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

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Commission's Findings and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of the Proposed Rule Change

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities association and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 15A(b)(6). Specifically, the Commission believes that the proposed extension of the NASD's equity option position limit hedge exemption pilot program will accommodate the needs of investors and market participants while at the same time furthering investor protection and the public interest.[12]

The Commission finds good cause to approve the proposed rule change, as amended prior to the 30th day after the date of publication of notice of filing thereof in the **Federal Register.** Specifically, by accelerating the approval of the NASD's rule proposal, the operation of the hedge exemption pilot program, which as been in place since 1990, will continue on an uninterrupted basis until December 31, 1998. The Commission previously extend the effectiveness of the equity option hedge exemption pilot program on an accelerated basis on two prior occasions.[13] The Commission believes that Amendment No. 1 improves the proposed rule change by shortening the extension of the pilot program only until December 31, 1998, instead of December 31, 1999. An extension until December 31, 1998 will give NASD Regulation sufficient time to consider the operation of the equity option hedge exemption program without allowing the program to drag on for another two years on a pilot basis.[14] The Commission believes that good cause exists to accelerate approval of the proposed rule change, as amended, because expressly continuing the hedge exemption pilot program by rule will reduce the potential for confusion about the status of such exemption, which expired on December 31, 1997, and will promote consistency among the options markets all of which are a similar exemption. Accordingly, the Commission believes that it is consistent with Section 15A(b)(6) of the Act to approve the proposed rule change on an accelerated basis.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested person are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. 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 at the Commission's Public Reference Room. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–NASD–98–02 and should be submitted by May 13, 1998.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[15] that the proposed rule change (SR–NASD–98–02) is approved on a pilot basis until December 31, 1998.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[16]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–10600 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

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

[13] *See* Exchange Act Release Nos. 36657 (December 29, 1995), 61 FR 434 (January 5, 1996) (accelerated approval extending effectiveness of hedge exemption pilot program through December 31, 1997); 33783 (March 18, 1994), 59 FR 14229 (March 25, 1994) (accelerated approval extending effectiveness of hedge exemption pilot program through December 31, 1995).

[14] The Commission notes that NASD Regulation initially requested that the equity option hedge exemption pilot program be extended until December 31, 1999. At the Commission's request, the proposed rule change was amended to shorten the requested extension only until December 31, 1998. Given that the equity option hedge exemption program has been running on a pilot basis for eight years, the Commission recommends that NASD Regulation either take steps to adopt the program on a permanent basis in the near future or eliminate it.

[15] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

[16] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–39875; File No. SR–PCX–98–02]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the Pacific Exchange, Inc. Relating to LMM Book Pilot Program Expansion to Allow Book Staffing by Employees of the LMM

April 15, 1998.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on January 23, 1998, the Pacific Exchange, Inc. (''PCX'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.[3]

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

PCX is proposing to expand its Lead Market Maker (''LMM'') Book Pilot Program by allowing qualified LMMs to manage their own employees in operating the options public limit order book under the pilot program.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] On April 13, 1998, the PCX submitted a letter, in response to Commission staff questions, providing a brief explanation of its proposed method for admitting employees to participate in the LMM Program and concerning its proposed surveillance of the LMM Program employees and operations. *See* Letter from Michael D. Pierson, Senior Attorney, Regulatory Policy, PCX, to Marie D'Aguanno Ito, Special Counsel, Division of Market Regulation, Commission, dated April 13, 1998.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

On October 11, 1997, the Commission approved an Exchange proposal to adopt a one-year pilot program under which a limited number of LMMs would be able to assume operational responsibility for the options public limit order book (''Book'') in certain option issues.[4] On September 22, 1997, the Commission approved an Exchange proposal to extend the program for one year, so that it is currently set to expire on October 12, 1998.[5]

Under the pilot program, approved LMMs manage the Book function, take responsibility for trading disputes and errors, set rates for Book execution, and pay the Exchange a fee for systems and services.[6] Only multiple-listed option issues are currently eligible to be traded under the pilot program.[7] Initially, the program was limited by allowing no more than three LMMs to participate in the program and no more than 40 option symbols to be used. But on April 1, 1997, the Commission approved an Exchange proposal to expand the program so that up to nine LMMs may participate and up to 150 option symbols may be used.[8]

The Exchange is now proposing to further expand the program by allowing LMMs to manage their own employees in operating the Book. Currently, the Exchange permits LMMs who are participating in the pilot program to use Exchange personnel to assist the LMM in performing the OBO function, and, in return, the Exchange charges the LMM a staffing charge for such use of Exchange personnel.[9] LMMs who manage their own employees would continue to set their own rates for Book executions, but would no longer be required to pay the Exchange a staffing charge (except under unusual circumstances).

Under the pilot program, Exchange staff currently assist LMMs in performing Order Book Official (''OBO'') functions, pursuant to Rules 6.51 through 6.59.[10] These functions include the OMO's duty to assist in the maintenance of a fair, orderly and competitive market.[11] LMMs running the Book will continue to be required to report to an Options Floor Official any unusual activity, transactions or price changes or other unusual market conditions or circumstances that are detrimental to the maintenance of a fair, orderly and competitive market.[12] LMMs who operate the Book will also continue to be required to disclose to members, upon request, the price and number of contracts that are bid below or that are offered above the Book information displayed, pursuant to Rule 6.55.[13]

In the event of unusual market circumstances, the Exchange will make Exchange staff available to assist the LMMs in performing their OBO functions on a temporary basis, and will charge such LMMs a reasonable fee for such services. In this regard, the Exchange intends to file with the Commission a proposal to establish those temporary staffing charges.

