

Building, Room 10202, Attention DOT/FAA Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Judith Street, ABC-100; Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591; Telephone number (202) 267-9895.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3507 of Title 44 of the United States Code, as adopted by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, requires that agencies prepare a notice for publication in the Federal Register, listing information collection requests submitted to OMB for approval or renewal under that Act. OMB reviews and approves agency submissions in accordance with criteria set forth in that Act. In carrying out its responsibilities, OMB also considers public comments on the proposed forms and the reporting and recordkeeping requirements. OMB approval of an information collection requirement must be renewed at least once every three years.

**Title:** Certification and Operations: Air Carriers and Commercial Operators of Large Aircraft-FAR 121.

**OMB Control Number:** 2120-0008.

**Abstract:** Each operation which seeks to obtain, or is in possession of, an air carrier operating certificate must comply with the requirements of FAR 121 in order to maintain data which is used to determine if the air carrier is operating in accordance with minimum standards.

**Need:** Title 49, United States Code, Section 44701, prescribes the requirements governing air carrier operations. Air carriers are respondents and the information collected is used to determine operators compliance and applicant eligibility.

**Respondents:** The respondents are an estimated 140 air carriers and commercial operators certificated under FAR 121.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Burden:** The estimated total burden is 3.3 million hours.

**Title:** Aviator Safety Studies.

**OMB Control Number:** 2120-0587.

**Abstract:** In order to conduct effective research on the contribution of pilots to aircraft accidents, data are required on the normative distribution of various pilot attributes and their association with accident

**Need:** In order to develop effective intervention programs to improve safety, data are required on the type and range of various pilot attributes related to their skill in making safety-related aeronautical decisions. The information collected will be used to develop new

training methods particularly suited to general aviation pilots.

**Respondents:** The respondents are an estimated 4,000 certified pilots.

**Frequency:** On occasion.

**Burden:** The estimated total burden is 8,000 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 27, 1996.

Phillip A. Leach,

Information Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 96-16864 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

### Petition for Modification of a Previously Approved Antitheft Device; Porsche

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Grant of petition for modification of a previously approved antitheft device.

**SUMMARY:** On June 2, 1989, this agency granted Porsche Cars of North America, Inc.'s (Porsche) petition for exemption from the parts-marking requirements of the vehicle theft prevention standard for the 911 and 928 car lines. On September 9, 1994, the agency determined that the proposed changes made on the 911 antitheft device for model year (MY) 1995 were *de minimis* changes and did not require Porsche to submit a petition to modify its exemption pursuant to 49 CFR 543.9(c)(2). This notice grants Porsche's petition for a new modification to its previously approved antitheft device for the 911 car line beginning with the 1998 model year. The agency grants this petition because it has determined, based on substantial evidence, that the modified antitheft device described in Porsche's petition to be placed on the car line as standard equipment is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rosalind Proctor, Office of Planning and Consumer Programs, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Proctor's telephone number is (202) 366-1740. Her fax number is (202) 493-2739.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In its MY 1989 petition, Porsche included a detailed description and diagrams of the identity, design, and location of the components of the antitheft device for the MY 1990 Porsche 911 and 928 car

lines. The antitheft device consisted of a central-locking system, a starter-interrupt feature and an audible and visible alarm system. The device was activated by locking either the driver or passenger door with the ignition key. When the ignition key was used to lock either the driver or passenger door, the remaining door was automatically locked. When all the doors were locked, the vehicle's alarm system automatically armed to monitor the protected areas of the vehicle. The alarm monitored the doors, front hood, rear trunk (911) or hatch (928), radio and ignition switch. If any of the protected areas were violated, the alarm horn would sound, and the fog and brake lights would flash. In its petition, Porsche stated that the car would not start as long as the alarm remained armed. Disarming the device was accomplished by unlocking either the driver or passenger door with the ignition key. The agency determined that the antitheft device Porsche intended to install on the MY 1990 911 and 928 car lines as standard equipment was likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements.

In its MY 1995 request for modification, Porsche included a detailed description of the identity, design and location of the components of the antitheft device, including diagrams of components and their location in the vehicle. Porsche stated that the MY 1995 device added a remote control, automatic activation and expanded anti-start features to the MY 1990 device. Porsche also described the antitheft device installed as standard equipment as passively activated. By letter dated September 9, 1994, the agency determined that the proposed changes made on the MY 1995 911 antitheft device were *de minimis* changes and did not require Porsche Cars North America, Inc. (Porsche) to submit a petition to modify its exemption. The agency determined that the antitheft device, which Porsche intended to install on the 911 car line as standard equipment, would be likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as would compliance with the parts-marking requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard.

