

54. Jam'yah Ta'awun Al-Islamia (a.k.a. Society of Islamic Cooperation) (a.k.a. Jam'iyat Al Ta'awun Al Islamiyya) (a.k.a. Jit), Qandahar City, Afghanistan;

55. Libyan Islamic Fighting Group;

56. Mamoun Darkazanli Import-Export Company (a.k.a. Darkazanli Company, Darkazanli Export-Import Sonderposten), Uhlenhorsterweg 3411 Hamburg, Germany;

57. Nada Management Organization Sa (f.k.a. Al Taqwa Management Organization Sa), Viale Stefano Franscini 22, CH-6900 Lugano TI, Switzerland;

58. Parks Trading Company, PO Box 3313, Deira, Dubai, UAE;

59. Rabita Trust, Room 9a, 2nd Floor, Wahdat Road, Education Town, Lahore, Pakistan; Wares Colony, Lahore, Pakistan;

60. Red Sea Barakat Company Limited, Mogadishu, Somalia; Dubai; UAE;

61. Revival of Islamic Heritage Society (RIHS), a.k.a. Jamiat Ihia Al-Turath Al-Islamiya, Revival of Islamic Society Heritage on the African Continent, Jamia Ihya ul Turath, Office Locations: Pakistan and Afghanistan;

62. Salafist Group for Call and Combat/GSPC (a.k.a. Le Groupe Salafiste Pour La Prediction et le Combat);

63. Somali Internet Company, Mogadishu, Somalia;

64. Somali International Relief Organization, 1806 Riverside Avenue, 2nd Floor, Minneapolis, Minnesota;

65. Somali Network Ab, Hallybybacken 15, 70 Spanga, Sweden;

66. Unmah Tameer E-Nau (Utn), Street 13, Wazir Akbar Khan, Kabul, Afghanistan; Pakistan;

67. Wafa Humanitarian Organization (a.k.a. Al Wafa, Al Wafa Organization, Wafa Al-Igatha Al-Islamia), Jordan House No. 125, Street 54, Phase II Hayatabad, Peshawar, Pakistan, Offices in: Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and UAE;

68. Youssef M. Nada, Via Riasc 4, CH-6911 Campionie D'Italia I, Switzerland;

69. Youssef M. Nada & Co. Gescellschaft M.B.H., Kaertner Ring 2/2/5/22, 1010 Vienna, Austria.

Dated: October 8, 2002.

**John R. Bolton,**

*Under Secretary, Arms Control and International Security, Department of State.*  
[FR Doc. 02-27152 Filed 10-23-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-25-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

### [Public Notice 4175]

#### **Public Meeting With Interested Parties for the Department of State and Other Agencies To Receive Views on Proposals To Modify and Expand the Role of the International Mobile Satellite Organization (IMSO)**

**AGENCY:** Department of State, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting and request for comments.

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE:** Tuesday, November 19, 2002, 9:30 am–12 pm, Department of State, 2201 C Street NW., Washington, DC.

**SUMMARY:** The International Mobile Satellite Organization (IMSO) Assembly of Parties (member governments) has created an Intersessional Working Group (IWG) to undertake a detailed study of a possible extension or expansion of IMSO's mandate. The issue to be addressed at this meeting is the role of IMSO in respect of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS), aeronautical safety services, and service to rural and remote areas of developing countries, including the principle and the legal methodology of a possible extension or expansion of IMSO's mandate. The Department of State wishes to receive the views of the public on the issues that will be addressed by the IWG, the first meeting of which is scheduled for January 20–24, 2003.

The two principal issues that have given rise to the creation of the IWG are: (1) Questions concerning the criteria for and potential consequences of the recognition by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) of additional service providers for the satellite component of the GMDSS and any possible role for IMSO with respect to such additional providers (currently, only Inmarsat Ltd. Of London is recognized as a satellite service provider of GMDSS); and (2) formal proposals of the Party of Denmark to amend the IMSO Convention to give the IMSO an expanded mandate with respect to GMDSS, aeronautical safety services, and mobile communications in rural and remote areas.

Currently, the IMSO oversees only Inmarsat, particularly with regard to Inmarsat's provision of GMDSS services. The IMO, which has responsibility for establishing maritime safety standards, has thus far only recognized Inmarsat as

a provider of the satellite component of the GMDSS. However, questions have arisen out of the possibility that the IMO may recognize additional satellite telecommunication companies as GMDSS providers in the near future, and what the role, if any, the IMSO should have in such a case.

The proposal of the Party of Denmark would expand the purpose of the IMSO "to ensure that one or more of the public interests set forth \* \* \* are met by each \* \* \* entity or entities through which a mobile satellite communications system is operated." The "public interests" are: "(1) Ensuring the provision of global maritime satellite communications services for the GMDSS; (2) ensuring the provision of global aeronautical mobile satellite safety communications services; and (3) seeking to serve all areas where there is a need for mobile satellite communications, giving due consideration to the rural and remote areas of developing countries."

The Department of State will prepare comments and proposals on the above issues to be submitted to the IWG participants before December 20, 2002. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit input and suggestions from interested parties for use in formulating the U.S. response that will be discussed at the January 2003 IWG meeting. The Terms of Reference for the IWG, the amendment proposal of the Party of Denmark, and certain other documents can be found on the Internet Web page of the Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy: <http://www.state.gov/e/eb/cip/>.

