

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public that the October 22–23 meeting of the Federal Aviation Administration Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee, scheduled to discuss Transport Airplane and Engine Issues (61 FR 53778, October 15, 1996), has been cancelled.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jackie Smith, Federal Aviation Administration (ARM–209), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–9682; fax (202) 267–5075.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 18, 1996.

Chris A. Christie,

Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 96–27205 Filed 10–18–96; 3:49 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. M–024]

Information Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Maritime Administration's (MARAD's) intentions to request extension of approval for three years of a currently approved information collection.

DATES: Comments should be submitted on or before (Sixty days following date of publication in Federal Register).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Lippold, Office of Ship Financing, Maritime Administration, MAR–530, Room 8122, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Telephone 202–366–1907 or fax 202–366–7901. Copies of this collection can also be obtained from that office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title of Collection: 46 CFR Part 298—Title XI Obligation Guarantees

Type of Request: Extension of currently approved information collection

OMB Control Number: 2133–0018

Form Number: MA–163

Expiration Date of Approval: January 31, 1997.

Summary of Collection of Information: Under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1271–1279) (the Act), the Maritime Administration (MARAD) is authorized to execute a full faith and credit guarantee by the United States of debt obligations issued to finance or refinance the construction or

reconstruction of vessels. In November 1994, the title XI program was expanded to permit issuance of loan guarantees for financing export vessels built in the United States and for shipyard modernization and improvement projects.

Need and Use of the Information: Prior to execution of a loan guarantee, the Act requires the Secretary of Transportation must, among other things, make determinations of economic soundness of the project and financial and operating capability of the applicant. The Secretary of Transportation has delegated this authority (See 49 CFR 1.66(e)) to the Maritime Administrator. The information collected is necessary to evaluate the project and capabilities, make the required determinations, and administer any agreements executed upon approval of loan guarantees.

Description of Respondents: Individuals/businesses interested in obtaining loan guarantees for construction/reconstruction of vessels satisfying criteria under the Act.

Annual Responses: 25

Annual Burden: 2,000 hours

Comments: Send all comments regarding this information collection to Joel C. Richard, Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR–120, Room 7210, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Send comments regarding whether this information collection is necessary for proper performance of the function of the agency and will have practical utility, accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to minimize this burden, and ways to enhance quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Dated: October 18, 1996.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–27171 Filed 10–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

Notice of Merger of Approved Trustee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to Public Law 100–710 and 46 CFR Part 221, that effective June 27, 1996, Meridian Bank, with offices at 35 North Sixth Street, Reading, Pennsylvania, 19601, has merged with and into CoreStates, N.A. As a result, the former Meridian Bank, is now CoreStates Bank N.A.

Dated: October 17, 1996.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–27172 Filed 10–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

Notice of Merger of Approved Trustee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to Public Law 100–710 and 46 CFR Part 221, that effective June 1, 1996, First Interstate Bank of Oregon, N.A., with offices at 1300 S. W. Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97208, has merged with and into Wells Fargo Bank, National Association. As a result, First Interstate Bank of Oregon, N.A., is now named Wells Fargo Bank, National Association.

Dated: October 17, 1996.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–27173 Filed 10–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 96–049; Notice 1]

Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Request for public comment on proposed collections of information.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under new procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatements of previously approved collections.

This document describes four collections of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments must refer to the docket and notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to Docket Section, Room 5109, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Please identify the proposed collection of information for which a comment is provided, by referencing its OMB Clearance Number. It is requested, but not required, that 1 original plus 2 copies of the comments

be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Complete copies of each request for collection of information may be obtained at no charge from Mr. Ed Kosek, NHTSA Information Collection Clearance Officer, NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 6123, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Kosek's telephone number is (202) 366-2589. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Clearance Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must publish a document in the Federal Register providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulations (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks public comment on the following proposed collection of information:

Consolidated Labeling Requirement for 49 CFR 571.115, and Parts 565, 541, and 567

Type of Request—Reinstatement of clearance.

OMB Clearance Number—2127-0510.

Form Number—This collection of information uses no standard forms.

Requested Expiration Date of

Approval—Three years from date of approval.

