Marshall Islands*
Mauritania*
Micronesia*
Moldova*
Mongolia
Mozambique*
Niger*
Oman*
Pakistan*
Palau*
Panama*
Qatar*
Russia
Rwanda*
Sao Tome and Principe*
Saudi Arabia*
Seychelles*
Sierra Leone*
Somalia
Sudan
Syria
Tajikistan*
Tanzania*
Togo*
Turkmenistan*
Uganda*
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates*
Uzbekistan
Vanuatu*
Vietnam
Yemen*

(b) Providing sensitive nuclear technology for an activity in any foreign country.

(c) Engaging in or providing assistance in any of the following activities with respect to any foreign country.

(1) Designing production reactors, accelerator-driven subcritical assembly systems, or facilities for the separation of isotopes of source or special nuclear material (enrichment), chemical processing of irradiated special nuclear material (reprocessing), fabrication of nuclear fuel containing plutonium, or the production of heavy water;

(2) Constructing, fabricating, operating, or maintaining such reactors, accelerator-driven subcritical assembly systems, or facilities;

(3) Designing, constructing, fabricating, operating or maintaining components especially designed, modified or adapted for use in such reactors, accelerator-driven critical assembly systems, or facilities;

(4) Designing, constructing, fabricating, operating or maintaining major critical components for use in such reactors, accelerator-driven subcritical assembly systems, or production-scale facilities; or

(5) Designing, constructing, fabricating, operating, or maintaining research reactors, test reactors or accelerator-driven subcritical assembly systems' capable of continuous operation above five megawatts thermal.

(6) Training in the activities of paragraphs (c) (1) through (5) of this section.

7. In § 810.10 paragraph (a), is revised to read as follows:

§ 810.10 Grant of specific authorization.

(a) Any person proposing to provide assistance for which § 810.8 indicates specific authorization is required may apply for the authorization to the U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585, Attention: Director, Nuclear Transfer and Supplier Policy Division, NN–43, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

* * * * *

8. In § 810.13, paragraph (g) is revised to read as follows:

§ 810.13 Reports.

* * * * *

(g) All reports should be sent to: U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585, Attention: Director, Nuclear Transfer and Supplier Policy Division, NN–43, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

9. Section 810.16 is revised as follows:

§ 810.16 Effective date and savings clause.

These regulations are effective on [insert date of publication of final rule in the Federal Register]. Except for actions that may be taken by DOE pursuant to § 810.11, this revision does not affect the validity or terms of any specific authorizations granted under the previous regulations or generally authorized activities under the previous regulations for which the contracts, purchase orders, or licensing arrangements are already in effect. Persons engaging in activities that were generally authorized under the previous regulations but that require specific authorization under the revised regulations must request specific authorization within 90 days but may continue their activities until DOE acts on the request.

[FR Doc. 99–16800 Filed 7–1–99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 93

[Docket No. 29624]

High Density Rule

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed interpretation; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This action requests comments on a proposed interpretation of the term ''operator'' as used to interpret the extra section provision of the FAA's High Density Rule. This proposed interpretation would permit one airline code-share partner to operate an extra section of a regularly scheduled flight of another code-share partner. It is intended to recognize the development of code-share arrangements in the aviation industry.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 12, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments regarding this action should be mailed, in triplicate, to Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket (AGC–10), Docket No. 29624, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Comments must be marked Docket No. 29624. Comments may be examined in Room 915G weekdays between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m., except on Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorelei Peter, Air Traffic and Airspace Law Branch, Office of the Chief Counsel, AGC–230, Federal Aviation Administration 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, (202) 267–3073.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to comment on this action by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Comments should identify the regulatory docket and should be submitted in triplicate to the Rules Docket address specified above. All comments received will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this action must include a preaddressed, stampted postcard marked ''Comments to Docket 29624.'' The postcard will be date stamped and mailed to the commenter.

Background

The FAA has broad authority under Title 49 of the United States Code (U.S.C.), Subtitle VII, to regulate and control the use of navigable airspace of the United States. Under 49 U.S.C. 40103, the agency is authorized to develop plans for and to formulate policy with respect to the use of navigable airspace and to assign by rule, regulation, or order the use of navigable airspace under such terms, conditions, and limitations as may be deemed

necessary in order to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient utilization of the navigable airspace. Also, under section 40103, the agency is further authorized and directed to prescribe air traffic rules and regulations governing the efficient utilization of the navigable airspace.

