The Commission has re-evaluated it's receipts of this form which attributes to a significant decrease in the number of respondents from 20,000 to 49 and a decrease in the total annual burden from 34,320 hours to 8 hours. The filing activity of this form has been reduced to more of a maintenance-type function since most of the markets have been disbursed, thus causing a significant decrease in receipts.

The information collected will be used by the Commission to determine whether the applicant is qualified legally, technically and financially to be licensed as a cellular operator.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–15699 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

June 10, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Persons wishing to comment on this information collection should submit comments by August 15, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commissions, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214 or via internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060–0132.

Title: Supplemental Information—72–76 MHz Operational Fixed Stations.

Form Number: FCC Form 1068–A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 300.

Estimate Hour Per Response: .50 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 150 hours.

Needs and Uses: FCC Rules require that the applicant agrees to eliminate any harmful interference caused by the operation to TV reception on either channel 4 or 5 that might develop. This form is required by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; International Treaties and FCC Rules 47 CFR Part 90.257.

FCC staff will use the data to determine if the information submitted will meet the FCC rule requirements for the assignment of frequencies in the 72–76 MHz band.

OMB Approval No.: 3060–0021.

Title: Civil Air Patrol Radio Station License.

Form Number: FCC Form 480.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions.

Number of Respondents: 12.

Estimate Hour Per Response: .084 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Total Annual Burden: 1 hour.

Needs and Uses: FCC Rules require that applicants file the FCC Form 480 to apply for a new, renewed, or modified Civil Air Patrol Radio Station License. This form is required by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; International Treaties and FCC Rules 47 CFR Parts 1.922, 87.21, and 87.31.

The data will be used by Commission personnel to evaluate the application to issue licenses, to provide information for enforcement and rulemaking proceedings and to maintain a current inventory of licensees.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–15698 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 10:02 a.m. on Tuesday, June 10, 1997, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider certain corporate, supervisory, and administrative enforcement matters.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Director Joseph H. Neely (Appointive), seconded by Mr. John F. Downey, acting in the place and stead of Director Nicolas P. Retsinas (Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision), concurred in by Ms. Julie Williams, acting in the place and stead of Eugene A. Ludwig (Comptroller of the Currency), and Acting Chairman Andrew C. Hove, Jr., that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matters could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of subsections (c)(2), (c)(6), (c)(8), and (c)(9)(A)(ii) of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(2), (c)(6), (c)(8), and (c)(9)(A)(ii)).

The meeting was held in the Board Room of the FDIC Building located at 550—17th Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated: June 11, 1997.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

By:

Robert E. Feldman,

Deputy Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–15777 Filed 6–11–97; 4:27 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714–01–M

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

[FLRA Docket No. WA–RP–60071]

Notice of Opportunity To Submit Amici Curiae Briefs in Representation Proceeding Pending Before the Federal Labor Relations Authority

AGENCY: Federal Labor Relations Authority.

ACTION: Notice of the opportunity to file briefs as amici curiae in a proceeding before the Federal Labor Relations Authority in which the Authority is determining the representational status of employees who have been geographically relocated from an activity with one bargaining unit to an activity with two bargaining units, both of which are alleged to include the relocated employees.

SUMMARY: The Federal Labor Relations Authority provides an opportunity for all interested persons to file briefs as amici curiae on significant issues arising in a case pending before the Authority. The Authority is considering the case pursuant to its responsibilities under the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute, 5 U.S.C. 7101–7135 (1994) (the Statute) and its regulations, set forth at 5 CFR part 2422 (1997). The issues concern how the Authority should resolve a representation case arising from an agency reorganization where two different unions claim to represent a group of employees who have been geographically relocated from one activity to another and the positions they encumber after the relocation are specifically excluded from the unit represented by one union and included in the unit represented by the other.

DATES: Briefs submitted in response to this notice will be considered if received by mail or personal delivery in the Authority's Office of Case Control by 5 p.m. on Monday, July 7, 1997. Placing submissions in the mail by this deadline will not be sufficient. Extensions of time to submit briefs will not be granted.

ADDRESSES: Mail or deliver briefs to Edward F. Bachman, Acting Director, Case Control Office, Federal Labor Relations Authority, 607 14th Street, NW., Suite 415, Washington, D.C. 20424–0001.

FORMAT: All briefs shall be captioned: *Defense Logistics Agency, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, Case No. WA–RP–60071, Amicus Brief.* Briefs shall also contain separate, numbered headings for each issue discussed. An original and four (4) copies of each amicus brief must be submitted, with any enclosures, on 8½x11 inch paper. Briefs must include a signed and dated statement of service that complies with the Authority's regulations showing service of one copy of the brief on all counsel of record or other designated representatives. 5 CFR 2429.27 (a) and (c). Copies of the Authority's decision granting the application for review in this case and a list of the designated representatives for the case may be obtained in the Authority's Case Control Office at the address set forth below. Copies will be forwarded (by mail or by facsimile) to any person who so requests by contacting Edward F. Bachman at the same address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward F. Bachman, at the address listed above or by telephone: (202) 482–6540.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 6, 1997, the Authority granted an application for review of the Regional Director's Decision and Order in *Defense Logistics Agency, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio,* Case No. WA–RP–60071 (53 FLRA No. 3 (1997)) (*Columbus Supply Center*). A summary of that case follows.

