information Reference Unit, Room 2404 (Rear). (PM-213). The comments will be made available as they are received. The EPA public information regulations (40 CFR Part 2) provide that a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Technical information may be obtained from Mr. Ernst P. Hall, at (202) 382-7126.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 17, 1983, the EPA proposed effluent limitations guidelines, pretreatment standards, and new source performance standards for phase I of the Nonferrous Metals Manufacturing Point Source Category (48 FR 7032). The comment period closed on May 27, 1983. EPA received over 1500 individual comments on this proposal from 100 commenters.

Comments were submitted by the Aluminum Association and several individual primary aluminum manufacturers stating that the cyanide treatment technology proposed by the Agency as the basis for best available technology (BAT) effluent limitations guidelines and new source performance standards cannot remove cyanide to the amounts the Agency proposed. In addition, the Association disagreed with EPA's assumption that activated carbon absorption treatment would be necessary to assure removal of polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) found in primary aluminum wastewater. Instead, the Association stated that data produced by its members showed that 90 percent or more of the PAH would be removed by lime precipitation and sedimentation (lime and settle) treatment. EPA agreed to conduct pilot scale studies of the treatability of cyanide and PAH in primary aluminum wastewater to help resolve those comments. The results of the two studies (conducted at a primary aluminum plant in July and August, 1983) are discussed in two draft reports available for public inspection in the EPA Public Information Unit.

The Agency also received a comment from the Aluminum Recycling Association concerning the need for a discharge allowance for ingot conveyor casting and stationary casting operations in secondary aluminum production. The Association correctly points out that the proposed regulation did not expressly discuss ingot conveyor casting as a method of casting for secondary aluminum. In order to assure

complete consideration of this comment EPA contacted 8 plants in its data base that did not clearly report the type of casting used (all other plants having reported use of casting methods other than ingot conveyor casting). We have summarized the results of that telephone survey, and of casting data submitted in the 1976 data collection portfolios, and these summaries are available for inspection in the Public Information Refernce Unit.

The Agency also is providing copies of other data collected since proposal in the Public Information Reference Unit. This information consists of trip reports and analytical data from sampling a primary tungsten, primary zinc, and two secondary lead plants, data collection portfolio data from several primary aluminum, primary copper, primary zinc, primary tungsten, secondary aluminum, secondary silver and secondary lead facilities not previously included in the data base and discharge monitoring reports collected for plants reporting use of lime and settle technology with or without polishing filtration. The data will be incorporated into the data base used for developing the final regulation.

Our preliminary analysis of the new data and information suggests the following:

a. The treatability study appears to support an increase in the achievable concentrations of cyanide used to establish BAT effluent limitations guidelines and new source of performance standards for primary aluminum production. The revised monthly average indicated by the study would be 2.0 mg/1 and the revised daily maximum would be 4.5 mg/1. This performance is based on a mean performance of 1.1 mg/1 and is achievable by use of cyanide precipitation, sedimentation and filtration. The Agency also has reviewed available literature and data submitted by Kaiser Aluminum (correspondence dated February 11, 1980) that supports a conclusion that these revised cyanide concentrations are achievable using ion exchange technology.

In addition, the Agency is considering applying a monitoring requirement for cyanide immediately after cyanide pretreatment. The treatability study appears to establish that lime and settle technology will not remove cyanide adequately. Further, not every wastestream from primary aluminum production contains cyanide. Thus, centralized lime and settle treatment not only is ineffective treatment for cyanide, but could result in dilution of cyanide below the allowable level (contrary to our conclusions in the proposed rule at 48 FR 7056). In order to assure that cyanide limitations are not achieved by dilution, an at-the-source monitoring requirement may be appropriate. If EPA promulgates an at-the-source requirement, we will include separate cyanide pretreatment costs in our cost estimates for complying with cyanide limitations.

b. The treatability study appears to support a conclusion that treatment of primary aluminum wastewater with lime precipitation, sedimentation, and filtration does remove PAH. Therefore, EPA is considering modifying its pollutant removal estimates (which assumed no removal of PAH without treatment with activated carbon) to reflect the results of the treatability study. The data also appears to support a conclusion that benzo(a)pyrene limitations based on an achievable concentration of 0.01 mg/1 are achievable without use of activated carbon treatment. Several other more soluble PAH such a pyrene and fluoranthene are removed by lime precipitation, sedimentation, and filtration, but may require treatment by activated carbon absorption in order to achieve removals to 0.01 mg/1. As such, benzo(a)pyrene removal may not be an indicator of complete PAH removal. The Agency solicits comments as to whether activated carbon pretreatment should continue to be part of BAT treatment in order to remove fully these more soluble PAH.

c. Our follow-up study of ingot conveyor casting practices in the secondary aluminum industry appears to indicate that no discharge allowance is justified for ingot conveyor casting. EPA's study identified three secondary aluminum plants achieving 100 percent recycle of contact cooling water used on ingot conveyors. In addition, the Agency has identified 18 secondary aluminum plants achieving 100 percent recycle of stationary casting contact cooling water.

