freedom by relocating to another part of the proposed country of removal.

(ii) In cases where the applicant has established past persecution before an immigration judge, the Service shall bear the burden of establishing the requirements of paragraphs (b)(1)(i)(A) or (B) of this section.

(2) *Future threat to life or freedom.* An applicant who has not suffered past persecution may demonstrate that his or her life or freedom would be threatened in the future in a country if he or she can establish that it is more likely than not that he or she would be persecuted on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion upon removal to that country. Such an applicant cannot demonstrate that his or her life or freedom would be threatened if the asylum officer or immigration judge finds that the applicant could reasonably avoid a future threat to his or her life or freedom by relocating to another part of the proposed country of removal. In evaluating whether it is more likely than not that the applicant's life or freedom would be threatened in a particular country on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, the asylum officer or immigration judge shall not require the applicant to provide evidence that he or she would be singled out individually for persecution if:

(i) The applicant establishes that in that country there is a pattern or practice of persecution of a group of persons similarly situated to the applicant on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(ii) The applicant establishes his or her own inclusion in and identification with such group of persons such that it is more likely than not that his or her life or freedom would be threatened upon return to that country.

(3) *Reasonableness of internal relocation.* For purposes of determinations under paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, it would not be reasonable to expect an applicant to relocate within a country to avoid persecution if the asylum officer or immigration judge finds that there is a reasonable possibility that the applicant would face other serious harm in the place of potential relocation. In cases where the persecutor is a national government, it shall be presumed that internal relocation would not be reasonable, unless the Service establishes that it would be reasonable for the applicant to relocate. In cases where the applicant has established past persecution before an immigration judge, the Service shall bear the burden of establishing that it would be reasonable for the applicant to relocate. In cases where the applicant has not established past persecution, the applicant shall bear the burden of establishing that it would not be reasonable for him or her to relocate.

* * * * *

Dated: June 5, 1998.

Janet Reno,

Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 98–15590 Filed 6–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–M

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 1616

Proposed Technical Changes; Standard for the Flammability of Children's Sleepwear: Sizes 7 Through 14; Correction

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Proposed technical changes; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a table in a proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** of May 21, 1998, regarding technical changes to the flammability standard for children's sleepwear. The table showing the distance from the shoulder for upper arm measurement for sizes 7 through 14 inadvertently omitted some fractions. This correction provides the complete and correct table. Due to the minor nature of this correction the Commission does not intend to extend the comment period for the proposed rule. However, if a commenter believes that additional time is necessary to comment due to the error, he/she may request an extension.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret Neily, Project Manager, Directorate for Engineering Sciences, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207; telephone (301) 504–0508, extension 1293.

Correction

In proposed rule FR Doc. 98–13026, beginning on page 27877 in the issue of May 21, 1998, make the following correction. On page 27884, correct the table that follows Diagram 1 to read as follows:

Distance from shoulder (G) to (H) for Upper Arm Measurement for Sizes 7 through 14

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
11.4 cm 4½″	11.7 cm 4⅝″	11.9 cm 4¾″	12.5 cm 4⅞″	12.8 cm 5″	13.1cm 5⅛″	13.7cm 5⅜″	14.2cm 5⅝″

Dated: June 4, 1998.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 98–15492 Filed 6–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

23 CFR Part 655

[FHWA Docket No. FHWA–98–3644]

RIN 2125–AE38

Revision of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; Part II—Signs

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed amendments to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); request for comments.

SUMMARY: The MUTCD is incorporated by reference in 23 CFR part 655, subpart F, approved by the Federal Highway Administrator, and recognized as the national standard for traffic control on all public roads. The FHWA announced its intent to rewrite and reformat the MUTCD on January 10, 1992, at 57 FR

1134. Due to the voluminous amount of text, the revision is being undertaken in phases. This notice of proposed amendment represents the third phase of the MUTCD rewrite effort and includes changes proposed to the following sections of the MUTCD:

1. 2A—General Provisions and Standards
2. 2D—Guide Signs—Conventional Roads
3. 2E—Guide Signs—Freeways and Expressways
4. 2F—Specific Service Signs
5. 2I—Signing for Civil Defense

The purpose of this effort is to rewrite and reformat the text for clarity and consistency of intended meanings; to include metric dimensions and values for the design and installation of traffic control devices; to improve the overall organization and discussion of the contents in the MUTCD; and to propose changes to the MUTCD that will enhance the mobility of all road users, promote uniformity, improve traffic safety by reducing the potential for run-off-road incidents, and incorporate technology advances in traffic control device application.

DATES: Submit comments on or before March 11, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Signed, written comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding the notice of proposed amendments contact Ms. Linda Brown, Office of Highway Safety, Room 3414, (202) 366–2192, or Mr. Raymond Cuprill, Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 4217, (202) 366–0834, Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

Internet users can access all comments received by the U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, by using the universal resource locator (URL):http://dms.dot.gov. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. Please follow the instructions online for more information and help.

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded using a modem and suitable communications software from the **Federal Register** Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512–1661. Internet users may reach the **Federal Register**'s home page at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs.

