FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Southern Region, Atlanta Airports District Office, Mr. Daniel Gaetan, Program Manager, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2–260, College Park, GA 30337–2747, (404) 305–7146.

The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Columbus Metropolitan Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On December 20, 1996 the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Columbus Airport Commission was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than April 2, 1997.

This application is for authority to use excess PFC revenues collected under previous collection authority. The following is a brief overview of the application:

Total estimated excess PFC revenue: $199,000.

Total amount of use approval requested in this application: $199,000.

Application number: 96–02–C–00–CSG.

Brief description of proposed impose and use projects: 107 Security Access Control System, remove and replace carpet with ceramic tiles in public use areas of the terminal building, and remove and replace carpeting in public holdrooms of the terminal building.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested to be required to collect PFCs: Three.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Columbus Metropolitan Airport.

Issued in College Park, Georgia on December 20, 1996.

Dell Jernigan,

Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 97–1326 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Tampa International Airport, Tampa, Florida

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue form a PFC at Tampa International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 20, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Dr., Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822–5024.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Louis E. Miller, Executive Director of the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority at the following address: Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, Terminal Building, 3rd level, Blue Side, Tampa International Airport, Tampa, Florida 33622–2287.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. C. Ed Howard, Plans and Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Dr., Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822–5024, (407) 812–6331. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue form a PFC at Tampa International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On January 10, 1997, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Hillsborough County Aviation Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than April 15, 1997

The following is a brief overview of PFC Application No. 97–03–C–00–TPA.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: June 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: September 1, 2000.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $25,540,952.

Brief description of proposed project(s):

Project 1.1: Acquire land for runway approach and transition zone for Runway 27.

Project 1.2: Expand and improve Federal Inspection Facilities.

Project 1.3: Landside terminal building fire protection system.

Project 1.4: Reconstruct existing Runway 18R/36L.

Project 1.5: Master Plan and Part 150 noise study update.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: On-demand air taxi/commercial operators that (1) do not enplane or deplane passengers at the Authority's main passenger terminal buildings, or (2) enplane less than 500 passengers per year at Tampa International Airport.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority.

Issued in Orlando, Florida on January 10, 1997.

Charles E. Blair,

Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 97–1328 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)

Denial of Petition for a Defect Investigation

This notice sets forth the reason for the denial of a petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30162 requesting that the agency commence a

proceeding to determine the existence of a defect related to motor vehicle safety.

By letter dated August 20, 1996, Adrienne Mitchem, Legislative Counsel, Washington Office, and Donald L. Mays, Director of Testing, Recreation and Home Improvement Department, Consumers Union (CU), petitioned the Administrator of NHTSA to investigate the Evenflo Travel Tandem child safety seat. Their petition is based on testing conducted before August 1996 for CU by an independent testing facility that utilized the 20-pound test dummy included in the test procedure for Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 213, ''Child Restraint Systems,'' that took effect on September 1, 1996.

The Evenflo infant/child restraint snaps into a base that can be left in the car. The seat base is secured to the vehicle seat with the vehicle seat belt and does not need to be unstrapped each time the child seat is removed from the vehicle. The Evenflo Travel Tandem is designed to be used only in a rearward facing position by children less than 20 pounds in weight.

The Travel Tandem seat shell fractured around the buckle assembly and the buckle released in two of the three CU tests when used in the rearward facing position with the seat snapped into the base, where it is held by two spring-loaded latching pawls. This method of using the seat is preferred by many parents, as it is a much faster and more convenient method of placing the child seat into the vehicle compared to fastening and unfastening the vehicle seat belt. The seat can also be used without the provided base, by securing it directly to the vehicle with the seat belts. When secured in this manner, the seat successfully completed all the crash tests conducted for CU. The seat portion is equipped with a handle, so that the infant can be carried in the seat to and from the vehicle.

The Travel Tandem seats tested by CU were manufactured in December 1995 and January 1996. In the version of FMVSS No. 213 in effect at that time, Section S7.1 requires that a seat that is recommended by its manufacturer for use by children up to 20 pounds be tested in the rearward facing position in a 30 mph dynamic test using a ''6-month-old'' dummy that weighs 17 pounds. Among many performance requirements, S5.1.1(a) provides that the seat must ''[e]xhibit no complete separation of any load bearing structural element * * *.'' In addition, pursuant to S5.1.4, '' * * * the angle between the system's back support surface for the child and the vertical shall not exceed 70 degrees.''

During an FMVSS No. 213 test, the child restraint is secured with a conventional seat belt to a standard specified passenger seat, which is mounted on a dynamic test sled. The sled is subjected to an acceleration intended to simulate that experienced in a typical 30 mph frontal vehicle crash. This acceleration is commonly measured in units of g, each of which is equal to 32.174 feet per second squared (i.e., the acceleration of gravity). The shape of the curve depicting the g's over time during a dynamic test is referred to as the acceleration ''pulse'' of the sled.

Section 6 of FMVSS No. 213 specifies the velocity change and acceleration conditions for dynamic tests of child restraints. The velocity change shall be 30 mph with the acceleration pulse of the test sled entirely within the curve shown in figure 2 of FMVSS No. 213.

Depending on the type of sled and how the sled is calibrated, the magnitude of the peak acceleration and the duration of time the seat is subjected to the acceleration can vary. If a particular sled subjects the seat to higher peak g's or if the duration of time that g's are sustained is longer than that specified in FMVSS No. 213, then the sled test is considered to be a more ''severe'' test than that specified in FMVSS No. 213. This appears to be the case with the CU Travel Tandem test and may have affected the outcome.

Revised requirements of FMVSS No. 213 took effect on September 1, 1996. Under the revised version of S7.1, a seat that is recommended by its manufacturer for use by children in a range up to 10 kg (22 pounds) is tested with a ''newborn'' test dummy (7.5 pounds) and a 9-month-old test dummy (20 pounds).

