County	Current FY 1998 allocation	Additional allocation	New FY 1998 allocation
Argentina	56,832	8,731	65,563
Australia	109,699	16,853	126,552
Barbados	7,830	0	7,830
Belize	14,538	2,234	16,772
Bolivia	10,573	1,624	12,198
Brazil	191,642	29,442	221,084
Colombia	31,720	4,873	36,593
Congo	7,258	0	7,258
Cote d'Ivoire	7,258	0	7,258
Costa Rica	19,825	3,046	22,871
Dominican Republic	232,614	35,736	268,350
Ecuador	14,538	2,234	16,772
El Salvador	34,363	5,279	39,643
Figi	11,895	1,827	13,722
Gabon	7,258	0	7,258
Guatemala	63,440	9,746	73,186
Guyana	15,860	2,437	18,297
Haiti	7,258	0	7,258
Honduras	13,217	2,030	15,247
India	10,573	1,624	12,198
Jamaica	14,538	2,234	16,772
Madagascar	7,258	0	7,258
Malawi	13,217	2,030	15,247
Mauritius	15,860	2,437	18,297
Mexico	25,000	0	25,000
Mozambique	17,182	2,640	19,821
Nicaraque	27,755	4,264	32,019
Panama	38,328	5,888	44,217
Papua New Guinea	7,258	0	7,258
Paraguay	7,258	0	7,258
Peru	54,189	8,325	62,513
Philippines	178,426	27,411	205,837
South Africa	30,398	4,670	35,069
St. Kitts & Nevis	7,258	0	7,258
Swaziland	21,147	3,249	24,395
Taiwan	15,860	2,437	18,297
Thailand	18,503	2,843	21,346
Trinidad-Tobago	9,252	1,421	10,673
Uruguay	7,258	0	7,258
Zimbabwe	15,860	2,437	18,297
Total	1,4000,000	200,000	1,600,000

Each allocation to a country that is a net importer of sugar is conditioned on compliance with the requirements of section 902(c)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C 1446g note).

Charlene Barshefsky,

United States Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 98–13378 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Environmental Impact Statement on the Proposed Urban Rail Project Between the Fullerton Transportation Center and Irvine Transportation Center, Orange County, CA

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as lead agency, and the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) intend to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) on a proposal by OCTA to further study the proposed implementation of an urban rail system within a corridor 45 kilometers (28 miles) long and 9.7 kilometers (6 miles) wide between the Cities of Fullerton and Irvine, known as the Orange County Urban Rail (Urban Rail) Project. In addition to NEPA, the proposed project is subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), therefore, a joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/EIS will be prepared.

The EIR/EIS will evaluate the following alternatives: 1) The Local Preferred Strategy (LPS) Alignment Alternative. This alternative would follow the alignment identified in the Priority Corridor Major Investment Study, June 1997, on an elevated guideway. 2) A Lower Cost Alternative (LCA). This alternative would connect the Fullerton and Irvine Transportation Centers and would serve many of the activity centers in the Corridor along a route which minimizes the distance and number of freeway crossings. The system would be primarily at grade on local streets. 3) A No Build Alternative, which involves no change to transportation services or facilities in the corridor beyond already committed projects. Potential new feasible alternatives generated through the scoping process will also be considered.

Scoping will be accomplished through correspondence with interested

persons, organizations, and Federal, State, and local agencies; and one public scoping meeting

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be submitted by June 22, 1998. *Written comments* should be sent to Ms. Cindy Krebs, OCTA, 550 South Main Street, P.O. Box 14184, Orange, CA 92863. *Written comments* may also be made at the public scoping meeting scheduled below. *Scoping Meeting:* The public scoping meeting will take place on: Thursday, June 4, 1998 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Fullerton Senior Center. See **ADDRESS** below.

People with special needs should contact Cindy Krebs at OCTA at the address below or by calling (714) 560–5740. A TDD number is also available: (714) 636–4327. The building is accessible to people with disabilities.

The meeting will be held in an ''open-house'' format, and representatives will be available to discuss the project throughout the time periods given. Informational displays and written material will also be available throughout the time periods given.

