and subscribers may call as well as all others.

Agreement No.: 224–201043.

Title: Port of Oakland/Ocean Management, Inc. D/B/A FESCO, Agencies North America Line (''FESCO'').

Parties: Port of Oakland, Ocean Management, Inc. d/b/a/FESCO Agencies North America Line.

Synopsis: The proposed Agreement provides that FESCO will have nonexclusive right to certain assigned premises at the Port's Charles P. Howard Terminal, for berthing, loading and discharging of its vessels and related liner operations. The term of the Agreement is for five years.

Dated: December 23, 1997.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–33868 Filed 12–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TIME AND DATE: 11:00 a.m., Monday, January 5, 1998.

PLACE: Marriner S. Eccles Federal Reserve Board Building, 20th and C Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20551.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Personnel actions (appointments, promotions, assignments, reassignments, and salary actions) involving individual Federal Reserve System employees.

2. Any items carried forward from a previously announced meeting.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Joseph R. Coyne, Assistant to the Board; 202–452–3204.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: You may call 202–452–3206 beginning at approximately 5 p.m. two business days before the meeting for a recorded announcement of bank and bank holding company applications scheduled for the meeting; or you may contact the Board's Web site at http://www.bog.frb.fed.us for an electronic announcement that not only lists applications, but also indicates procedural and other information about the meeting.

Dated: December 24, 1997.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97–34069 Filed 12-24-97; 11:12 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 971–0026]

Shell Oil Company; Texaco Inc.; Analysis To Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before March 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, room 159, 6th St. and Pa. Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Baer, Federal Trade Commission, 6th & Pennsylvania Ave., NW, H–374, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–2932. George Cary, Federal Trade Commission, 6th & Pennsylvania Ave., NW, H–374, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–3741.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46, and § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the accompanying complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the Commission Actions section of the FTC Home Page (for December 19, 1997), on the World Wide Web, at ''http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions97.htm.'' A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, room H–130, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326–3627. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

I. Introduction

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') has accepted from Shell Oil Co. (''Shell'') and Texaco Inc. (''Texaco'') (collectively ''Proposed Respondents'') an Agreement Containing Consent Order (''Proposed Consent Order''). The Commission has also entered into a Hold Separate Agreement that requires Proposed Respondents to hold separate and maintain certain divested assets. The Proposed Consent Order remedies the likely anticompetitive effects, in seven geographic markets, arising from certain aspects of Proposed Respondents' joint venture.

II. Description of the Parties and the Transaction

Shell, which is headquartered in Houston, TX, is one of the world's largest integrated oil companies. Among its other businesses, Shell operates petroleum refineries that make various grades of gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene jet fuel, among other petroleum products, and Shell sells these products to intermediaries, retailers and consumers. It owns or leases approximately 3,400 gasoline stations nationally and sells gasoline to jobbers or gasoline dealers that operate another 5,000 retail outlets throughout the United States. During fiscal year 1996, Shell sold about $8.66 billion of gasoline nationally and had revenues from downstream operations (refining, transportation, and marketing of petroleum products) of approximately $22.7 billion.

Texaco, which is headquartered in White Plains, NY, is another of the world's largest integrated oil companies. Among its other businesses, Texaco operates petroleum refineries in the United States that make gasoline, diesel fuel, kerosene jet fuel, and other petroleum products, and sells those products throughout the midwestern and western United States. Texaco owns one-half of Star Enterprises, Inc., a joint venture between Texaco and Saudi Refining, Inc. Star also operates refineries and markets gasoline and other petroleum products, under the Texaco name, in the southeastern and eastern United States. About 14,000 retail outlets sell Texaco-branded gasoline throughout the United States. In fiscal year 1996, Texaco and Star earned about $207 million in profits from their downstream operations; in 1996, Texaco had worldwide revenues of approximately $45.5 billion.

On or about March 18, 1997, Shell and Texaco entered into a memorandum of understanding to form a limited liability corporation (''LLC''), to be known as ''Westco,'' into which Shell and Texaco would transfer their refining and marketing businesses and assets in the midwestern and western United States, together with their pipeline and other transportation interests throughout the United States. On or about July 16, 1997, Shell, Texaco and Saudi Refining entered into a memorandum of understanding to form a second LLC, to be known as ''Eastco,'' into which Shell and Star would transfer their refining and marketing businesses and assets in the southeastern and eastern United States. (Eastco and Westco are referred to jointly or separately as ''Joint Venture.'')