Copies of this new information and data are available for public inspection in the EPA Public Information Reference Unit. Comments are solicited only on the new data and on the preliminary analysis outlined above. These comments must be received by EPA on or before November 25, 1983, to ensure their consideration.

Dated: October 28, 1983.

Rebecca W. Hanmer,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Water.

[FR Doc. 83-29976 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[Gen. Docket No. 83-1009; FCC 83-440]

Multiple Ownership of AM, FM and Television Broadcast Stations

Correction

In FR Doc. 83-28801 beginning on page 49438 in the issue of Tuesday, October 25, 1983, certain footnote references should be corrected to read as follows:

On page	In footnote	The reference to	Should have read
49443	59	59	58
49443	61	59	58
49443	63	63	62
49443	63	61	60
49445	Table 4, footnote 1.	14	71
49445	Table 5, footnote 1.	76 (3 times)	Table 4, footnote 1
49445	Table 5, footnote 1.	74	71
49445	Table 6, footnote 1.	76 (2 times)	Table 4, footnote 1
49445	Table 6, footnote 1.	77	Table 5, footnote 1
49445	73	77	Table 5, footnote 1
49445	74	78	Table 6, footnote 1
49445	75	77	Table 5, footnote 1
49446	86	89	83
49446	87	89	83
49446	88	89	83
49447	89	92	86
49447	90	95	89
49447	91	70	69
49447	91	94	88
49447	Table 8, footnote 1.	99	95
49448	96	99 (2 times)	95
49448	96	98	94
49448	99	70	69
49449	103	99	95
49449	103	90	84
49449	105	71	Table 2, footnote 1
49449	109	70	69
49449	110	92	86
49449	111	70	69
49450	114	70	69
49450	116	70	69
49450	117	96	92
49450	119	96	92
49450	120	70	69
49450	120	117A	113
49451	125	71	Table 2, footnote 1

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Ch. 5

Implementation of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR)

AGENCY: Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice invites written comments on the General Services Administration proposal to establish the General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR) as Chapter 5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations System. The GSAR will implement and supplement the Federal Acquisition Regulations. The new GSAR will supercede the current General Services Administration Procurement Regulations. The following Parts of the proposed GSAR are available for review and comment:

Part 501—Federal Acquisition Regulations System
Part 502—Definitions of Words and Terms
Part 529—Taxes
Part 530—Cost Accounting Standards
Part 531—Contract Cost Principles and Procedures
Part 550—Extraordinary Contractual Actions

DATE: Comments are due not later than December 5, 1983.

ADDRESS: Request for copies of the proposals and comments should be addressed to the Office of GSA Acquisition Policy and Regulations, Office of Acquisition Policy, Room 4026, 18th & F Streets, NW., Washington, D.C. 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ida Ustad, Office of GSA Acquisition Policy and Regulations, Office of Acquisition Policy, (202) 523–4754.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Impact

The Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), by memorandum dated October 4, 1982, exempted agency procurement regulations from Executive Order 12291. The General Services Administration (GSA) certifies that these documents will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq.). The rule does not contain information collection requirements which require approval by OMB under 44 U.S.C. 3501 et. seq. This rule provides uniformity with other Federal agencies and reduces the administrative impact on bidders as set forth in OFPP Policy Letter 83–2.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Chapter 5

General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations, Government procurement.

Dated: October 21, 1983.

William B. Ferguson,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 83–29945 Filed 11–3–83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–61–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PS–78; Notice 1]

Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Design of Pipeline Components, General Requirements

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to revise the general requirements for design of pipeline components to recognize that limiting stresses to "unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service" is not an appropriate criterion, from a safety standpoint, for many pipeline components. In response to a petition from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Materials Transportation Bureau proposes to clarify the requirements.