The proposed text for Chapters 2A, 2D, 2E, 2F, and 2I of the MUTCD is available from the FHWA, Office of Highway Safety (HHS–10). It is also available on the FHWA home page at the following URL: http://www.ohs.fhwa.dot.gov/devices/mutcd.html.

Background

The 1988 MUTCD (which includes Part 6, Revision 3, dated September 1993) is available for inspection and copying as prescribed in 49 CFR Part 7. It may be purchased for $57 (Domestic) or $71.25 (Foreign) from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, Stock No. 650–001–00001–0. This notice is being issued to provide an opportunity for public comment on the desirability of proposed amendments to the MUTCD. Based on the comments submitted and upon its own experience, the FHWA will issue a final rule concerning the proposed changes included in this notice.

The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD) is a national organization of individuals from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), the National Association of County Engineers (NACE), the American Public Works Association (APWA), and other organizations that have extensive experience in the installation and maintenance of traffic control devices. The NCUTCD voluntarily assumed the arduous task of rewriting and reformatting the MUTCD and submitted a request for changes to the FHWA. The NCUTCD proposal is available from the U.S. DOT Docket (see address above). Pursuant to 23 CFR Part 655, the FHWA is responsible for approval of changes to the MUTCD.

Although the MUTCD will be revised in its entirety, it will be done in phases due to the voluminous amount of text. The FHWA has reviewed the NCUTCD's recommendations for MUTCD Part III—Markings, Part IV—Signals, and Part VIII—Traffic Control for Roadway-Rail Intersections. The proposed text for Parts III, IV, and VIII was published as Phase 1 of the MUTCD rewrite effort in a previous notice of proposed amendment, dated January 6, 1997, at 62 FR 691. The FHWA also has reviewed the NCUTCD's recommendations for MUTCD Part I—General Provisions and Part VII—Traffic Controls for School Areas. The proposed text for Parts I and VII were published as Phase 2 of the MUTCD rewrite effort in a notice of proposed amendment dated December 5, 1997, at 62 FR 64324.

This notice of proposed amendment is for Phase 3 of the MUTCD rewrite effort and includes the proposed text for: MUTCD Chapter 2A—General Provisions and Standards; Chapter 2D—Guide Signs—Conventional Roads; Chapter 2E—Guide Signs—Expressways and Freeways; Chapter 2F—Specific Service Signs; and Chapter 2I—Signing for Civil Defense. In order to achieve consistency, this notice also embraces revisions proposed in Phase 1 or 2 of this process that affect chapters in Part II. The public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the remaining parts of the MUTCD in a future notice of proposed amendment. The FHWA invites comments on the proposed text for the above listed chapters of Part II. A summary of the significant changes contained in these chapters is provided in this notice of proposed amendment.

As indicated in previous notices, the proposed new style of the MUTCD would be a 3-ring binder with 8½ × 11 inch pages. Each part of the MUTCD would be printed separately in a bound format and then included in the 3-ring binder. If someone needed to reference information on a specific part of the MUTCD, it would be easy to remove that individual part from the binder. The proposed new text would be in column format and contain four categories as follows: (1) Standards—representing ''shall'' conditions; (2) Guidance—representing ''should'' conditions; (3) Options—representing ''may'' conditions; and (4) Support—representing descriptive and/or general information. This new format would make it easier to distinguish standards, guidance, and optional conditions for the design, placement, and application of traffic control devices. For review purposes during this rewrite effort, dimensions will be shown in both metric and English units. This will make it easier to compare text shown in the 1988 Edition with the proposed new edition. The adopted final version of the new MUTCD, however, will be solely in metric units.

This effort to rewrite and reformat the MUTCD will be an ongoing activity over the next two years. Some of the other issues which will be addressed in a future notice of proposed amendment are: Minimum retroreflectivity standards for signs and pavement markings; signing for low-volume rural

roads; and traffic control for light-rail grade crossings. These proposed changes to the MUTCD are intended to enhance the mobility of all road users, promote uniformity, improve traffic safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, reduce the potential for run-off-road incidents, and incorporate technology advances in traffic control device application.

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 2A—General Provisions and Standards

The FHWA proposes to change the chapter title to ''General Provisions and Standards.''

In Section 2A.1, paragraph 5, the FHWA proposes changing the first sentence so that the design and application standards for ''all'' signs (not just ''guide'' signs) are dependent on the particular class of highway on which they are used. The FHWA also proposes adding ''Special Purpose Road'' to the list of highway classification definitions.

In Section 2A.3, the FHWA proposes to add a sentence to inform readers that in some cases engineering studies may show that signs are not necessary at certain locations. The general public is familiar with the concept of conducting an engineering study to determine if signs *are* necessary at a certain location. It is important to point out, however, that the reverse of this concept is also possible.

In Section 2A.7, the FHWA proposes changing the title from ''variable message signs'' to ''changeable message signs.'' For consistency of terminology, the FHWA proposes the term ''changeable message signs'' since it is more commonly used within the transportation field and it is used throughout the text in MUTCD Part 6F.2, Revision 3. Also in paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes adding a sentence to refer readers to Section 6F.2 which provides additional discussion on changeable message signs used in temporary traffic control zones. FHWA recognizes the expanded and increased use of changeable message signs particularly in the area of intelligent traffic control. We are interested in receiving comments and guidance on your experiences with designing, installing, and maintaining changeable message signs.