III. The Proposed Complaint and Consent Order

The Commission has entered into an agreement containing a Proposed Consent Order with Shell and Texaco in settlement of a proposed complaint. The proposed complaint alleges that the proposed Joint Venture violates Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45, and that consummation of the Joint Venture would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18, and Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The proposed complaint alleges that the Joint Venture will lessen competition in each of the following markets: (1) Conventional gasoline and kerosene jet fuel in the Puget Sound area of Washington State (i.e., the cities of Seattle, Tacoma, Olympia, Bremerton and surrounding areas); (2) conventional gasoline and kerosene jet fuel in the Pacific Northwest (i.e., the States of Washington and Oregon west of the Cascade mountains); (3) CARB gasoline (specially formulated gasoline required in California) in the State of California; (4) asphalt in the northern portion of the State of California (approximately north of Fresno); (5) transportation of refined light petroleum products to the inland portions of the State of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee (i.e., the portions more than 50 miles from ports such as Savannah, Charleston, Wilmington and Norfolk) (''inland Southeast''); (6) CARB gasoline in San Diego County, CA; and (7) conventional gasoline and diesel fuel on the island of Oahu, HI.

To remedy the alleged anticompetitive effects of the Joint Venture, the Proposed Consent Order requires Proposed Respondents: (1) To divest Shell's refinery located in Anacortes, WA (''Anacortes Refinery''), and to allow all of Shell's branded dealers and jobbers in Washington and Oregon to enter into supply contracts with the acquirer of that refinery, notwithstanding the existence of any long-term contracts or termination penalties; (2) to divest either Texaco's interest in the Colonial pipeline or Shell's interest in the Plantation pipeline; (3) to divest gasoline stations in San Diego County representing a sufficient volume to establish a viable wholesale competitor; and (4) to divest the terminal and retail operations of either Shell or Texaco on Oahu. Each divestiture must be made to an acquirer that receives the prior approval of the Commission and in a manner approved by the Commission, and must be completed within six months of the Commission's final issuance of the consent order. Proposed Respondents must also enter into and maintain a ten-year agreement to supply Huntway Refining Company with undiluted heavy crude oil. The Proposed Consent Order provides that no amendment to the Huntway supply agreement relating to price, volume or termination will be effective until approved by the Commission.

For ten (10) years after the consent order becomes final, the Proposed Respondents are prohibited from entering into a joint venture or other affiliation involving or acquiring petroleum refining or marketing assets in Alaska, California, Oregon and Washington valued at $100 million or more, without giving prior notice to the Commission, where such venture would not be subject to the reporting requirements of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. 18a.

Proposed Respondents are required to provide the Commission with a report of compliance with the consent order within sixty (60) days following the date that the consent order becomes final, every sixty (60) days thereafter until the divestitures are completed, and annually for a period of ten (10) years.

Proposed Respondents also have entered into a Hold Separate Agreement. Under the terms of this Agreement, until the divestiture of the Shell Anacortes Refinery has been completed, Proposed Respondents must maintain the Shell Anacortes Refinery as a separate, competitively viable business, and not combine it with the operations of the Joint Venture. Under the terms of the Proposed Consent Order, Proposed Respondents must also maintain the other assets to be divested in a manner that will preserve their viability, competitiveness and marketability, must not cause their wasting or deterioration, and cannot sell, transfer, or otherwise impair the marketability or viability of the assets to be divested. The Proposed Consent Order and the Hold Separate Agreement specify these obligations in detail.

The FTC staff conducted the investigation leading to the Proposed Consent Order in collaboration with the Attorneys General of the States of California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington. As part of this joint effort, Proposed Respondents have entered into agreements with these States settling charges that the Joint Venture would violate both state and federal antitrust laws. To avoid conflicts between the Proposed Consent Order and the State consent decrees, the Commission has agreed to extend the time for divesting particular assets if all of the following conditions are satisfied: (1) Proposed Respondents have fully complied with the Proposed Consent Order; (2) Proposed Respondents submit a complete application in support of the divestiture of the assets and businesses to be divested within four months after the Commission's final approval of the consent order (two months before the required divestitures must be completed); (3) the Commission has in fact approved a divestiture; but (4) Proposed Respondents have certified to the Commission within ten days after the Commission's approval of a divestiture that a State has not approved that divestiture. If these conditions are satisfied, the Commission will not appoint a trustee or seek civil penalties for an additional sixty days, in order to allow Proposed Respondents either to satisfy the State's concerns or to produce an acquirer acceptable to the Commission and the State. If the State remains unsatisfied at the end of that additional period, the Commission may appoint a trustee and seek penalties.

IV. Resolution of the Competitive Concerns

The Proposed Consent Order alleviates the alleged competitive concerns arising from the Joint Venture in seven geographic markets, which are discussed below.

A. Refining of Conventional Gasoline, Kerosene Jet Fuel, and CARB Gasoline

Four companies operate refineries in and around Seattle, WA, and one company operates a small refinery in Tacoma, WA. Shell and Texaco operate refineries in Anacortes, WA, and produce conventional gasoline and kerosene jet fuel, among other products. Shell also produces CARB gasoline. Conventional gasoline and kerosene jet fuel are each product markets, because operators of gasoline-fueled automobiles and of jet aircraft are unlikely to switch to other fuels in response to a small but significant and nontransitory increase in the price of gasoline or kerosene jet fuel, respectively.

Puget Sound is a relevant antitrust geographic market for conventional gasoline because the refiners in this market can profitably raise prices by a small but significant and nontransitory amount without losing significant sales to other refiners. The five Seattle refineries supply virtually all of the conventional gasoline consumed in the Puget Sound market. The nearest refineries, located in California, Alaska, and Canada, are unlikely to divert gasoline from their current markets into Puget Sound in response to a small but significant and nontransitory increase in price because of transportation costs and limited access to a sufficient number of independent retail outlets. A Puget Sound price increase likely would not be defeated even if Puget Sound refiners were unable to raise price in Portland, OR, since Puget Sound refiners could price discriminate between Puget Sound and Portland.

The Joint Venture may also adversely affect competition in the broader geographic market of the Pacific Northwest. This market is supplied by the refiners in Washington, one refinery in San Francisco, and one refinery in Alaska. Other refiners are unlikely to enter this market. Customers in the Pacific Northwest will not practicably turn outside the market to obtain supplies for a small but significant and nontransitory increase in price. After the Joint Venture, the Puget Sound refiners could coordinate their prices. As measured by refinery capacity, the Joint Venture will increase the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (''HHI'') for conventional gasoline in Puget Sound by 1318 points to 3812, and increase the HHI in the Pacific Northwest by 561 points to 2896.

The refiners in Puget Sound also supply all of the jet fuel used by airlines at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Three refiners bid to supply the airlines flying into that airport, which receives all of its jet fuel supplies by the Olympic Pipeline. Only four refiners, including Shell and Texaco, practicably can send jet fuel through that pipeline. These refiners thus have a cost advantage over more distant refiners. The Joint Venture will eliminate one of these firms as an independent bidder, raising the likelihood that the incumbents could raise prices by a small but significant and nontransitory amount before alternative supplies flow into the market. The Joint Venture will raise the HHI in this market by 481 points to 5248.

Airlines in Portland can and do obtain fuel supplies from the refiners that use the Olympic Pipeline as well as from a refinery in the San Francisco area. The Joint Venture will eliminate one of these firms as an independent bidder, thus allowing the remaining bidders to raise prices above competitive levels. Accordingly, for airlines in Portland, the relevant geographic market is the Pacific Northwest. The Joint Venture will raise the HHI in this market by 258 points to 2503.

California requires a special formulation of gasoline, known as ''CARB gasoline,'' which is more expensive to produce than conventional gasoline. The product market in California is therefore CARB gasoline because, by law, consumers in that state have no alternative. Most refiners in California, as well as Shell's refinery at Anacortes, can make CARB gasoline. Shell and Texaco both market CARB gasoline in California. Prices would have to rise by more than a small but significant amount over current and projected levels to induce refiners outside the West Coast to make CARB gasoline and transport it to California by tanker. The market is moderately concentrated and will be moderately concentrated after the Joint Venture. The proposed transaction will raise the HHI by 154 points to 1635.

