

a first violation will be subject to a written warning. Subsequent violations will be referred to the Business Conduct Committee.

III. Discussion

After careful review, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange. In particular, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Sections 6(b)(5) and 11A(a)(1)(C)(iii) and (iv) of the Act. Section 6(b)(5) requires that the rules of an exchange be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices and to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system. With respect to Section 11A, Congress found that it is in the public interest and appropriate for the protection of investors and the maintenance of fair and orderly markets to assure the availability to brokers, dealers, and investors of information with respect to quotations for and transactions in securities, and to assure the practicability of brokers executing investors' orders in the best market.⁷ The proposed rule change will assure the availability of information with respect to quotations because it requires specialists to provide enhanced information regarding orders to the market by revising Advice A-1 to correspond to Exchange Act Rule 11Ac1-4.

In addition, the Commission believes the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5)⁸ because the incorporation of the limit order display rule into the Exchange's own rules should enhance compliance with the rule, thereby improving member handling of customer limit orders.⁹

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,¹⁰ that the proposed rule change (Phlx-98-24) is approved.

summary discipline and abbreviated reporting; Rule 19d-1(c)(1) requires prompt filing with the Commission of any final disciplinary action. However, minor rule violations not exceeding \$2,500 are deemed not final, thereby permitting periodic, as opposed to immediate, reporting.

⁷ 15 U.S.C. 78k-1(a)(1)(C)(iii) and (iv).

⁸ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

⁹ In approving these rules, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

¹⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.¹¹

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-7090 Filed 3-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice #2999]

Overseas Presence Advisory Panel (OPAP) Meeting Notice; Closed Meeting

The Department of State announces a meeting of the Overseas Presence Advisory Panel on Thursday, April 29, 1999 at 9:00 a.m. at the U.S. Department of State. The panel is charged with advising the Secretary of State with respect to the level and type of representation required overseas in the face of new foreign policy priorities, a heightened security situation and extremely limited resources. Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and 5 U.S.C. 522b[c][1], it has been determined that the meeting will be closed to the public. The agenda calls for discussion of classified and sensitive information relative to findings derived from travel to overseas Embassies and Consulates; this would include intelligence and operational policies, and security aspects of all the U.S. Government agencies the Department of State supports abroad.

For more information contact Peter Petrihos, Overseas Presence Advisory Panel, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520; phone: 202-647-6477.

Dated: March 15, 1999

Ambassador William H. Itoh,

Executive Secretary, Overseas Presence Advisory Panel.

[FR Doc. 99-7110 Filed 3-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-35-P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. WTO/D-152]

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Regarding Sections 301-310 of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative ("USTR") is providing notice of the request for the

establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization ("WTO"), by the European Communities ("EC"), to examine Title III, chapter 1 (sections 301-310) of the United States Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Trade Act") (19 U.S.C. 2411-2420). In this dispute, the EC alleges that sections 301-310 of the Trade Act are inconsistent with obligations of the United States under the Dispute Settlement Understanding ("DSU"), the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the WTO, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade ("GATT 1994"). The USTR invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in this dispute.

DATES: Although the USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted by April 10, 1999, to be assured of timely consideration by the USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Sandy McKinzy, Litigation Assistant, Office of Monitoring and Enforcement, Room 122, Attn: Section 301-310 Dispute, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joanna McIntosh, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395-7203.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 127(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), the USTR is providing notice that on February 2, 1999, the EC submitted a request for the establishment of a WTO dispute settlement panel to examine whether sections 301-310 of the Trade Act are inconsistent with the WTO obligations of the United States. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body ("DSB") considered the EC's first request for the establishment of a panel on February 17, 1999, and its second request on March 2, 1999; a panel was established at this meeting.

