

LYKES) (collectively, the Vessels). The Vessels are currently bareboat chartered from Sea Crews II to Lykes Lines Limited, LLC (Lykes Lines). Sea Crews II intends to form a trust to own the Vessels (Owner Trustee). FABC asserts that it, the FABC Subsidiaries, Sea Crews II, and the Owner Trustee are citizens of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended. Further, FABC reports that Lykes Lines is a U.S. citizen for purposes of obtaining a registry endorsement.

More particularly, the approvals, findings, and determinations requested include those that may be deemed necessary under statute, regulation, or contract in order:

1. For the FABC Subsidiaries to assume the existing bareboat charters of the Vessels from Sea Crews II to Lykes Lines for the term of the MSP Operating Agreements;

2. For Lykes Bros., acting through Sea Crews II, its successor in interest, to transfer the MSP Operating Agreements to FABC, which in turn would assign them to the FABC Subsidiaries;

3. For the FABC Subsidiaries to time charter the Vessels to Lykes Lines for the term of the MSP Operating Agreements.

FABC, by letter dated April 9, 1998, filed an application with MARAD for participation in the MSP with the MSP Operating Agreements. FABC asserts that its application for participation in the MSP provides MARAD the information regarding FABC, the FABC Subsidiaries, and the Vessels required for MARAD to act on the application to transfer the MSP Operating Agreements to FABC, and in turn, to the FABC Subsidiaries.

FABC requests that MARAD:

1. Allow the requested transfers to become effective in accordance with the applications, and pursuant to law; and

2. Take any and all actions that MARAD may deem necessary or appropriate in order to confirm and effectuate FABC's participation (through the FABC Subsidiaries) in the MSP as transferee of the MSP Operating Agreements.

This notice invites comments on maritime policy issues that may be raised by the Lykes Bros./Sea Crews II/FABC proposal relating to the transfer of the MSP Operating Agreements to FABC, and in turn to the FABC Subsidiaries. This application may be inspected in the Office of the Secretary, Maritime Administration. Any person, firm, or corporation having an interest in this proposal and desiring to submit comments concerning the application must file written comments, in

triplicate, with the Secretary, Maritime Administration, Room 7210, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Comments must be received no later than the close of business on April 27, 1998. This notice is published as a matter of discretion, and the fact of its publication should in no way be considered a favorable, or unfavorable, decision on the application, as filed, or as may be amended. MARAD will consider any comments timely submitted and take such action with respect thereto as may be deemed appropriate.

Dated: April 10, 1998.

By Order of the Maritime Administration.

**Edmund T. Sommer, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary, Maritime Administration.*

[FR Doc. 98-10024 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[U.S. DOT Docket Number NHTSA-98-3724]

#### Reports, Forms, and Record Keeping Requirements

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

**ACTION:** Request for public comment on proposed collection 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 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 reinstatement of previously approved collections.

This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before June 15, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments must refer to the docket notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., 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 2 copies of the comment be provided. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Complete copies of each request for collection of information may be obtained at no charge from Mr. Michael Robinson, NHTSA Information Collection Clearance Officer, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 6123, NAD-40, Washington, D.C. 20590. Mr. Robinson's telephone number is (202) 366-9456. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control 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 first 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 regulation (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;

(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 for public comments on the following proposed collections of information:

(1) *Title:* 23 CFR Parts 1200, 1204 and 1205 Uniform Safety Program Cost Summary Form (HS 217) for Highway Safety Plan.

*OMB Control Number:* 2127-0003.

*Affected Public:* State, Local or Tribal Government.

*Abstract:* The Highway Safety Act of 1966 (23 U.S.C. 401 *et seq.*) established a formula grant program to improve highway safety in the States. As a condition of the grant, the Act provides that the States must meet certain requirements contained in 23 U.S.C.

402. Section 402(a) requires each State to have a highway safety program, approved by the Secretary of Transportation, which is designed to reduce traffic crashes and the deaths, injuries, and property damage resulting from those crashes. Section 402(b) sets forth the minimum requirements with which each State's highway safety program must comply. A 1987 amendment to the Highway Safety Act required the Secretary to determine, through a rulemaking process, those programs "most effective" in reducing crashes, injuries, and deaths, taking into account "consideration of the States having a major role in establishing [such] programs." The Secretary was authorized to revise the rule from time to time. In accordance with this provision, the agencies have identified, over time, nine such programs, the "National Priority Program areas: (1) Alcohol and other Drug Countermeasures, (2) Police Traffic Services, (3) Occupant Protection, (4) Traffic Records, (5) Emergency Medical Services, (6) Motor Safety, (7) Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety, and (8) Speed Control & (9) Roadway Safety.

Under this program, States submit the Highway Safety Program and other documentation explaining how they intend to use the grant funds. In order to account for funds expended under these priority areas and other program areas, States are required to submit a Program Cost Summary. The Program Cost Summary is completed to reflect the State's proposed allocations of funds (including carry-forward funds) by program area, based on the projects and activities identified in the Highway Safety Plan. During the past several years, numerous steps have been taken to reduce the burden of paperwork on the States. The annual burden will remain low due to the minimum amount of documentation required to be provided has been substantially reduced. We have simplified this process even more by automating the Program Cost Summary.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 570.

*Number of Respondents:* 57.

Issued on: April 7, 1998.

**Adele Derby,**

*Associate Administrator for State and Community Services.*

[FR Doc. 98-9931 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-98-3715]

#### Receipt of Petition for Decision that Nonconforming 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruiser Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruiser multi-purpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruiser MPVs that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

**DATES:** The closing date for comments on the petition is May 15, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. (Docket hours are from 10 am to 5 pm.).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5306).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania ("Champagne") (Registered Importer 90-009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruiser MPVs are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which Champagne believes are substantially similar are 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruiser MPVs that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer, Toyota Motor Corporation, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruisers to their U.S. certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruisers, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 1981-1988 Toyota Landcruisers are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence*, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 203 *Impact Protection for the Driver From the Steering Control System*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention*