

with the 2,000-contract limit. The change from 2,000 to 4,000 option contracts involves standards that are a protection against possible manipulation. These standards insure that only option contracts having an underlying stock that has either very high trading volume or high trading volume and a high number of shares outstanding will receive the higher limit. The standards mean that the options and stocks involved are significantly less susceptible to manipulation. To be eligible for the 4,000-contract limit, either the most recent six-month trading volume of the underlying stock must have totaled at least 20,000,000 shares; or the most recent six-month trading volume of the underlying stock must have totaled at least 15,000,000 shares and the underlying stock must have at least 60,000,000 shares currently outstanding.

Every six months, the Exchange will review the status of underlying stocks for options traded on the Exchange to determine which limit should apply. Two new lists shall be published and distributed to all members and member firms. The 4,000 limit will be effective on the date set by the Exchange, which date will allow time for appropriate notice to be given. Any change from a 4,000 to a 2,500 limit will take effect after the last expiration then trading, unless the requirement for a 4,000 limit is met at the time of the intervening six-month review.

The basis for this proposed rule change is Section 6(b)(5) of the 1934 Act, in that the proposed change would increase market depth and liquidity, which is in the public interest, while continuing to protect investors from manipulative activity.

(B) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The proposed rule change imposes no burden on competition.

(C) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants or Others

Comments on the proposed rule change were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 35 days of the date of the publication of this notice in the *Federal Register* or within such longer period: (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding; or

(ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) by order approve such proposed rule change; or

(B) institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section.

Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the above-mentioned, self-regulatory organization. All submissions should refer to the file number in the caption above and should be submitted within 21 days after the date of this publication.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

Dated: May 2, 1983.

George A. Fitzsimmons,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-12811 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster Loan Area #2080; Amdt. #1]

Mississippi; Declaration of Disaster Loan Area

Declaration #2080 (See 48 FR 18969) is amended in accordance with FEMA's declaration of April 16, 1983, to include Copiah, Pearl River, Simpson, and Covington Counties and the adjacent Counties of Claiborne and Pike in the State of Mississippi. All other information remains the same, i.e., the termination dates for filing applications for physical damage is close of business on June 16, 1983, and for economic injury until the close of business on January 16, 1984.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs Nos. 59002 and 59008)

Dated: May 4, 1983.

Heriberto Herrera,
Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 83-12811 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

Paperwork Reduction Policies Affecting Small Business; Hearing and Request for Comments

The Chief Counsel for Advocacy will conduct six public hearings on small business paperwork burdens. The goal of the hearings is to assess the impact of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (PRA) on the small business community and to explore ways to provide greater relief from paperwork burdens.

Written comments or personal appearances are requested. Statements should respond to issues listed below but need not be limited by the list. One of the most difficult problems in assessing the effectiveness of paperwork control is the lack of specific information from small businesses. This notice and the public hearings seek to develop specific information.

Written comments by persons who will not be testifying at a hearing must be received by July 15, 1983. Requests to present an oral statement must be made two weeks in advance of the particular hearing, and witnesses are urged to make two copies of their testimony available to the Chief Counsel at the hearing.

Interested parties should submit two copies of their comments, suggestions, or other information about Federal paperwork and paperwork reduction policies to Mr. Frank S. Swain, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, U.S. Small Business Administration, Room 1012, 1441 "L" Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20416. Attention: Paperwork Hearings.

To schedule testimony at one of the hearings, contact Dr. Philip Nicoll, Senior Advocate for Paperwork Policy, at the Office of Advocacy, U.S. Small Business Administration, Room 1012, 1441 "L" Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20416, phone (202) 634-6180.

The dates and cities scheduled are:

Monday, June 6, 1983, Tampa, Florida
Wednesday, June 15, 1983, Dallas, Texas
Wednesday, June 22, 1983, Indianapolis, Indiana
Thursday, June 30, 1983, Boston, Massachusetts
Wednesday, July 13, 1983, San Francisco, California
Friday, July 15, 1983, Seattle, Washington

For exact times and places, call (202) 634-6180.