DATE: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on this proposal. All comments must be filed by January 3, 1983. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all the material that is considered relevant to any statement of fact or argument made.

ADDRESS: Communications should be sent to the Dockets Branch, Room 8426, Materials Transportation Bureau, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, and identify the docket and notice numbers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Cory, (202) 426–2082.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

American Society of Mechanical Engineers' Petition

The Gas Piping Technology Committee of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), by letter of April 6, 1983, petitioned the MTB to revise § 192.143, General requirements, Subpart D of Part 192. This section, limiting the stress in components to "unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service" in the context of "Each component of a pipeline . . .." is both impractical and technically inappropriate for valves, flanges, and some other components, according to the petition. These components achieve primary pressure containment through bolting, gaskets, elastomer seals, and sealing compounds. The basis for design of the metallic parts is unit strain (i.e., elastic deformation) at critical locations under rated pressure.

The ASME stated that the objective in designing such components is to limit the strain at these critical locations so that the pressure seal will remain functional. These components have an irregular contour and the stress levels at rated pressure vary from very low to highly localized conditions that approach or may exceed the yield strength. Thus, the actual stress levels can only be determined by a finite element stress analysis.

The "unit stress" language entered § 192.143 through paragraph 831 of the 1969 Edition of the B31.8 Code for Pressure Piping, Gas Transmission, and Distribution Piping Systems. The Code Committee realized the error of the statement and revised paragraph 831 in 1969. This revision would have been in a 1970 Edition, but was not published due to the adoption of Part 192. However, this revision is contained in the 1975 Edition.

The petitioner further pointed out that it has been common practice in design of pipelines to limit operating pressure of valves, flanges, and similar components in accordance with their design rating, e.g., ASA 150 (WOG 275), ASA 300 (WOG 720 psi), ASA 400 (WOG 960 psi), ASA 600 (1440 psi), etc. This practice is based upon sound engineering standards (see standards listed in Part 192, Appendix A—Incorporated by Reference) that have proven to provide safety at least equal to the pipe design level for the same design pressure. This has been the intent of the present wording of § 192.143. In addition, the listed specifications have been required for such components since Part 192 was first issued.

In view of the above, MTB concurs with the ASME petition that clarification of § 192.143 is needed. Therefore, MTB proposes to amend § 192.143 to provide an option to designing pipeline components on the basis of unit stresses by permitting the design to be based on

the pressure being rated in accordance with the requirements of an appropriate specification listed in Appendix A of Part 192. In addition, components that were manufactured to an edition of a listed specification that has not been referenced in Part 192 would be permitted to be used by compliance with § 192.144. This standard permits the use of components made to an unlisted edition of a specification listed in Appendix A. Components not covered by a specification listed in Appendix A or § 192.144 would be considered for waiver upon appropriate application and justification by the pipeline operator.

Cost Impact

This rulemaking is not "major" under Executive order 12291 because it will have a positive effect on the economy of less than $100 million a year, and no adverse effects are anticipated. Also, it is not "significant" under Department of Transportation Policies and Procedures (DOT Order 2100.5).

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) requires a review of certain rules proposed after January 1, 1981, for their effects on small businesses, organizations, and governmental bodies. I certify that the proposed rules will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because there will be no direct or indirect costs of compliance or other adverse effects and overall effects will be minimal.

List of Subject in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, Design of pipeline components.

PART 192—[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, MTB proposes that § 192.143 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations be revised as follows:

§ 192.143 General requirements.

Each component of a pipeline must be able to withstand operating pressures and other anticipated loadings with unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service or must be pressure rated in accordance with the requirements of the applicable specification listed in Appendix A or meet the requirements of § 192.144.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1672; 49 U.S.C. 1804; 49 CFR 1.53; Appendix A to Part 1, and Appendix A to Part 106.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 31, 1983.

Richard L. Beam,

Associate Director for Pipeline Safety Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 83-29884 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Status Review for the Amber Darter (Percina antesella), Trispot Darter (Etheostoma trisella), and Reticulate Logperch (Percina sp.)