The FHWA proposes to combine Sections 2A–16, 17, and 18 of the 1988 MUTCD into proposed new Section 2A.8, Illumination and Retroreflectivity. The FHWA also proposes to include two new tables to help clarify the discussion contained in the text for Section 2A.8 (Table 2A.2 and Table 2A.3).

In Section 2A.8, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to extend the general requirements of sign retroreflectivity or illumination to ''all'' signs, not just regulatory and warning signs. This requirement would apply to all signs unless specifically stated otherwise in the MUTCD text for a particular sign or group of signs. The FHWA believes this will improve safety and visibility during adverse ambient conditions. After the FHWA has developed minimum retroreflectivity levels, the FHWA would include this information as GUIDANCE in the proposed new Section 2A.9.

In Section 2A.10, the FHWA proposes to include the discussion of shapes in a table format for clarity and ease of reading. The FHWA also proposes to expand the number of shapes for exclusive use. In Section 2A–10 of the 1988 MUTCD, the STOP and YIELD signs were the only signs with an exclusive shape. The FHWA proposes to include the Pennant, Crossbuck, and Trapezoid as exclusive shapes.

In Section 2A.11, the FHWA proposes to include the discussion on colors in a table format for clarity and ease of reading. Also in Section 2A.11, the FHWA proposes to include a statement that the color coordinates and values shall conform to those shown in the color specifications described on page 6–39 of the ''Standard Highway Signs'' (SHS) Book.[1] The FHWA believes that including this statement will help promote uniformity of colors where traffic control signs are designed and installed by providing the reader with a specific reference source for determining the proper color coordinates and values.

In Section 2A.13, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to add a sentence to explain that new symbol signs shall be adopted by FHWA based on research evaluation studies to determine the road users comprehension and recognition of the sign. The FHWA is also proposing to add an option that State and/or local highway agencies may conduct this research.

In Section 2A.14, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes adding GUIDANCE for determining sign letter heights. Sign letter heights should be determined based on 1 inch per 40 feet of legibility distance. The FHWA believes this would improve safety for all road users and especially for older road users whose vision may be diminished.

In Section 2A–15 of the 1988 MUTCD, only destination guide signs could combine the use of upper-case and lower-case letters. The FHWA proposes in Section 2A.14 to include an OPTION that allows the use of upper-case and lower-case letters on street name signs in addition to destination signs. This is consistent with the language in the final rule dated January 9, 1997, which discusses increased letter sizes on street name signs. The FHWA also proposes deleting the restriction of using series B alphabets only on street name signs. Other standard series alphabets could be used as appropriate.

In the last paragraph of Section 2A.17 in the proposed new text, the FHWA has moved the discussion on bridge sign supports currently in Section 2A–28 to this section on Overhead Sign Installations. The 1988 MUTCD states that ''on *urban* freeways and expressways . . . signs may be placed on bridges.'' In the proposed new edition of the MUTCD, the FHWA proposes to delete the word ''urban'' so that this sign application is not limited to urban freeways and expressways. In addition, the FHWA proposes to reduce this information from GUIDANCE to an OPTION condition in order to allow the traffic engineer more flexibility.

In Section 2A.18, the FHWA proposes to change the minimum mounting height for all signs to 2.1 m (7 feet). This would include signs in rural districts. In the 1988 MUTCD, the mounting height was 7 feet for signs only in urban districts, in work zones, or in areas where parking or pedestrian movement occurs. The proposed change is recommended based on research studies that show safety benefits can be derived from moving the sign panel out of the danger zone where the sign may become a projectile and result in road user injuries if struck by an errant vehicle. In addition, the FHWA proposes to indicate a STANDARD minimum mounting height for supplemental plaques of 1.2 m (4 feet), rather than referring to a variable height measured in terms of the main sign.

In paragraph 6 of Section 2A.18, the FHWA proposes including an OPTION that allows flexibility in the mounting height of signs installed on steep backslopes. In the last paragraph of Section 2A.18, the FHWA proposes adding a SUPPORT discussion on the term ''clear zone'' as defined in the AASHTO ''Roadside Design Guide.''[2]

[1] ''Standard Highway Signs,'' FHWA, 1979 Edition (Metric) is included by reference in the 1988 MUTCD. It is available for inspection and copying at the FHWA Washington Headquarters and all FHWA Division and Region Offices as prescribed at 49 CFR part 7.

[2] The ''Roadside Design Guide,'' 1989, is available for purchase from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), 444 North Capitol Street, NW., Washington, DC 20001. It is available for inspection from the FHWA Washington Headquarters and all

Section 2A.19 discusses the minimum lateral offset outside the roadway for freeway and expressway signs. The FHWA proposes to add a STANDARD to the first paragraph that requires sign supports within the clear zone to be breakaway or shielded for the safety of the road user particularly in run-off-road incidents.

In paragraph 2 of Section 2A.23, the FHWA proposes to include day and night inspections as a part of sign maintenance. Although this is general practice among many engineering and transportation officials, we believe it is a practice worth reiterating in the MUTCD.