1. Reason for These Hearings

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) was passed by Congress in 1980 to systematize and reduce Federal information collection and recordkeeping requirements. The Act marks the recognition of the increasing burden of duplicative government forms, reports and recordkeeping requirements.

Studies show that small businesses in particular are disproportionately burdened by Federal paperwork requirements. Since many paperwork burdens are the same for all companies regardless of size, small businesses' ability to compete is disproportionately affected by the paperwork aspects of regulation.

The PRA made several important changes in the law. It centralized Federal paperwork authority in the Office of Management and Budget and created the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). The Act set goals for reduction of Federal paperwork by 25 percent from April 1981 to April 1983. It also provided that no person could be penalized for not complying with a Federal information collection requirement unless the requirement has been cleared by OMB and has been assigned an OMB clearance number.

The PRA authorized the OIRA to function until September 30, 1983, and Congress is currently considering reauthorization of the OIRA. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy has been charged by Congress with developing information to correct small business problems and is authorized by law to hold hearings for these purposes (Pub. L. 94-305, Sections 203(5) and 204(5)). Thus, the Chief Counsel seeks assistance from the public in gauging the progress made toward controlling regulations and paperwork through the Paperwork Reduction Act as well as other regulatory reform efforts. In addition the Chief Counsel oversees agency compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which directs agency analyses of both regulatory and paperwork burdens.

2. Who Should Comment or Testify?

Small business owners, small business organizations, or other individuals who can provide personal examples, statistical information, or other information or perceptions about trends in paperwork burdens affecting business at the Federal and state levels. For example, persons with experience with paperwork burdens related to the following would be particularly appropriate: Tax, government contracting, environmental, health and

safety regulation, licensing, periodic business censuses, regulation of transportation, communications, banking or energy and construction.

3. Issues to Address

Information is welcome on any aspect of small business paperwork and recordkeeping policy, but specific responses for the following questions will be especially appreciated.

1. Have business-related Federal recordkeeping or reporting burdens increased or decreased since 1981?
2. Which paperwork requirements impose the greatest burdens on business? Please provide specific information on the costs imposed by the particular paperwork requirement or operational limitations. Are these changes that should be made in the paperwork requirement?
3. Are there examples where paperwork burdens have been reduced since 1981? What was the impact of these changes? Describe any initiatives by Federal agencies to involve small business in paperwork policy decisions.
4. Have state and local paperwork burdens changed since 1981? Please explain. Have states adopted paperwork requirements dropped by Federal agencies?
5. Is repetitious paperwork imposed by different units of the same agency or department, or by more than one agency or department of Federal or state government? Please describe.
6. Are you familiar with the public protection provision of the Paperwork Act? Do you know of Federal forms or recordkeeping requirements that do not bear an OMB clearance number? Document each one.
7. Are there changes that you would recommend in the Government's response to the paperwork problems of small businesses?

Dated: May 9, 1983.

Frank S. Swain,

Chief Counsel for Advocacy.

[FR Doc. 83-12812 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

[CGD 83-023]

Certificate of Alternative Compliance; Notice of Certificate Granted for the 270' WMEC Class

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to paragraph (c), Section 1605, Title 33 of the United

States Code, notice of certification of alternative compliance granted to the 270' WMEC class of Coast Guard cutters is hereby made.

On January 5, 1983, the 270' Famous class was granted an exemption from the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (72 COLREGS) vertical and horizontal positioning requirements for masthead lights. These exemptions were made under authority of Rule 1(e) of 72 COLREGS and Sec. 6 of the International Navigational Rules Act of 1977 (91 Stat. 309, 33 U.S.C. 1605).

Rule 23 of 72 COLREGS requires vessels over 50 meters in length to carry a forward and after masthead light. Section 2 of Annex I to 72 COLREGS requires the forward masthead light to be carried not less than 11.6 meters (the maximum beam of the vessel) above the hull. The 270' WMEC class cannot meet this requirement because of its special construction and purpose.