For all three fuels in all the geographic markets, the products are homogeneous, and wholesale prices are publicly available and widely reported to the industry. Refiners therefore readily can identify firms that deviate from a coordinated or collusive price. Existing exchange agreements likely will facilitate identifying and punishing those deviating from a coordinated or collusive price. Industry members have raised prices in the past by selling products outside the market, sometimes at a loss, in order to remove supplies that had been exerting downward pressure on prices. Entry by a refiner is unlikely to be timely, likely, and sufficient to defeat an anticompetitive price increase because of environmental constraints and because new refining capacity requires substantial sunk costs. The transaction could raise the costs of conventional and CARB gasoline and kerosene jet fuel in these markets by more than $150 million.

To remedy the harm, Section II of the Proposed Consent Order requires the Proposed Respondents to divest Shell's Anacortes refinery, which refines all of the products at issue (including CARB gasoline) and sells into all of the relevant markets (including California). This divestiture will eliminate the refining overlap in the Puget Sound and Pacific Northwest markets, and reduce the increase in concentration (HHI) in the California CARB gasoline market to less than 100 points. The Proposed Consent Order also requires Shell to allow its dealers and jobbers in Washington and Oregon the opportunity to become affiliated with the acquirer. This will increase the likelihood that a viable competitor has access to gasoline and retail outlets from which it can sell the gasoline.

B. Transportation of Undiluted Heavy Crude Oil to the San Francisco Bay Area

Texaco owns a heated pipeline (''THPL'') that carries undiluted heavy crude oil from the San Joaquin Valley of California to refineries in the San Francisco Bay area. THPL is the only source of undiluted heavy crude into that area. Huntway Refining Company is an asphalt refiner in the Bay area, and Shell is the only other refiner of asphalt in northern California. Shell and Huntway together make about 85 percent of the asphalt used in northern California. Both Shell and Huntway buy undiluted heavy crude from Texaco, transported by the THPL, and refine that oil into asphalt (among other products). Northern California (north of Fresno) is the relevant geographic market for asphalt because asphalt refineries outside the region are not competitive alternatives for most customers. The transaction would allow the Joint Venture to raise Huntway's costs by increasing prices of undiluted heavy crude to Huntway relative to the price charged to Shell. (Huntway's costs would increase if it were required to purchase more expensive lighter crudes or diluted heavy crudes). Shell could therefore raise prices of asphalt to consumers or prevent Huntway from cutting its price. Entry is unlikely to defeat this price increase. In the absence of the Proposed Consent Order, the Joint Venture could raise costs to asphalt buyers in northern California by more than three-quarters of a million dollars.

Section VII of the Proposed Consent Order eliminates this risk by requiring the Proposed Respondents to enter into a 10-year supply agreement with Huntway, the terms of which must be approved by the Commission. The parties have in fact entered into such an agreement, which constitutes a confidential exhibit to the Proposed Consent Order. The Proposed Consent Order prohibits the Joint Venture from increasing the price or reducing the volume of crude oil supplied to Huntway, and also prohibits Proposed Respondents from terminating the supply agreement (except on terms identified in that agreement). The Proposed Consent Order also provides that any amendment relating to an increase in price, a decrease in volume, or termination is ineffective until approved by the Commission.

C. Transportation of Refined Light Petroleum Products to the Inland Southeast

The inland Southeast receives essentially all of its refined light petroleum products (including gasoline, diesel fuel and jet fuel) from either the Colonial pipeline or the Plantation pipeline. These two pipelines basically run parallel to each other from Louisiana to Washington, DC, and directly compete to provide petroleum product transportation services in the inland Southeast. Texaco owns approximately 14 percent of Colonial and has representation on the Colonial board of directors. Shell owns approximately 24 percent of Plantation and has representation on Plantation's board.

The proposed transaction would put the Joint Venture in a position to influence the decisions of both pipelines. The Proposed Respondents would also be privy to confidential competitive information of each pipeline. The effect of the Joint Venture might be substantially to lessen competition, including price and service competition, between the two pipelines. The Commission has previously recognized that control of overlapping interests in these two pipelines might substantially reduce competition in the market for transportation of light petroleum products to this section of the country. *Chevron Corp.*, 104 F.T.C. 597, 601, 603 (1984). To prevent the competitive harm from the Joint Venture, Section V of the Proposed Consent Order requires the Proposed Respondents to divest to one or more third parties either Texaco's interest in Colonial or Shell's interest in Plantation.

D. Local Gasoline Distribution in Oahu, HI

Gasoline and diesel fuel are supplied to Hawaii either by two refineries on Oahu (owned by Chevron and BHP) or by tanker. Most of the gasoline consumed on Oahu is produced in the two Oahu refineries. Shell, Texaco, Tosco, and the two refinery owners buy gasoline from the refineries and sell gasoline and diesel fuel at wholesale on Oahu. Terminal capacity on Oahu is essential to wholesale operations on that island; it is not economically feasible to sell directly from a refinery or a tanker or from a terminal on another island. Also, consumers of gasoline on Oahu have no alternative but to buy gasoline there. Accordingly, the relevant market in which to analyze the transaction is the wholesale sale (including terminal operations) and the retail sale of gasoline on Oahu. The markets are highly concentrated. As measured by gasoline sales from the terminal, the Joint Venture will raise the HHI by 267 points to 2160.

The market is susceptible to collusion or coordination. The Joint Venture will reduce the six competitors to five; the product at wholesale is homogeneous; and product exchanges enable the oil companies to share cost information and facilitate detection and punishment of any deviations from prices that might be coordinated. New entry is unlikely to defeat an anticompetitive price increase. An entrant would require sufficient terminal capacity and enough retail outlets to be able to buy gasoline at the tanker-load level, or 225,000 barrels (about 9.5 million gallons). Terminal capacity of this scale is unavailable in Oahu, and less than 2 percent of existing retail gasoline stations are available to affiliate with a new entrant at the wholesale level.

Section IV of the Proposed Consent Order restores competition by requiring Proposed Respondents to divest either Shell's or Texaco's terminal and retail assets on Oahu to a third party. In the absence of such relief, consumers in Hawaii are likely to pay over $2 million more for gasoline and diesel fuel.

E. Local Gasoline Distribution in San Diego County

Six vertically integrated oil companies control approximately 90 percent of the gasoline sold at both wholesale and retail in San Diego County. These oil companies require their branded retailers to buy gasoline at San Diego terminals, where these companies set the wholesale price. On average, San Diego wholesale prices exceed those in Los Angeles by more than the cost of pipeline transportation from Los Angeles to San Diego. There is no bottleneck at the pipeline preventing additional gasoline from flowing into the market to reduce the price difference between San Diego County and Los Angeles, suggesting that prices in San Diego can be and have been affected by the firms in that market. The wholesale and retail markets in San Diego County will be highly concentrated as a result of the Joint Venture, which will raise the HHI by 250 points to 1815.

There are barriers to entry at the retail level because of slow population growth, limited availability of adequate retail sites, permitting requirements, and the need to obtain a ''critical mass'' of stations to compete in the market. Furthermore, the extensive degree of vertical control, combined with barriers at the retail level, raises entry barriers at the wholesale level. The Joint Venture likely will enhance the prospects of collusion and tacit coordination, which could raise

Section III of the Proposed Consent Order restores competition by requiring the Proposed Respondents to divest to a single entity gasoline stations representing enough volume to create a viable competitor at the wholesale level and reduce concentration levels to within the thresholds of the *Merger Guidelines.*

V. Opportunity for Public Comment

The Proposed Consent Order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty days, the Commission will again review the Proposed Consent Order and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the Proposed Consent Order or make final the agreement's consent order.

The Commission anticipates that the Proposed Consent Order will cure the competitive problems alleged in the complaint. The purpose of this analysis is to invite public comment on the Proposed Consent Order, including the proposed divestitures, to aid the Commission in its determination of whether to make final the Proposed Consent Order. This analysis is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the Proposed Consent Order, nor is it intended to modify the terms of the Proposed Consent Order in any way.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

Separate Statement of Commissioner Mary L. Azcuenaga; Concurring in Part and Dissenting in Part; in Shell/Texaco/Star, File No. 9710026

Today, the Commission accepts for comment a consent order resolving allegations that the proposed joint venture of Shell Oil Company with Texaco Inc. and Star Enterprises would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. I find reason to believe that the joint venture, if consummated, would affect competition adversely in the refining of asphalt in Northern California and, therefore, support Paragraph VII of the order, which provides relief in that market. I do not find reason to believe the other violations of law alleged in the complaint and, therefore, dissent from Paragraphs II, III, IV and V of the order, which require divestitures in other markets. Although the allegation relating to refineries in the northwestern United States is arguably valid, on balance, I cannot support it and, therefore, cannot support Paragraph II of the order. The complaint allegations that support Paragraphs III, IV and V of the order seem to me far removed from our usual analysis under the merger guidelines.