Major Issues Raised by the EC and Legal Basis of the Complaint

The EC claims that sections 301-310 of the Trade Act impose "specific, strict time limits" that require the United States to make "unilateral determinations" regarding WTO violations by other WTO members, as well as trade sanctions that are prescribed as a result of such violations. By making these determinations, the EC contends that the United States is acting inconsistently with the DSU and the

¹¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

GATT 1994 in situations when, at the end of the time limits imposed by sections 301–310, the DSB has not yet made a determination that a WTO member has not complied with its WTO obligations, and has not yet authorized the suspension of concessions with regard to such non-compliance. Specifically, the EC alleges that the U.S. legislation is inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under Articles 3, 21, 22, and 23 of the DSU; Article XVI:4 of the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the WTO; and Articles I, II, III, VIII, and XI of the GATT 1994.

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute. Comments must be in English and provided in fifteen copies to Sandy McKinzy at the address provided above. A person requesting that information contained in a comment submitted by that person be treated as confidential business information must certify that such information is business confidential and would not customarily be released to the public by the commentator. Confidential business information must be clearly marked "BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL" in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy.

Information or advice contained in a comment submitted, other than business confidential information, may be determined by the USTR to be confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If the submitting person believes that information or advice may qualify as such, the submitting person—

- (1) Must so designate the information or advice;
- (2) Must clearly mark the material as "SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE" in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page of each copy; and
- (3) Is encouraged to provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), the USTR will maintain a file on this dispute settlement proceeding, accessible to the public, in the USTR Reading Room: Room 101, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508. The public file will include a listing of any comments received by the USTR from the public with respect to the proceeding; the U.S. submissions to the panel in the proceeding, the

submissions, or non-confidential summaries of submissions, to the panel received from other parties in the dispute, as well as the report of the dispute settlement panel, and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body. An appointment to review the public file (Docket WTO/D–152, Sections 301–310 Dispute) may be made by calling Brenda Webb, (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Amelia Porges,

Senior Counsel for Dispute Settlement.

[FR Doc. 99–7080 Filed 3–22–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Summit County, CO

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent and public scoping meetings.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for the proposed transportation improvements on SH 9 from Frisco to Breckenridge in Summit County, Colorado.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Scott Sands, FHWA Colorado Division, 555 Zang Street, Room 250, Denver, CO 80228, Telephone: 303/969–6730 extension 362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for transportation improvements on SH 9 from Frisco to Breckenridge in Summit County, Colorado. The EIS will evaluate the No-action and Build alternative(s) on SH 9 study limit from I–70 to River Park Drive south of Breckenridge, and determine the estimated costs and potential impacts associated with each. CDOT will be the local lead agency for the preparation of the EIS. The project is approximately ten miles in length and alternatives which may be evaluated included TSM (Transportation System Management), various four lane roadway typical sections and transit alternatives. Scoping has begun within the Environmental Assessment first initiated for this project. A public

scoping meeting was held in Frisco, Colorado on November 5, 1998. Scoping meetings have also been conducted with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Frisco City Council, Breckenridge City Council, Summit County Commissioners as well as interested citizens, property owners, business owners and others. Scoping will be continued through coordination with affected parties, organizations, federal, state and local agencies with future public and one-on-one meetings which will be held throughout the life of the project.

Written comments on project scope should be sent to: Ms. Lisa Kassels, Planning and Environmental Project Manager, CDOT Region 1, 18500 East Colfax Avenue, Aurora, CO 80011, Telephone: 303/757–9156.

FHWA, CDOT and other local agencies invite interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state and local agencies to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives.

Information describing the purpose of the project, the proposed alternatives, the areas to be evaluated, the citizen involvement program, and the preliminary project schedule will be available. These scoping materials may be requested contacting Ms. Lisa Kassels at the address and phone number above. Scoping comments may be made verbally at future public meetings or in writing. The public will receive notices on location and time of future meetings through newspaper advertisements and individual correspondence.

To ensure that a full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project develops, contact Ms. Lisa Kassels.

All significant social, economic, and environmental impacts of the alternatives carried forward for further study (e.g., the No-action alternative, a TSM alternative, a Build alternative) will be evaluated. Depending upon the alternatives under study, environmental and social impacts to be evaluated may include safety and mobility impacts, traffic and parking impacts if stations are proposed, visual impacts, impacts on cultural and paleontological resources, and noise impacts. Impacts on natural areas, threatened and endangered species, and water quality