Please confirm attendance at the meeting using the contact information below. The meeting will be held in an informal roundtable fashion. However, up to 15 minutes will be allocated to anyone who wishes to make a formal presentation. Copies of written comments and proposals to be discussed at the meeting should be provided electronically seven days in advance and will be posted on the Web page. Additional written comments (provided electronically) will be accepted by the Department of State until December 4, 2002 and will be posted on the Web page.

**MAILING ADDRESS:** Send comments to Brian Hunt, Office of the Coordinator—International Communications and Information Policy, Mail Code EB/CIP, U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street NW., Washington DC 20520–5820. Paper submissions must include a copy on diskette in Word or ASCII format.

Electronic copies may be sent via e-mail to [huntbj@state.gov](mailto:huntbj@state.gov).

**TO CONFIRM ATTENDANCE OR FOR**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** For additional information, contact Brian Hunt—voice: 202-647-5832, fax: 202-647-5957, e-mail: [huntbj@state.gov](mailto:huntbj@state.gov).

Dated: October 18, 2002.

**Steven W. Lett,**

*Deputy U.S. Coordinator, International Communications and Information Policy, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 02-27153 Filed 10-23-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-07-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### Environmental Impact Statement: Utah, Wasatch, Carbon, and Emery Counties, UT

**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 (EIS) will be prepared for a proposed highway improvement project in Utah, Wasatch, Carbon, and Emery Counties, Utah.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sandra Garcia, Transportation and Environmental Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, UT 84118, Telephone: (801) 963-0182.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with the Utah Department of Transportation, will prepare an EIS on a proposal to improve US Highway 6 (US 6) in Utah, Wasatch, Carbon, and Emery Counties, Utah. The proposed improvements would involve reconstruction of the existing US 6 between Interstate-15 (I-15) at Spanish Fork and I-70 at Green River, a distance of about 206 kilometers (128 miles).

Improvements to the corridor are considered necessary to maximize safety by designing the highway to meet current standards and to provide for existing and future travel demand. Also, included in the proposal is the relocation of the port of entry in Helper, Utah. Alternatives under consideration include (1) taking no-action (no-build); (2) using alternate travel modes; (3) widening the existing two-lane highway to four lanes; and (4) adding passing and climbing lanes. Incorporated into and studied with the various build alternatives will be design variations of grade and alignment to improve overall safety.

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 or are known to have interest in this proposal. A series of public meetings will be held in Green River, Price, and Spanish Fork in November 2002. In addition, a public hearing will be held after the draft EIS has been prepared. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment before the public hearing.

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

(Catalogue of Federal and Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: October 16, 2002.

**William R. Gedris,**

*Structural/Environmental Engineer, Salt Lake City, Utah.*

[FR Doc. 02-27081 Filed 10-23-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

#### Preparation of Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Impact Statement for Commuter Corridor Between the Cities of Deland and Kissimmee, FL

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Transit Administration (FTA); the Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (locally known as LYNX); METROPLAN ORLANDO, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Orlando and Kissimmee, Florida urbanized areas; the Volusia County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Volusia County MPO); and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) intend to conduct scoping meetings and prepare an Alternatives Analysis leading to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate commuter transportation

improvements in the CSX Transportation (CSXT) freight rail corridor between the cities of Deland and Kissimmee, Florida in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended.

This Notice of Intent is being published at this time to notify interested parties and to invite participation in the study. The study area will generally follow the existing CSXT Corridor from Deland, Florida to Kissimmee, Florida through the City of Orlando. The corridor analysis is necessary to explore alternative modes of north-south travel to Interstate 4 (I-4), currently under reconstruction and limited by capacity constraints.

The following alternatives will be evaluated in the study: (1) A baseline alternative based on existing LYNX operations, the most recent LYNX Transportation Development Plan for the corridor including but not limited to transit preferential treatments and/or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and other relevant studies. (2) Commuter Rail with Light Rail Transit (LRT), and without LRT, consistent with the METROPLAN ORLANDO 2020 Cost Feasible Long Range Plan associated bus feeder and public transit circulator service and the joint operations of CSXT. [Note: The alternative without LRT is to provide information to local decision makers as a part of the Long Range Plan update process and is not intended to be an alternative for consideration unless local decision makers modify the 2020 Cost Feasible Plan.] (3) A No Action Alternative with LRT.

**DATES:** *Comment Due Date:* Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to Ms. LaChant Barnett, Project Manager, LYNX, 445 West Amelia Street, Suite 800, Orlando, Florida, 32801 by December 19, 2002. *Scoping Meetings:* Scoping for the study will be developed during review of previous studies and consultation with affected agencies and interested persons through correspondence and at public meetings.

**ADDRESSES:** A series of four public scoping meetings will be held in the corridor to explain the purpose of the study, describe the process that will be followed, define the limits of the study area, to answer any questions that may exist and to receive comments, thoughts and/or opinions relevant to the study. Dates, times and locations of the scoping meetings are as follows:

Tuesday, October 29, 2002, 11:30 am–1:30 p.m., Orlando Public Library—Albertson Conference Room—3rd Floor, 101 East Central Boulevard, Orlando, Florida 32801.