The High Density Traffic Airports Rule, or ''High Density Rule,'' 14 CFR part 93, subpart K, was promulgated in 1968 to reduce delays at five congested airports: JFK International Airport, LaGuardia Airport, O'Hare International Airport, Ronald Reagan Washington National (National) Airport, Newark International Airport (33 FR 17896; December 3, 1968). The regulation limits the number of instrument flight rule (IFR) operations at each airport, by hour or half-hour, during certain hours of the day. It provides for the allocation to carriers of operational authority, in the form of a ''slot'' for each IFR landing or takeoff during a specific 30- or 60-minute period. The restrictions were lifted at Newark in the early 1970's.

On December 16, 1985, the Department of Transportation (Department) promulgated the ''buy/sell'' rule (14 CFR part 93, subpart S), a comprehensive set of regulations that provide for the allocation and transfer of air carrier and commuter slots (50 FR 52180; December 20, 1985). The two primary features of this rule were, first, that initial allocation would be accomplished by ''grandfathering'' existing slots to the carriers that currently held them, and second, that a relatively unrestricted aftermarket in slots would be permitted. As a result, effective April 1, 1986, slots used for domestic operations could be bought and sold by any party.

Current Requirements

14 CFR 93.123(b)(4) permits air carriers at LaGuardia, Newark, O'Hare and National Airports to conduct ''extra section'' operations of scheduled flights. Additionally, commuters are permitted to conduct extra section operations of scheduled flights at National Airport. An extra section is when an operator conducting a scheduled operation with a slot finds it necessary to use an additional aircraft to service passengers that cannot be accommodated on the original scheduled flight. Under these circumstances, the operator may conduct that additional flight or ''extra section'' without another slot.

The purpose of the extra section provision was to accommodate operations that an operator cannot precisely predict. Extra section operations are not scheduled operations and it would be impractical to obtain permanent slots for such operations. Regular scheduled operations do not have the same uncertainty and, these require slots. The extra section authority is available to any air carrier, or commuter operator at Washington National, with a slot for regularly scheduled operations. The extra section must: (1) Be non-scheduled; (2) serve passengers that cannot be accommodated on the original scheduled flight for which the operator has obtained an arrival or departure slot; and (3) depart no more than a few minutes before, on, or after the time at which the original flight was scheduled (46 FR 58306; November 27, 1981).

Historically, the FAA has interpreted the extra section provision as limited to aircraft operated by the operator who had the slot and conducted the scheduled operation. At the time this provision was promulgated, code-share agreements were not widely used. The FAA finds that the increasing use of code-share agreements in the aviation industry warrants a reexamination of this interpretation.

Proposed Interpretation

For purposes of the extra section provision codified in 14 CFR 92.123(b)(4), the FAA proposes to interpret the term ''operator'' to include the partners to a code-share agreement/alliance. As a result of this proposed interpretation, one code-share partner may conduct an extra section operation to an original scheduled flight of another code-share partner without the need for an additional slot. This interpretation does not change the requirement for the operator conducting the original scheduled operation to have a slot allocated under 14 CFR 93.123. This interpretation also does not affect any aspect of the Department's policy and regulations addressing code-share.

The FAA does not anticipate that this proposed interpretation would result in any operational impact at the airports since the regulations permit use of extra sections. Lastly, the FAA emphasizes that this proposed interpretation does not affect or in anyway modify the provisions of 14 CFR 93.123(c), which establishes the type of aircraft that may operate in air carrier and commuter slots at the high density traffic airports. The regulations governing slots do not permit the use of air carrier category aircraft in commuter slots. Specifically, at National Airport, only commuter equipment may be used to conduct extra sections of commuter operations when using a commuter slot.

The FAA requests comments on the above-proposed interpretation. The FAA finds that because there is an immediate need for this flexibility in extra section operations, the public interest supports a short comment period.

Regulatory Evaluation Summary

Changes to Federal regulations must undergo several economic analyses. First, Executive Order 12866 directs that each Federal agency shall proposed or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs. Second, the Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to analyze the economic effect of regulatory changes on small business and other small entities. Third, the Office of Management and Budget directs agencies to assess the effect of regulatory changes on international trade. This proposed interpretation has been reviewed as an interpretive rule in accordance with Executive Order 12866 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980. It is not a ''significant regulatory action'' as defined in the Executive Order or the Department of Transportation Regulatory Policies and Procedures.

The proposed interpretation would permit code share partners to operate extra sections at certain high density airports. Extra section operations are already permitted by the rule. This proposed interpretive rule would not impose any new or additional costs on code share partners.

Moreover, since the expected impact is minimal, this proposal does not warrant a full evaluation. This proposed interpretative rule is not considered significant under the regulatory procedures of the Department of Transportation (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979).

