

Time and Date: 3:00 p.m., December 9, 1998.

Place: OPM Conference Center, Room 1350, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC. The conference center is located on the first floor.

Status: This meeting will be open to the public. Seating will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Individuals with special access needs wishing to attend should contact OPM at the number shown below to obtain appropriate accommodations.

Matters to be Considered: This National Partnership Council meeting will proceed with its regular order of business in line with its 1998 Strategic Plan and Calendar.

Contact Person for More Information: Andrew M. Wasilisin, Acting Director, Center for Partnership and Labor-Management Relations, Office of Personnel Management, Theodore Roosevelt Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Room 7H28, Washington, DC 20415-2000, (202) 606-2930.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

[FR Doc. 98-32651 Filed 12-4-98; 12:59 pm]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice #2940]

Shipping Coordinating Committee; Subcommittee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping; Notice of Meeting

The Shipping Coordinating Committee (SHC) will conduct an open meeting at 09:30 AM on Tuesday, December 15, 1998, in Room 2415 of the United States Coast Guard Headquarters Building, 2100 2nd Street SW, Washington DC 20593-0001. The primary purpose of the meeting is to prepare for the thirtieth session of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) to be held at IMO from January 25 to 29, 1999.

The primary matters to be considered include:

1. Review of IMO guidance on principles of safe manning (i.e., crew size);
2. Work emanating from the 1995 Conference of Parties to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW), including

consideration of training requirements for maritime pilots;

3. Medical standards for seafarers, particularly physical abilities for entry level seafarers;

4. Validation of an IMO model course on Electronic Chart Display and Information Systems (ECDIS); and

5. Guidance associated with the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel (STCW-F Convention, as adopted by the 1995 conference; not yet ratified or in force).

Members of the public may attend the meeting up to the seating capacity of the room. Interested persons may seek information by writing: Mr. Christopher Young, U. S. Coast Guard (G-MSO-1), Room 1210, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001 or by calling: (202) 267-0229.

Dated: November 25, 1998.

Stephen M. Miller,

Secretary, Shipping Coordinating Committee.

[FR Doc. 98-32616 Filed 12-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Aviation Proceedings, Agreements Filed During the Week Ending November 27, 1998

The following Agreements were filed with the Department of Transportation under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. Sections 412 and 414. Answers may be filed within 21 days of date of filing.

Docket Number: OST-98-4810.

Date Filed: November 24, 1998.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject:

PAC/Reso/403 dated October 28, 1998

Finally Adopted Resos r1-21

PAC/Meet/156 dated October 28, 1998—Minutes

Intended effective date: February 1, 1999

Docket Number: OST-98-4811.

Date Filed: November 24, 1998.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject:

COMP Telex Mail Vote 975

Commission Paid In Malawi—Reso 016a

Intended effective date: December 1, 1998

Docket Number: OST-98-4812.

Date Filed: November 24, 1998.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject:

PAC/Reso/404 dated October 28, 1998

Mail Vote A100 (Reso 808-Sales

Agency Rules in Latin

America/Caribbean, except Brazil)

Intended effective date: January 1, 1999

Dorothy W. Walker,

Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 98-32508 Filed 12-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Notice of Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits Filed Under Subpart Q During the Week Ending November 27, 1998

The following Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits were filed under Subpart Q of the Department of Transportation's Procedural Regulations (See 14 CFR 302.1701 et. seq.). The due date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motions to Modify Scope are set forth below for each application. Following the Answer period DOT may process the application by expedited procedures. Such procedures may consist of the adoption of a show-cause order, a tentative order, or in appropriate cases a final order without further proceedings.

Docket Number: OST-98-4808.

Date Filed: November 23, 1998.

Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motions to Modify Scope: December 21, 1998.

Description: Application of Tower Air, Inc. pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 41108 and Subpart Q applies for the issuance of a new Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity or Amendment of its existing Certificate for Route 401, to engage in foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail between New York, New York and Rome, Italy. Tower Air plans to utilize the authority herein requested to operate two 747 aircraft presently in its fleet, commencing May 1, 1999. Tower therefore requests that it be allocated two U.S.-Italy frequencies per week.

Docket Number: OST-98-4809.

Date Filed: November 23, 1998.

Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motions to Modify Scope: November 25, 1998.

Description: Application of US Airways, Inc. pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Sections 41102 and 41108, Part 201, and Subpart Q, applies for a Certificate of

Public Convenience and Necessity and allocation of seven weekly frequencies to engage in scheduled foreign air transportation of persons, property and mail between Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Milan, Italy, beginning April 1, 1999.