By letter dated February 21, 1996, Porsche submitted its petition for a second modification to its previously approved antitheft device. Porsche's submittal is a complete petition, as required by 49 CFR 543.9(d), in that it meets the general requirements contained in § 543.5 and the specific content requirements of § 543.6.

Porsche stated that the antitheft device on the MY 1998 car line differs from the MY 1995 device in that it is simpler and better integrated. In the MY 1998 device, the disablement of the engine can only be accomplished by using the key in the ignition, while in the MY 1995 device it could be done through the use of the remote control. Also, in the MY 1995 antitheft device the vehicle could only be locked or unlocked using the remote control, while in the MY 1998 antitheft device, it can be done by using the key or the remote control.

The MY 1998 antitheft device will consist of a micro-processor based immobilizer system, which prevents the engine management system from functioning when the system is engaged, and a central-locking and alarm system. The immobilizer system is automatically activated by removing the correct key from the ignition switch/steering lock. The ignition key contains a radio signal transponder which sends a signal to the control unit to allow the engine to start. According to Porsche, only by inserting the proper key into the ignition switch will the correct signal be sent to the control unit. The time for the control unit to verify the correct signal takes only milliseconds and is completed in the time it takes to turn the key to start the engine. Disablement of the immobilizer system is virtually impossible, since the only way to enable the engine management system is by using the correct ignition key to send the proper code to the immobilizer system, which then signals the engine management system to operate. Removal of the key returns the device to its normal "off" state where engine operation is impossible. Therefore, even if the driver/operator forgets to lock the doors upon leaving the vehicle, an unauthorized person will be unable to move the vehicle unless the proper ignition key is used to disable the immobilizer system.

Porsche also stated that, for MY 1998, the antitheft device will feature a central-locking system that can be activated by using either the ignition key or the remote control. When either the ignition key or the remote control is used to lock any door, all doors are locked and the vehicle's alarm system is automatically armed to monitor the protected areas of the vehicle. The device monitors for opening of the doors, front luggage compartment, rear decklid, fuel filler door, soft top storage compartment, glove compartment, radio contact switches and interior movement via an infra-red sensor. If one of the protected areas of the vehicle is

violated, the horn will sound and the lights will flash.

The antitheft device will function separately from the immobilizer system in that the immobilizer system cannot be disabled by any manipulation of the door locks or the central-locking system. Porsche states that any manipulation of the door locks or the central-locking system will not disable the immobilizer system because neither the door locks or the central-locking system are capable of sending the necessary codes to the control unit. When the alarm system is armed, a "safe" function is activated that removes the mechanical link between the inside and outside door handles and the locking mechanism. This prevents the manipulation of the door handles from having any influence on the door locks.

Porsche states that an unauthorized person will be unable to operate the vehicle without the use of the proper key. Porsche also states that disconnection of power to the antitheft device or the engine management system does not affect their operation.

The immobilizer and alarm systems are located within the passenger compartment of the vehicle. The control unit is located under the driver seat and the battery and alarm horn are inaccessibly located inside the front trunk of the vehicle.

Porsche addressed the reliability and durability of its antitheft device by providing a list of specific tests that ensure the system's integrity. The tests included testing for extreme temperature, voltage spike, reverse polarity, electromagnetic interference, vibration and endurance. Additionally, the antitheft device utilizes a built-in self test which constantly checks for system failures. If a failure is detected, the driver/operator is signaled by the alarm indicator.

Porsche compares its MY 1998 antitheft device to similar devices that have previously been granted exemptions by the agency. It compared its proposed device to devices that do not have alarms such as the General Motors' PASS-Key device, the Mercedes-Benz 202 car line device and the Porsche MY 1997 (confidential nameplate) device. Porsche states that the agency has previously determined that these devices without alarms are as effective as parts marking. Therefore, Porsche contends that since the MY 1998 device will include the same features and an alarm as standard equipment, its device will also be as effective in reducing and deterring theft as parts marking. Based on data from the FBI's National Crime Information Center, NHTSA's official source of theft

data, Porsche showed that the theft rate of the Chevrolet Camaro fell below the median after installation of the PASS-Key device in MY 1989. Porsche reports that for MY 1988, the Chevrolet Camaro had a theft rate of 25.7394 (per thousand vehicles produced) and for MY 1993, it fell to 2.7243. Preliminary theft data for MY 1994 show that theft rates for the Chevrolet Camaro and Mercedes-Benz 202 car lines remain below the median of 3.5826. The preliminary data for MY 1994 show a theft rate of 3.5375 for the Chevrolet Camaro and 1.3810 for the Mercedes-Benz 202 car line. Porsche also stated that other GM models equipped with the PASS-KEY device, such as the Pontiac Firebird and Chevrolet Corvette, have shown large decreases in theft rates. Preliminary theft data for MY 1994 show a theft rate of 3.0927 for the Pontiac Firebird and 4.5884 for the Chevrolet Corvette. Additionally, Porsche reaffirmed that its MY 1998 device will provide engine disablement for its 911 line, which it believes is at least as effective as that provided by the GM PASS-Key device.