Initial Regulatory Flexibility Determination

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, was enacted by U.S. Congress to ensure that small entities are not unnecessarily or disproportionately burdened by Government regulations. The RFA requires a regulatory flexibility analysis if a proposed rule has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities.

The FAA is aware of only two air carriers regularly using extra sections in their daily operations (''shuttle operators''). These operators are not small entities. Moreover, while the resulting flexibility in the use of one partner's aircraft to support the operation of the other partner will result in some benefits to the affected air carriers and commuters, they are minimal when compare to the

overall revenues derived from their operations. Accordingly, pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Federal Aviation Adminsitration certifies that this rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The FAA solicits comments from affected entities with respect to this finding and determination and requests that commenters provide supporting data or analyses.

International Trade Impact Analysis

The provisions of this proposed interpretive rule would have little or no impact of trade for U.S. firms doing business in foreign countries and foreign firms doing business in the United States.

Federalism Implications

The proposed interpretive rule would not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this rule would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism assessment.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (the Act), codified in 2 U.S.C. 1501–1571, requires each Federal agency, to the extent permitted by law, to prepare a written assessment of the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule when such a mandate would be ''significant.'' A significant regulatory action under the Act is any provision in a Federal agency regulation that would result in an expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, or by the private sector, in the aggregate of $100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year.

Since this proposed interpretive rule does not impose any cost, the requirements of Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 do not apply.

Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507(d)), the FAA has determined that there are no requirements for information collection associated with this proposed rule.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 28, 1999.

Nicholas G. Garaufis,

Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 99–16807 Filed 7–1–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 453

Extension of Time for Comments Concerning Trade Regulation Rule on Funeral Industry Practices

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (''the Commission'' or ''FTC'') has extended the date by which comments must be submitted concerning the review of its Trade Regulation Rule on Funeral Industry Practices (''Funeral Rule''). This document informs prospective comments of the change and sets a new date of August 11, 1999, for the end of the comment period.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until the close of business on August 11, 1999. Notification of interest in participating in the public workshop must be submitted separately on or before August 11, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be identified as ''16 CFR part 453'' and submitted to: Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H–159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for future details.

All comments will be placed on the public record and will be available for public inspection in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, and the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 4.11, during normal business days from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., at the Public Reference Room, Room 130, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20580. In addition, comments will be posted ont he Internet at the FTC's web site: ''*www.ftc.gov*.''

Notification on interest in participating in the Public Workshop-Conference should be submitted in writing on or before August 11, 1999, to Myra Howard, Division of Marketing Practices, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Myra Howard, (202) 326–2047, or Mercedes Kelley, (202) 326–3665, Division of Marketing Practices, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 5, 1999, the Commission published in the **Federal Register** a Request for Comment on its Funeral Industry Practices Rule (''Funeral Rule'' or ''Rule''), 16 CFR part 453, as part of its regulatory review program. 64 FR 24250. The Funeral Rule details a number of unfair and deceptive practices relating to providers of funeral goods and services, and sets forth preventive requirements in the form of price and information disclosures to ensure the funeral providers avoid engaging in the enumerated unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The **Federal Register** notice (''notice'') posed thirty questions in all; some were general regulatory review questions, while others asked about material issues that are specific to the Funeral Rule and the funeral industry. The notice requested commenters to provide answers where possible, and specifically asked for data, surveys and empirical evidence to support comments submitted to the Commission. Pursuant to the **Federal Register** notice, the comment period currently ends on July 12, 1999.

Between June 11, 1999, and June 16, 1999, staff have received requests for a modest extension of the comment period from four separate organizations representing a variety of viewpoints on the Rule—the National Funeral Directors Association (''NFDA''), the American Association of Retired Persons (''AARP''), the Funeral and Memorial Societies of America, Inc. (''FAMSA''), and the Monument Builders of North America (''MBNA''). The parties indicated that additional time was required to prepare thorough, thoughtful responses to the questions contained in the **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission is mindful of the need to deal with this matter as expeditiously as possible. However, the Commission is also aware that some of the issues raised by the **Federal Register** notice are rather complex, and it welcomes as much substantive input as possible to facilitate its decisionmaking process. Accordingly, in order to provide sufficient time for these and other interested parties to prepare useful comments, the Commission has decided to extend the deadline for comments by thirty (30) days, until August 11, 1999.

Additional Comment Information

The Commission requests that commenters submit the original plus five copies, if feasible. To enable prompt review and public access, all written comments should also be submitted, if possible, in electronic form. To submit