The 270' class is equipped with an optical sight connected to its COMDAC system. This sight is located directly aft of the forward mast location. If the forward light is placed at the required height, it would interfere with the operation of the sight. The alternative vertical position for the forward masthead light is approximately 10.7 meters above the main deck. This is the closest possible compliance with the positioning requirements of Section 2 of Annex I to 72 COLREGS without interfering with the special function of the vessel.

Section 3 of Annex I to 72 COLREGS specifies a minimum horizontal distance between the two masthead lights of half the vessel's length. The 270' WMEC class cannot meet this requirement because of its special construction and purpose.

The helicopter hangar and flight deck limit the separation on the after end of the vessel and the gun mount on the forward deck limits separation between the masthead lights to about 16.4 meters. This is the closest possible compliance with the positioning requirements of Section 3 of Annex I to 72 COLREGS without interfering with the special function of the vessel.

The vessels in the 270' class include, but are not limited to, the following:
CGC BEAR (WMEC 901)
CGC TAMPA (WMEC 902)
CGC HARRIET LANE (WMEC 903)
CGC NORTHLAND (WMEC 904)
CGC SPENCER (WMEC 905)
CGC SENECA (WMEC 906)
CGC ESCANABA (WMEC 907)
CGC TAHOMA (WMEC 908)
(WMEC 909)

(WMEC 910)
(WMEC 911)
(WMEC 912)
(WMEC 913)

A copy of the Certificate of Alternative compliance and documentation are available for inspection at Coast Guard Headquarters, Office of Navigation, Room 1606, 2100 Second St. S.W., Washington, D.C. 20593, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Dated: May 4, 1983.

R. A. Bauman,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Navigation.

[FR Doc. 83-12755 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

Federal Aviation Administration

Updated Report of the Fleet Status and Compliance Plans of U.S. Domestic Aircraft Operators as They Move Toward Compliance with the FAA's Aircraft Noise Regulation

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

SUMMARY: The table below summarizes the fleet compliance status as of January 1, 1977 (approximately the date the regulation was issued), the status as of April 1, 1980, January 1, 1981, January 1, 1982, January 1, 1983, and fleet projections for the phased compliance deadline of January 1, 1985. When the regulation was issued, slightly over 20 percent of the U.S. fleet met the FAA noise standards. As of January 1, 1983, almost 73 percent of the fleet complied

and that percentage will reach 86 percent by January 1, 1985.

DISCUSSION: In December 1976, the FAA issued Subpart E of Part 91 of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR Part 91] which prescribes noise limits for U.S. registered, civil subsonic turbojet airplanes with maximum weights over 75,000 pounds and having standard airworthiness certificates. These requirements prohibit domestic operation in the United States of affected airplanes after specified dates, with full compliance required by January 1, 1985.

In November 1980, the FAA issued a final rule (adopting Title III of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979) to extend these same noise compliance requirements to all operators of affected aircraft in the United States, whether U.S. or foreign registered. This rule also provided for exemptions to extend the compliance deadline for two-engine airplanes (DC-9, Boeing 737, BAC 1-11, and SE-201) to January 1, 1985 (for over 100 seats) or to January 1, 1988 (for 100 or fewer seats) as protection for small community service.

To ensure that all domestic operators are taking appropriate steps to meet the noise compliance requirements, the FAA amended 14 CFR Part 91 in December 1979, to require the operators of affected turbojet airplanes to provide the current status of their fleets and their plans for achieving timely and continuing compliance. The first summary report on Fleet Noise Compliance was published on July 17, 1980 (45 FR 48011), the second on August 6, 1981 (46 FR 40126), and the third on July 8, 1982 (47 FR

29754). This report is an update to that publication.

As originally issued, the FAA noise compliance regulation required full compliance by January 1, 1985. To date, the FAA has issued exemptions for 488 two-engine airplanes as protection for small community service. These exemptions were issued to 33 operators and extend the compliance dates to January 1, 1985, for 130 airplanes and to January 1, 1988, for 358 airplanes.