Summary of the Collection of Information—Under 49 CFR 571.115

and Part 565, provisions are made which specify the format and content for a vehicle identification number (VIN) system and the general physical requirements for a VIN and its installation to simplify vehicle information retrieval. This system will aid NHTSA in reducing the incidence of accidents by increasing the accuracy and efficiency of vehicle recall campaigns and in achieving many of its safety goals. Manufacturers are required to assign a unique VIN to each new vehicle and to inform NHTSA of the code used in forming the VIN. The regulations apply to passenger cars, multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, buses, trailers, incomplete vehicles, and motorcycles.

Part 541 requires manufacturers to either label or affix a VIN to specific major component parts of certain passenger motor vehicles, multipurpose passenger vehicles, and light-duty trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of 6,000 pounds or less. Replacement component parts must be marked with the "DOT" symbol, the letter "R", and the manufacturer's logo.

Part 567 requires the VIN to be appear on the certification label.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use of the information—State motor vehicle administrations, law enforcement organizations, and other agencies utilize the unique VIN as a means of identifying motor vehicles that are registered within their state. NHTSA utilizes this vehicle identification number to identify motor vehicles that are subject to defect notices. NHTSA also uses these VINs to calculate motor vehicle theft rates by model year/calendar year as required by Section 603 of the Cost Savings Act.

Under Part 565, vehicle manufacturers are required to identify those trucks and multipurpose passenger vehicles manufactured between September 1, 1993, and September 1, 1995, that are equipped with automatic occupant crash protection (such as air bags or automatic belts). If this information were *not* available, NHTSA would not be able to determine if trucks or multipurpose passenger vehicles equipped with an air bag or an automatic safety belt are being certified as being in compliance with Federal Standard 208. This lack of information would seriously hinder the agency's efforts to select vehicles for purchase on the open market for the purposes of conducting crash tests to "spot check" a manufacturer's compliance. If each vehicle were not labeled with a VIN and if the VIN information were not collected by

NHTSA, these programs which require vehicle identification would not be possible.

The identification of major parts of high-theft motor vehicle lines is designed to decrease automobile theft by making it more difficult for criminals to "chop" vehicles into component parts and then fence such parts. The information would aid law enforcement officials at all levels of Government in the investigation of "chop shops" by creating evidence for prosecution of the operators for possession of stolen motor vehicle parts. Major parts are marked on high-theft vehicle lines. Operators of both "chop shops" and auto body repair shops would avoid possession of parts bearing identification that links the parts to a stolen vehicle. Thus, Congress intends major parts identification to decrease the market for stolen parts and therefore, to decrease the incentive for motor vehicle theft.

If this information were not available, the legislative goal of a comprehensive scheme against automobile theft would be frustrated. The Theft Prevention Statute would not effectively deter "chop shop" operators because law enforcement officials could not readily identify parts in the operators' possession as stolen. Also, stolen parts, when recovered, could not easily be traced back to the proper owner and returned to the owner or insurer. Further, failure to require parts' identification would violate the Theft Prevention Statute.

Description of the Likely Respondents (Including Estimated Number, and Proposed Frequency of Response to the Collection of Information)—All foreign and domestic manufacturers are potential respondents. NHTSA estimates 1,000 respondents per year with a frequency of approximately 18,670,000 responses. The responses are an estimation of the total production of motor vehicles and replacement parts.

Estimate of the Total Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden Resulting from the Collection of Information—The agency estimates that approximately 64 percent of all passenger motor vehicles produced would be selected as high-theft models subject to the standard. Assuming 18 million passenger motor vehicle sales per year, 11.52 million motor vehicles annually would be covered. Costs of compliance are estimated at \$10.00 per vehicle for stamped identifiers, and \$5.20 per vehicle for label identifiers. The total annual fleet costs are, thus, estimated at \$115.2 million for stamped identifiers (\$10.00 × 11.52 million) and \$59.9 million for label identifiers (\$5.20 × 11.52 million).

Authority: 440 U.S.C. 3506(c); delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Dated: September 19, 1996.

L. Robert Shelton,

Acting Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 96-27164 Filed 10-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

Research and Special Programs Administration

Pipeline Safety User Fee Assessment Methodology

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) invites representatives of industry, state and local government, and the public to an open meeting on pipeline safety user fee assessments. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information on the present assessment methods used by RSPA in determining pipeline safety user fees and to explore a broad range of other approaches for assessing user fees.