I understand that the parties have negotiated identical relief with various state attorneys general and that the divestitures in the proposed Commission order will be required in any event. My obligation, however, is to apply federal law as I see it.

[FR Doc. 97–33872 Filed 12–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

AGENCY: General Accounting Office.

ACTION: Notice of January meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. No. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board will hold a two day meeting on Thursday and Friday, January 22 and 23, 1998, from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. in Room 7C13 of the General Accounting Office building, 441 G St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the following issues: (1) Accounting for Loans and Loan Guarantees; (2) Accounting for Property and Plant Equipment; (3) Accounting for Social Insurance; and (4) the addition of new projects for 1998.

Any interested person may attend the meeting as an observer. Board discussions and reviews are open to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wendy Comes, Executive Director, 441 G St., N.W., Room 3B18, Washington, D.C. 20548, or call (202) 512–7350.

Authority: Federal Advisory Committee Act. Pub. L. No. 92–463, Section 10(a)(2), 86 Stat. 770, 774 (1972) (current version at 5 U.S.C. app. section 10(a)(2) (1988); 41 CFR 101–6.1015 (1990).

Dated: December 23, 1997.

Wendy M. Comes,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 97–33938 Filed 12–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1610–01–M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 3090–0040]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request Entitled Application for Shipping Instructions and Notice of Availability

AGENCY: Federal Supply Service, GSA.

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments regarding reinstatement to a previously approved OMB clearance (3090–0040).

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Office of Acquisition Policy has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve a reinstatement of a previously approved information collection requirement concerning Application for Shipping Instructions and Notice of Availability.

DATES: Comment Due Date: March 2, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, should be submitted to: Edward Springer, GSA Desk Officer, Room 3235, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, and to Marjorie Ashby, General Services Administration (MVP), 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marcia Crockett, Acquisition Operations & Electronic Commerce Center, Supply Management Division, (703) 305–7551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

The GSA is requesting the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to reinstate information collection, 3090–0400, concerning Application for Shipping Instructions and Notice of Availability. This information collection supports and justifies the markup of the six percent surcharge for the GSA export reimbursable program. It also is used to evaluate and obtain the best cube utilization of shipping vans and containers for export direct delivery shipments. The form contains data necessary to prepare Transportation Control and Movement Documents (TCMD) which are required when material enters the Defense Transportation System.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 500; *annual responses*: 4,000; *average hours per response*: .20; *burden hours*: 1,333.

COPY OF PROPOSAL: A copy of this proposal may be obtained from the GSA Acquisition Policy Division (MVP), Room 4011, GSA Building, 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405, or by telephoning (202) 501–3822, or by faxing your request to (202) 501–3341.

Dated: December 19, 1997.

Ida M. Ustad,

Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 97–33905 Filed 12–29–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–61–M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Federal Supply Service; Broker and Direct Move Management Services Provider Participation in the General Services Administration's Centralized Household Goods Traffic Management Program (CHAMP)

AGENCY: Federal Supply Service, GSA.

ACTION: Notice of proposed program changes for comment: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: This document extends the comment period of the document published at 62 FR 64225, December 4, 1997, to January 12, 1998. Earlier this year, GSA provided the household goods transportation industry an opportunity to comment on its draft 1997 Household Goods Tender of Service (HTOS). GSA has received and reviewed the industry's comments on the draft 1997 HTOS and is in the process of making appropriate revisions to the document before issuing it in final. The provisions contained in this notice apply to household goods transportation broker and direct move management services provider participants in CHAMP and were not included in the original draft HTOS. We are offering these provisions for industry review and comment at this time.

DATES: Please submit your comments by January 12, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to the Travel and Transportation Management