The Exchange believes that allowing LMMs to hire their own employees to operate the Book will have no negative impact on the Exchange's oversight and regulation of activities on the Options Trading Floor. LMMs who operate the Book will continue to be subject to higher capital requirements than other LMMs or Market Makers.[14] The Exchange will continue to employ Exchange staff to monitor the operations of all LMMs. Exchange staff will also continue to prepare all Unusual Activity Reports that are forwarded to the Surveillance Department for review. Finally, Floor Officials will continue to monitor the activities of LMMs, including those activities that are brought to the attention of Floor Officials by members of the trading crowd, who serve a self-policing function.

The Exchange believes that the proposed change will make the Exchange LMM Program more competitive because it will provide LMMs with the same flexibility currently held by options specialists at other exchanges, and DPMs at the Chicago Board Options Exchange.

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)[15] of the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5),[16] in particular, in that it is designed to facilitate transactions in securities, to promote just and equitable principles of trade and to protect investors and the public interest.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

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

Written 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 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, including whether the proposed change is consistent with the Act. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 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

[4] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 37810 (October 11, 1996), 61 FR 54481 (October 18, 1996) (approving File No. SR–PSE–96–09).

[5] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 39106 (September 22, 1997), 62 FR 51172 (September 30, 1997).

[6] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 37874 (October 28, 1996), 61 FR 56597 (November 1, 1996) (approving SR–PSE–96–38, establishing a staffing charge for LMMs who participate in the pilot program).

[7] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 38273 (February 12, 1997), 62 FR 7489 (February 19, 1997).

[8] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 38462 (April 1, 1997), 62 FR 16886 (April 8, 1997).

[9] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 37874, *supra.*

[10] *See* PCX Rule 6.82(h)(1)(a).

[11] *See* PCX Rule 6.53.

[12] *See* PCX Rule 6.54.

[13] *See* PCX Rule 6.57.

[14] *See* PCX Rule 6.82, Commentary .05 (requiring that LMMs who run the Book to maintain ''minimum net capital,'' as provided in SEC Rule 15c3–1, and also to maintain a cash or liquid asset position of at least $500,000, plus $25,000 for each issue over 5 issues for which they perform the function of an OBO).

[15] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[16] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

available for inspection and copying in the Commission's public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the PCX. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–PCX–98–02 and should be submitted by May 13, 1998.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–10607 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on January 30, 1998 [FR 63, page 4687].

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 22, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Davis, U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Information Management, telephone (202) 267–2326.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

United States Coast Guard (USCG)

Title: Boating Statistics Questionnaire.

OMB No.: 2115–0618

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Recreational Boaters, Federal and State Officials, Safety Professional Boating Organizations and Boating Industry Representatives.

Abstract: The U.S. Coast Guard publishes a report, Boating Statistics annually on recreational boating accidents. The report is distributed to approximately 7,000 people. The Coast Guard will conduct a survey to determine customer's information needs and measure their satisfaction with the Boating Statistics report.

Need: Under 46 U.S.C. 6102(b), the Coast Guard is authorized to collect, analyze, and annually publish statistical information on recreational boating accidents.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: 320.

Addresses: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725–17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention USCG Desk Officer. Comments are invited on: The need for the proposed collection of information for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 16, 1998.

Vanester M. Williams,

Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 98–10732 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Agency and Public Scoping for Cal Black Memorial Airport Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Utah Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice of public and agency scoping.

SUMMARY: The Northwest Mountain Region of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) as lead and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and National Park Service (NPS) as cooperating agencies announce that the FAA intends to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to address issues arising from the 1993 10th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals Decision concerning the closure of Halls Crossing Airport and the development of Cal Black Memorial Airport. To ensure that all significant issues related to the action are identified, additional scoping comments are requested.

DATE AND ADDRESS FOR COMMENTS: Scoping was conducted in 1990 concerning the development of this replacement airport and the transfer of land from the BLM to San Juan County. Subsequent to the 1993, 10th Circuit Court Decision additional scoping was conducted in 1995 and 1997. Additional scoping is being conducted prior to initiating the Draft Supplemental EIS. The FAA has prepared a scoping document that is available by contacting the FAA or by accessing the Internet site at ''http:/www.airportnetwork.com/U96''.

Send comments to, or seek additional information from, the responsible Federal official: Mr. Craig Sparks, Denver Airports District Office, Federal Aviation Administration, 26805 East 68th Street, Suite 224, Denver, Colorado 80249–6361. To be considered, written comments must be received on or before May 18, 1998. Comments may also be submitted through the project web site, which may be accessed at: ''http:/www.airportnetwork.com/U96''.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Halls Crossing Airport was located within the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, a unit of the NPS. Due to safety issues with this airport, an EIS was undertaken concerning the development of a replacement airport. In 1990, the FAA issued a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the development of a replacement Airport, in cooperation with the BLM and NPS. In August 1990, the FAA issued a record of decision approving the development of Cal Black Memorial Airport and conveying the land from BLM to San Juan County. In reaching its approval, the FAA determined that no significant impacts would result from the new airport to the recreational experience of visitors to the recreational area.

In 1990, the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), et al brought suit against the FAA concerning the adequacy of the EIS and the adequacy of the BLM Plan Amendment and land transfer process. In its July 7, 1993, decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit, remanded the EIS decision back to the FAA for further environmental analysis of aircraft noise impacts to the recreational use of public lands and the BLM's plan amendment and transfer of land.

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).