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of review.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is reviewing the status of the amber darter (*Percina antesella*), trispot darter (*Etheostoma trisella*), and reticulate logperch (*Percina* sp.) to determine if these species and their habitat should be provided protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. These fishes are currently known from the Conasauga River (Murray and Whitfield Counties, Georgia; Bradley and Polk Counties, Tennessee). The amber darter is also known from one site on the Etowah River (Cherokee County, Georgia). The distribution of these fishes could be reduced if water development projects now being considered for the upper Conasauga River are implemented without adequately considering the requirements of these species. Due to the limited distribution of the three fishes, any factors which degrade water quality in this short river reach, i.e., land use changes, chemical spills, increases in agricultural and urban runoff, could threaten the survival of these species. Based on information gathered through this review process plus the results of a status survey being conducted under a Service contract and other presently available data, the Service will determine if the three fishes should be proposed for inclusion on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. Comments and information are sought from the public.

DATES: Comments from all interested parties must be received by February 2, 1984.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons, organizations, agencies, and governments are requested to submit comments to Mr. Warren Parker, Field Supervisor, Endangered Species Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 100 Otis Street, Room 224, Asheville, North Carolina 28801 (704/259-0321).

Comments and material relating to this notice are available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard G. Biggins (704/259-0321) (see above address).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The amber darter (*Percina antesella*), trispot darter (*Etheostoma trisella*), and reticulate logperch (*Percina* sp) are known from tributaries of the Coosa River drainage in Georgia and Tennessee. Specifically, the trispot darter and reticulate logperch appear to be restricted to approximately 20 miles of the Conasauga River in Murray and Whitfield Counties, Georgia and Bradley and Polk Counties, Tennessee. The amber darter exists in this same short stretch of the Conasauga River and at one locality in the Etowah River, Cherokee County, Georgia, where a single specimen of the species was found in 1980 (Etnier, *et al.*, 1981). The amber darter was once known to exist near the mouth of Shoal Creek, a tributary of the Etowah River, Cherokee County, Georgia, but this population was apparently lost in the 1950's when the Allatoona Reservoir was flooded. The trispot darter once existed in Cowans Creek, a tributary of Spring Creek which flows into the Coosa River in Cherokee County, Alabama (Bailey and Richards, 1963), and the Coosa River proper in Etowah County, Alabama (Ramsey, 1976). However, these are now flooded by backwaters of Weiss Dam and Neely Henry Dam respectively.

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and the Tennessee Heritage Program of the Tennessee Department of Conservation list all three darters as Threatened. In a publication edited by both agencies, *Tennessee Rare Wildlife Volume I: The Vertebrates*, they stated, relative to amber darter habitat, that "the combination of gently flowing runs and silt-free substrate is rare in these times of widespread siltation due to poor watershed management or impoundments. The Conasauga River in Tennessee remains clear in all but the heaviest of floods indicating its uniqueness and importance in preservation of the amber darter . . ." Ramsey (1973), in a report on extinct and rare freshwater fishes in Georgia, classified the amber and trispot darters

as "rare-1 species" which he defined, in part, as species not known to survive in reservoirs of channelized streams. Ramsey further categorized these two darters as "vulnerable" which he defined as ". . . species whose range is extremely limited and a species that could be rendered extinct by a single land-use change."

The amber and trispot darters and the reticulate logperch apparently require unpolluted clear water streams. The amber darter utilizes areas with moderate current over gravel and silt-free sand substrate (Williams and Etnier, 1977). The trispot inhabits the sluggish current along the stream margin over detritus substrate (Ryon, 1981). The reticulate logperch occurs in flowing pool areas and riffles over clean substrate of rubble, sand, and gravel (Starnes and Etnier, 1980). Siltation which often results when lands are cleared for agriculture or other land uses is a major factor affecting the quality of these habitats. Siltation changes the character of the stream so that gravel riffle areas become infiltrated with silt and the detritus substrates are smothered with fine silt particles.

The upper Conasauga River flows through the Cherokee National Forest. This provides some protection for downstream habitat sections where the fish are found. However, the fish are threatened from agricultural and urban runoff in the agricultural and developed sections of the watershed. There is also the potential that a toxic chemical spill could eliminate a major portion of the population. Another threat could come from the water development and flood control projects being studied for the upper Conasauga River near Dalton, Georgia. These projects, depending on type and extent, could severely impact the species if biological requirements of these fishes are not considered in the planning process.

Effects of This Notice of Review

This notice is a public announcement of the Service's intent to collect data on the status of the trispot and amber darters and reticulate logperch and their habitat, and to solicit information on likely impacts which could result from the species and their Critical Habitat being proposed and listed.