ADDRESSES: *Written comments* should be sent to Ms. Cindy Krebs, OCTA, 550 South Main Street, P.O. Box 14184, Orange, CA 92863. *Written comments* may also be made at the public scoping meting as scheduled below. The *Scoping Meeting* will take place at the following location: Thursday, June 4, 1998 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., Fullerton Senior Center, 340 W. Commonwealth Ave., Fullerton, CA 92832.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Cindy Krebs, OCTA, 550 South Main Street, P.O. Box 14184, Orange, CA 92863, (714) 560–5740, or fax (714) 560–5794.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Scoping

FTA and OCTA invite interested individuals, organizations, and Federal, State, and local agencies to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS and identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. An information packet describing the purpose of the project, the location, the proposed alternatives, and the impact areas to be evaluated is being mailed to affected Federal, State, and local agencies. Others may request the scoping materials by contacting Ms. Cindy Krebs, OCTA, 550 South Main Street, P.O. Box 14184, Orange, CA 92863, (714) 560–5740, or fax (714) 560–5794. Scoping comments may be made in writing at the public scoping meeting. See the Scoping Meeting section above for the location and time. During scoping, comments should focus on identifying specific social, economic, or environmental impacts to be evaluated and suggesting alternatives that are less costly or less environmentally damaging while meeting the identified mobility needs. Scoping is not the appropriate time to indicate a preference for a particular alternative. Comments on preferences should be communicated after the Draft EIR/EIS has been completed. If you wish to be placed on the mailing list to receive further information as the project develops, contact: Ms. Cindy Krebs, OCTA, 550 South Main Street, P.O. Box 14184, Orange, CA 92863, (714) 560–5740, or fax (714) 560–5794.

II. Description of Study Area and Project Need

The study area extends from the City of Fullerton in a general southward direction through the Cities of Anaheim, Orange, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Costa Mesa and then eastward to the City of Irvine, California. The area is approximately 45 kilometers (28 miles) long and 9.7 kilometers (6 miles) wide.

The study corridor contains key activity, employment, and transportation facilities in Orange County such as: Fullerton College, Downtown Fullerton, Fullerton Transportation Center, Orangefair Mall, Downtown Anaheim, Disneyland, Anaheim Convention Center, Anaheim Stadium (Edison Field), Anaheim Amtrak Station, the Arrowhead Pond, the City Mills, the St. Joseph Children's Hospital, the Main Place Mall, Santa Ana Transportation Center, Downtown Santa Ana, the Federal, County and City Civic Center area, South Coast Plaza/Metro, Orange Coast College, John Wayne Airport, UCI, the Irvine Spectrum and Entertainment Center, and the Irvine Transportation Center.

This EIR/EIS is the logical next step in transportation planning and project development following OCTA's completion of a Major Investment Study (MIS) of the mobility needs in the study area. This MIS employed a far-reaching public involvement program, continuous coordination with affected and interested agencies, and a detailed evaluation of a wide range of alternatives to meet the identified mobility needs. As the MIS process was mode-neutral in nature, the public identified a comprehensive set of bus, road, and urban rail alternatives. Detailed analysis at a conceptual engineering level was completed for a set of alternatives to identify project cost, ridership, cost-effectiveness measurements, and environmental benefits and impacts. The results led to the development of a Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) that includes: (1) optimization of the present system through expanded bus service and increased Metrolink commuter rail service seats and (2) continued study of a light rail system between the Fullerton and Irvine Transportation Centers. This EIS focuses on the light rail alternative.

An effective multi-modal transportation network within the project study area is necessary to meet the future mobility needs of businesses and residents in Orange County. By the year 2020, despite current and planned transportation system improvements, the magnitude and nature of the County's population and employment growth trends are projected to result in continuing transportation challenges in the corridor area as evidenced by: increasing travel—approximately 1.8 million more daily trips; growing transit-reliant population—doubling of senior population; continuing freeway congestion—73 percent of the freeway system will operate at 30 m.p.h. or less during morning and evening peak periods; increasing arterial congestion—major intersections with delay will grow from four percent to 27 percent; and limited travel options—congested freeway and street system, and financially constrained bus and Metrolink service.

III. Alternatives

The alternatives proposed for evaluation include: (1) LPS Alignment Alternative. This alternative would follow the alignment identified in the Priority Corridor Major Investment Study (June, 1997), which provided for an elevated guideway from end to end within the arterial corridors. The elevated guideway would typically be supported on columns within the median. (2) A Lower Cost Alternative (LCA). This alternative would connect the Fullerton and Irvine Transportation Centers and would serve many of the activity centers in the Corridor along a route which minimizes the distance and number of freeway crossings. The system would be primarily at grade on local streets. (3) A No Build Alternative, which involves no change to transportation services or facilities in the corridor beyond already committed projects. Potential new feasible alternatives generated through the scoping process will also be considered.