1. Background

During the summer of 1996, 970 employees, including 212 employees in two job series (GS–1670 equipment specialist and GS–1910 quality assurance specialist) (hereinafter ''the two job series'') accepted jobs through the Department of Defense (DOD) Priority Placement Program (PPP) at the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio (Activity). These employees had previously been located at DLA, Defense Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio (Dayton Supply Center), where the positions they encumbered had been represented in a portion of a nationwide consolidated unit of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO (hereinafter the AFGE consolidated unit). Those positions are excluded from the AFGE consolidated unit at the Activity, where 198 employees in the two job series are represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers Local 7, AFL–CIO (IFPTE). The representational status of the remaining employees who were relocated from the Dayton Supply Center is not in dispute.

Separate from the relocation at issue in this case, the Activity changed the manner in which the employees in the two job series perform their work. Prior to 1994, employees in the two job series at the Activity did not work together with employees in other disciplines on interdisciplinary teams. In 1994, a reorganization resulted in the creation of interdisciplinary teams and, since that time, employees in the two job series have worked and been co-located with employees from other disciplines.

In October 1996, AFGE filed the petition in this case, seeking to clarify its consolidated unit at the Activity to include all employees in the two job series, including the 212 former Dayton Supply Center employees and the 198 employees currently represented by IFPTE. According to AFGE, the 1994 reorganization eliminated the separate community of interest previously shared by employees in that unit and resulted in an accretion of those employees into the AFGE consolidated unit. AFGE contends that since 1994 only one unit covering these employees has existed at the Activity and that, as a result, all employees placed in Activity positions after the subsequent disestablishment of the Dayton Supply Center are appropriately included in that unit.

2. The Regional Director's Decision

The Regional Director dismissed the petition. The Regional Director concluded that the IFPTE bargaining unit is an appropriate unit, consistent with section 7112(a) of the Statute. The Regional Director found that the former Dayton Supply Center employees in the two job series are properly included in the IFPTE unit because they are no different from new hires. Citing *U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Allen Park, Michigan,* 43 FLRA 264, 265 (1991), the Regional Director also concluded that, after the 1994 reorganization, the employees in the two job series did not accrete to the AFGE consolidated unit. Applying the factors for determining successorship set forth in *U.S. Department of the Navy, Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia,* 52 FLRA 950 (1997), the Regional Director further concluded that the Activity is not a successor employer to Dayton Supply Center and that, therefore, IFPTE retained its status as the exclusive representative of the former Dayton Supply Center employees in the two job series.

3. The Application for Review

AFGE filed the application for review, contending that review of the Regional Director's decision is warranted, under 5 CFR 2422.31(c), because it departs from Authority precedent. Specifically, AFGE contends that the Regional Director erred in determining that the IFPTE unit remained appropriate after the 1994 reorganization. AFGE also contends that the Regional Director's determination that the former Dayton Supply Center employees in the two job series are properly included in the IFPTE unit is contrary to Authority precedent concerning accretion and severance. Finally, AFGE asserts that the Regional Director's determination that the Activity is not a successor employer to Dayton Supply Center is based on a misapplication of the

principles concerning successorship set forth in Authority precedent.

4. Questions on Which Briefs Are Solicited

The Authority granted the application for review under 5 CFR 2422.31(c). The Authority found that there are genuine issues with respect to whether the Regional Director correctly applied principles relating to appropriateness of units, successorship and accretion in determining the representational status of employees in the two job series. In granting the application on these grounds, the Authority found that it appears that there is an absence of precedent that applies where a union seeks to continue to represent a group of employees who have been geographically relocated to an activity and the positions they encumber are specifically excluded from the unit at the activity represented by that union and included in the description of a unit represented by another union.

The Authority has directed the parties in the case to file briefs addressing the following questions, among others:

1. How, if at all, should successorship and accretion principles be applied to determine the representational status of employees who have been geographically relocated from a facility with one bargaining unit to a facility with two bargaining units, both of which are alleged to include the relocated employees?

a. Does the fact that the positions encumbered by the employees are specifically excluded from one of the bargaining units in the gaining facility and specifically included in the other bargaining unit affect the application of these principles? If so, how?

b. Does the fact that, before their reassignment, the employees were represented in the same consolidated unit that specifically excludes their positions at the gaining facility affect the application of these principles? If so, how? Do ''severance'' principles apply to this situation?

c. When, if at all, is an election appropriate in such circumstances? Is this determination affected by the relative size of the employee complements?

2. Do successorship principles apply where employees are relocated under a program such as the DOD Priority Placement Program?

3. Under what circumstances, if at all, should geographically relocated employees be considered comparable to newly hired employees?

4. Has a party waived its right to raise the effects of a reorganization on the appropriateness of a unit if it did not file a petition at the time of the reorganization?

As these matters are likely to be of concern to agencies, labor organizations, and other interested persons, the Authority finds it appropriate to provide for the filing of amicus briefs addressing these issues.

Dated: June 11, 1997.

Edward F. Bachman,

Acting Director, Case Control Office, Federal Labor Relations Authority.

[FR Doc. 97–15690 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6727–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act. Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than July 10, 1997.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (Randall C. Sumner, Vice President) 411 Locust Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2034:

1. First Eldorado Bancshares, Inc., Eldorado, Illinois; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Dana Bancorp, Inc., Dana, Indiana, and thereby indirectly acquire First National Bank of Dana, Dana, Indiana.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, June 10, 1997.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97–15627 Filed 6–13–97; 10:02 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act. Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than July 11, 1997.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas (Genie D. Short, Vice President) 2200 North Pearl Street, Dallas, Texas 75201-2272:

1. First Marshall Bancshares, Inc., Marshall, Texas, and First Marshall Delaware Bancshares, Inc., Dover, Delaware; to become bank holding companies by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of First Marshall Corporation, Marshall, Texas, and thereby indirectly acquire East Texas National Bank of Marshall, Marshall, Texas.