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 2D—Guide Signs—Conventional Roads

Throughout Chapter 2D, the FHWA proposes to replace the word ''marker'' with the word ''sign,'' since these route and auxiliary markers are generally considered signs. The sign numbers will continue to carry the ''M'' designation (example: M1–4). Also throughout Chapter 2D it is important for the reader to remember to refer to Chapter 2A for placement, location, and other general criteria for signs, since this information is not repeated in every section.

In Section 2D.3, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to extend the general requirement for retroreflectivity to all guide sign messages and legends unless specific exceptions are provided. This is consistent with the proposed text in Section 2A.8 which requires retroreflectivity of all signs.

In Section 2D.9, paragraph 5 discusses route system signing and the order of preference for the priority legend. The FHWA proposes to include a STANDARD sentence stating that the highest priority legend shall be placed on the top or to the left of the sign panel. This would help the road user better identify the class of roadway (example: Interstate vs. County roadway).

In Section 2D.11, paragraph 6, the FHWA proposes to include a sentence that allows the OPTION of placing a white panel behind the Off-Interstate Business Route signs when they are installed on a green guide sign. This would help road users by improving the sign's contrast and conspicuity.

In Section 2D.15, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to re-emphasize the 10 percent increase in size for the first letter of cardinal direction messages. Although this change was adopted in a previous final rule, we are reiterating our intent to strongly encourage States and local transportation departments to implement this change during their normal sign replacement and maintenance schedules. Increasing the first letter of cardinal directions, such as EAST and WEST, helps the road user in the navigation task by providing a clearer distinction between the similar appearance of these two messages. The same principle is true for the NORTH and SOUTH cardinal directions.

In Section 2D.33, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to add an option that allows the route sign and the cardinal direction to be included within the destination sign panel. We are also proposing to include guidance on the minimum sizes for these signs to ensure that they are readable by the road user.

Paragraph 5 of Section 2D–35 in the 1988 Edition of the MUTCD required that destination signs with four destinations shall be shown on two separate sign panels. In Section 2D.34, paragraph 9 of the proposed text, the FHWA proposes to change this requirement from a ''shall'' to a ''should'' condition. We propose this change since the MUTCD currently allows the option of placing all four destinations on a single panel in situations where spacing is critical. Based on this, it seems reasonable to ''recommend'' rather than to ''require'' the use of two sign panels.

In paragraph 2 of Section 2D–38 in the 1988 Edition of the MUTCD, distance signs were required to be placed approximately 500 feet outside the municipal limits or at the edge of the built-up district. In the proposed text for new Section 2D.37, the FHWA proposes to delete this specific distance requirement and allow the State and local transportation departments the flexibility to determine the appropriate sign location.

In paragraph 9, Section 2D–45 in the 1988 Edition of the MUTCD, general service signs and accompanying supplemental plaques could have either a retroreflective or an opaque blue background. Since the FHWA proposes to require all guide signs to be retroreflective (see Section 2D.3), opaque backgrounds would be no longer allowed. This change is reflected in the proposed text for new section 2D.44, paragraph 15.

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 2E—Guide Signs—Expressways and Freeways

The FHWA proposes to combine Chapters 2E (Guide Signs—Expressway) and 2F (Guide Signs—Freeway) in the 1988 Edition of the MUTCD into a new Chapter 2E— Freeway and Expressway Guide Signs.

In Section 2E.5, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to require that signs must be either retroreflectorized or independently illuminated. The 1988 MUTCD classified this provision as a GUIDANCE condition. The proposed new text would classify it as a STANDARD condition. The FHWA also proposes to use the term ''independent illumination'' since it may include, but is not limited to, ''internal illumination.''

In Section 2E.5, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to recommend that all overhead sign installations should be illuminated if an engineering study shows that retroreflection alone will not perform effectively. This proposed change would improve the visibility of overhead signs, particularly at night.

In Section 2E.6, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to add visual clutter from roadside development to the list of features which characterize urban conditions. Growth in business development and environmental changes make this an appropriate item to consider when installing signs since excessive signs may create information overload for some road users and may complicate the navigation task.

In Section 2E.6, paragraph 2, the FHWA lists special sign treatments for improving travel on urban freeways and expressways. The FHWA proposes to add the following to this list: ''Frequent use of street names as the principal message in guide signs.'' This would improve the guidance information provided to road users.

In Section 2E.8, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to expand the GUIDANCE for certain classes of highways that should not be signed as memorial highways. Instead of just applying to Interstate routes, the FHWA proposes to expand the GUIDANCE to include all freeways and expressways.

In Section 2E.9, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to clarify the GUIDANCE in the 1988 MUTCD which addresses the appropriate amount of legend on guide signs. Instead of the words ''Not more than two destination names * * * on any single major guide sign,'' the FHWA proposes to change the wording to ''on any Advance Guide or Exit Direction sign.'' The FHWA proposes to indicate these specific types of major guide signs instead of guide signs in general.

In Section 2E.12, paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes to add language to highlight the fact that States are responsible for the selection of control cities shown on guide signs.