The table also indicates the pace at which U.S. operators are moving the four-engine narrowbody models (Boeing 707 and 720, DC-8) from domestic service. All of these will be gone by January 1, 1985, except for 75 stretch DC-8's, which are currently planned for reengining.

Information in the compliance plans submitted by many of the operators included future additions to their fleets. Where available, these data have been incorporated in the table. However, operators are not required to provide this type of information to the FAA under this program and, as a consequence, this table is not indicative of total future airplane purchases or the total future U.S. fleet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard N. Tedrick, Manager, Noise Policy and Regulatory Branch, AEE-110, Noise Abatement Division, Office of Environment and Energy, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20591, Telephone: (202) 755-9027.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on April 28, 1983.

Richard N. Tedrick,

Acting Manager, Noise Abatement Division, AEE-100.

NOISE COMPLIANCE FLEET PROJECTIONS

Airplane type	Jan. 1, 1977		Apr. 1, 1980		Jan 1, 1981		Jan 1, 1982		Jan 1, 1983		Jan 1, 1985	
	Total airplanes	Number complying	Total airplanes	Number complying	Total airplanes	Number complying	Total airplanes	Number complying	Total airplanes	Number complying	Total airplanes	Number complying
A300	0	0	14	14	19	19	25	25	30	30	34	34
BAC 1-11	33	0	44	0	44	0	57	0	51	0	46	10
B707	277	0	190	0	147	0	84	0	80	0	0	0
B720	21	0	12	0	11	0	9	0	5	0	0	0
B727	842	186	1,082	540	1,076	648	1,138	764	1,073	1,067	1,068	1,068
B737	150	7	224	71	229	82	247	109	281	140	315	204
B747	112	35	141	121	145	132	151	150	148	148	151	151
CONVAIR	25	0	8	0	8	0	8	0	4	0	0	0
DC-8	224	0	164	0	161	0	143	2	133	21	75	75
DC-9	367	32	400	74	405	83	476	111	509	166	533	322
DC-10	124	124	146	146	152	152	162	162	165	165	166	166
L1011	81	81	91	91	93	93	110	110	117	117	110	110
SE210	0	0	6	0	8	0	4	0	2	0	1	0
B757	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	33	33
B767	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	89	89
BA146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Total	2,256	465	2,522	1,057	2,497	1,209	2,614	1,433	2,619	1,895	2,627	2,269
Percent		20.6		41.9		48.4		54.8		72.4		86.4

[FR Doc. 83-12675 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Federal Highway Administration

(FHWA Docket No. 82-17, Notice 2)

Alternate Designs for Bridges; Policy Statement**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.**ACTION:** Notice of policy statement.

SUMMARY: This notice provides a statement of FHWA policy on the development of alternate designs for major bridges to be constructed with Federal-aid highway funds. A proposed policy statement was published on October 18, 1982, in order to solicit public comments. Those comments as well as revisions to the proposed policy statement are discussed under the heading **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. F. D. Sears, Review and Analysis Branch Bridge Division, (202) 472-7680, or Mr. Michael J. Laska, Office of the Chief Counsel, (202) 426-0761, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On December 4, 1979, the FHWA issued a Technical Advisory (TA) entitled *Alternate Bridge Designs*. This Technical Advisory was intended to stimulate competition in the design of safe and economical bridge structures and, at the same time, through the competitive bidding process, to take advantage of the prevailing economic conditions which will provide a finished structure at the lowest possible cost without sacrificing safety, quality, or aesthetics.

A memorandum was issued to all Regional Federal Highway Administrators on April 22, 1981, to strengthen FHWA's effort in promoting the use of alternate bridge designs among all State and local governments, including those that have adopted certification acceptance. On September 23, 1981, a second memorandum to all Regional Federal Highway Administrators requested each division office to review and revise its administrative procedures to ensure that alternate bridge designs would be incorporated in all major bridge projects. Guidelines were presented in still a third memorandum on June 16, 1982, to all Regional Federal Highway

Administrators, so that FHWA field offices could take appropriate measures to assure themselves that the spirit and intent of alternate bridge designs were being followed.