Dorothy W. Walker,

Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 98-32509 Filed 12-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-98-4208; Notice 2]

MHT Luxury Alloys, Denial of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

MHT Luxury Alloys (MHT) of Torrance, California has determined that some of the rims it manufactured and marketed fail to comply with 49 CFR 571.120, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, "Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars," and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." MHT has also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—"Motor Vehicle Safety" on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published, with a 30-day comment period, on August 5, 1998, in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 41890). NHTSA received four comments on this application during the 30-day comment period. All four commenters recommended the denial of the application.

Paragraph S5.2 of FMVSS No. 120 states that each rim, or at the option of the manufacturer in the case of a single-piece wheel, the wheel disc shall be marked with the information listed in paragraphs (a) through (e), in lettering not less than 3 millimeters high, impressed to a depth or, at the option of the manufacturer, embossed to a height of not less than 0.125 millimeter. These five paragraphs labeled (a) through (e) require the following labeling:

(a) A designation which indicates the source of the rim's published nominal dimensions;

(b) The rim size designation;

(c) The symbol DOT, constituting a certification by the manufacturer of the rim that the rim complies with all

applicable motor vehicle safety standards;

(d) A designation that identifies the manufacturer of the rim by name, trademark, or symbol; and

(e) The month, day, and year or the month and year of manufacture.

From January 1, 1996 through November 13, 1997, MHT produced and sold approximately 13,000 rims which are not labeled with four of the five items required by the standard. However, MHT did permanently place on the center of the rim on the weather side a mark of "MHT," "NICHE," "NEEPER," or other registered trade name of MHT Luxury Alloys, which it believes is a sufficient designation of the rim's manufacturer.

MHT supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following statements:

1. Although the symbol "DOT" [and other labeling requirements] did not appear on the described rims, each rim did comply with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards.

2. MHT has received no complaints from consumers that (i) the rims did not comply with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards, or (ii) the rims did not contain the required labeling.

3. The subject rims were initially designed and manufactured for application on passenger vehicles. MHT's management was not aware of the labeling requirements and believed that because the rims were originally designed and manufactured for passenger vehicles, they were exempt from the labeling requirements.

4. The names "MHT," "NICHE," "NEEPER," and other registered trade names of MHT are extremely well known in the industry and to the consumers of motor vehicle rims. MHT believes that a consumer could inquire at any store, distributor, warehouse, or manufacturer within the United States as (i) to the identity and general location of MHT, (ii) be advised that MHT is the manufacturer of rims that bear its name and its trademarks, and (iii) that MHT is located in Los Angeles County, California. MHT has consistently responded promptly and fully to any consumer inquires regarding its products.

5. Upon receipt of a National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) letter, dated October 6, 1997, MHT promptly ordered a marking machine to imprint each new and "in warehouse" rim with the required information. Since November 13, 1997, all rims distributed by MHT have been marked in compliance with S5.2.

NHTSA received comments from four individuals. One of the comments was

received by NHTSA's Office of Safety Assurance, during the comment period, and was deemed relevant to the inconsequentiality decision and was placed in the docket.

The first commenter, Jesse Hsiao, urged the agency not to grant the application, because the commenter believes: (1) Without labeling, a consumer cannot determine whether the rims are to be used on a passenger car or a truck; (2) the MHT rims are specifically designed for a truck, not a passenger car; and (3) a cap marked with MHT is not sufficient, because the cap can easily pop off the wheel, or the cap may not even be placed on the wheel at the time of delivery to the customer.

The second commenter, a tire dealer located in Southern California, stated serious concerns about the future liability problems with MHT wheels and urged the agency to require MHT to recall the non-complying truck wheels. This commenter made the following statements: (1) MHT should be forced to provide evidence that its truck wheels comply with all safety standards. Truck and Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) wheels require a much higher maximum load capacity than passenger vehicle wheels; (2) MHT's statement that it did not believe it had to mark the wheels, because the rims were originally designed for passenger cars, is dishonest and does not make sense; (3) MHT's statement that subject truck rims were initially designed for passenger vehicles is incorrect. Wheels for passenger vehicles have different offsets, different center bore, different center pad, different bolt patterns, and different load capacities, than the wheels designed for trucks and SUVs; (4) MHT's statement that their management was not aware of the labeling requirements is not true. MHT wheels are manufactured in Progressive Custom Wheels' foundry, where all wheels, except MHT's, are stamped with the appropriate labeling; (5) Many MHT truck wheels are sold without the MHT, Niche, or Neeper trade marks. MHT sells some wheels directly to new car dealers. In many cases, these wheel caps bear the car manufacturer's name (i.e. Ford, Toyota, etc.). Without the marking on the wheel, the consumers will be confused about the origin of their wheels. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, to trace the wheels to MHT; and (6) As of September 1998, MHT continued to distribute unmarked wheels.

The third commenter, Richard E. Rice, provided general comments regarding MHT's application. The commenter made the following statements: (1) Since