In Section 2E.16, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to add an OPTION that clarifies the proper use of periods on

FHWA Division and Region Offices as prescribed at 49 CFR part 7.

guide signs. Periods may be used, but only when abbreviating a cardinal direction as part of a destination name. Although this is an implied practice, the FHWA believes it should be specifically stated in the MUTCD.

In Section 2E.17, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to require that symbol designs be essentially like those shown in the MUTCD. In the 1988 MUTCD this was recommended practice instead of required practice.

In Section 2E.19, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to require the practice of showing only one destination for each directional arrowhead on diagrammatic signs. In the 1988 MUTCD this was an OPTION rather than STANDARD practice. This proposed change would make it clearer for the road users to select the proper lane for their destinations.

In Section 2E.20, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to add a new STANDARD which would prohibit the use of the EXIT ONLY panel on diagrammatic signs at any major bifurcation or split. This proposed change is aimed at eliminating potentially confusing situations for the road users.

In Section 2E.21, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to include a larger letter height of 450 mm (18 inches) for changeable message signs. The FHWA also proposes to include additional criteria for the use of changeable message signs based on the text in Part VI of the 1988 MUTCD. This proposed change would improve the visibility of signs for the road user.

In Section 2E.24, paragraph 1, the FHWA has proposed to include reference to the importance of the clear zones and breakaway supports when determining the horizontal clearance distance for sign installation. These principles are important considerations for reducing the potential for run-off-road incidents.

In Section 2E.29, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to increase the vertical dimension of the exit number sign panel which includes the word EXIT, the appropriate exit number, and the suffix letter A or B (on multi-exit interchanges). The proposed change would increase the vertical dimension from 600 mm (24 inches) to 750 mm (30 inches). This change would improve the visibility of signs for the road user.

In Section 2E.31, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to change the GUIDANCE for placement of Advance Guide signs in advance of the exit gore from: ''400m to 1 km'' (¼ to ½ miles) to: ''1 to 2 km'' (½ to 1 mile).

In Section 2E.31, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to require that the word EXIT be omitted from the bottom line of Advance Guide sign text where interchange exit numbers are used. The FHWA proposes to change this from an OPTION to STANDARD practice.

In Section 2E.33, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to recommend that only one supplemental guide sign should be used on each interchange approach. The FHWA proposes to change this from optional to recommended practice.

In Section 2E.34, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to add a STANDARD that population figures or other similar information shall not be used on Exit Direction signs.

In Section 2E.34, paragraph 7, the FHWA proposes to highlight the GUIDANCE which is in the 1988 MUTCD concerning the proper placement of the exit number panels. The placement of the exit number panel on the proper side of the sign would help the road users select the appropriate exit lane.

In Section 2E.34, the last sentence of paragraph 10, the FHWA proposes to allow the States more flexibility to use any type of overhead support for installing the Exit Direction sign. Presently cantilevered supports are specified.

In Section 2E.41, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to include GUIDANCE that the signing layout should be similar for interchanges which have only one exit ramp in the direction of travel. This proposed change is intended to promote uniformity.

In Section 2E.42, paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes to add an OPTION for installing overhead guide signs at freeway to freeway interchanges at the 1 km (½ mile) point in advance of the theoretical gore of each connecting ramp.

The following changes are proposed in Section 2E.52:

1. In paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to add a new option that an action message, such as NEXT RIGHT, may be used on general road user service signs which do not have exit numbers included on the sign. A new figure (2E–38) has also been added.

2. In paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes to provide specific guidance for General Service signs that include distances. Distances to services should be shown when the service is more than 2 km (1 mile) from the interchange.

3. In paragraph 4b, the FHWA proposes to add ''modern sanitary facilities'' as a criteria for food establishments since most restaurants have restroom facilities. Also in paragraph 4b, the FHWA proposes modifying the recommended number of days that a food service displayed on a service sign is open. The FHWA proposes to modify the text from ''7'' days a week to ''6 or 7'' days a week. The current guidance in the MUTCD already permits a State to develop a specific service sign policy with a ''less than 7 days a week'' criteria. However, this proposed change would provide a clearer example of the possible alternative criteria that States may use to provide the road user more information about desired service. The proposed changes would not impose additional requirements or costs on State or local highway agencies.

4. In paragraph 5, the FHWA proposes a new STANDARD which would require that General Road Service signs that are operated on a seasonal basis shall be removed or covered during periods when the service is not available. This reduces the chance of road users mistakenly leaving their routes only to find that the particular service is closed.

In Section 2E.57, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to add an OPTION which allows Radio-Traffic Information signs (D12–4) to be used in conjunction with traffic management systems. The D12–4 is a proposed new word message sign.

In Section 2E.57, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to reduce the maximum number of frequencies shown on the Radio Information signs from 4 to 3. In addition, the FHWA proposes to include a new figure which illustrates this concept and to change the text from an OPTION condition to a STANDARD condition.

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 2F—Specific Service Signs

Due to the proposed consolidation of Chapters 2E (Expressway Guide Signs) and 2F (Freeway Guide Signs) of the 1988 MUTCD Edition into a combined Chapter 2E, the FHWA proposes to move the discussion in 2G (Specific Service Signs) to a new Chapter 2F.