On October 18, 1982, the FHWA published a notice of a proposed policy statement (47 FR 46403) on alternate bridge designs. The intent of this notice was to replace the current TA with a consolidated formal FHWA policy on Alternate Bridge Designs and to invite public comment thereon. This notice establishes a policy on alternate bridge design based on comments made to the docket as well as a further review.

Discussion of Comments

Sixty-eight comments were received in response to the proposed policy statement. Comments were submitted by representatives from the following interest groups: 43 government agencies (36 State, 6 local, and one Federal), 10 trade associations, 8 consulting firms, 6 contractors, and one private citizen.

A primary issue addressed by those submitting comments was the scope of the application of the proposed policy. Fourteen respondents indicated that the policy should only be applied to major bridges. Three respondents indicated that there should be no restrictions as to application. Eight respondents indicated a variety of estimated construction costs above which the policy should apply with the highest amount being \$10 million. Although not specifically indicated in the October 18 Notice, it had been the intent of the FHWA that the policy would emphasize major bridges. Accordingly, the final policy statement has been revised to reflect the application to major bridges as defined in the Federal-Aid Highway Program Manual (FHPM 6-1-2-1).¹

Another issue addressed concerned the requirements that States obtain documented concurrence of noncompetitiveness from industry to waive alternate design. Twenty-one respondents indicated opposition to such a requirement citing the difficulty and potential lack of objectivity in obtaining such concurrence. The FHWA agrees with the comments and for this reason, the final policy statement is revised to delete the requirement of documented concurrence.

Seventeen respondents addressed the utilization of value engineering clauses. While two respondents indicated that

value engineering need not be applied, 10 respondents indicated that value engineering should apply at the design stage, while five indicated it should be applied during the construction stage. The final policy statement has been revised to encourage value engineering at the design stage. With regard to preliminary plan approval, 21 respondents commented that State expertise in bridge type selection should be recognized as a factor in reaching preliminary bridge plan approval decisions. The FHWA agrees with the comments made and for this reason, the final policy statement has been revised to reflect and acknowledge such State studies.

Upon further review, the provisions on specific construction methods within design documents and maintenance which were proposed in the October 18 Notice have been deleted. The deletions are being made because the provisions are considered not to be appropriately related to the policy being established. The provision on consideration of competitive materials and structural types has been simplified. Finally, a provision is added which states that the established policy shall not be interpreted to exclude consideration of alternate designs for any other type or classification of structure when appropriate.

Based upon the aforementioned analysis and discussion of comments made to the docket, the FHWA is establishing a policy to encourage alternate designs and strategies in the process of selecting the type of bridge to be constructed.

The final FHWA policy is as follows:

1. Preliminary plan development for major bridges should be based on engineering and economic evaluation of acceptable alternate designs. The definition of a major bridge is contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Program Manual (FHPM 6-1-2-1).
2. Alternate designs should consider the utilization of competitive materials and/or structural types.
3. Economic evaluation of preliminary estimates should take into consideration, to the maximum extent possible, the relative accuracy of estimates for state-of-the-art type methods of construction.
4. When comparative economic estimates are reasonably close to each other, two or more complete sets of contract documents should be prepared and advertised.
5. Value engineering at the design stage should be strongly encouraged.
6. Options should be considered for structure components (piling, expansion

¹ The FHPM is available for inspection and copying as prescribed in 49 CFR Part 7, Appendix D. Major bridges are bridges estimated to cost more than \$5 million, or having spans in excess of 150 feet, or viaduct type of structures whose total length is in excess of 1,000 feet. This criterion applies to individual units of separated dual bridges.

joints, bearings, prestressing systems, etc.).

7. A determination of FHWA approval and participation in the development of alternate or single project plans, specifications and estimates for major bridges will be made after evaluation of a State's submittal of preliminary bridge plans and cost studies. Recognizing that the States are experienced and have broad expertise in factors pertinent to bridge type selection in their States, the FHWA will review comprehensive State studies and subsequent recommendations as a primary factor in reaching preliminary bridge plan approval decisions.