This notice does not formally bring either species under the protection of the Endangered Species Act. Consequently, there will be no effect on Federal activities through Section 7 of the Act. This notice also does not imply any prohibitions on taking of the species as stated in Section 9. The Service does believe, however, that these fishes may qualify for Endangered Species Act protection. For this reason and due to their apparent rarity, the amber darter, trispot darter, and reticulate logperch should be given some consideration in environmental planning for projects which could impact the Conasauga River in Whitfield and Murray Counties, Georgia, and in Bradley and extreme southwestern Polk Counties, Tennessee. The amber darter should also be considered for projects which could impact the Etowah River in the area of Cherokee County, Georgia.

Public Comments Solicited

The Service is seeking comments from State agencies in Tennessee and Georgia on the species and their potential Critical Habitat. With this Notice of Review, the Service is also inviting and requesting anyone who may have information on these species to contact Mr. Warren Parker, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see Addresses section). Although all comments are welcome, the Service has particular interest in receiving comments on the following:

1. Biological, commercial, or other relevant data concerning any threat (or the lack thereof) to these species;

2. The location of and the reasons why any habitat occupied by these species should or should not be determined to be Critical Habitat as provided for by Section 4 of the Act;

3. Additional information concerning the range and distribution of these species;

4. Current or planned activities which may adversely affect these species or their habitat; and

5. Possible impacts to Federal activities if Critical Habitat is designated.

The Service will analyze all existing data, as well as data resulting from this review, and from any future research. If our analysis indicates that any one or all of these species merit Endangered or Threatened status, the Service will propose the species for listing. Such a proposal would afford additional opportunity for interested parties to comment prior to any decision by the Service to formally list these species.

Author

This Notice of Review was prepared by Richard G. Biggings, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Species Field Office, Plateau Building, Room A-5, 50 South French Broad Avenue, Asheville, North Carolina 28801 (704/258-2850).

References

Bailey, R.M., and W. Richards. 1963. Status of *Poecilichthys hopkinsi* Fowler and *Etheostoma trisella*, new species, percid fishes from Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina. Occ. Pap. Mus. Zool. Univ. Mich. (630):1-21.

Bryant, R.T., B.H. Bauer, M.G. Ryon, and W.C. Starnes. 1979. Distributional notes on fishes from northern Georgia with comments on the status of rare species. Proc. Southeastern Fishes Council. 2(4). 4 pp.

Etnier, D.A., B.H. Bauer, and A.G. Haines. 1981. Fishes of the Gulf Coastal Drainage of North Georgia. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. 6 pp.

Lee, D.S., C.R. Gilbert, C.H. Hocutt, R.E. Jenkins, E.E. McAllister, and J.R. Stauffer, Jr. 1980. Atlas of North American Freshwater Fishes. N.C. State Mus. Nat. Hist., Raleigh. i-x + 854 pp.

Ramsey, J.S. 1973. A preliminary list of extinct and rare freshwater fishes of Georgia. Alabama Cooperative Fishery Unit, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. 7 pp.

Ramsey, J.S. 1976. Freshwater fishes. pp. 53-65. *In:* H. Boschung (ed.) Endangered and Threatened Plants and Animals of Alabama. Bull. Alabama Mus. Nat. Hist. No. 2, University. 92 pp.

Ryon, M.T. 1981. The life history and ecology of *Etheostoma trisella* (Pisces: Percidae). M.S. thesis, Univ. of Tenn. 79 pp.

Starnes, W.C., and D.A. Etnier. 1980. Fishes. pp. 111-112. *In:* Eager, D.C. and R.M. Hatcher (eds.), Tennessee's Rare Wildlife, Vol. I: The Vertebrates. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and Tennessee Conservation Department. 337 pp.

Stiles, R.A., and D.A. Etnier. 1971. Fishes of the Conasauga River drainage, Polk and Bradley Counties, Tennessee. J. Tenn. Acad. Sci. 46:12-16.

Williams, J.D., and D.A. Etnier. 1977. *Percina (Imostoma) antesella*, a new percid fish from the Coosa River system in Tennessee and Georgia. Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 90:6-16.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and threatened wildlife, Fish, Marine mammals, Plants (agriculture).

(Pub. L. 93-205, 87 Stat. 885; Pub. L. 95-632, 92 Stat. 3751; Pub. L. 96-159, 93 Stat. 1225; Pub. L. 97-304, 96 Stat. 1411 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.))

