FILE NAME: ! ăōŜăűƨă ƛƴ l l·ƛℕ 5ℕȅŜℕă ó l 5ú

DATE: мфун

DOC#: l 5ллр

5OCUMENT DESCRIPTIONϒ CŜŘŜℕl·f wŜƎƛăűŜℕ bƨűƛŎŜ

Availability of NPRM

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Public Affairs, Attention: Public Information Center, APA-430, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20591, or by calling (202) 426-8058. Communications must identify the docket number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also request a copy of Advisory Circular 11-2, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Distribution System, which describes the application procedures.

Background

On June 15, 1982, the FAA issued Notice No. 82-8 which requested public comments on proposed changes to SFAR 44-3. Several alternative proposals were presented. One suggestion would be to divide the additional slots at controlled airports in a 70 percent—30 percent proportion. Under this proposal, the slots would be distributed in three phases: first at a New Entrant Random Lottery; then at an Impacted Incumbent Ranked Drawing; and finally at a General Random Lottery. Comments were also invited concerning proposed alternatives. Comments on the NPRM had to be submitted on or before June 29, 1982.

On June 22, the ATA submitted a petition to extend from June 29 to July 15 the date by which comments on the NPRM must be received. In support of its petition, ATA states that additional time is necessary to attempt to reach a consensus on a replacement proposal. ATA states that because many of the individuals necessary to take part in this effort are currently involved in other related events, additional time is, therefore, necessary to file comments acceptable to a significant segment of the entire industry. ATA's comments were filed on behalf of 13 carriers. They advised that United Airlines objects to the request.

On June 22, the RAA requested an extension of 2 weeks in the comment period to permit regional carriers to consider adequately and to offer comments regarding future slot allocation policies.

Extension of Comment Period

In consideration of the ATA and RAA petitions, the FAA concludes that extending the comment period until July 15 would serve the public interest. This minor extension will not affect the agency's ability to implement any new mechanism in a timely manner. Accordingly, the comment period for Notice No. 82-8 is extended and will close on July 15, 1982.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 91

Air traffic control.

(Secs. 307 (a) and (c), and 601(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. Sections 1348 (a) and (c), 1354(a), and 1421(a)); Sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. Section 1655(c)))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on June 23, 1982.

J. Lynn Helms,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 82-17458 Filed 6-25-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 1145

Hair Dryers Containing Asbestos; Withdrawal of Proposed Rule to Regulate Under the Consumer Product Safety Act

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Withdrawal of proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In 1979 the Commission proposed a rule to use the procedures available under the consumer Product Safety Act, rather than those of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, should regulatory action against hair dryers containing asbestos become necessary. Since the Commission now believes that no such regulatory action will be necessary, it is withdrawing the proposed rule.

DATE: The withdrawal is effective on July 28, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alan Shakin, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207; telephone (301) 492-6980.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: During 1979 the Commission began investigating a risk of injury associated with the inhalation of respirable asbestos fibers emitted in the airflow of hair dryers containing asbestos. If regulation of that risk proved necessary, the Commission preliminarily believed that the Consumer Product Safety Act would provide a more expeditious way of eliminating or reducing it than would the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. The Commission therefore proposed a rule, in accordance with the applicable statutory requirement (15 U.S.C. 2079(d)), finding that it would be "in the public interest" to regulate the hair dryer asbestos risk under the Consumer Product Safety Act. 44 FR 28828 (May 17, 1979).

After the Commission proposed the rule in May 1979, all of the affected manufacturers, importers, and private labelers acted voluntarily to recall the hair dryers containing respirable asbestos fibers. The Commission approved corrective action plans for all of those companies, and the public was notified of the recall on television, in newpapers, and by signs in stores. Consumers returned nearly two million of the hair dryers.

The Commission now believes that regulation of the risk will not be necessary. If regulation unexpectedly became necessary, the Commission could again propose a rule like the one proposed in May 1979.

The Commission hereby withdraws the proposed rule (16 CFR 1145.7) to regulate hair dryers containing asbestos under the Consumer Product Safety Act.

(Sec. 30(d), Pub. L. 92-573, 86 Stat. 1231, as amended, 90 Stat. 519, 92 Stat. 3742 (15 U.S.C. 2079(d))

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 1145

Consumer protection, cancer, asbestos.

Dated: June 23, 1982.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 82-17484 Filed 6-25-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner

24 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. R-82-980]

Property Improvement and Mobile Home Loans

AGENCY: Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Section 338 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 amended the National Housing Act to permit special loan limits for manufactured (mobile) homes and lots located in high cost area designations. This rule would increase the maximum loan limits by varying amounts up to $7,500 for single and multisection homes