These test conditions, however, were not required for the seats tested by CU in order to be certified by Evenflo as complying with the standard because the seats were manufactured prior to September 1, 1996.

The petitioners reported that when CU tested Travel Tandem seats in the rearward-facing position with a 20-pound dummy at a speed of slightly over 30 mph, with the seat mounted on the seat base, two of the three seats tested exhibited fractures. In the two cases, the shell of the seat body fractured around the buckle assembly and the buckle released. This could create a serious problem, because in an actual collision the child can be ejected from the vehicle. In fact, in one of the three tests the child dummy was sent hurtling through the air when the buckle was released during the testing.

In NHTSA's ongoing compliance testing program, four Evenflo Travel Tandem seats, one in each fiscal year from 1993 through 1996, were tested by the Calspan SRL Corporation, Buffalo, New York, using a 17-pound test dummy. All seats passed the requirements of FMVSS No. 213.

NHTSA has reviewed all reported cases of the safety seat body/frame cracking and inadvertent buckle release, and found no such cases involving the Evenflo Travel Tandem child seat.

In its petition, CU provided the agency with data indicating that the Evenflo Travel Tandem seat may fracture around the buckle assembly when the acceleration or dummy weight exceeds the specifications of FMVSS No. 213. However, the seat successfully passed the tests that were conducted in strict conformance with the test procedures of FMVSS No. 213 applicable to the seats tested by CU.

When a safety standard establishes minimum performance requirements for motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment through the use of specific values for particular parameters, as is the case here, NHTSA does not consider performance failures at higher levels to, in themselves, demonstrate that a safety-related defect exists. Moreover, NHTSA has consistently taken the position that the fact that a vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment would not comply with a newly-issued, more stringent safety standard, which was not in effect on the date the vehicle or equipment was manufactured, does not constitute evidence that the vehicle or its equipment is defective. Thus, given the fact that the the Evenflo Travel Tandem seat appears to satisfy the performance requirements of FMVSS No. 213 when tested with a 17-pound test dummy utilizing a conforming acceleration pulse, its performance with heavier dummies or at higher test speeds and accelerations does not indicate the existence of a safety defect.

On September 11, 1996, Evenflo Company, Inc. issued a press release stating that Evenflo products are designed and tested to meet or exceed FMVSS No. 213. Nevertheless, Evenflo will be offering a reinforcing plate to any consumers who are concerned about the performance of their seats based on the CU report.

In consideration of the available information, there is no reasonable possibility that an order concerning the notification and remedy of a safety-related defect based on the petitioner's allegations would be issued at the

conclusion of an investigation. Therefore, the petition has been denied.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30162(a); delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: January 7, 1997.

Michael B. Brownlee,

Associate Administrator for Safety Assurance.

[FR Doc. 97–706 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB–474X]

Old Augusta Railroad Company—Whole-Line Abandonment Exemption—in Perry County, MS

AGENCY: Surface Transportation Board.

ACTION: Notice of exemption.

SUMMARY: The Board, under 49 U.S.C. 10502, exempts from the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 10903–04, the abandonment by Old Augusta Railroad Company of its entire 2.5-mile rail line located between milepost 0.0 at Augusta and milepost 2.5 at New Augusta, in Perry County, MS, subject to labor protective conditions.

DATES: This exemption will be effective on February 20, 1997. Petitions to stay must be filed by February 5, 1997 and petitions to reopen must be filed by February 17, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send pleadings referring to STB Docket No. AB–474X to: (1) Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, Surface Transportation Board, 1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20423, and (2) Eugenia Langan, Shea & Gardner, 1800 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 927–5660. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 927–5721.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Additional information is contained in the Board's decision. To purchase a copy of the full decision, write to, call, or pick up in person from: DC News & Data, Inc., Room 2229, 1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20423. Telephone: (202) 289–4357/4359. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through TDD services (202) 927–5721.]

Decided: January 6, 1997.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Owen, and Commissioner Simmons. Commissioner Simmons did not participate.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary,

[FR Doc. 97–1383 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–00–P

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition; Determinations

Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985, 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978 (43 FR 13359, March 29, 1978), and Delegation Order No. 85–5 of June 27, 1985 (50 FR 27393, July 2, 1985), I hereby determine that the objects to be included in the exhibit, ''The Victorians: British Painting in the Reign of Queen Victoria, 1837–1901'' (See list [1]), imported from abroad for the temporary exhibition without profit within the United States, are of cultural significance. These objects are imported pursuant to a loan agreement with the foreign lenders. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the listed exhibit objects at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC from on or about February 16, 1997 to May 11, 1997, is in the national interest. Public Notice of this determination is ordered to be published in the Federal Register.

Dated: January 15, 1997.

Wally Stuart,

Acting General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 97–1436 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230–01–M

[1] A copy of this list may be obtained by contacting Jacqueline H. Caldwell, Esq., Assistant General Counsel, at 202–619–6982, and the address is Room 700, U.S. Information Agency, 301 4th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20547–0001.

U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy Meeting

AGENCY: United States Information Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: A meeting of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy will be held on January 22 in Room 600, 301 4th Street, S.W., Washington D.C. from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

The Commission will participate in a discussion with members of the Public Diplomacy Foundation to discuss the Foundation's role and information age foreign policy. Representing the Foundation will be its President Barry Zorthian, Leonard Baldyga, and Jack Harrod.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please call Betty Hayes, (202) 619–4468, if you are interested in attending the meeting. Space is limited and entrance to the building is controlled.

Dated: January 14, 1997.

Rose Royal,

Management Analyst, Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 97–1386 Filed 1–17–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230–01–M