For these reasons, Porsche believes that the antitheft device proposed for installation on its 911 car line is likely to be as effective in reducing thefts as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of part 541.

NHTSA believes that there is substantial evidence indicating that the modified antitheft device installed as standard equipment on the MY 1998 Porsche 911 car line will likely be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the requirements of the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR part 541). This determination is based on the information that Porsche submitted with its petition and other available information. The agency believes that the modified device will continue to provide the types of performance listed in § 543.6(a)(3): promoting activation; attracting attention to unauthorized entries; preventing defeat or circumventing of the device by unauthorized persons; preventing operation of the vehicle by unauthorized entrants; and ensuring the reliability and durability of the device.

As required by 49 CFR 543.6(a)(4), the agency also finds that Porsche has provided adequate reasons for its belief that the modified antitheft device will reduce and deter theft. This information included a description of reliability and functional tests conducted by Porsche for the antitheft device and its components.

For the foregoing reasons, the agency hereby exempts the Porsche 911 car line that is the subject of this notice, in

whole, from the requirements of 49 CFR part 541.

If, in the future, Porsche decides not to use the exemption for the car line that is the subject of this notice, it should formally notify the agency. If such a decision is made, the car line must be fully marked according to the requirements under 49 CFR 541.5 and 541.6 (marking of major component parts and replacement parts).

NHTSA notes that if Porsche wishes in the future to modify the device on which this exemption is based, the company may have to submit a petition to modify the exemption. Section 543.7(d) states that a part 543 exemption applies only to vehicles that belong to a line exempted under this part and equipped with the antitheft device on which the line's exemption is based. Further, § 543.9(c)(2) provides for the submission of petitions "(t)o modify an exemption to permit the use of an antitheft device similar to but differing from the one specified in that exemption."

The agency wishes to minimize the administrative burden which § 543.9(c)(2) could place on exempted vehicle manufacturers and itself. The agency did not intend in drafting part 543 to require the submission of a modification petition for every change to the components or design of an antitheft device. The significance of many such changes could be *de minimis*. Therefore, NHTSA suggests that if the manufacturer contemplates making any changes the effects of which might be characterized as *de minimis*, it should consult the agency before preparing and submitting a petition to modify.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 33106; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: June 27, 1996.

Patricia Breslin,

Acting Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96-16840 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment

**AGENCY:** Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Veterans Benefits

Administration (VBA) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this information collection. This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13; 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Comments should address the accuracy of the burden estimates and ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology, as well as other relevant aspects of the information collection.

**DATES:** Written comments and recommendations on the proposal for the collection of information should be received by no later than September 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Nancy J. Kessinger, Veterans Benefits Administration (20M30), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20420. All comments will become a matter of public record and will be summarized in the VBA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. In this document the VBA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*OMB Control Number:* 2900-0055.

*Title and Form Number:* Request for Determination of Loan Guaranty Eligibility—Unremarried Surviving Spouses, VA Form 26-1817.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Need and Uses:* A completed VA Form 26-1817 constitutes a formal request by an unremarried surviving spouse of a veteran for a certificate of eligibility for home loan benefits. The information is used to determine the applicant's basic eligibility for the benefit.

*Current Actions:* Title 38, U.S.C., 3701(b)(2), authorizes the VA to extend home loan benefits to unremarried surviving spouses of veterans whose deaths occurred either while serving on active duty or were a direct result of service-connected disabilities.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 187 hours.

*Estimated Average Burden Per Respondent:* 15 minutes.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 750.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the form should be directed to Department of Veterans Affairs, Attn: Jacquie McCray, Information Management Service (045A4), 810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC

20420, Telephone (202) 273-8032 or FAX (202) 273-5981.

Dated: June 24, 1996.

By direction of the Secretary.

William T. Morgan,

Management Analyst.

[FR Doc. 96-16779 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on this information collection. This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13; 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Comments should address the accuracy of the burden estimates and ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology, as well as other relevant aspects of the information collection.

**DATES:** Written comments and recommendations on the proposal for the collection of information should be received by no later than September 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Nancy J. Kessinger, Veterans Benefits Administration (20M30), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20420. All comments will become a matter of public record and will be summarized in the VBA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. In this document VBA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*OMB Control Number:* 2900-0092.

*Title and Form Number:* Counseling Record—Personal Information, VA Form 28-1902.

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Need and Uses:* A counseling psychologist uses the form to evaluate veteran claimants and assist eligible veterans to plan a suitable program of vocational rehabilitation. If needed, VA must develop a program of assistance and services to improve the veteran's potential to participate in vocational