At the same time, FHWA approvals will be based upon the need to ensure safe, efficient and cost effective bridge projects which meet the aesthetic and structural requirements of the site and are based upon the latest, proven technology and techniques.

8. The submittal of preliminary bridge plans for approval should be accompanied by the State's plan for developing the project to completion (horizontal or vertical stage construction, number of contracts, etc.).

9. This policy shall not be interpreted as deterring any State or FHWA field office from considering alternate designs for any other type or classification of structure which they would consider appropriate.

This policy is written with the intent of taking advantage of the evolving state-of-the-art of bridge construction and fluctuating economic conditions in the market place while not compromising sound engineering, safety, quality control, or aesthetics.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The Procedures as provided by OMB Circular A-95 regarding State and local clearinghouse review of Federal and federally assisted programs and project apply to this program.)

Issued on: May 5, 1983.

L. P. Lamm,
Deputy Federal Highway Administrator,
Federal Highway Administration.

[FR Doc. 83-12734 Filed 5-11-83; 9:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

Environmental Impact Statement; San Mateo County, California

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project

on Route 1 in San Mateo County, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Eyres, District Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, P.O. Box 1915, Sacramento, California, 95809, telephone (916) 440-3541.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation, will prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed solutions to road failure on Route 1 at Devil's Slide. The limits of the proposed action run from Half Moon Bay Airport to Linda Mar Boulevard in the City of Pacifica, a distance of 7 miles.

The EIS will discuss the no project alternative and three route alternatives: the bypass alignment adopted by the California Highway Commission; a bypass alignment in the general vicinity of Martini Creek; and the existing Route 1 alignment. For the adopted and Martini Creek alignments, two design alternatives are under consideration.

1. Construction of a 2-lane highway with slow-vehicle lanes on grades; and
2. Construction of a 4-lane, ultimate 6-lane, freeway.

The existing alignment alternative will only provide a continuance of the existing 2-lane highway by realignment in the immediate vicinity of Devil's Slide.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed interest in this proposal.

A public scoping meeting was held on March 10, 1983, at the Farallone View Elementary School in Montara. Notice of the meeting was published in the *San Mateo Times*, the *Pacific Tribune*, and the *Half Moon Bay Review*. Another scoping meeting for local, State, and Federal agencies is scheduled for May 26, 1983, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 22, Caltrans District Office, 150 Oak Street, San Francisco, California. Public agencies involved with this project will be notified by mail of this meeting.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed, and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address given above.

Issued on: May 3, 1983.

James H. Lamb,
Acting District Engineer, Sacramento,
California.

[FR Doc. 83-12742 Filed 5-11-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

Federal Railroad Administration

[FRA Waiver Petition Dockets HS-83-1 through HS-83-7]

Petition for Exemption From the Hours of Service Act

Correction

In FR Doc. 83-11615 appearing on page 19812 in the issue of Monday, May 2, 1983, the date at the beginning of the sixteenth line of column two should have read, "June 10, 1983."

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Calendar of Meetings for International Harmonization of Safety Standards

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) will continue its participation during this year in the international meetings to harmonize U.S. and foreign motor vehicle safety standards. These meetings will be conducted by the Group of Experts on the Construction of Vehicles (WP29) under the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) and the eight groups of Rapporteurs of the WP29. The NHTSA participates in all of the rapporteur meetings except those on Pollution which are presented by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

This calendar consists of those meetings in which the NHTSA and the EPA will provide representation and in which the public interest is expected. It is published for information and planning purposes and the meeting dates and places are subject to change. Inquiries or comments relating to specific meetings should be made at least two weeks preceding that meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Francis J. Turpin, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, (NRM-10), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590 (202) 426-2212.

May 31-June 3, 1983

Group of Rapporteurs on General Safety Provisions (GRSG), Forty-second Session—Rome, Italy