Dated: October 26, 1983

G. Ray Arnett,

Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 83-29681 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 48, No. 215
Friday, November 4, 1983

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Nutrition Service

Food Stamp Program; Thrifty Food Plan; Guam and the Virgin Islands

AGENCY: Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

ACTION: General notice.

SUMMARY: The Department is changing the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) amount of food stamps which participating households receive. TFP changes for the 48 States and D.C., Alaska, and Hawaii have already been published. The TFP changes in this Notice are for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel Woodhead, Supervisor, Issurance and Benefit Delivery Section, Program Design and Rulemaking Branch, Program Planning, Development and Support Division, Family Nutrition Programs, Food and Nutrition Service, USDA, Alexandria, Virginia 22302.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Publication

The Guam and Virgin Islands State agencies must implement this action on October 1, 1983, and these offices need adequate advance notice of the new amounts to carry out all steps necessary for them to meet the implementation deadline. Based on regulations published at 47 FR 46485–46487 (October 19, 1982) annual statutory adjustments to the TFP are issued by General Notices published in the **Federal Register** and not through rulemaking proceedings.

Classification

This action has been reviewed under Executive Order 12291 and Secretary's Memorandum 1512–1. It will not result in a major increase in costs or prices, nor will it affect competition, productivity, employment, investment, or innovation. Therefore, this action has been classified as not major.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Robert E. Leard, Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, has certified that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The action will increase the amount of money spent on food through food stamps in Guam and the Virgin Islands. However, this money will be distributed among all food vendors in these places, so the effect on any one vendor will not be significant.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This action does not contain reporting or recordkeeping requirements subject to approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Background

The TFP is a plan for the consumption of foods of different types (food groups) that families might use to provide nutritious meals and snacks for family members. The plan suggests amounts of food for men, women, and children of different ages, and it meets all dietary standards. As the cost of food rises, the cost of the TFP also increases.

The TFP constitutes the basis for uniform allotments for food stamp households. The TFP allotment amount is the maximum benefit level payable to a household of a particular size. The maximum benefit is paid to households which have no net income. For households which have some income, the allotment is determined by reducing the TFP amount for the household's size by 30 percent of the household's net income. As prescribed by the statute, the TFP allotment amounts for each household size are based on the TFP for a particular four-person household. There are separate TFP amounts for the 48 States and D.C., Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. By law, the TFP allotment amounts for Guam and the Virgin Islands cannot exceed those in the 50 States.

The TFP amounts are adjusted periodically to reflect changes in price levels. Section 3(o) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, provides that the next adjustment will take place October 1, 1983, based upon June 1983 TFP costs for a family of four persons consisting of a man and woman ages 20–54 and children 6–8 and 9–11. To obtain allotment amounts for each household size, this number is divided by four, reduced by one percent, multiplied by the appropriate household size and economy of scale factor, and the final result is rounded down to the nearest lower dollar.

The Department published adjusted TFP amounts for the 48 States and D.C., Alaska, and Hawaii at 48 FR 45442, October 5, 1983. TFPs developed in 1975 or prior to 1975 were used for all areas. June 1983 TFP costs for Guam and the Virgin Islands were delayed so the appropriate adjustments could not be made until now. June 1983 TFP costs for a four-person household were $376.10 in Guam and $328.10 in the Virgin Islands. After appropriate calculations were made, final amounts for Guam and the Virgin Islands were $372 and $324 respectively. These amounts were compared to results in the 50 States and D.C. to insure that they did not exceed allotment amounts there.

The following table shows the new allotments for Guam and the Virgin Islands. Allotments are increased for all household sizes.

THRIFTY FOOD PLAN AMOUNTS—JUNE 1983, AS ADJUSTED

Household size	Guam [1]	Virgin Islands [1]
1	$111	$97
2	204	178
3	293	255
4	372	324
5	442	385
6	530	462
7	586	511
8	670	584
Each additional member	+83	+73

[1] Adjusted to reflect the cost of food in June, adjustments for each household size, economies of scale, 1 percent reduction, and rounding.

(91 Stat. 958 (7 U.S.C. 2011–2029))

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs No. 10.551, Food Stamps)

Dated: October 31, 1983.

Robert E. Leard,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 83–29999 Filed 11–3–83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–30–M

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Uniform System of Accounts and Reports for Certificated Air Carriers; Passenger Origin-Destination Survey

AGENCY: Civil Aeronautics Board.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Collection of Information under the Provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 35).