Throughout Chapter 2F the following terms are used consistently with the following specific meaning: logo sign panel, sign, and sign assembly. The term ''logo sign panel'' is a smaller separate sign panel which would be placed on a specific service sign and onto which a logo is placed. The term ''sign'' means a larger sign panel with white legend, white border and blue background onto which the logo sign panels are placed. A ''sign assembly'' consists of more than one sign.

In Section 2F.1, paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes to classify the equal opportunity criteria (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) as a STANDARD,

since most Federal programs require compliance with Title VI regulations.

In Section 2F.1, paragraphs 5 and 12, the FHWA proposes to add an ATTRACTIONS category to the types of Specific Service signs. The FHWA proposes to add the ATTRACTIONS category to the four service categories which are currently contained in the MUTCD (gas, food, lodging, and camping). This change was requested by the Kentucky Department of Transportation and is numbered and titled Request II–264(C), ''Specific Service Logo for Tourist Attraction Signs.'' Specific Service signs for this type of service are being installed and studied with FHWA experimental approval on a limited basis in Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania under experimental requests II–227(Ex), II–232(Ex), and II–260(Ex). These experiments are due for completion between 1999 and 2001 and contain sign criteria similar to the criteria proposed for the MUTCD. Interim study reports from Kentucky and the New York State Thruway indicate that programs with these signs are successfully assisting road user, increasing business, and reducing billboard demand regarding tourism and attractions, with no impact on highway safety and operations. Other States are expressing similar interests and FHWA anticipates additional positive results from the experimentations.

In Section 2F.1, paragraph 8, the FHWA proposes guidance that allows for alternative fuels on specific Service sign logos. Also, in Section 2F.3, paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes an option which allows for alternative fuel legends on the bottom of logo panels. These proposed changes are consistent with the scope of use for alternative fuels on general service signs which was published as a final rule in the **Federal Register** dated January 9, 1997. The request number for this change was II–226(C)—General Motorist Service Signing for Alternative Fuels.

In Section 2F.1, paragraph 9, the FHWA proposes modifying the recommended number of days that a food service is open from ''7'' days a week to ''6 or 7'' days a week. The FHWA also proposes to add an option in Section 2F.3, paragraph 4, which would allow food service facilities that are open only 6 days a week to display the day that the facility is closed at the bottom of the logo panel. The current guidance in MUTCD Section 2G–5.7 permits a State to develop a Specific Service sign policy with a less than 7 days a week criteria. However, these proposed changes provide a clearer example of possible alternative criteria that States may use to provide the road user more information about desired service. The proposed changes would not impose additional requirements or costs on State or local highway agencies.

In Section 2F.2, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to allow the maximum of two service types to be placed on any specific service sign at any interchange or intersection. Based on this proposed change, the FHWA also proposes to eliminate the requirement in Section 2G–5.5 of the 1988 MUTCD for a separate sign at freeway and expressway interchanges for each service type. Also, the related ''remote rural'' exception criteria for these signs for both interchanges and intersections would be deleted. These proposed changes would allow for additional sign designs and would not impose any additional costs to the States.

In Section 2G–5.5 of the MUTCD 1988 Edition, the recommended maximum number of logos for a Specific Service sign (or sign assembly) is six for the GAS services and four logos for food, lodging, and camping services. In the proposed new Section 2F.4, paragraph 2, the FHWA proposes to recommend a maximum of six logos for a sign in any of the service categories. This request for change was submitted by the NCUTCD. It was originally designated as part of request number II–161(C) and is also being considered as a part of request number II–193(C). The FHWA is aware that some States commonly allow 6 logos on the signs for any of the four types of services and for the experimental attraction service signs. The States have not reported any negative impacts. Based on the proposed six logo maximum for each sign, the FHWA also proposes to require a maximum of three logo panels for each of the two allowable service types contained on any sign or sign assembly instead of the two logo panels maximum for each service type as currently required in Sections 2G–5.5 and 2G–5.6. The FHWA believes that few highway jurisdictions allow and few sign installations currently contain more than the proposed maximum number of logos. Since the State and local highway jurisdictions have the option to use less than the maximum six logos, the proposed changes would not impose any significant additional costs.

In Section 2F.4, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to allow for any expressway intersection the maximum logo panel size of 1500 mm (60 inches) by 900 mm (36 inches). In Section 2G–5.3, Table II–4 of the 1988 MUTCD, the maximum size for expressway intersections is 900 mm (36 inches) by 600 mm (24 inches). This change would give the States and local transportation departments greater latitude in the selection of sign sizes and would not impose any additional costs.

In Section 2F.5, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to eliminate the two intersection categories as shown in Section 2G–5.4, Table II–5, of the 1988 MUTCD and to establish a minimum letter height of 250 mm (10 inches) for all service signs on freeways and expressways. The FHWA also proposes to increase the minimum letter height for service signs on ramps and conventional highways from 100 mm (4 inches) to 150 mm (6 inches). The compliance date is proposed to be 10 years after the effective date of the final rule or as signs are replaced within the 10 year period. This would allow for replacement after the normal service life of the signs.