IV. Probable Effects

FTA and OCTA will evaluate, in the EIR/EIS, all significant social, economic,

and environmental impacts of the alternatives. The previous MIS study evaluated these impacts at a corridor level of detail for the LPS Alternative alignment. These issues will be evaluated at a project level of detail in the Draft EIR/EIS. Among the primary transit issues to be evaluated are the expected increase in transit ridership, the expected increase in mobility for the corridor's transit dependent, the support of the region's air quality goals, the capital outlays needed to construct the project, the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities created by the project, and the financial impacts on the funding agencies. Potentially affected environmental and social resources proposed for analysis include land use and neighborhood impacts, residential and business displacements and relocations, traffic and parking impacts near stations, traffic circulation, visual impacts, impacts on cultural and archaeological resources, and noise and vibration impacts. Impacts on air and water quality, groundwater, hazardous waste sites, and water resources will also be covered. The impacts will be evaluated both for the construction period and for the long-term period of operation. Measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts will be considered.

V. FTA Procedures

The EIR/EIS and the conceptual engineering for the Urban Rail project will be prepared simultaneously. The EIR/EIS/conceptual engineering process will assess the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives while refining their design to minimize and mitigate any adverse impacts. After its publication, the Draft EIR/EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment, and a public hearing will be held. On the basis on the Draft EIR/EIS and comments received, OCTA will select a preferred alternative to carry forward into the Final EIR/EIS and complete engineering. Following this action by OCTA, OCTA will request FTA authorization to proceed with the Final EIS/EIR and complete engineering.

Issued: May 15, 1998.

Leslie Rogers,

Regional Administrator Federal Transit Administration Region IX.

[FR Doc. 98–13438 Filed 5–19–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–98–3782; Notice 1]

Laforza Automobiles, Inc.; Receipt of Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208

Laforza Automobiles, Inc., of Escondido, California, (''Laforza'') has applied for a temporary exemption from the automatic restraint requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*, as described below. The basis of the application is that compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard.

This notice of receipt of an application is published in accordance with the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 30113(b)(2) and does not represent any judgment of the agency on the merits of the application.

Laforza is a Nevada corporation established in August 1997. To date it has produced no motor vehicles. It intends to purchase chassis from Magnum Industriales s.r.l., an Italian company, ''where it will undergo the necessary modifications for the US market.'' A Ford engine, transmission, and associated emission control systems will be installed, and the end result will be a multipurpose passenger vehicle (sport utility) called the Prima 4X4. Laforza estimates a total production of 400 units between the date of the exemption and December 31, 2000. This is the date that its requested temporary exemption would expire.

Laforza seeks an exemption from S4.2.6.1.1 and S4.2.6.2 of Standard No. 208. Paragraph S4.2.6.1.1, in pertinent part, would require Laforza to provide a driver side airbag on not less than 80 percent of all Primas manufactured before September 1, 1998. Paragraph S4.2.6.2 would require all Primas manufactured on and after September 1, 1998, to be equipped with both driver and right front passenger airbags. Although the passenger side airbag is not required until September 1 of this year, ''the airbag development program has to include both the passenger and driver side airbags since the development duration for a driver's side airbag would overlap the time when a passenger's side airbag will be required.'' Laforza continues, ''If the development is not combined, many of these tests would have to be repeated with a significant increase in test and material costs.''

In the first 6 months after its agreement with Magnum, Laforza spent ''an estimated total of 200 manhours and $15,000'' on airbag compliance issues. Lacking the resources to independently develop an airbag system, it ''has contacted airbag development companies in the US to assist with the project.'' Laforza has concluded that it will take 2 years to develop and certify the system. If immediate compliance were required, the cost would be $4,000,000. An exemption would permit Laforza to generate revenues ''to meet the costs mandated by the airbag development program'' and spread these costs over a period of time. Because the company is less than a year old, it could not submit corporate balance sheets and income statements for the three years immediately preceding the filing of its application, as specified by NHTSA's regulation. Its stockholder equity is $900,000.

Laforza argues that ''production of the Laforza Prima 4X4 is in the best interest of the public and the US economy,'' pointing to the uniqueness of the vehicle, and the American components that it incorporates, the powertrain from Ford Motor Company and the purchase of ''other parts * * * from approximately five different US companies.'' The company currently employs 15 people full-time and three people part time, which will grow as production increases. Further, ''in addition, * * * at least 50 employees from other companies are involved in the Laforza project.'' During the exemption period, the Prima will be ''equipped with a conventional retractor type, three-point driver and passenger seatbelt system that meets all requirements of FMVSS No. 208,'' and the vehicle otherwise complies with all Federal motor vehicle safety standards that apply to it.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the application described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and the notice number, and be submitted to: Central Docket Management Facility, room Pl–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated below will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket (from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.) at the above address both before and after that date. Comments may also be viewed on the internet at web site dms.dot.gov. To the extent possible, comments filed after the