SUMMARY: The Civil Aeronautics Board is requesting the Office of Management and Budget's approval of extension of CAB Form 2787, "Passenger Origin-Destination Survey Report," (O & D) filed pursuant to section 19-7 of Part 241 of the Board's Economic Regulations. Extension is requested for one year through January 1, 1985.

DATE: October 27, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Linda K. Koman, Data Requirements Section, Information Management Division, Office of Comptroller, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20428, (202) 673-6042.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Agency Clearance Officer from Whom a Copy of the Collection of Information and Supporting Documents is Available: Robin A. Caldwell (202) 673-5922

How Often the Collection of Information Must Be Filed: Quarterly

Who is Asked or Required to Report: U.S. Certificated Air Carriers

Estimate of Number of Annual Responses: 180

Estimate of Number of Annual Hours Needed to Complete the Collection of Information: 70,200

Phyllis T. Kaylor,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-30086 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

[Order 83-11-6]

Application; Aeroleon, S.A.; Order To Show Cause

AGENCY: Civil Aeronautics Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Board proposes to dismiss as moot the applications of Aeroleon, S.A., Docket 35803 and 38823. The application in Docket 35803 requests a foreign air carrier permit to conduct non-scheduled cargo flights between points in Mexico and specified points in the United States. In Docket 38923, the applicant seeks unlimited all-cargo exemption authority.

Objections: All interested persons having objections to the Board's tentative findings and conclusions that these applications are moot and should be dismissed, as described in the order cited above, shall, no later than November 25, 1983, file a statement of such objections with the Civil Aeronautics Board (20 copies) and mail copies to the applicant, the Department of Transportation, the Department of State, and the Ambassador of Mexico in Washington, D.C. A statement of objections must cite the docket numbers and must include a summary of testimony, statistical data, or other such supporting evidence.

If no objections are filed, the Secretary of the Board will enter an order which will make final the Board's tentative findings and conclusions and dismiss the applications of Aeroleon, S.A. in Docket 35803 and 38823.

ADDRESSES:

Dockets 35803 and 38823, Docket Section, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C. 20428

Robert E. Cohn, Esquire, Butler, Binion, Rice, Cook & Knapp, 818 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

To get a copy of the complete order, request it from the C.A.B. Distribution Section, Room 101, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20428. Persons outside the Washington metropolitan area may send a postcard request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Pitzer Trowbridge, Regulatory Affairs Division, Bureau of International Aviation, Civil Aeronautics Board—202-673-5134.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board: November 1, 1983.

Phyllis T. Kaylor,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-30024 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits Filed Under Subpart Q of the Board's Procedural Regulations; Week Ended October 28, 1983

Subpart Q Applications

The due date for answers, conforming application, or motions to modify scope are set forth below for each application. Following the answer period the board may process the application by expedited procedures. Such procedures may consist of the adoption of a show-cause order, a tentative order, or in appropriate cases a final order without further proceedings. (See 14 CFR 302.1701 et seq.).

Date filed	Docket No.	Description
Oct. 24, 1983	41769	Arrow Air, Inc., c/o Lawrence D. Wasko, Seamon, Wasko & Ozment, 1211 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20036. Conforming Application of Arrow Air, Inc. pursuant to Section 401 of the Act and Subpart Q of the Board's Procedural Regulations for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in scheduled foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail as follows: A. Between the coterminal points Miami, Florida and San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the one hand, and the coterminal points Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, Brazil, on the other hand, nonstop and via the intermediate point Caracas Venezuela, and other intermediate points in the Caribbean and South America; B. Between the coterminal points Miami, Florida and San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the one hand, and the coterminal points Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, Brazil, and Buenos Aeries, Argentina, on the other hand, nonstop and via the intermediate point Caracas, Venezuela, other intermediate points in the Caribbean and South America. Answers may be filed by November 7, 1983.
Oct. 24, 1983	41774	Northwest Airlines, Inc., Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport, St. Paul, Minnesota 55111. Application of Northwest Airlines, Inc. for an amendment to Segment 3 of its certificate for Route 179 which would authorize Northwest to engage in the scheduled air transportation of persons, property and mail on an unrestricted basis between Detroit and London as follows: "3. a. Between the terminal point Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN and the terminal point, London, United Kingdom; b. Between the terminal point Boston, MA and the terminal point London, United Kingdom; c. Between the terminal point Detroit, MI and the terminal point London, United Kingdom." Conforming Applications, Motions to Modify Scope and Answers may be filed by November 23, 1983.