DATES: The meeting will be held on November 22, 1996, 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the U.S. Department of Transportation 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. Room 6200-04.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marvin Fell, (202) 366-6205, U.S. Department of Transportation, RSPA 400 Seventh St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 regarding the subject matter of this notice, or the Dockets Unit (202) 366-5046, regarding copies of this notice or other material referenced in this notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Accountable Pipeline Safety and Partnership Act of 1996 Section 60127 requires that, "[t]he Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a report analyzing the present assessment of pipeline safety user fees solely on the basis of mileage to determine whether—

(1) That measure of the resources of the Department of Transportation is the most appropriate measure of the resources used by the Department of Transportation in the regulation of pipeline transportation; or

(2) Another basis of assessment would be a more appropriate measure of those resources:

(b) Considerations—In making the report, the Secretary shall consider a wide range of assessment factors and

suggestions and comments from the public."

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 60103, gas and hazardous liquid pipeline operators pay annual user fees to fund the U.S. Department of Transportation's Pipeline Safety program. The Act provides that a fee shall be imposed on each person operating a pipeline transmission facility, a liquefied natural gas facility, or a hazardous liquid pipeline facility to which chapter 601 of 49 U.S.C. applies. The Act requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish a schedule of fees for pipeline usage that bear a reasonable relationship to the miles of pipeline, volume-miles, revenues or an appropriate combination thereof. In establishing the schedule, the Secretary must take into account the allocation of Departmental resources.

After discussions with the major trade associations representing these industries a consensus was reached that pipeline mileage provides the most reasonable basis for determining fees to be paid by operators of gas transmission lines and hazardous liquid pipeline facilities. For LNG facilities it was determined that storage capacity was the appropriate basis for a fee.

In order to reduce its administrative burden, RSPA decided to exempt small operators from the payment of user fees so that those operators would not be unduly burdened. Operators with less than 10 miles of gas transmission lines and 30 miles of hazardous liquid pipelines would therefore be exempt. Further, it was concluded that charging fees to local distribution companies (LDCs) would be administratively burdensome because many LDCs are small operators. The imposition of such fees could result in a double counting against LDCs because transmission operators would likely pass along the costs of these fees to LDCs as a cost of doing business.

In choosing to use pipeline mileage (and facility capacity in the case of LNG) RSPA chose an assessment method that minimizes the administrative expenses of collection. However, this method of assessment may not reflect how RSPA allocates its resources in regulating pipelines. For example, new construction inspections are not factored into mileage-based user fees. Presently, companies are charged the same fee regardless of accident history, although RSPA resources may be expended disproportionately on companies with poor safety records. The questions below address some of the issues concerning the present assessment methodology:

(1) Should RSPA charge a fee for new construction?

(2) Should RSPA charge a fee on LDCs to recognize that some of RSPA's resources are devoted to regulating these operators?

(3) Should RSPA consider accident history when computing fees?

(4) Should other risk based measures be considered?

(5) Should volume be considered in the fee calculation?

(6) Should throughput, i.e., volume-mileage, be considered?

(7) Should diameter of the pipeline be considered a cost factor?

(8) Should location be a factor in determining the user fee? Does a pipeline in a densely populated area or an environmentally sensitive area require greater oversight than a pipeline in a remote area that is not environmentally sensitive?

(9) Will RSPA need to require an annual report from liquid operators, which currently do not provide such reports, to collect information necessary for an alternative to the present assessment method? What could this mean to the administrative costs and paperwork burden of these operators?

RSPA seeks comments on these issues and any other concerns the public has on the assessment of user fees, including any ideas to improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of collection.

Interested persons are invited to attend the meeting and present oral or written statements on the matters set for the meeting. Any person who wishes to speak should notify Marvin Fell at the above address. Please estimate the time that will be required for your presentation. RSPA reserves the right to limit the time of each speaker, if necessary, to ensure that everyone who requests an opportunity to speak is allocated sufficient time. Interested parties that are not scheduled to comment will have an opportunity to comment after all presentations are completed with the approval of the meeting officer.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 17, 1996.

Richard B. Felder,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 96-27120 Filed 10-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

Toward A Metric America—A Dialogue Open to the Public

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.