In Section 2F.6, paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to eliminate the requirement of a separate sign panel for each specific service sign category displayed. Also in paragraph 1, the FHWA proposes to allow a maximum of two service categories to be displayed on any specific service sign panel at any expressway interchange or intersection. The limitation to ''remote rural'' interchanges and intersections has been deleted.

In Section 2F.6, paragraph 2, and as noted on Figure 2F–2, the FHWA proposes adding guidance that specific service ramp signs should be spaced at least 30 m (100 ft) from the exit gore sign, from each other, and from the ramp terminal. This proposed GUIDANCE was recommended by the NCUTCD based on a survey which they conducted of the practices of 18 State transportation departments.

In Section 2F.7, paragraph 4, the FHWA proposes adding an option to allow the exit number panel on the top of Specific Service signs on the freeway or expressway for the single-exit interchanges. Also, in Section 2F.9, paragraph 5, the FHWA proposes adding an option to allow for the NEXT RIGHT (LEFT) and other directional legends to be placed below the logos on the signs for intersections as is shown in figure 2–47 of the 1988 MUTCD. Currently, these legends are required to be located on the same line above the logos as the service type word message. The proposed changes would allow the Specific Service signs to be consistent with other guide sign designs.

In Section 2F.9, paragraph 3, the FHWA proposes to allow the State and local transportation departments to determine acceptable visibility limits.

Section 2G–5.6 of the 1988 MUTCD recommends that logos should not be displayed for services and qualified facilities which are visible within 90 m (300 feet) of the intersection.

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 2I—Signing for Civil Defense

Based on the changes in section numbering for Part II, the FHWA proposes to number the Signing for Civil Defense as Chapter 2I instead of 2J. The only other proposed change to this chapter is to reformat the text so that Standards, Guidance, Option, and Support conditions are clearly indicated.

Discussion of Adopted Amendments to Part II of the 1988 MUTCD

The following adopted changes were published in a previous **Federal Register** final rule dated January 9, 1997 and are highlighted in this discussion of proposed changes for purpose of consistency:

1. In Section 2D.38 of the proposed text, the FHWA has added language for the increased minimum letter size of street name signs. In the **Federal Register** final rule dated January 9, 1997, the minimum letter size was increased from 4 inches to 6 inches for streets with speeds greater than 25 miles per hour.
2. In Section 2D.44, the FHWA has added language for the Alternative Fuel, Truck Parking, and Cellular Phone Emergency Signs.
3. In Section 2D.47, the FHWA has added language for the Non-Carrier Airport, Adopt-A-Highway, and Recycling Collection Center signs.
4. In Section 2E.52, paragraph 4a, the FHWA has included language for the Compressed Natural Gas, Electric Vehicle Charging, and other alternative fuel signs.
5. In Section 2E.52, paragraph 14, the FHWA has added language on Truck Parking signs which is consistent with what was adopted by the final rule referenced above.
6. In Section 2E.58, paragraph 2, the FHWA has added language which increases the maximum vertical size of a symbol or logo Carpool Information sign to 900 mm (36 inches).
7. In section 2F.3, paragraph 1, the FHWA has included the standard definition for logo for specific service signs.

Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above will be considered and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address. Comments received after the comment closing date will be filed in the docket and will be considered to the extent practicable, but the FHWA may issue a Final Rule at any time after the close of the comment period. In addition to late comments, the FHWA will also continue to file in the docket relevant information that becomes available after the comment closing date, and interested persons should continue to examine the docket for new material.

Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures

The FHWA has determined that this action is not a significant regulatory action within the meaning of Executive Order 12866 or significant within the meaning of Department of Transportation regulatory policies and procedures. It is anticipated that the economic impact of this rulemaking would be minimal. The new standards and other changes proposed in this notice are intended to improve traffic operations and provide additional guidance, clarification, and optional applications for traffic control devices. The FHWA expects that these proposed changes will create uniformity and enhance safety and mobility at little additional expense to public agencies or the motoring public. Therefore, a full regulatory evaluation is not required.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

In compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96–354, 5 U.S.C. 601–612), the FHWA has evaluated the effects of this proposed action on small entities. This notice of proposed rulemaking adds some new and alternative traffic control devices and traffic control device applications. The proposed new standards and other changes are intended to enhance traffic operations, improve roadway safety, expand guidance and navigation information provided to road users, and clarify traffic control device application and practices. As noted previously, expenses to implement or comply with the proposed changes would be minimal, if any. Therefore, the FHWA hereby certifies that these proposed revisions would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

This rule does not impose unfunded mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4). This rulemaking relates to the Federal-aid Highway Program which is a financial assistance program in which State, local, or tribal governments have authority to adjust their program in accordance with changes made in the program by the Federal government, and thus is excluded from the definition of Federal mandate under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Executive Order 12612 (Federalism Assessment)

This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that this action would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism assessment. The MUTCD is incorporated by reference in 23 CFR part 655, subpart F, which requires that changes to the national standards issued by the FHWA shall be adopted by the States or other Federal agencies within two years of issuance. The proposed amendments are in keeping with the Secretary of Transportation's authority under 23 U.S.C. 109(d), 315, and 402(a) to promulgate uniform guidelines to promote the safe and efficient use of the highway. To the extent that this amendment would override any existing State requirements regarding traffic control devices, it does so in the interests of national uniformity.

Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review)

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

Paperwork Reduction Act

This action does not contain a collection of information requirement for purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

National Environmental Policy Act

The agency has analyzed this action for the purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and has determined that this action would not have any effect on the quality of the environment.

Regulation Identification Number

A regulation identification number (RIN) is assigned to each regulatory action listed in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. The Regulatory Information Service Center publishes the Unified Agenda in April and October of each year. The RIN contained

in the heading of this document can be used to cross reference this action with the Unified Agenda.

List of Subjects in 23 CFR Part 655

Design standards, Grant programs—Transportation, Highways and roads, Incorporation by reference, Signs, Traffic regulations.

(23 U.S.C. 109(d), 114(a), 315, and 402(a); 23 CFR 1.32; 49 CFR 1.48)

Issued on: June 4, 1998.

Gloria J. Jeff,

Deputy Administrator, Federal Highway Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–15607 Filed 6–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

23 CFR Part 655

[FHWA Docket No. FHWA–98–3643]

Revision of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices: Request for Comments on the MUTCD Outreach Effort

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Request for comments on the MUTCD Outreach Effort.

SUMMARY: The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) is incorporated by reference in 23 CFR part 655, subpart F, approved by the Federal Highway Administrator, and recognized as the national standard for traffic control on all public roads. The FHWA announced its intent to rewrite and reformat the MUTCD on January 10, 1992, at 57 FR 1134. The FHWA plans to publish and distribute a new edition of the MUTCD in the year 2000. The purpose of this request for comment is to: identify the role of the MUTCD in our customer and partner organizations and develop a comprehensive outreach strategy to ensure that information within the revised MUTCD reaches the appropriate audiences in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 9, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Signed, written comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the top of this document and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590–0001. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Linda Brown, Office of Highway Safety, Room 3414, (202) 366–2192, or Mr. Raymond Cuprill, Office of the Chief Counsel, Room 4217, (202) 366–0834, Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

Internet users can access all comments received by the U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL–401, by using the universal resource locator (URL): http://dms.dot.gov. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. Please follow the instructions online for more information and help.

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded using a modem and suitable communications software from the **Federal Register** Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512–1661. Internet users may reach the **Federal Register**'s home page at: http://www.nara.gov/nara/fedreg and the Government Printing Office's database at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs.

The proposed text for the MUTCD 2000 is available from the FHWA, Office of Highway Safety (HHS–10). It is also available on the FHWA home page at the following URL: http://www.ohs.fhwa.dot.gov/devices/mutcd.html.

Background

The current 1988 MUTCD is available for inspection and copying as prescribed in 49 CFR Part 7, appendix D. It may be purchased for $44 (Domestic) or $55 (Foreign) from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, Stock No. 650–001–00001–0. This request for comment is being issued to provide an opportunity for public comment on the best manner in which to disseminate information contained in the next edition of the MUTCD.

The Manual On Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) is approved by the Federal Highway Administrator as the standard for design, application, and placement of traffic control devices used on all roads open to public travel. The MUTCD contains principles for the design and installation of signs, signals, pavement markings and other traffic control devices. Roadway safety is one of FHWA's primary focus areas. Single-vehicle run-off-road crashes account for about one-third of all highway fatalities annually and motor vehicle crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists account for another 15 percent of all highway fatalities annually. To make an impact on our strategic safety objective of reducing the number of highway-related fatalities and injuries, the FHWA is focusing resources in these areas that have the most significant impact in achieving roadway safety. Providing all users of the highway system with better guidance tools is a critical element in addressing run-off-road, pedestrian, and bicyclist traffic crashes. Traffic control devices (TCDs) are the roadway guidance tools that ensure safety by providing for the orderly and predictable movement of all traffic throughout the Nation's transportation system. TCDs such as pavement markings, signs, and signals are the language with which we communicate to the road users.

With the Interstate highway system near completion and the growth in roadway traffic volumes and congestion increasing, our Nation is at the crossroads of its transportation development. The FHWA recognizes the need to infuse new ideas and technology into the highway program—ideas that will help us solve our current and future highway safety challenges. We also recognize that the policies and technologies that we implement today will have a strong impact on our citizens and industries well into the 21st century. The FHWA is in the process of publishing a new MUTCD for the next millennium. The Agency's goal for the ''MUTCD 2000'' is to enhance the mobility of all road users, promote uniformity, improve traffic safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, reduce the potential for run-off-road incidents, and incorporate technology advances in traffic control device application.

Marketing and public outreach are recognized as important elements in this effort. In this new era of transportation, we realize that marketing and public outreach are very necessary components of developing, promoting, and implementing effective programs. As the FHWA began to identify our outreach audience, it became apparent that: (1) the MUTCD affects a large and varied audience, and (2) many of our partners and customers are relatively uninformed about principles and techniques for the proper design and application of traffic control devices. Additionally, the general public has little understanding of the respective roles of the Federal, State, and local transportation agencies